

# Yearbook of the United Nations

## 1981





YEARBOOK OF THE  
UNITED NATIONS  
1981

Volume 35

# YEARBOOK OF THE UNITED NATIONS 1981

Volume 35



Department of Public Information  
United Nations, New York

COPYRIGHT © 1985 UNITED NATIONS

ISSN: 0082-8521

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATION
----------------------------

SALES NO. E.84.I.1
--------------------

07500



## Foreword

**N**O ONE who looks closely at the pattern of relations among nations can rationally question the necessity of international organization. Much of what each country needs can be obtained only in co-operation with others. What each country does within its borders may affect the lives not only of its neighbours but also of peoples on the other side of the globe. This reality, which expanding technology brings ever closer to home, obliges nations to turn to one another to discuss their problems.

There are countless institutions where people with common concerns exchange ideas, draw up plans, reach agreements. Many are successful because they benefit the special interests of limited groups of more-or-less like-minded nations or organizations brought together by regional, economic or social ties. To the extent that these institutions act without harming others, they may help not only their own members but also those outsiders whose activities they touch.

But there is an ever-growing part of human life where there can be no outsiders. The nuclear peril endangers all humanity. Economic links may be most extensive between countries of similar systems, but the earth's resources are distributed so unequally that no single grouping can be self-sufficient. There may be different ideas about the content of human rights, but some standards are applicable to all human beings. It may be more comfortable to associate with those having the same political values, but the realities of coexistence oblige us to understand and to co-operate with all nations, not only our immediate friends.

It is this requirement for universality which the United Nations was established to serve. Yet the very diversity of its membership gives it the most difficult role of all. The United Nations must strive to limit and reverse the arms race; it must seek to resolve political conflicts which neighbours cannot settle; it should deal with economic imbalances that extend beyond single regions; it must endeavour to establish universal standards of law and justice in a world where many individuals cannot be sure of justice even at the local level.

However intractable the problems, the efforts to resolve them will continue as long as humanity has hope. The United Nations remains an expression of that hope. This latest volume of the Yearbook of the United Nations offers a continuing record of those efforts.



Javier PÉREZ DE CUÉLLAR  
Secretary-General

# Contents

FOREWORD, by SECRETARY-GENERAL JAVIER PÉREZ DE CUÉLLAR	v
USING THIS EDITION OF THE YEARBOOK	xii
ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE YEARBOOK	xiv
EXPLANATORY NOTE ON DOCUMENTS	xvi

## Part One: United Nations

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE WORK OF THE ORGANIZATION	3
-----------------------------------------------------------------	---

### POLITICAL AND SECURITY QUESTIONS

I. DISARMAMENT	19
General aspects of disarmament, 21; Nuclear weapons, 34; Non-nuclear weapons, 69; Other aspects of disarmament and related matters, 89.	
II. PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE	113
Scientific and technical aspects, 114; Legal aspects, 118; Preparations for UNISPACE-82, 124; Register of launchings of space objects, 126.	
III. LAW OF THE SEA	126
Conference on the Law of the Sea, 127.	
IV. INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY	140
Implementation of the 1970 Declaration on international security, 140; Declaration against intervention, 145; Implementation of the 1978 Declaration on societies and peace, 149; Good-neighbourliness between States, 150; Review of UN peace-keeping operations, 152; International Day and Year of Peace, 155.	
V. AFRICA	156
South Africa and apartheid, 156; Other questions involving South Africa, 214; Chad situation, 222; Status of the Comorian island of Mayotte, 223; Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Sudan, 225; Status of Malagasy islands in the Indian Ocean, 225; Armed attack against Seychelles, 226; Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity, 228.	
VI. ASIA	231
Western Asia, 232; South-East Asia, 239; Korean question, 253.	
VII. LATIN AMERICA	253
VIII. MIDDLE EAST	255
General aspects, 257; Situation between individual Arab States and Israel, 275; Financing of UN peace-keeping forces in the Middle East, 294; Situation in the territories occupied by Israel, 300; Palestine refugees, 325.	
IX. CYPRUS QUESTION	340
General aspects, 340; UN Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, 344; Other aspects, 345.	

X.	ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONS	347
	Appointment of the Secretary-General, 347; Admission of Members to the United Nations, 348; Organizational questions concerning the General Assembly, 350; Organizational questions concerning the Security Council, 353; Relations between the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations, 353; Other organizational questions, 357.	
XI.	OTHER POLITICAL QUESTIONS	357
	Questions concerning the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 358; Radiation effects, 361; Information, 362.	
<b>ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS</b>		
I.	DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL POLICY	377
	Economic co-operation, 378; Economic and social conditions and trends, 384; Development planning and information, 395; Public administration, 398; Rural development, 399; Special measures for the least developed and other developing countries, 401.	
II.	DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	418
	General aspects of operational activities for development, 419; Technical co-operation, 431; UN Capital Development Fund, 468.	
III.	DISASTERS, EMERGENCY RELIEF AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE	471
	Disasters and emergency relief, 472; Economic assistance, 495.	
IV.	INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND FINANCE	530
	International trade, 532; Finance, 557; Insurance, 564.	
V.	TRANSPORT, COMMUNICATIONS AND TOURISM	565
	Transport, 566; Communications, 571; Tourism, 573.	
VI.	INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT	575
	Programme and finances of UNIDO, 576; Industrial development activities, 585; Development of specific industries, 595.	
VII.	TRANSNATIONAL CORPORATIONS	599
VIII.	REGIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ACTIVITIES	606
	Regional co-operation and strengthening of regional commissions, 607; Africa, 609; Asia and the Pacific, 635; Europe, 648; Latin America, 660; Western Asia, 669.	
IX.	NATURAL RESOURCES	673
	General aspects of natural resources, 674; Mineral resources, 678; Water, 681; Cartography, 687.	
X.	ENERGY	688
	Non-nuclear energy, 689; Nuclear energy, 711.	
XI.	FOOD	716
	Food problems, 717; Food aid, 725.	
XII.	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	733
	Vienna Programme of Action, 734; Financing of science and technology, 736; Activities of the UN system, 743; UN machinery, 750; Technology transfer, 753; Brain drain, 757; Information science, 759; Marine science and technology, 760.	



XIII.	SOCIAL AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT	761
	Social development and welfare, 761; Cultural development, 775.	
XIV.	POPULATION	778
	Population policy and trends, 778; UN Fund for Population Activities, 781; Other UN population activities, 785.	
XV.	HEALTH AND HUMAN RESOURCES	794
	Health, 795; Human resources development, 804.	
XVI.	ENVIRONMENT	813
	Programme and finances of UNEP, 814; Environmental activities, 822.	
XVII.	HUMAN SETTLEMENTS	843
	Programme and finances of UNCHS, 844; Human settlements activities, 848.	
XVIII.	HUMAN RIGHTS	859
	Action against discrimination, 864; Civil and political rights, 889; Economic, social and cultural rights, 915; Advancement of human rights, 926; Human rights violations, 943; Other human rights questions, 968.	
XIX.	WOMEN	979
XX.	CHILDREN, YOUTH AND AGING PERSONS	998
	Children, 999; Youth, 1014; Aging persons, 1022.	
XXI.	REFUGEES	1027
	UN High Commissioner for Refugees, 1028; Assistance to refugees in Africa, 1039; International co-operation to avert new flows of refugees, 1050; International protection of refugees, 1054.	
XXII.	DRUGS OF ABUSE	1056
XXIII.	STATISTICS	1068
XXIV.	ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONS	1074
	Co-ordination in the UN system, 1075; Economic and Social Council, 1076; Restructuring the economic and social sectors of the UN system, 1092.	

## TRUSTEESHIP AND DECOLONIZATION

I.	GENERAL QUESTIONS RELATING TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES	1095
	Implementation of the Declaration on independence for colonial countries, 1095; Other general questions concerning NSGTs, 1114.	
II.	INTERNATIONAL TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM	1118
	General aspects, 1119; Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1120.	
III.	NAMIBIA	1126
	Namibia question, 1128; Economic and social conditions, 1168; International assistance, 1171.	
IV.	OTHER COLONIAL TERRITORIES	1179

## LEGAL QUESTIONS

I.	INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE	1201
II.	LEGAL ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL RELATIONS	1204

III.	STATES AND INTERNATIONAL LAW	1223
	Diplomatic relations, 1223; State succession in respect of property, archives and debts, 1227; State immunities, liability and responsibility, 1230.	
IV.	INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW	1234
	Strengthening the role of the United Nations, 1234; Host country relations, 1241; Conventions on privileges and immunities, 1243.	
V.	TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS	1245
VI.	INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC LAW	1251
	International trade law, 1253; Legal aspects of the new international economic order, 1260.	
VII.	OTHER LEGAL QUESTIONS	1263
	International Law Commission, 1264; UN Programme for the teaching and study of international law, 1267; Other matters, 1269.	

## ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS

I.	UNITED NATIONS FINANCES	1271
	UN regular budget, 1272; Assessment of contributions, 1287; UN financial situation, 1295; Accounts and auditing, 1301.	
II.	UNITED NATIONS PROGRAMMES	1303
	Programme planning, 1304; Joint Inspection Unit, 1312; Administrative and budgetary co-ordination in the UN system, 1314.	
III.	UNITED NATIONS OFFICIALS	1315
	Composition of the Secretariat, 1316; Personnel questions, 1322; Salaries, allowances and pensions, 1337; Other staff questions, 1353.	
IV.	OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGEMENT QUESTIONS	1362
	Conferences and meetings, 1363; Documentation, 1370; Administration and management, 1376; UN premises, 1380; Security measures, 1383; Computers and information systems, 1385; UN postage stamps, 1387.	

## Part Two: Intergovernmental organizations related to the United Nations

I.	INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (IAEA)	1391
II.	INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION (ILO)	1396
III.	FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)	1406
IV.	UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO)	1411
V.	WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO)	1418

VI.	INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT (WORLD BANK)	1427
VII.	INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION (IFC)	1435
VIII.	INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION (IDA)	1439
IX.	INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND (IMF)	1446
X.	INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION (ICAO)	1452
XI.	UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION (UPU)	1457
XII.	INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION (ITU)	1460
XIII.	WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION (WMO)	1464
XIV.	INTER-GOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION (IMCO)	1469
XV.	WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)	1472
XVI.	INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (IFAD)	1478
XVII.	INTERIM COMMISSION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION (ICITO) AND GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE (GATT)	1482

## Appendices

I.	ROSTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS	1489
II.	CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE Charter of the United Nations, 1491; Statute of the International Court of Justice, 1500.	1491
III.	STRUCTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS General Assembly, 1506; Security Council, 1527; Economic and Social Council, 1528; Trusteeship Council, 1540; International Court of Justice, 1541; Principal members of the Secretariat, 1542.	1506
IV.	AGENDA OF UNITED NATIONS PRINCIPAL ORGANS IN 1981 General Assembly, 1544; Security Council, 1550; Economic and Social Council, 1550; Trusteeship Council, 1551.	1544
V.	UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION CENTRES AND OFFICES	1553

## Indexes

USING THE SUBJECT INDEX	1558
SUBJECT INDEX	1559
INDEX OF NAMES	1594
INDEX OF RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS	1604
HOW TO OBTAIN PREVIOUS VOLUMES OF THE YEARBOOK	1607



## Using this edition of the Yearbook

The Yearbook of the United Nations covers the main activities of the United Nations during a calendar year (Part One) and those of each related organization in the United Nations system (Part Two).

The 1981 edition, subject-oriented like previous editions, has been redesigned to help the user find information more readily. Part One (United Nations), containing 50 chapters, is divided into five major sections: political and security questions, economic and social questions, trusteeship and decolonization, legal questions, and administrative and budgetary questions.

Each chapter is divided into a hierarchy of topics, with each level having a heading of distinctive appearance, as shown in the following example from the chapter on international trade and finance:

---

### International trade

---

#### Commodities

##### Individual commodities

##### Fibres

##### Hard fibres. (within-paragraph heading)

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. A within-paragraph heading such as this identifies a body or other entity dealing with a topic.

Related topics are adjacent to one another. For example, "Hard fibres" is preceded by "Cotton" and followed by "Jute"; "Individual commodities" is preceded by "Common Fund for Commodities". The assignment of headings implies no editorial judgement about the relative importance of a topic.

##### Structure and scope of articles

Presented under each topical heading is a summary of pertinent United Nations activities, including those of intergovernmental and expert bodies, major reports, Secretariat activities, and the views of States in written communications and debate. At the end of each article are a list of documents, linked by numerical indicators to references in the text, and the text of relevant resolutions and/or decisions by the principal United Nations organs. The Yearbook covers the following:

Activities of United Nations bodies. All resolutions, decisions and other major activities of the principal organs and subsidiary bodies, including sub-commissions and sub-committees, are summarized in the respective articles. The texts of all resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council, with information on

their adoption, are reproduced under the relevant topic. Where an article refers to a text reproduced elsewhere in the book, the documentary notes give the resolution or decision number and page reference for the text.

Major reports. Most 1981 reports of the Secretary-General on which a United Nations body took action during the year, along with selected reports from other United Nations sources such as seminars and working groups, are summarised briefly under the relevant topic(s). The document symbols of all reports cited in an article appear in the documentary notes.

Secretariat activities. The operational activities of the United Nations for development and humanitarian assistance are described under the relevant topics. For all major activities financed outside the United Nations regular budget, information is given on contributions by individual countries and on expenditures. Financial data are obtained from the audited accounts prepared for each fund, and cover the 1981 calendar year unless otherwise specified.

Views of States. Each written communication sent to the United Nations by a Member State and circulated separately as a document of a principal organ has been summarized under the topic where it is most relevant.

All substantive statements by States in the principal organs have been analysed by Yearbook editors, and their main points can be found under the pertinent topics. For example, the views of States on an arms embargo against South Africa, expressed in the General Assembly's debate on apartheid, are summarised under the topic "Arms embargo". Covered in this volume are debates in the Security Council, plenary and Main Committee meetings of the General Assembly (except for the general debate in plenary meetings and the discussion of the United Nations programme budget for 1982-1983), and plenary meetings of the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council, as reported in the official verbatim or summary records. Debate summaries concentrate on the main trends of a discussion; users wishing details on the position of individual States should refer to the official meeting records, identified by symbol in the documentary notes.

Related intergovernmental organizations. Part Two of the Yearbook describes the 1981 activities of each specialized agency and the International Atomic Energy Agency, based on information prepared by them for the Yearbook. Included are data on budgets, contributions by member States and principal officials.

##### Documentary notes

Documents on each topic are cited by symbol at the end of the article. A numerical indicator links information in the article with the documentary reference. The list of documents is arranged in three groups: (1) reports, resolutions and decisions, proposals that were not adopted and other documents which are sources

for information in the article; (2) references to previous editions of the Yearbook; and (3) meeting records, and documents not mentioned in the article, such as publications and statements of administrative and financial implications. The items in the last group do not have numerical indicators.

Meeting records are cited by symbol together with the range(s) of dates between which the meetings occurred. Italicized numbers refer to meetings at which a topic was specifically discussed (usually when a proposal relating to it was being examined); other numbers indicate all other meetings at which a broader discussion took place on an agenda item or range of items encompassing the topic.

#### Texts

The Yearbook reproduces the texts of all resolutions and decisions adopted in 1981 by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. These texts, at the end of the pertinent articles, are preceded by: the resolution/decision number, vote totals (in favour-against-abstaining), meeting number and date of adoption; information on their approval by a sessional or subsidiary body prior to final adoption, with document symbols of drafts, approved amendments and committee reports; the title (if any) of the resolution or decision; and a list of sponsors. Details of any recorded or roll-call vote on the resolution/decision as a whole follow the text.

#### Terminology

The terminology used in subject headings and the subject index largely corresponds to the subject descriptors used by the United Nations Bibliographical Information System (UNBIS) and published in the UNBIS Thesaurus (United Nations Publication: Sales No. E.81.I.17). As these terms are also used in the indexes to United Nations documents published by the Dag Hammarskjöld Library, including the periodical United Nations Documents Index (UNDOC) and the indexes to the documents and proceedings of the principal organs, the Yearbook may be used in conjunction with those indexes as a reference guide to the entire body of United Nations documentation.

Formal titles of bodies, organisational units, conventions, declarations and officials are given in full on first mention in an article or sequence of articles. They are also used in resolution texts, and in the subject index under the key word of the title.

Short titles may be used in subsequent references. They employ key words, usually not capitalized, from the formal title, such as "Committee on colonial countries" for "Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples". Capital letters are used when the only

difference between full and short title is the omission of a term such as "Ad Hoc", "International", "Special" or "United Nations" ("Committee against Apartheid", for "Special Committee against Apartheid"). These short titles have no official standing.

#### How to find information in the Yearbook

The 1981 edition has been designed to enable the user to locate information on United Nations activities in a number of ways.

By subject: Broad subjects may be located in the table of contents. Each chapter opens with an introduction highlighting the main developments and giving page numbers where details or resolution texts may be found. Where a topic is sub-divided, shorter introductions may precede a series of articles. Cross-references in the articles give page numbers for related information. The subject index may be used to locate individual topics and specific references to the bodies dealing with each.

By body: Although the Yearbook is oriented by subject rather than by body, surveys of the work of many bodies appear under the topic of their main concern. For example, the introduction to the environment chapter lists the topics considered by the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, with page cross-references. For the principal organs, APPENDIX IV gives the 1981 agenda for each session, with references to the relevant Yearbook pages. The members, officers, and date and place of sessions of each body are given in APPENDIX III. The subject index lists bodies by the key word(s) of their formal title: "Apartheid, Special Committee against".

By resolution and decision number: A numerical list of all resolutions and decisions adopted in 1981 by the principal organs, with page numbers for their text or other Yearbook reference, appears in the final pages of the book.

Each resolution and decision text is at the end of an article summarizing it and giving the circumstances of its adoption. Where a resolution contains paragraphs on a topic dealt with separately in the Yearbook, such as a paragraph on the Namibia question in a resolution on independence for colonial countries, information on those paragraphs, including voting results and explanations of vote, is contained under the topic of the paragraph, cross-referenced in the article on the resolution as a whole.

Other information: The annual report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization in 1981 is reproduced, beginning on page 3. A list of Member States, with their dates of admission to the United Nations, comprises APPENDIX I. The Charter of the United Nations, including the Statute of the International Court of Justice, is in APPENDIX II. A personal name index follows the subject index.

## ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE YEARBOOK

AALCC	Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee	ICP	International Comparison Project
ACABQ	Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions	ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
ACC	Administrative Committee on Co-ordination	ICRP	International Commission on Radiological Protection
ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific	ICSC	International Civil Service Commission
ADB	African Development Bank	IDA	International Development Association
AMS	Administrative Management Service	IDB	Industrial Development Board [UNIDO]
ANC	African National Congress of South Africa	IEFR	International Emergency Food Reserve
APDC	Asian and Pacific Development Centre	IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ARSAP	Agricultural Requisites Scheme for Asia and the Pacific	IFC	International Finance Corporation
ASEAN	Association of South-East Asian Nations	ILC	International Law Commission
BIS	Bank for International Settlements	ILMAC	Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission
CCAQ	Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions	ILO	International Labour Organisation
CCIR	International Radio Consultative Committee [ITU]	ILPES	Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning
CCITT	International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee	IMCO	Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization
CCOP/SOPAC	Committee for Co-ordination of Joint Prospecting for Mineral Resources In South Pacific Offshore Areas	IMF	International Monetary Fund
CDP	Committee for Development Planning	INCB	International Narcotics Control Board
CELADE	Latin American Demographic Centre	INFOTERRA	International Referral System for Sources of Environmental Information [UNEP]
CERD	Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination	INSTRAW	International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Woman
CFA	Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes	INTIB	Industrial and Technological Information Bank [UNIDO]
CGPRT	coarse grains, pulses, roots and tuber crops	IOB	Inter-Organisation Board for Information Systems
CILSS	Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel	IOC	International Oceanographic Commission
CMEA	Council for Mutual Economic Assistance	IPC	International Pepper Community
COPAC	Joint Committee for the Promotion of Aid to Co-operatives	IPDC	International Programme for Development of Communication [UNESCO]
COPUOS	Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space	IPF	Indicative planning figure [UNDP]
CPC	Committee for Programme and Co-ordination	IRIRC	International Refugee Integration Resource Centre
CSDHA	Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs [DIESA]	IRPTC	International Register of Potentially Toxic Chemicals [UNEP]
DAC	Development Assistance Committee [OECD]	ISIP	Integrated Systems Improvement Project [UNDP]
DIEC	Development and International Economic Co-operation	ISU	Information Systems Unit [DIESA]
DIESA	Department of International Economic and Social Affairs	ITC	International Trade Centre [UNCTAD/GATT]
DIS	Development Information System [ISU]	ITO	International Trade Organization
DPI	Department of Public Information	ITU	International Telecommunication Union
DTA	Democratic Turnhalle Alliance [Namibia]	IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
DTCD	Department of Technical Co-operation for Development	IYDP	International Year of Disabled Persons
EC	European Community	IYY	International Youth Year
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa	JAG	Joint Advisory Group on the International Trade Centre
ECDC	economic co-operation among developing countries	JIU	Joint Inspection Unit
ECE	Economic Commission for Europe	JUNIC	Joint United Nations Information Committee
ECLA	Economic Commission for Latin America	LDC	least developed country
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States	LPG	liquefied petroleum gas
ECWA	Economic Commission for Western Asia	MFA	Multifibre Arrangement [Arrangement Regarding Trade In Textiles] [GATT]
EEC	European Economic Community	MNLITD	Movimento Nacional para a Libertação a Independência de Timor-Dili
ESC	Economic and Social Council	MULPOC	Multinational Programming and Operational Centre [ECA]
ESCAP	Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific	NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
EURATOM	European Atomic Energy Community	NEA	Nuclear Energy Agency [OECD]
FADINAP	Fertilizer Advisory, Development and Information Network for Asia and the Pacific	NGO	non-governmental organization
FALPRO	Special Programme on Trade Facilitation	NPT	Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	NSGT	Non-Self-Governing Territory
FICSA	Federation of International Civil Servants' Associations	NUSS	Nuclear Safety Standards [IAEA]
FRETILIN	Frente Revolucionária de Timor Leste Independente	OAEPC	Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries
G A	General Assembly	OAS	Organization of American States
GAB	General Arrangement to Borrow [IMF]	OAU	Organization of African Unity
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade	ODA	official development assistance
GCO	Greeting Card Operation [UNICEF]	OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
GDP	gross domestic product	OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
GDPS	Global Data-Processing System [WMO]	PAC	Pan Africanist Congress of Azania [South Africa]
GEMS	Global Environmental Monitoring System [UNEP]	PADIS	Pan-African Documentation and Information System
GNP	gross national product	PANS	Procedure for Air Navigation Services [ICAO]
GOS	Global Observing System [WMO]	PCT	Patent Co-operation Treaty [WIPO]
GSP	generalized system of preferences	PHC	primary health care
GSTP	global system of trade preferences	PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
GTS	Global Telecommunication System [WMO]	POLISARIO	Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency	POPIN	Population Information Network
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization	RCA	Regional Co-operation Agreement for Research Development and Training Related to Nuclear Science and Technology [IAEA]
ICARA	International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa	RID	International Regulations concerning the Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Rail
ICCROM	International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property	SALT	strategic arms limitation talks
ICITO	Interim Commission for the International Trade Organization	S C	Security Council
ICJ	International Court of Justice		
ICM	Intergovernmental Committee for Migration		



## Abbreviations

XV

SCDPDM	Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities	UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
SDA	special drawing rights	UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
SG	Secretary-General	UNIDF	United Nations Industrial Development Fund [UNIDO]
SIDFA	Senior Industrial Development Field Adviser [UNIDO]	UNIDIR	United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research
SIS	Special Industrial Service [UNIDO]	UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
SNA	United Nations System of National Accounts	UNIDROIT	International Institute for the Unification of Private Law
SOLAS	International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea [IMCO]	UNIFIL	United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon
SPC	Special Political Committee	UNIPAC	UNICEF Packing and Assembly Centre
START	strategic arms reduction talks	UNISPACE-82	Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space
SWAPO	South West Africa People's Organization [Namibia]	UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
TC	Trusteeship Council	UNRFRNRE	United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration
TCDC	technical co-operation among developing countries	UNRISD	United Nations Research Institute for Social Development
TCP	Technical Co-operation Programme [FAO]	UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
TDB	Trade and Development Board [UNCTAD]	UNSCEAR	United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation
TELECOM-83	World Telecommunication Exhibition	UNSDRI	United Nations Social Defence Research Institute
TIR	transport international routier [International road transport] [ECE]	UNSO	United Nations Sudano-Sahellian Office
TNC	transnational corporation	UNTAG	United Nations Transition Assistance Group [Namibia]
UN	United Nations	UNTSO	United Nations Truce Supervision Organization [Israel and neighbouring States]
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund	UNU	United Nations University
UNCHS	United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)	UNV	United Nations Volunteers
UNCITRAL	United Nations Commission on International Trade Law	UPU	Universal Postal Union
UNCIVPOL	United Nations civilian police [UNFICYP]	WAPA	weighted average of post adjustments
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development	WCISP	World Climate Impact Studies Programme
UNDOF	United Nations Disengagement Observer Force [Golan Heights]	WFC	World Food Council
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme	WFP	World Food Programme
UNDRO	Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator	WFS	World Fertility Survey
UNEF	United Nations Emergency Force	WHO	World Health Organization
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme	WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	WMO	World Meteorological Organization
UNFDAC	United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control	WTO	World Tourism Organisation
UNFICYP	United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus	WWW	World Weather Watch [WMO]
UNFPA	United Nations Fund for Population Activities	YUN	Yearbook of the United Nations

## EXPLANATORY NOTE ON DOCUMENTS

Documentary notes at the end of each article in Part One of this volume give the symbols of the main documents issued in 1981 on the topic, arranged by type of document—drafts not adopted, letters and notes verbales, publications (with titles), reports, resolutions, statements of administrative and financial implications, meeting records, etc. Items in these notes are linked by numerical indicators to the article text, as described on page xii. The following is a guide to the principal document symbols:

A/- refers to documents of the General Assembly, numbered in separate series by session. Thus, A/36/- refers to documents issued for consideration at the thirty-sixth session, beginning with A/36/1. Documents of special and emergency special sessions are identified as A/S- and A/ES-, followed by the session number: in 1981, A/ES-8/- (eighth emergency special session). A/C.- refers to documents of six of the Assembly's Main Committees, e.g. A/C.1/- is a document of the First Committee, A/C.6/-, a document of the Sixth Committee. The symbol for documents of the seventh Main Committee, the Special Political Committee, is A/SPC/-. A/BUR/- refers to documents of the General Committee. A/AC.- documents are those of the Assembly's ad hoc bodies and A/CN.-, of its commissions; e.g. A/AC.105/- identifies documents of the Assembly's Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. A/CN.4/-, of its International Law Commission. Assembly resolutions and decisions since the thirty-first (1976) session have been identified by two Arabic numerals: the first indicates the session of adoption; the second, the sequential number in the series. Resolutions are numbered consecutively from 1 at each session. Decisions of regular sessions are numbered consecutively, from 301 for those concerned with elections and appointments, and from 401 for all other decisions. Decisions of special and emergency special sessions are numbered consecutively, from 11 for those concerned with elections and appointments, and from 21 for all other decisions.

E/- refers to documents of the Economic and Social Council, numbered in separate series by year. Thus, E/1981/- refers to documents issued for consideration by the Council at its 1981 sessions, beginning with E/1981/1. E/AC.-, E/C.- and E/CN.-, followed by identifying numbers, refer to documents of the Council's subsidiary ad hoc bodies, committees and commissions. For example, E/C.1/-, E/C.2/- and E/C.3/- refer to documents of the Council's sessional committees, namely, the First (Economic), Second (Social) and Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committees, respectively; E/CN.5/- refers to documents of the Council's Commission for Social Development, E/CN.7/-, to documents of its Committee on Natural Resources. E/ICEF/- documents are those of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Symbols for the Council's resolutions and decisions, since 1978, consist of two Arabic numerals: the first indicates the year of adoption and the second, the sequential number in the series. There are two series: one for resolutions, beginning with 1

(resolution 1981/1); and one for decisions, beginning, since 1980, with 100 (decision 1981/100).

S/- refers to documents of the Security Council. Its resolutions are identified by consecutive numbers followed by the year of adoption in parentheses; beginning with resolution 1 (1946).

T/- refers to documents of the Trusteeship Council. Its resolutions are numbered consecutively, with the session at which they were adopted indicated by Roman numerals, e.g. resolution 2171(XLVII) of the forty-seventh session. The Council's decisions are not numbered.

ST/-, followed by symbols representing the issuing department or office, refers to documents of the United Nations Secretariat.

Documents of certain bodies bear special series symbols, including the following:

ACC/-	Administrative Committee on Co-ordination
CERD/-	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
DC/-	Disarmament Commission
DP/-	United Nations Development Programme
HS/-	Commission on Human Settlements
ID/-	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
ITC/-	International Trade Centre
TD/-	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNEP/-	United Nations Environment Programme
UNITAR/-	United Nations Institute for Training and Research

Many documents of the regional commissions bear special symbol series. These are sometimes preceded by the following:

E/CEPAL/-	Economic Commission for Latin America
E/CN.14/-,	
E/ECA/-	Economic Commission for Africa
E/ECE/-	Economic Commission for Europe
E/ECWA/-	Economic Commission for Western Asia
E/ESCAP/-	Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

"L" in a symbol refers to documents of limited distribution, such as draft resolutions; "CONF." to documents of a conference; "INF." to those of general information. Summary records are designated as "SR.", verbatim records by "PV.", each followed by the meeting number.

United Nations sales publications each carry a sales number with the following components separated by periods: a capital letter indicating the language(s) of the publication; two Arabic numerals indicating the year; a Roman numeral indicating the subject category; a capital letter indicating a subdivision of the category, if any; and an Arabic numeral(s) indicating the number of the publication within the category. Examples: E.81.IX.5; E/F.R.82.II.E.8; E/F.S.81.XVII.11.

## PART ONE

# United Nations



## Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization

Following is the text of the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization, submitted to the General Assembly and dated 12 September 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> The Assembly took note of the report on 17 December.<sup>(1)</sup>

### I

The past year has brought new crises and few encouragements. The pattern of world affairs has shifted in unexpected and at times ominous ways, creating fresh strains in international relations and tending to aggravate many existing problems. It is right and appropriate to view this situation with concern. We would be well advised, however, to bear in mind that change and stress are inevitable in human affairs; indeed, one of the major functions of the United Nations is to provide the institutional framework through which the nature and implications of these stresses may be identified and considered in a civilized and peaceful way, so that timely concerted steps may be taken to deal with them effectively before they grow out of control.

The main features of the international landscape as it has evolved over the past year are all too well known. Relations between East and West have once again become severely strained. The arms race, especially the competition in nuclear weapons, continues unabated, representing not only a perennial risk to human survival but also an inordinate waste of human and other vital resources. A number of key disputes, dangerously interconnected with the fragile structure of world peace, remain unresolved and continue to give rise to violence and frustration. The effort to devise global economic solutions suitable to present realities remains deadlocked, while poverty and economic disaster threaten large segments of the world's population. Violence and various forms of terrorism have taken an increasing toll.

This is a dark picture and one of which Governments are very much aware. Indeed, there is no shortage of proposed solutions for one or another of the problems in question, and never before has humanity been in possession of such a variety of means to deal with its problems. It is evident, however, that we are still far from reconciling our differences as to the approaches to be used and the solutions to be chosen, especially since these problems are in many cases

tied to severe conflicts of interest which require the most intensive efforts of creative statesmanship if they are to be overcome in a concerted and generally acceptable manner. For the United Nations, therefore, the basic question, is whether we shall be able to take advantage of our awareness and knowledge to act together and in time before our problems overwhelm our capacity for dealing with them in an orderly and peaceful manner.

### II

Looking back over the nearly 10 years I have served as Secretary-General of the United Nations, there have unquestionably been advances in many fields, and some specific crises, including humanitarian emergencies, have in fact been resolved. The main problems, however, have persisted and even become more acute, although there have been successes in preventing some of these problems from escalating out of control.

Ten years ago, the international situation was dominated by the destructive war in Indo-China, which seemed to defy efforts at a negotiated settlement and could not be dealt with in the framework of the United Nations. That war, moreover, poisoned relations between the great Powers and adversely affected many other aspects of international life. In the south Asian sub-continent, war was imminent, and a major humanitarian crisis had developed. The most populous country in the world was still not represented in the United Nations. On the problems of the Middle East, Cyprus, Southern Rhodesia and Namibia, efforts to find basic solutions were continuing with little apparent prospect of early success, while in two of these situations the actual area of conflict was being controlled by deploying United Nations peace-keeping operations. A wide variety of efforts were continuing on various aspects of disarmament. The world economic situation and the relationship of developed and developing countries-known as the North-South dialogue-were major fields of effort and anxiety.

Since that time there have been many fluctuations in the world situation and its component parts. The People's Republic of China at last assumed its rightful place in the Organization. Great hopes were pinned on the process of detente. The war in the south Asian sub-conti-

nent was followed by improved relations in the area and the growing effectiveness of the immense United Nations relief operation in Bangladesh.

In 1973, the Middle East war, apart from significantly changing the Middle East balance itself, put East-West relations to a severe test which they in the end survived, contributed to radical changes in the world economic situation and demonstrated beyond question the value of the United Nations as a mechanism for crisis management and conflict control. It also gave a new basis and momentum to United Nations peace-keeping operations. The Middle East has remained a central anxiety and preoccupation of the international community throughout the period.

In 1974, the coup in Cyprus and subsequent events radically changed the situation in the island without in any way solving the problem. The United Nations has remained at the centre of the peace-making and peace-keeping effort in Cyprus ever since.

In 1975, the war in Indo-China came at last to an end, leaving behind it a wasteland of political, humanitarian and economic problems, many of which are still with us.

Since the civil war in 1975, developments in Lebanon have been a major and tragic feature of the international scene. The United Nations became more closely involved with Lebanon in 1978, when the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) was created in the aftermath of violence in the area, culminating in the military intervention of Israel in southern Lebanon. The situation in Lebanon has remained a major preoccupation of the Organization up to the present time.

In 1979, events in Indo-China, and particularly in Kampuchea, created new tensions which, despite all efforts through the machinery of the United Nations, still remain to be resolved. A further problem, giving rise to the most serious repercussions on the broader international scene, developed in Afghanistan. The issue of the United States hostages in Iran presented the world community with a new and unprecedented crisis, which was finally resolved in January of this year.

The war between Iran and Iraq, which began in September 1980, has resisted to this day the efforts of the United Nations as well as other groupings of Governments to find a peaceful solution.

The accession to independence of the Portuguese colonies in 1974, and that of Zimbabwe in 1980, brought the process of decolonization near to a conclusion. The major outstanding problem remains the achievement of independence for

Namibia, which has been and is the subject of intensive efforts to find an internationally acceptable settlement.

The effort to make progress on disarmament has continued during the period, reaching a peak at the tenth special session of the General Assembly in 1978. These efforts have been paralleled by bilateral and multilateral negotiations outside the United Nations, such as the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT). Nevertheless, this most difficult and vital of problems remains a central preoccupation of the international community and looms above all others as an obstacle to our transition to a new and less dangerous scheme of international relations. Indeed, there have been set-backs in the search for arms control agreements, although efforts seem at present to be under way to find a new basis for the resumption of the SALT process, and of negotiations on theatre weapons systems.

On the humanitarian side, the United Nations system has led the struggle to deal with a number of massive emergencies—Bangladesh, the Sahel, the refugees of Africa and Indo-China and the critical situation in Kampuchea, to name only some of the major challenges. Countless human lives have been saved by these endeavours, which for all the difficulties they faced have strikingly illustrated the capacity of the international community to bring relief and hope to the victims of war and disaster.

The effort to translate the human rights principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights into binding obligations has constituted a major innovation in defining the area of legitimate international concern. The international community has displayed a growing interest in the protection of human rights. Individuals and peoples all over the world have looked to the United Nations to act effectively in securing the realization of human rights and in taking measures against violations of these rights. The good offices of the Secretary-General have also become an essential and valuable complement to the organs and procedures for the promotion and protection of human rights.

The relatively new role of the United Nations in concentrating information and expertise on new global problems resulting mainly from technological change has intensified since the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in 1972. Population, food, water and energy have been among the subjects of world conferences since that time, while intensive efforts have also been made on the rights and status of women and children.

The Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New Interna-

tional Economic Order, adopted in 1974, created a new and exceedingly complex target for the efforts of the international community to arrive at satisfactory economic arrangements for the new world that has come into being since the Second World War.

On the important complex of questions relating to the law of the sea, an immense effort has been deployed, with extraordinary though not yet conclusive success, to arrive at a comprehensive treaty. This is a subject of capital importance to the economic aspirations of mankind and, as we have recently been reminded, to future peace and order. I hope that the difficulties that have prevented the completion of this treaty will be speedily overcome.

I have given a cursory review of some of the main points of the preceding decade as a reminder of the complexity and variety of the issues we face and of the encouraging fact that, though many problems remain obdurate, we do advance and make innovations, in spite of all the frustrations and obstacles of which we constantly complain.

### III

Aside from the specific problems of our time to which I have referred, there are certain unique factors which confront humanity and which must be taken into account if we are to maintain direction and make progress in the immense task of building some reasonably acceptable degree of world order. These factors are to some extent the result of the scientific and technological revolution, which has altered the human condition in ways which we are still only beginning to comprehend. Over the past decade, the United Nations has played a crucial role in focusing attention on them.

The first of these factors is the existence of weapons of mass destruction capable, in far less than their present quantities, of destroying our society and civilization.

The second is the population explosion which, in putting immense strains on the environment and on the structures of society, could well in the next generation fatally damage both. Allied to this problem is the fact that in the industrial age we have become dependent on irreplaceable raw materials which are being consumed at a reckless speed before adequate substitutes have been devised.

A third factor is the effect of the revolution in communications which has thrown together, in an accelerated time-frame, nations and peoples living in an interdependent world with little compatibility or practice in existing together. One of my predecessors referred to this situation as the one world that has been imposed upon us before we were ready for it.

I shall revert later in more detail to some aspects of these phenomena. All of them point, and urgently so, to the necessity of a vastly greater and more decisive effort to make international institutions work before we stumble into an irreversible trend to disaster.

How does the United Nations measure up to these great challenges of our time? I have to say that, for all our efforts and our undoubted sincerity, the Organization has not yet managed to cut through the political habits and attitudes of earlier and less hurried centuries and to come to grips decisively with these new factors of our existence. We talk about and express our anxieties and our good intentions, but we have yet to act upon the clear indications of what we are really up against.

All too often there is a tendency in some quarters to regard the United Nations as a side-show, while the real business of international relations and politics goes on elsewhere. This is, in my view, an extremely short-sighted attitude. The realists who set up the United Nations did so in the aftermath of a world disaster and in the knowledge that that disaster had come about from a failure to learn the lessons of the past. They knew, and we should remember, how quickly the fair weather of peace-time can be overtaken by unexpected and violent storms, particularly now when modern technology has speeded up the chain reaction of cause and effect. We need, now more than ever, the institutional shelters and defences that will protect our fragile society from such storms, and the restraint and accommodation that will be required to manage our planetary resources prudently and fairly. Until now the United Nations, with all its weaknesses, represents the best available structure for this purpose. We need to develop and strengthen the United Nations, not to undercut and deride it. It has already done an immense service in facilitating the process of geopolitical change, in absorbing much of the friction and heat of that process, in diagnosing global ailments and in devising remedies for them.

As it is, in matters of peace and security the Organization tends to come into its own mainly in times of acute international crisis. Then briefly, and simply because there is no other alternative, the determination to co-operate in averting disaster temporarily overcomes scepticism about international institutions. We urgently need, in this and other fields, to develop the Organization into a far more systematic, orderly, day-to-day means of improving and regulating the different aspects of international relations. Only then will interdependence and the new irreversible compression of human society into one world become a constructive rather than a negative force in human affairs.

## IV

As I stated at the outset, the past year has been predominantly one of tension and severely strained relationships. The setbacks to East-West relations and a number of unresolved regional conflicts are a dangerous combination. The main thrust of the efforts of the United Nations has therefore been devoted to attempts to resolve or to contain such conflicts.

The situation in the Middle East with all its complexities and ramifications continues to be of central concern to the entire international community, containing as it does an explosive potential of conflict endangering world peace. Regrettably, the past year has seen few signs of progress towards the comprehensive settlement that ultimately can ensure a peaceful and just future for all the nations and peoples of the region. In fact, the already complex situation has been further complicated by a series of grave and often violent developments. The heightening of tension between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic, the Israeli attack on the nuclear facility in Iraq, the continuing cycle of violence in and around Lebanon, which recently escalated with tragic consequences, have all underlined the dangers inherent in the absence of progress towards a comprehensive settlement.

The ongoing tragedy of Lebanon is a telling reminder of the absolute necessity of embarking on the path of negotiation, however steep and difficult it may prove. The recently arranged cease-fire provides an opportunity that must not be missed, for it will not easily recur. No cease-fire, peace-keeping operation or other expedient for containing the conflict can, in the end, prevent new outbursts of violence as long as the basic elements of the problem are not tackled in negotiations involving all the parties concerned. I wish here to pay tribute to the officers and men of UNIFIL who have played, with great courage and devotion, a vital role of conflict control in southern Lebanon in exceptionally difficult circumstances.

With the acquisition of ever more sophisticated offensive weapons, each succeeding outburst of violence will inevitably become more destructive and at the same time more difficult to contain. It is only realistic to note that the spectre of nuclear weapons already looms over the area.

The United Nations has since 1948 been engaged in a practical way in operations designed to control conflict in the Middle East. Without these efforts, the situation would undoubtedly be infinitely more dangerous and destructive than it actually is. The Organization is also a universal forum in the framework of which efforts to evolve a peaceful settlement may in the end best be pursued. Such efforts will require not only the

participation of all concerned, but their active determination to succeed. The issues are well known and include the right of all States in the area to live in peace, within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, and withdrawal from occupied territories. In this context, the question of Jerusalem remains of primary importance. We need urgently, in the interests of world peace as well as of the peoples of the Middle East, to take every possible step to encourage the will to negotiate and to settle on a solution to the central and obdurate problem of the Middle East.

A source of deep concern to the international community is the continuing conflict between Iran and Iraq. Besides causing great human suffering and material loss, the war carries the danger of far-reaching and unpredictable consequences in a very sensitive area of the world. It is imperative for the preservation of international peace and security that the fighting should come to an end and that an agreed settlement is reached, as soon as possible, in conformity with the principles of justice and international law and with due respect for the legitimate rights of both parties.

In an effort to resolve the dispute by peaceful means I offered my good offices to Iran and Iraq and appointed Mr. Olof Palme, former Prime Minister of Sweden, as my Special Representative. The Islamic Conference and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have shown similar concern and have also sent missions to the area. I have been kept informed of these efforts.

It has become clear that the issues underlying the conflict are complex and that a solution will not be reached easily. My Special Representative has discussed a comprehensive settlement involving a cease-fire and the withdrawal of forces as well as appropriate procedures for the peaceful resolution of the issues under dispute. In that context, he has also discussed possible measures which would enable the commercial ships of different nationalities, which became immobilized by the conflict, to leave the area. Although agreement on the overall issues is yet to be reached, the continued support for the mission of my Special Representative, shown by both parties, has encouraged the continuation of our efforts.

Efforts to move forward to a just and lasting settlement of the Cyprus problem have continued throughout the year as part of the good offices mission entrusted to me by the Security Council. Meanwhile, the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus continues its essential function of preserving calm in the island. The difficulties in the way of a political solution of

this problem are well known and need no further exposition here. I feel strongly, however, that a settlement is long overdue. The intercommunal talks still appear to be the best available means of negotiating a solution of this highly intractable problem which, during the past few weeks, has entered a new stage with the submission of comprehensive proposals encompassing both the territorial and constitutional aspects. This development has led to renewed hope that the negotiations may now enter a more constructive phase. To take advantage of this situation, I and my Special Representative may find it necessary to make special efforts and present some new ideas, as appropriate, to sustain the momentum of the negotiating process. I hope that any such moves on my part will be accepted in the spirit in which they are offered, as tools of the negotiating process for the purpose of facilitating progress towards an agreed solution. It bears repeating that continued delay in this effort only serves to consolidate the status quo, which both parties have found to be unsatisfactory.

The crisis over Afghanistan, which has caused great tension and anxiety throughout the world community in the past year, presents a somewhat different kind of challenge. The General Assembly has pronounced itself on the principles involved and the action required. Many efforts have been made to facilitate negotiations among the parties concerned with a view to achieving a fair political solution which will ensure that the Afghan people will be able to determine their own destiny, free from foreign intervention and interference. To this end I have designated a Personal Representative, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, who has made two visits to the area and will continue to follow up all possibilities for a peaceful resolution of the problem.

The situation in South-East Asia remains a matter of grave concern. Peace and stability have not yet come to that tortured region and the situation remains precarious, especially with regard to the Kampuchean problem.

Following extensive consultations, the International Conference on Kampuchea, called for by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/6, was held in New York from 13 to 17 July 1981. I have also continued my efforts in the exercise of my good offices and I have been kept informed of consultations that have taken place among the countries of the region as well as other States. Regrettably, these efforts on many levels have not so far been able to bridge the gap which exists between the positions of the parties and States concerned, and real progress is yet to be made towards achieving a just and lasting settlement of this complex problem. Urgent efforts must be

made by all concerned to achieve such a settlement with full regard for the principles of the Charter and the decisions of the General Assembly in order to resolve a serious situation which continues to deny peace and prosperity to the people of Kampuchea and indeed of the entire region. In this connection, I note with satisfaction that the programme of assistance to the people of Kampuchea undertaken by the United Nations system has been successful in averting the worst of the famine and devastation that had been feared, although grave uncertainties and problems still lie ahead. Evidently, however, it is only with the achievement of a comprehensive solution of the underlying political and military issues that a fundamental solution to the humanitarian problem can be found.

The continuing stalemate over Namibia is extremely harmful to the interests of the people of Namibia as well as to the peace, security and development of southern Africa as a whole. It is indeed now affecting international relations on an even wider scale. The recent massive South African incursion into Angola, resulting in heavy casualties and destruction, tragically underscores the urgency of a solution to the problem of Namibia, for which territory the United Nations has a unique responsibility.

In my concern to break the impasse, which has regrettably lasted far too long, I took a series of initiatives culminating in the meeting at Geneva last January. When, at that meeting, South Africa stated that it was not yet prepared to sign a cease-fire agreement and proceed to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435(1978), a great opportunity was missed. As a result, the bloodshed and violence continue, frustration and bitterness increase, and the future has to wait. In spite of various bilateral efforts since that time, no breakthrough has as yet been achieved. As I have said repeatedly, resolution 435(1978) must remain the basis for the attainment of Namibia's independence. I cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity of moving forward and away from the present impasse. The recently concluded debate at the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly reflects the deep and widespread concern felt by the international community on this matter. Renewed and concerted efforts are essential so that we can proceed without further delay to the solution envisaged in resolution 435(1978), which has already been extensively discussed and agreed upon in principle.

Another, and major, concern in Africa is the persistence of the policy of apartheid in South Africa which has created so much bitterness and strife. Over the years we have seen its tragic consequences. The various races have been separated

through a network of legislation which has denied the vast majority their basic human rights. It has uprooted large numbers from their homes and has compelled many others to live in so-called homelands against their choice. All the people of South Africa must be enabled to participate on an equal footing in guiding the destiny of their country. Otherwise, violence will persist. Moreover, a continuation of the present racial policies of the Government of South Africa can only cause further strains on its relations with other members of the international community.

It is therefore understandable that, with growing impatience, there is increasing demand for additional steps to secure the elimination of apartheid. It was for this reason that the General Assembly recently convened in Paris the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa.

Another urgent question for which an early solution must be found is that of Western Sahara. The situation remains tense, and every effort must be made to resolve it in keeping with the principles of the Charter. In this respect the General Assembly has made clear its position and has reaffirmed the right of the people of the Territory to self-determination.

This is a matter to which the Organization of African Unity (OAU) has given its utmost attention. In this connection, I wish to pay tribute to the African leaders whose dedicated efforts have led to the recent agreement within OAU, under the chairmanship of President Moi of Kenya, on a peaceful solution of the problem. I had an opportunity of meeting recently with President Moi in Paris and discussing the role envisaged for the United Nations in the implementation of the OAU decision to organize and conduct a referendum in the territory and maintain a cease-fire. I expect further discussions to take place on this matter when the Chairman of OAU visits United Nations Headquarters towards the end of September.

As concerns the role of the United Nations in the practical arrangements for the solution of this problem, the appropriate organs of the United Nations will no doubt be requested to take the necessary decisions.

In Latin America, political and economic models are being adjusted to meet the expectations of societies in which traditional values are in a state of evolution and change. New circumstances and changed approaches have led to varying perceptions of each nation's political, economic and social requirements. In Central America, these changes have created a convulsive situation which has caused considerable concern and anxiety. The situation is further com-

plicated by a self-perpetuating process of charges and countercharges of foreign intervention.

I have consistently maintained that these problems require political solutions, arrived at with full regard for the individuality and sovereignty of each Latin American nation. It is also necessary to increase international co-operation to improve the social and economic conditions which prevail in the area, and which constitute, in the last analysis, the underlying reason for the current political turmoil. I welcome in this respect the joint efforts of Canada, Mexico, the United States and Venezuela, announced in the Bahamas, to help in the social and economic development of the Central American and Caribbean countries.

It is encouraging to note that the Latin American countries have continued to follow their tradition of settling their international disputes by peaceful means. On other occasions I have expressed my preoccupation about the dispute between Argentina and Chile over the Beagle Channel. These countries sought the mediation of His Holiness Pope John Paul II, whose continuing efforts have averted the danger of a military confrontation. In the same spirit of adherence to the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes, the Governments of Ecuador and Peru decided to engage in negotiations after a series of armed skirmishes early this year. By their positive attitude these Governments were able to arrest an escalation of hostilities. I hope that similar means will be used to settle other bilateral conflicts which have unfortunately arisen in the region.

## V

Events in the past year have combined to focus the attention of the world community once again on one of the central problems of our time—the arms race, which has continued practically unchecked almost since the end of the Second World War, and its infinitely ominous extension into the sphere of nuclear weapons.

What is called the problem of the arms race is in reality a complex of problems. The largest single factor fuelling the world-wide arms build-up has for a long time been the hostility between East and West. After a period of relative relaxation, the relations between the super-Powers are again going through a period of tension, and there are clear indications of a sharply intensified upward spiral in their arms build-up.

This development, with its evident risks for the future of all mankind, would be enough to justify the increased concern of the world community. But it is now becoming increasingly clear that the arms race, in all its fundamental

irrationality and with all its attendant risks, shows signs of - extending to the entire world. While the overwhelming bulk of military spending is still incurred by the two major blocs, defence expenditures in other countries in real terms have nearly doubled in the past decade, and the upward trend is continuing. All countries, large and small, cite legitimate security needs to justify their participation in the accelerating arms build-up. However, in addition to being inherently dangerous, the tensions generated in this manner may trigger destabilizing tendencies, with the risk of escalation in the event of competitive big-Power involvement. Furthermore, the arms race tends to drain away, more rapidly than ever, resources desperately needed for development.

From their first appearance in history, the existence of nuclear weapons added a new and frightening dimension to the potentialities for world catastrophe. While the Governments concerned have rightly expressed their extreme aversion to using such weapons, their very existence in the tense context of great-Power relationships constitutes an unprecedented threat to human society and civilization. In international affairs, confusion, confrontation and emotion cannot accurately be foreseen, forestalled or controlled, and a nuclear war would be both devastatingly quick and conclusive. If the present nuclear-arms race among the most powerful States is the greatest potential danger threatening mankind, a similar race between additional nuclear States will add immeasurably to that danger and to the risk of the actual use of nuclear weapons.

For many years now, a major objective of the international community has been to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy while preventing or deterring its military applications. A most important measure in this context is the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which 115 States are parties. Progress towards promoting the universality of that Treaty and the generalized acceptance of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards would go far to allay anxieties that the spread of nuclear technology and material might open the door to potential military capabilities. It is also important to give urgent consideration to ways of ensuring that advanced technological means will not be used to circumvent the safeguards system.

Another highly significant development is the growing consideration being given to nuclear-weapon-free zones, of which the Treaty of Tlatelolco already provides a successful example. Besides being significant measures of non-proliferation, nuclear-weapon-free zones would also represent important steps towards regional nuclear disarmament.

International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards are an essential element in verifying the compliance with obligations undertaken with such agreements. These safeguards must provide the maximum possible confidence that the agreement is adequately implemented and are therefore basic to its effectiveness. Various international co-operative schemes, such as the joint storage of irradiated fuel or separated plutonium, are under consideration to strengthen the safeguards system and supplement it by institutional arrangements in order to enhance international confidence. It is also of great importance that agreements be reached between supplier countries and potential recipient States on conditions for supply of nuclear material, equipment and know-how, which not only promote non-proliferation but also help to establish a reliable supply market.

Recent events illustrate how important it is that all States should adhere to effective non-proliferation safeguards, be it through the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or through a nuclear-weapon-free zone, or bilaterally submit their entire nuclear effort to the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and that, if any State is concerned that the system may not give timely warning of a suspected event, it should make use of the international procedures inherent in the system to ascertain the factors in the case.

The recent debate on the raid on the Iraqi nuclear installations raised a number of questions which could not at the time be adequately answered. On such matters which directly affect not so much the future as the question of whether there is to be a future, I feel that the international community should have the best and most authoritative expert advice. I therefore think it might be wise to reactivate the Scientific Advisory Committee, which served the United Nations with distinction and effectiveness in the development of activities and conferences on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This Committee of most distinguished and respected scientists gave unique guidance and authority to those early efforts. If reconstituted at a similar level, following consultations with the International Atomic Energy Agency, it might, I believe, play a new and highly constructive role in problems such as the one I have just described.

I have drawn attention in the past to the close relationship between the arms race and the desire of States to ensure their security against what they perceive as concrete external dangers. Real progress towards a genuinely disarmed world must depend to a large extent on the development of confidence among nations and the removal of at least some of the sources of mistrust and hostility.

For this reason, I hope that the negotiations on strategic arms limitations will be resumed at the earliest possible date and carried forward to a successful conclusion. I also hope that the forthcoming meeting between the foreign ministers of the United States and the Soviet Union will constitute a new beginning in the efforts to restore dialogue and resume constructive negotiations. Recent proposals to convene summit meetings on both a bilateral and a multilateral basis in the Security Council are a natural extension of this renewed effort to maintain dialogue and communication, and deserve careful consideration.

The maintenance of dialogue is an essential, part of the effort to remove the causes of suspicion and hostility between nations which fuel the current world-wide arms race. It must be recognized that the search for absolute security can, in fact, breed further insecurity. History demonstrates that there are times when an arms race can acquire a momentum of its own, quite independent of the political causes which initially provoked it, and lead inexorably to disaster.

It is the duty of the international community to attempt to break, at every possible point, the deadly cycle which leads from suspicion and hostility to increased armaments and from increased armaments to a further heightening of suspicion and hostility. At the same time, a renewed and concerted effort by the international community, conducted at every level, including the very highest, to deal directly with the threats posed by the arms race in all its forms seems to me in order.

In 1978 the General Assembly held a special session at which it laid the groundwork for sustained and meaningful progress towards disarmament. Unfortunately, the hopes embodied in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session have not yet been realized. Preparations are now in progress for a second special session of the Assembly devoted to disarmament, to be held in the spring of 1982. That session will provide an appropriate occasion for a renewed and concerted effort to deal directly with the awesome threats posed by the arms race.

## VI

Disarmament, in a nuclear age, is a matter of survival. Economic and social order in an age of interdependence and technological change is a matter of survival with decency and self-respect.

In spite of attempts to adjust national policies and strengthen international co-operation, the world economy is still encountering very serious difficulties, and a vastly greater effort is needed if lasting results are to be achieved. A generally low level of economic performance persists, af-

fecting countries in all regions. Industrial output is practically stagnant and the expansion of world trade has slowed down. Payment imbalances have increased dramatically, unemployment and underemployment are worsening and, in spite of some recent progress, inflation is still at unacceptably high levels.

The international setting has had an adverse effect on the efforts of developing countries to accelerate their growth and restore their payments position. In 1980 there was an actual decline in the per capita incomes of a large majority of the developing countries, and a further year of decline in 1981 cannot yet be ruled out. It is ironical that, at a time when there is greater awareness than ever before of the need for development and for the ordering of the world's economy, there is, if present trends persist, a prospect that by 1990 the number of persons on the globe living in absolute poverty could exceed 800 million.

Such a situation of stagnation or increasing poverty is absolutely unacceptable. It contains the seeds of widespread tension and unrest which constitute, in the final analysis, a threat to world peace and stability.

In such a situation it is deeply disturbing to witness an actual weakening of international co-operative effort and an erosion of the system of multilateral co-operation. There has been an increasing trend towards unilateral measures which shift the burden of economic adjustment onto trading partners or onto the rest of the world. There is also a further danger of retaliatory measures, creating a vicious circle in which all countries will eventually find themselves worse off, as happened in the period between the two world wars.

The major industrial countries find it increasingly difficult to allocate resources to meet pressing economic and social needs at a time of slow growth, increasing inflation, changing monetary values and a general loss of economic dynamism. The competition for existing resources by a variety of interests has also made it difficult to take action to curb inflation. At the same time, military expenditure absorbs more and more resources without in the end enhancing international security. This year \$500 billion is being earmarked for armaments at a time when development assistance, which makes a very important and fundamental contribution to international stability, is marking time. Only 5 per cent of that sum would suffice to reach the target for official development assistance set in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.

At the international level, it has also proved difficult to take timely and necessary decisions.



Progress is too small and too slow, as was evident, despite the constructive spirit in which it was undertaken, at the eleventh special session of the General Assembly. The international dialogue has not in recent months produced the impetus necessary for the implementation of the International Development Strategy adopted by the General Assembly, apart from notable progress in the official multilateral financing of balances of payments. On the contrary, unilateral measures have increased uncertainty and added to the factors militating against the success of the Strategy.

In particular, there are disturbing shortfalls in critically needed voluntary resource allocations to those international organizations which have a vital role to play in achieving the objectives of the International Development Strategy. Recently, for example, the suspension of some operations of the International Development Association deprived low-income developing countries of irreplaceable investment resources. At the same time, severe resource constraints are threatening the support which the United Nations Development Programme envisages rendering to the developing countries. This unfortunately also comes at a time when organizations of the United Nations system, most with years of experience, have a highly refined but underutilized capacity to provide development assistance.

The international community has a common and urgent interest in reversing the present adverse trends. A strengthening of international support in the key areas of food, energy, raw materials, finance and trade would do much to change the present economic situation in the interests of all countries. There is a compelling need to treat these problems in an integrated and coherent manner with the participation of all groups of countries.

I regret that to this day Member States have been unable to reach an agreement which would enable them to begin the process of global negotiations, the principle of which was adopted by the General Assembly in 1979. I sincerely hope that the misgivings or mistrust which persist in various quarters, as well as the substantive differences, can soon be overcome by the necessary political decisions.

Meanwhile, the forthcoming meeting of some heads of State or Government from the North and the South in Cancun may provide a renewed political impetus for achieving a meeting of minds conducive to the subsequent initiation of concerted actions affecting all Member States.

Within the United Nations, the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy agreed last month on the Nairobi Programme of Action to promote the development and utiliza-

tion of selected alternative energy sources. While the problems encountered by the Conference serve to measure the complexity of the energy situation confronting nations, the Programme of Action is a tangible achievement representing a basis for constructive and co-operative effort in a significant area that includes certain energy sources of critical importance, in particular to developing countries. The Programme of Action by itself is not a panacea but a beginning. Its effective implementation will depend on the continuing commitment of Governments and the supporting efforts of the United Nations system. A broader focus will eventually be needed, including, in due course, a realistic look at areas and types of energy sources not so far covered.

The United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, held in Paris early this month, drew attention to the plight of countries whose standard of living was already at unacceptable levels and which faced further deterioration if international action was not forthcoming. The Conference emphasized the need for special measures, including concessional assistance, for such countries, in the context of the overall effort for development.

These meetings provide opportunities for tackling, at the highest level and from different angles, the most pressing economic and social problems of the world and the obstacles which until now have inhibited our progress. In our time, international economic problems are inextricably linked with the maintenance of peace and stability and affect both the domestic and the external policies of countries. The complexity and scope of these problems demand statesmanship and political leadership of the highest order, for in the settlement of these problems lies the essential key to a stable and prosperous future, as well as to a satisfactory life for all the people of this earth. Only a new and bold approach, and vitally required resources, can remedy the present tendencies towards fragmentation, dispersal of effort and unilateralism, which are in the end policies of weakness, lack of confidence and despair.

## VII

The Charter speaks, in Article 55, of "the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations...". In fact, the United Nations has tried to go a good deal further along this road than its founders had foreseen. The effort to come to grips with problems affecting hundreds of millions of people across the whole spectrum of the human race is a testimony to a growing sense of humanity and responsibility.

The General Assembly proclaimed 1981 International Year of Disabled Persons, with the theme "Full participation and equality". The call of the Assembly has evoked a response on a much larger scale than had been anticipated. Over 100 Governments have established national committees to co-ordinate activities in support of the disabled; and the general public has reacted enthusiastically and, above all, so have the disabled themselves. At the international level, the secretariat of the International Year of Disabled Persons has arranged a series of seminars and symposia and has formulated a long-term plan of action to deal with this world-wide problem. I hope that the momentum generated by the Year will be sustained through practical measures equal to the needs of the situation.

In 1982 the problems of the elderly and the aged will be considered by a world assembly.

Sometimes the focus of international compassion is compelled to centre on a particular humanitarian tragedy of our time. In April of this year, the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa, sponsored by the United Nations in close co-operation with OAU and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, recognized in a dramatic fashion the fact that Africa, with 5 million refugees, now accounts for more than half of the total world refugee population. This immense burden, falling upon some of the least developed countries of the world, is far beyond the resources of the countries of asylum which none the less, with their traditional hospitality, have done their best to care for their hapless guests. Ninety-nine Governments took part in this Conference, at which a large number of non-governmental organizations were also represented. The Conference achieved considerable success in focusing attention on the plight of African refugees, in mobilizing practical support for their help and in assisting the countries of asylum to bear the burden. A total of \$560 million was pledged. This was a remarkable and timely international response and a convincing message of hope in answer to a desperate cry for help.

In Kampuchea and Thailand, as a result of developments in the former country, the international organizations concerned—the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the World Food Programme (WFP) and the International Committee of the Red Cross—under the co-ordination of the United Nations, continued to provide humanitarian assistance. The basic objective of preserving life in Kampuchea has been secured up to the present time, but pros-

pects for the rest of 1981 are dependent on the outcome of the current monsoon and are, at best, very uncertain. On the border between Kampuchea and Thailand, UNICEF, WFP and the International Committee of the Red Cross, with the assistance of several voluntary agencies, are providing basic rations for some 200,000 Kampuchians who are assembled in camps at the present time. Security, in the usually accepted sense of that word, is non-existent in the area; several political groups are strongly opposed to each other and there is a continuous toll of dead and wounded. This unfortunate situation is unlikely to be satisfactorily resolved unless a political solution to what has become an international problem can be found. Progress has been made by UNHCR in dealing with refugees in holding centres; the programme of resettlement is proceeding steadily and action has been initiated which could lead to the voluntary repatriation of a significant number of other Kampuchians now in these centres. Just under 100,000 Thai villagers affected by the influx of refugees from Kampuchea are receiving assistance from WFP, UNICEF and the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Another extremely serious refugee situation is the influx into Pakistan and Iran of more than 2 million refugees from Afghanistan. The High Commissioner is making all possible efforts to assist in alleviating the plight of these refugees.

In my last annual report I mentioned the problem of security, which sometimes arises in humanitarian emergencies. Unfortunately, we have not as yet found any satisfactory solution to this problem, which not only affects on occasion the effectiveness of relief and humanitarian operations, but also endangers the safety and the lives of the international and local personnel taking part in these operations.

## VIII

In the contemporary world, the interrelationship between human rights and questions of peace and security is emerging into sharper focus. The purposes and principles of the Charter are mutually supporting and interdependent. Thus, it is increasingly clear that peace and development are necessary for the full realization of human rights. At the same time, in the absence of respect for human rights, peace and development lose much of their meaning. It is essential, therefore, that the efforts of the United Nations and its Member States to promote and protect civil and political as well as economic, social and cultural rights should be accorded the highest importance. The wide-ranging activities of the United Nations may be considered as integral parts of the efforts to promote and protect

human rights. After all, the fact that millions of human beings are plagued by poverty, disease and lack of fulfilment of basic human needs constitutes one of the most extensive violations of human rights in the world today.

It is incumbent upon the United Nations to tackle all forms of violations of human rights which are deliberately inflicted upon human beings, such as apartheid and racial discrimination, political assassinations, torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, enforced or involuntary disappearances, slavery and slavery-like practices. These and other serious violations of human rights which affect large numbers of people cannot be tolerated or excused, whatever the circumstances and wherever they occur, and the United Nations would be failing in its essential mission if it proved unable to deal with such violations in an effective manner.

I therefore welcome the consideration now being given by the Commission on Human Rights, as well as by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, to ways and means of responding urgently to situations of gross violations of human rights. Various forms of action have been taken to deal with certain situations of this kind, including public debate, contacts with Governments concerned, the appointment of special rapporteurs, envoys or representatives, the designation of working groups of experts and the dispatch of appeals. Consideration has also been given to confidential procedures to deal with some situations. It is my hope that these efforts will be continued and strengthened.

For my own part, I have continued to work with the Commission on Human Rights in its efforts to deal with situations of gross violations of human rights and, at the Commission's request, I have on numerous occasions initiated contacts with Governments. I have also continued to exercise my good offices on humanitarian grounds whenever I consider that my efforts may be of help to the victims concerned.

As regards the setting of standards, work is currently under way in various areas such as the prohibition of torture, the rights of the child, of minorities, of migrant workers and of non-citizens as well as the protection of prisoners and detainees and religious freedoms. I welcome the advances which have been made towards the adoption of a declaration on the elimination of all forms of intolerance and of discrimination based on religion or belief.

## IX

The Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea opened its tenth session last March under the shadow of the untimely passing

of its President, Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe, an architect of the vast negotiating process that had led to the present draft Convention.

Despite the significant advance achieved over the last seven years, the hope that the work of the Conference would be concluded during 1981 did not materialize. It was with deep regret that I had to acknowledge that reality on the occasion of the opening of the tenth session.

At its resumed tenth session, the Conference was able, however, to find more generally acceptable solutions to some of the problems that had heretofore presented great difficulties. These include a new formulation on the delimitation of maritime boundaries between States with opposite or adjacent coastlines, as well as decisions on the sites of the future International Sea-Bed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. Moreover, the Conference decided to formalize the text of the draft Convention and agreed to a timetable for its adoption.

I hardly need to emphasize once more the effect that the outcome of this Conference will have on the perceptions of Governments regarding the capacity of the United Nations to serve as an instrument for finding multilaterally negotiated solutions for global problems. Nor do I find it necessary to restate that there is no better alternative to a generally acceptable convention in which all matters pertaining to ocean space will be treated as a whole. The Conference agreed to hold its decision-making session during the spring of 1982 and to schedule the signing of the Final Act at Caracas early next autumn. In this connection, I appeal to the Governments concerned to make a final concentrated effort to compose the remaining differences, including those that have emerged recently.

## X

In preparing my programme budget proposals for the biennium 1982-1983, my overriding concern was to preserve as effectively as possible the level of programmes approved by the Member States while recognizing the world-wide climate of economic and financial constraints. As long ago as the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, I reaffirmed my long-standing commitment to a policy of strict budgetary restraint. Continuing efforts to reduce budget growth in line with that policy have made it possible to present a zero real growth budget. I wish to emphasize here that this policy, which is basically effected through redeployment of staff resources, will in no way weaken, curtail or pre-empt programmes for support of economic and social development in developing countries.

In my report to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, I referred to the importance

of rationalizing the substantive activities of the Organization to ensure that their orientation, content and delivery are timely and relevant to the priority needs of Member States. I can report that some progress has now been achieved in such a rationalization, aiming at the identification of activities which have little chance of making an effective contribution to the international community collectively and to Member States individually, and concentrating on activities which can make such a contribution. This search for greater relevance and effectiveness should be pursued through the setting of explicit priorities among United Nations programmes, new approaches to the formulation of the medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989, and the further development of procedures for programme evaluation.

The Organization has had for several years a system for setting priorities among its programmes, but this system was hampered by a number of technical difficulties. A reformulation of these procedures has been proposed which would result in the phased introduction of a new system of priority-setting over the next few years. The purpose is to ensure that high-priority programmes receive appropriate resources either through fresh allocations by the General Assembly or through redeployment of resources from lower priority activities. This system of priority-setting would apply to all activities covered by the regular budget, except for activities undertaken pursuant to decisions of the Security Council relating to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The size and relative complexity of our Organization have to be reckoned with, and it has become necessary to decentralize many financial activities. In recent years, Member States have expressed concern that such decentralization should not in any way diminish the role of the central financial and programming services. To meet this concern, the Organization's programme planning and financial policies are being further reviewed. Particular attention is being given to the administration and control of the regular budget, the management of the cash resources of the Organization, and the acceptance and management of extrabudgetary resources.

## XI

Ensuring the vitality and viability of the international civil service is a continuing and complex task. The difficulties in maintaining the principles and objectives of the Charter with respect to the concept of an independent international civil service are a matter of legitimate concern, from their different viewpoints, to Member

States, the administration and the staff. There is now, I believe, a greater awareness on all sides of the complexity of the day-to-day functioning of an international secretariat that must operate under conditions dissimilar to those obtaining in any national civil service, and even different from those prevailing in the early years of the Organization.

The very diversity of the international Secretariat inevitably creates stresses and strains which have to be accommodated if the system is to work. This is a challenge for all concerned, whatever their particular interests may be. We cannot ignore these obvious realities, but we must try unceasingly, as the Charter requires, to concentrate on enhancing the efficiency, competence and integrity of the international civil service and to ensure respect for the exclusively international character of its responsibilities.

As we experience and try to cope with the dilemmas of the international Secretariat, we are constantly challenged from a number of directions. There are those who rightly insist that the letter and spirit of the Charter relating to the international civil service must be scrupulously observed. There are the legislative intergovernmental bodies of the Organization which from time to time initiate various proposals for the reform or improvement of the service. These proposals include specific directives concerning such matters as equitable geographical distribution, a more balanced distribution of nationalities in the units of the Secretariat, equal opportunities between the sexes, and reform of various aspects of our personnel policies. There is also constantly expressed the vitally essential viewpoint of the dedicated international civil servants who carry out the day-to-day tasks of the Organization.

As regards directives from intergovernmental bodies, efforts are under way to bring about as effectively and practically as possible the reforms and changes required. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that the pace of reform and change is unlikely, in the present circumstances, to be as rapid or as comprehensive as would ideally be desired. In this regard, I feel that it would be prudent to bear in mind that there are certain areas of administration where, of necessity, the Secretary-General must continue to have proper discretion and responsibility in order to fulfil his tasks in accordance with the Charter.

As far as the members of the Secretariat are concerned, there is no doubt that, as a result of the strains and stresses mentioned above, the rank and file of the staff is sometimes disillusioned. As we go through the inescapable process of adjusting to the new international environment and circumstances, many staff members may wonder whether circumstances at times

compel a departure from the principles set out in the Charter. I fully understand such anxieties and, for my part, I am determined that the principles of the Charter will at all times be upheld. However, we must also take account of realities. Member States are increasingly concerned about the high cost of international organizations, of which the largest part is for staff costs. In addition, those who bear the bulk of these costs expect their share of the financial burden to be adequately reflected in the composition of the Secretariat. Obviously, such approaches sometimes have an impact on career development prospects as well as recruitment policies and are therefore of concern to the international staff. On the other hand, due regard must be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible. In these circumstances, it is important to ensure that the interests of the international civil servants be preserved while recognizing the concerns of Member States.

The security of international civil servants is of increasing concern to staff members and should also be of major concern to all Member States. The Secretariat has reason to be concerned that the commitments made under the Charter and the relevant conventions regarding the inviolability of the international civil service are not being fully complied with. I strongly urge all Governments to maintain these commitments in regard to the international civil service and, if problems arise, to discuss them in full frankness with the Secretary-General and the administration.

The health and viability of the international civil service depend primarily on the quality of its staff. This is why I and the executive heads of the various United Nations agencies and programmes continue to make all possible efforts to ensure the recruitment into the service of men and women who meet the standards set out in the Charter. At the present time, we are, to some extent, going through what might be called a generation crisis. After more than three decades, those who joined the United Nations Secretariat at the outset have left or are leaving the service. These dedicated men and women have made an outstanding contribution and have been the very foundation of the international civil service as we know it today. Their spirit of devotion and service is being passed on to the new generation of staff members, who will certainly bring their own contributions to the development of an international institution on which so much will depend in the future.

## XII

Since public support and understanding are indispensable to the effectiveness and development

of our Organization, the problems of public information are of perennial—and often daily—concern to the Secretary-General. It is natural and desirable that a growing, and to some extent experimental, political system such as the United Nations should be subjected to continuous comment and criticism. And, since the Organization belongs to all the peoples of the world, that comment and criticism should come from as wide and varied a constituency as possible.

What concerns me far more is the starting-point and context of much of the criticism of the activities of the United Nations. Our experience in this century has shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that a world organization must be developed without delay and with the widest possible participation to enable us not only to deal with the effective maintenance of international peace and security, but to bring order into many other aspects of human activity, which, owing to the technological revolution, are now closely and vitally intertwined. In other words, we are living in one world whether we like it or not, and we have to develop institutions capable of regulating and guiding that world. Criticism which starts from this premise is welcome and constructive, however harsh it may sometimes be, though I think it is important to recognize that the United Nations is not a supranational government, but an organization of sovereign States. The other kind of criticism, which starts from the assumption that international organizations and co-operation are unnecessary, undesirable and unrealistic, strikes me as, at best, short-sighted and, at worst, dangerous for the future.

I cannot claim that we have been very successful so far in explaining to a world-wide public the nature, the problems and the basic necessity of the United Nations. All too often people seem to think that the Organization is no real concern of theirs or is even a threat to their own interests. As we get further away from the Second World War, more and more people seem unaware that devastating storms can suddenly darken the more or less tranquil skies of peace-time. I never cease to wonder at the equanimity with which many people appear to accept the implications of nuclear weapons and their steady and fantastic development. One witnesses with amazement the calm and almost academic public discussions of the growth and possible use of the vast new arsenal of sophisticated weapons, as if the whole system of destruction were perfectly safe because it was meant for deterrence and would therefore, in reality, never be used. In history there are very few instances of weapons which, once invented, remain permanently in the store-room.

People need to be constantly reminded that, if the instruments of peace set up to universal

acclaim after the Second World War are properly used and developed, there is an alternative to this nightmare. It is, admittedly, an alternative which will, especially in the early stages, require great courage, vision and self-confidence, but the blueprint is there in the Charter.

The economic and social challenges of our time are, in their different ways, almost equally compelling. Again, we have a choice—to accept the present uncertainties and inequities and the privations and misery of a large segment of humanity, with all of the threat to world stability which they constitute, or to persevere in devising the better system which we know can be devised. Again, the second alternative will require courage, vision and an immense amount of hard work, not to mention public support at every stage. But can any reasonable person be in serious doubt as to the choice?

These basic choices are the context in which we must endeavour to gain public support and understanding for this very complex Organization. The daily activities of the United Nations, its difficulties and shortcomings as well as its achievements, will then be seen in a more realistic perspective. It is unrealistic to expect universal approval and enthusiasm for all of the works of an Organization as diverse and as complicated as the United Nations. But it should be possible to gain increasing understanding of its place in the world and of its vital purposes.

In these days when communications and the media, as never before, are so much an integral part of political life and power, we have to learn to use new methods, not to proselytize a reluctant public but to give that public a serious and informed basis on which to judge and to act in its own real interests. Those interests, for better or for worse, are now intimately bound up with the interests of all the other peoples of the world.

I hope very much that Member States will make every effort to assist us in the Secretariat in making our Organization better understood, not only through their participation in the General Assembly or in the Committee on Information, but also in the day-to-day political life of their countries.

### XIII

At the outset of this report, I gave a somewhat bleak assessment of the past year. I do not believe, however, that we have any basic reason for despair. We have tremendous problems, some of them the product of our own ingenuity. But we also have great assets and great possibilities if we are prepared to work together in taking advantage of them.

I feel strongly that a more positive approach to many of our problems would do much to over-

come what now appear to be stalemates or insuperable obstacles. Such a positive approach must be related primarily to hopes for the future rather than to the grievances of the past.

It is only natural that the great historic changes of recent decades have generated serious conflicts of interest among nations, compounded at times by clashing conceptions of the past and incompatible visions of the future. These conflicts are genuine and often spring from the operation of factors inherent in the political, economic and social dynamics of the contemporary world. In earlier periods, tensions resulting from such situations would almost inevitably have led to hostility and possibly war. The danger of this happening again is still very much with us, and indeed the risks of confrontation have become immeasurably greater because of the development of ever more sophisticated means of destruction. What is different about the present is precisely that in the United Nations we now have an instrument to deal with these stresses in a rational manner. This instrument, however, is only as good as we make it. If properly used, it should enable us to substitute civilized and peaceful consideration of serious problems for hostile confrontation and the resort to violence with all their appalling dangers.

It would be idle to claim that Governments have in all cases learned to take full advantage of the United Nations as an instrument placed at the disposal of the international community to help solve, or at least to control, some of its intractable problems. To do so requires the steadfast application of political will, as well as a positive approach to the problems involved. This is particularly true of the great economic and social challenges of our time and especially of what is now referred to as the North-South range of problems.

For the great political issues which we face, a new attitude and a more positive approach might also pay unexpected dividends. While the problems are difficult, there can be movement towards solutions that would take due account of the interests and aspirations of all concerned. We know, for example, that the problems of the Middle East are made deeper and more complex on all sides by past events and the memory of those events. Seen in the context of the future, however, that region with its abundance of human and other resources should be a particularly promising and favoured part of the world. Similarly, if the present stalemate could be overcome and bitterness and violence be allowed to abate, an independent Namibia could become the catalyst of a radical improvement of relationships in the whole region of southern Africa, another area of great promise and potential. The

same considerations apply to other problem areas mentioned in this report.

I need hardly add that a positive approach to the relationships of the greatest Powers would perhaps be the greatest boon of all.

I know that it is easier to counsel such an attitude than to adopt it, and that virtually all Governments have difficulties, often of the most serious kind, in choosing the shortest and most rational route to solutions. But I am increasingly impressed by how little advantage any party derives in the long run from, and how great is the loss engendered by, the perpetuation of a problem, not only for those directly concerned but also often for the international community as a whole.

One of the great advantages of the United Nations is that its help and its services as an intermediary can be accepted without loss of face by all concerned since it is an Organization that belongs to all its Members. I urge that its facilities be used more intensively and more along the lines laid down in the Charter to solve the great perennial problems of our time.

As anyone who works in the United Nations knows, there are few, if any, short cuts to a more just, better organized and more peaceful world. I believe, however, that the path mapped out in the Charter 36 years ago is still the best route for a world of sovereign nations, which is the reality of our time. Indeed, the possible alternatives do not bear serious consideration. In many respects we have gone further along the way than—especially in moments of anxiety or frustration—we tend to believe.

I hope that in the coming year we may see, and take part in, further steps forward both on particular issues and towards the general goal of a more peaceful and more equitable world community. I also hope that it will be a year both of efforts and of results on the international scene and that, in the months before us, the United Nations will be used in constructive ways to promote peace and to solve problems.

To bring this about will require understanding and statesmanship of the highest order. It will also require a realization that, while humanity must find the capacity and the will to tackle its difficulties, it has no real alternative for survival.



KURT WALDHEIM  
Secretary-General

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/437, 17 Dec., text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/1.

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/437

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President: agenda item 10.

Report of the Secretary-General on  
the work of the Organization

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly took note of the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization.

# Political and security questions

## Chapter 1

### Disarmament

International tensions and the continued arms race had an adverse effect on disarmament negotiations and deliberations during 1981, and as a consequence there were few tangible results in the field of disarmament. Various aspects of arms limitation, disarmament and the consequences of the arms race were considered by the Disarmament Commission, composed of all United Nations Member States; the Committee on Disarmament, a 40-nation negotiating body meeting at Geneva; and the General Assembly and its First Committee.

The Disarmament Commission, meeting at United Nations Headquarters from 18 May to 5 June,<sup>(7)</sup> adopted a consensus recommendation restating some general principles in favour of nuclear and conventional disarmament (p. 21), and considered other matters without making substantive recommendations (p. 29). The Commission proposed to continue work in 1982 on unfinished business.

During much of the year, the Committee on Disarmament (p. 30) was the only active forum for interregional disarmament negotiations, since several sets of bilateral or trilateral talks outside the United Nations framework were in suspense. By the end of the year, the General Assembly was able to welcome the commencement, on 30 November, of negotiations between the USSR and the United States on medium-range nuclear forces in Europe.

The Committee met from 3 February to 24 April and from 11 June to 21 August, and submitted a report to the General Assembly.<sup>(4)</sup> Four of its ad hoc working groups met during the year, dealing respectively with security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States, radiological weapons, chemical weapons and a comprehensive programme of disarmament. The Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons framed 18 draft articles or elements of an international convention to ban such weapons (p. 69). However, the Committee failed to agree on proposals to establish subsidiary bodies on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban or on cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament.

Work continued at two sessions in New York (4-15 May and 5-16 October) of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament,<sup>(8)</sup> as a result of which the Assembly decided to hold the special session in New York from 7 June to 9 July 1982.<sup>(13)</sup> Also, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research completed in 1981 its first full year of operation (p. 106).

The General Assembly, at its regular 1981 session, discussed 20 disarmament items, some of them embracing more than one issue. Under those items, it adopted on 9 December a record number of 49 resolutions on specific disarmament questions. These resolutions were recommended by the First Committee, devoted to disarmament and related international security questions, following a general debate on disarmament at 24 meetings of the Committee (15 October-4 November). In addition, on 27 October,<sup>(12)</sup> the Assembly requested a report by the Secretary-General suggesting obligations and measures to protect nature from the pernicious effects of the arms race, and to limit and prohibit the types of military activity presenting the greatest danger for nature.

Aspects of disarmament negotiations and machinery were dealt with in four resolutions initiated under the collective item on implementation of the recommendations adopted at the 1978 special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.<sup>(62)</sup> The Assembly urged States to intensify efforts to conclude negotiations taking place in the Committee on Disarmament and other forums,<sup>(40)</sup> and called on States to observe the principles of its 1979 Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament<sup>(10)</sup> and to refrain from action that could hamper disarmament negotiations.<sup>(31)</sup> Noting that the Disarmament Commission had been unable to conclude consideration of its agenda, the Assembly requested the Commission to continue its work.<sup>(29)</sup> The Assembly urged the Committee on Disarmament to continue negotiations on priority items and to complete the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament (p. 22)



in time for consideration by the Assembly at its 1982 special session.<sup>(33)</sup>

In other resolutions concerning disarmament bodies, the Assembly renewed the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference,<sup>(27)</sup> which held two brief sessions in 1981 without being able to agree on when such a conference might be held;<sup>(6)</sup> and it recommended completion of the first review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament during the 1982 special session.

On nuclear disarmament, the Assembly adopted several resolutions. By one, noting that the Committee on Disarmament had not reached agreement on a basis for negotiations on nuclear disarmament, the Assembly called on the Committee to continue consultations concerning the establishment of an ad hoc working group on the question.<sup>(32)</sup> By another, the Assembly urged the United States and the USSR to pursue negotiations towards achievement of substantial reductions and significant qualitative limitations of strategic arms, and invited them to keep it informed of the results.<sup>(55)</sup>

The Assembly adopted three resolutions concerning non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war. By one, it urged all nuclear-weapon States and others to submit their views, proposals and practical suggestions for ensuring the prevention of nuclear war, for consideration at the 1982 special session.<sup>(14)</sup> By another, it declared again that the use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a crime against humanity, and that the use or threat of use of such weapons should be prohibited, pending nuclear disarmament.<sup>(36)</sup> In a Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe, the Assembly proclaimed that States and statesmen first to use nuclear weapons would be committing the gravest crime against humanity, and that doctrines allowing for such use were incompatible with moral standards and United Nations ideals.<sup>(61)</sup>

The Assembly adopted seven resolutions on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and related matters. Concerning Africa, it reiterated its call on all States to respect that continent as a nuclear-weapon-free zone and called on States, corporations and others to terminate military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, including the provision of electronic equipment and related technology;<sup>(21)</sup> and it reaffirmed that South Africa's nuclear plans and capability endangered peace and security.<sup>(20)</sup> With regard to Latin America, the Assembly, noting that the United States had ratified Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, reiterated its invitation to France to do likewise.<sup>(17)</sup>

In three resolutions related to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, the Assembly requested that its 1980 resolution urging steps to implement the proposal for such a zone<sup>(11)</sup> be transmitted to the 1982 special session;<sup>(22)</sup> it stated that the Israeli attack in June 1981 on Iraqi nuclear installations (p. 275) adversely affected prospects for establishing the zone and declared it imperative that Israel place its nuclear facilities under safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency;<sup>(23)</sup> and, after receiving a report by a Group of Experts on Israeli nuclear armament,<sup>(2)</sup> it requested the Security Council to prohibit all nuclear co-operation with Israel and to institute enforcement action to prevent that country from endangering peace and security by its nuclear-weapon capability.<sup>(59)</sup> The Assembly also reaffirmed its endorsement in principle of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.<sup>(24)</sup>

Further, with the object of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, the Assembly requested the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean to make every effort to accomplish preparatory work for a Conference on the Indian Ocean, including consideration of convening the Conference by the first half of 1983.<sup>(26)</sup> The Committee held four series of meetings at United Nations Headquarters in 1981<sup>(5)</sup> but was unable to harmonize views on convening the Conference.

With regard to other nuclear disarmament issues, the Assembly adopted seven resolutions, calling for the Committee on Disarmament: to elaborate an agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on territories where there were none at present;<sup>(51)</sup> to continue negotiations on security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States with a view to elaborating a convention;<sup>(42)</sup> to explore further efforts to reach a common formula on such guarantees which could be included in a legally binding international instrument;<sup>(43)</sup> to start negotiations on a conventions prohibiting neutron weapons;<sup>(38)</sup> to initiate negotiations on a treaty to prohibit nuclear-weapon tests as a matter of the highest priority<sup>(19)</sup> — a request that was coupled in another resolution with a call for a halt to all nuclear-test explosions by the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States;<sup>(18)</sup> and to pursue at an appropriate stage the question of a verified prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices.<sup>(53)</sup>

In the field of non-nuclear weapons, the Assembly adopted two resolutions on chemical weapons prohibition: by one it urged the Committee on Disarmament to continue negotiations on a chemical weapons convention and to re-

establish its Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons for this purpose;<sup>(44)</sup> and by the other it urged similar action and also called on States to refrain from producing and deploying binary and other new types of chemical weapons.<sup>(45)</sup> In a separate action,<sup>(46)</sup> it extended the mandate of the Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons, which presented an initial, inconclusive report in November.<sup>(9)</sup>

The Assembly also requested the Committee to intensify negotiations towards an agreement to prohibit new weapons of mass destruction<sup>(25)</sup> and to continue negotiations for the early conclusion of a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons.<sup>(48)</sup> Regarding a possible arms race in outer space, it adopted two resolutions, one favouring the negotiation of effective and verifiable agreements, starting with one on anti-satellite systems,<sup>(49)</sup> and the other the conclusion of a general treaty against the stationing of weapons in space.<sup>(60)</sup>

In the sphere of conventional weapons, the Assembly urged States to sign and ratify the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects,<sup>(41)</sup> which was opened for signature in April together with three annexed Protocols covering such devices as incendiary weapons and land-mines. It requested the establishment of a group of experts to prepare a study on conventional armaments and disarmament,<sup>(47)</sup> and referred to the special session on disarmament a 1980 study on regional disarmament.<sup>(54)</sup>

In two resolutions on military budgets, the Assembly appealed to States to exercise restraint in their military expenditures while the Disarmament Commission considered principles for freezing and reducing them,<sup>(15)</sup> and recommended that all Member States report their military expenditures annually to the United Nations, using a form devised by an expert panel in 1980.<sup>(16)</sup> On the link between disarmament and international security, it called for action by States to render Security Council decisions effective as a spur to disarmament negotiations.<sup>(57)</sup>

In addition to the study on Israeli nuclear armament (mentioned above), five studies on aspects of disarmament were completed in 1981 and submitted to the Assembly, which took note of them in separate resolutions. The topics were disarmament and development,<sup>(34)</sup> disarmament and international security,<sup>(58)</sup> confidence-building measures,<sup>(52)</sup> institutional arrangements for disarmament<sup>(50)</sup> and a World Disarmament Campaign.<sup>(30)</sup> A study on a proposed international

agency for satellite monitoring of compliance with international disarmament agreements was submitted to the Preparatory Committee for the 1982 special session (p. 104). The Assembly noted with appreciation a report on the work of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies.<sup>(39)</sup>

Finally, with regard to information and training of personnel on disarmament questions, the Assembly decided to continue the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament,<sup>(28)</sup> requested an annual compilation of a table listing the States parties to multilateral disarmament agreements,<sup>(35)</sup> and invited views concerning a proposed world-wide collection of signatures in support of disarmament.<sup>(37)</sup> The United Nations continued to issue two serial publications on disarmament activities: *Disarmament: A Periodic Review by the United Nations*<sup>(1)</sup> and *The United Nations Disarmament Yearbook*.<sup>(3)</sup>

Publications: <sup>(1)</sup>*Disarmament: A Periodic Review by the United Nations*, vol. IV, No. 1, Sales No. E.81.IX.5; No. 2, Sales No. E.81.IX.6. <sup>(2)</sup>Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament Disarmament Study Series 6 (A/36/431), Sales No. E.82.IX.2. <sup>(3)</sup>*The United Nations Disarmament Yearbook*, vol. 6, 1981, Sales Nos. E.82.IX.6 (cloth), E.82.IX.7 (paper).

Reports: <sup>(4)</sup>Committee on Disarmament, A/36/27; <sup>(5)</sup>Committee on Indian Ocean, A/36/29; <sup>(6)</sup>Committee on World Disarmament Conference, A/36/28; <sup>(7)</sup>Disarmament Commission, A/36/42; <sup>(8)</sup>Preparatory Committee for Second Special Session of General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, A/36/49 & Corr.1; <sup>(9)</sup>S-G and Group of Experts on alleged use of chemical weapons, A/36/613.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(10)</sup>34/88, 11 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 86); (11)35/147, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 66); <sup>(12)</sup>36/7, 27 Oct. 1981 (p. 836); (13)36/81 A (p. 29), <sup>(14)</sup>36/81 B (p. 40), <sup>(15)</sup>36/82A (p. 91), (16)36/82 B (p. 92), (17)36/83 (p. 49), <sup>(18)</sup>36/84 (p. 66), <sup>(19)</sup>36/85 (p. 67), (20)36/86A (p. 47), <sup>(21)</sup>36/86 B (p. 45), (22)36/87A (p. 50), <sup>(23)</sup>36/87B (p. 54), <sup>(24)</sup>36/88 (p. 55), <sup>(25)</sup>36/89 (p. 78), <sup>(26)</sup>36/90 (p. 95), <sup>(27)</sup>36/91 (p. 27), <sup>(28)</sup>36/92A (p. 108), <sup>(29)</sup>36/92 B (p. 30), (30)36/92C (p. 110), (31)36/92D (p. 25), <sup>(32)</sup>36/92 E (p. 37), (33)36/92 F (p. 33), (34)36/92 G (p. 99), (35)36/92H (p. 109), <sup>(36)</sup>36/92 I (p. 41), <sup>(37)</sup>36/92J (p. 112), (38)36/92 K (p. 63), (39)36/92 L (p. 107), (40)36/92M (p. 24), (41)36/93 (p. 85), (42)36/94 (p. 60), (43)36/95 (p. 61), (44)36/96A (p. 72), (45)36/96 B (p. 73), <sup>(46)</sup>36/96 C (p. 76), <sup>(47)</sup>36/97 A (p. 88), <sup>(48)</sup>36/97B (p. 80), (49)36/97C (p. 83), <sup>(50)</sup>36/97 D (p. 106), <sup>(51)</sup>36/97 E (p. 57), <sup>(52)</sup>36/97 F (p. 104), <sup>(53)</sup>36/97 G (p. 68), (54)36/97 H (p. 89), <sup>(55)</sup>36/97 I (p. 39), (56)36/97J (p. 34), <sup>(57)</sup>36/97K (p. 101), (58)36/97 L (p. 102), (59)36/98 (p. 52), (60)36/99 (p. 83), <sup>(61)</sup>36/100 (p. 43), 9 Dec.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(62)</sup>1978, p. 17.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-44, 52, 53 (19 Oct.-4 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

## General aspects of disarmament

### General disarmament issues

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION ACTION. During its 1981 substantive session (New York, 18

May-5 June), the Disarmament Commission, as in previous years, considered various aspects of the arms race, with the aim of elaborating a general approach to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament. In its recommendations, adopted by consensus on 5 June and set out in its report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission noted with grave concern that it was meeting at a critical moment of deterioration in international relations and that the arms race, particularly in its nuclear aspect, had escalated to new levels. The Commission expressed the conviction that the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, ran counter to efforts to relax international tensions, that progress in disarmament would benefit the strengthening of peace and security and the improvement of international relations, and that all nations had a vital interest in nuclear and conventional disarmament.

The Commission referred to the special responsibility of nuclear-weapon States in achieving nuclear disarmament, and added that States with the largest military arsenals had special responsibility in pursuing conventional armaments reduction.

The Commission considered nuclear disarmament to be the most effective security assurance against the use of nuclear weapons (p. 34) and that, pending its achievement, the nuclear-weapon States should give effective assurance to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of such weapons (p. 58). The Commission recommended the strengthening of the existing nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America (p. 48), the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions and the establishment of zones of peace.

The most recent agreements on strategic arms control between the two most heavily armed nuclear-weapon States remained unratified, the Commission noted (p. 37). Further, it deplored the continuing increase in military expenditures (p. 89), largely in the nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States, and it emphasized the need to release such resources for international economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries (p. 96).

The Commission noted with profound regret that, although there had been limited progress in certain areas, there continued to be a marked lack of progress in others. Accordingly, it urged all States, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, to intensify the search for a common approach to disarmament, especially in areas with the highest concentration of armaments, including Europe. To that end, it was urgent to initiate or intensify negotiations, particularly multi-

lateral negotiations on questions vital to both nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States.

The United States reserved its position on the Commission's recommendations, noting that they were based on a working paper introduced in the closing days of the session and observing that the Commission's deliberations had been insufficiently detailed to permit the development of considered judgements on the important and complicated issues covered.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Disarmament Commission, A/36/42.

#### Comprehensive disarmament programme

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT. Work on a comprehensive programme of disarmament continued at the 1981 session of the Committee on Disarmament<sup>(1)</sup> on the basis of an outline adopted in 1980,<sup>(4)</sup> providing for an introduction or preamble and chapters on objectives, principles, priorities, measures, stages of implementation, and machinery and procedures.

The Committee's Ad Hoc Working Group on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, meeting between 19 February and 17 August, completed a preliminary examination of all chapters except the introduction or preamble, whose form and substance could not be determined pending completion of substantive chapters. The Group considered a number of working papers, containing the views of various delegations on the programme.

At the conclusion of its work in 1981, the Group reported to the Committee that, although it had made progress towards elaboration of the programme, several important and complex issues remained unresolved, particularly those relating to measures, stages and the nature of the programme. It had used a four-stage programme as a working hypothesis and had then discussed which disarmament measures should be included in the first stage, but different views had been expressed on specific measures and on time-frames for implementation. The Group recommended that it resume work in January 1982.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In a resolution of 9 December on the report of the Committee on Disarmament,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly requested that body to complete, during the first part of its 1982 session, the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and to submit the programme in time for consideration and adoption by the Assembly at the second special session devoted to disarmament, in June/July 1982 (p. 27).

Discussing in the First Committee the work done on the programme, Mexico remarked that views still differed on three points: whether to establish the number of stages in the programme,

whether to determine their duration and what the content of those stages should be.

A number of countries, such as Algeria, Chile, Egypt, India, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Somalia and Yugoslavia, stated that the programme should specify disarmament priorities to be achieved within certain time-frames. Ghana thought the document should be legally binding. India recalled that in 1962 both the USSR and the United States had presented draft treaties on general and complete disarmament which were to have been implemented in their entirety within a decade or so.<sup>(5)</sup> In China's view, the programme would facilitate disarmament by providing for specific measures by stages.

Austria and Finland, however, expressed doubts about the advisability of rigid time-frames for the various stages, but favoured regular review conferences to monitor and direct the implementation of the programme. The need for review was also stressed by the Federal Republic of Germany, which added that the credibility of the programme would be judged on the basis of how realistic its goals were. Belgium believed that the task of reviewing implementation could be entrusted to the Disarmament Commission. Sweden remarked that the programme's impact would be completely dependent on the will to implement it through multilateral negotiations.

Bangladesh suggested that the programme might also envisage parallel progress in dispute settlement and in building a United Nations interregional security and peace-keeping capability.

Czechoslovakia observed that the socialist States of Eastern Europe saw the programme as a practical instrument for a comprehensive revitalization of disarmament negotiations in all necessary directions. The German Democratic Republic considered that calls to alter disarmament priorities in the name of realism, especially regarding such issues as verification and "transparency", were actually appeals to sit still and must therefore be rejected. Poland suggested that, apart from specific priorities, the programme should reaffirm the principles of disarmament negotiations, such as the sovereign equality of States, undiminished security for all at the lowest possible level of military force, and a balance of rights and obligations.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Disarmament, A/36/27 (Committee documents, CD/228, appendix II, vols. I, II).

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA 36/92 F, para. 2, 9 Dec. p. 33).

Yearbook references: <sup>(3)</sup>1962, p. 6; <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 28.

#### Implementation of the resolutions of the tenth special session

By a resolution of 9 December 1981<sup>(3)</sup> on implementation of the recommendations and de-

cisions of its tenth special session—the first such session devoted to disarmament, held in 1978<sup>(4)</sup>—the General Assembly expressed concern about the arms race and constantly growing military budgets, and called on States to promote international security and disarmament. It urged States to intensify efforts to bring to a successful end the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament and other international forums, and to proceed to or resume negotiations on disarmament agreements in priority areas. It recommended that the Committee on Disarmament concentrate on substantive and priority items with a view to achieving tangible results (p. 31). Calling on States to refrain from actions which could have negative effects in regard to disarmament, the Assembly invited all States engaged in disarmament negotiations outside the United Nations framework to keep it and the Committee on Disarmament informed of results, and to implement the results so as to create conditions for further progress.

This resolution, sponsored by 28 States, was adopted by the Assembly without vote, after the First Committee approved it in similar fashion on 20 November, on the basis of a draft revised by its sponsors. It was introduced by Yugoslavia, which stressed that, despite the significance attached by all to implementation of the measures set out in the Final Document of the 1978 session,<sup>(2)</sup> there was deep concern that many aims of the session had not been attained. Accordingly, the sponsors felt that implementation of the decisions taken at that session would be the best way to halt the arms race and create conditions conducive to disarmament.

The sponsors' revisions to the draft reflected parts of an earlier draft resolution by the German Democratic Republic and Mongolia, entitled "Obligation of States to contribute to effective disarmament negotiations".<sup>(1)</sup> By that proposal, the Assembly would have expressed alarm about escalation of the arms race and conviction that disarmament negotiations must be conducted without pre-conditions. In addition to urging intensified negotiating efforts, it would have called for preservation and expansion of the existing system of disarmament agreements, and recommended that special attention be attached at future Assembly sessions to continuous review of such negotiations. In the light of the ideas incorporated in the 28-nation draft, of which it had become a sponsor, the German Democratic Republic decided not to press the proposal to a vote.

The United States, which joined in the consensus, stated that, although it strongly supported the call for genuine progress in arms control, it was concerned that the resolution failed to

acknowledge the importance of verification, balance and mutual restraint.

During the First Committee debate on disarmament, several States referred to the issue of verification of compliance with disarmament agreements. The USSR stated that verification should proceed from a clear-cut agreement on arms limitation and disarmament measures, should be commensurate with the scope and form of the obligations established by agreements on arms limitation and disarmament, should not infringe on the sovereign rights of States or allow interference in their internal affairs, and should not be used for a hostile and slanderous campaign by one State against another or serve as a means of complicating international relations. The United Kingdom held that, in most disarmament negotiations, the problem of verification would be near the heart of the discussion; efforts for the conclusion of disarmament agreements built on confidence must be redoubled, and confidence could develop only if there was a willingness to move away from secrecy towards a freer exchange of information.

France also stressed the importance of verification provisions as necessary conditions for mutual confidence in disarmament agreements, while Belgium stated that verification mechanisms, if they were to be credible and effective, must be strictly adapted to the material to be verified. New Zealand believed that greater openness in the provision of information and flexibility in considering verification proposals, especially on the part of States which had shown reluctance to co-operate in those areas, would contribute substantially to disarmament prospects.

Draft resolution not pressed: <sup>(1)</sup>German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, A/C.1/36/L.25.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>S-10/2, 30 June 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 39); <sup>(3)</sup>36/92 M 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1978, p. 17.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 32, 34-38 (19 Oct.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/92 M

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) without vote. 20 November (meeting 38): 28-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.26/Rev.1); agenda item 51 (h)

Sponsors: Algeria. Argentine. Bahamas. Congo. Cuba. Cyprus. Ecuador. Egypt. Ethiopia. German Democratic Republic. Ghana. India. Indonesia. Mexico. Niger. Nigeria. Pakistan. Panama. Peru. Qatar. Romania. Sierra Leone. Sri Lanka. Sudan. Venezuela. Viet Nam. Yugoslavia. Zaire.

#### Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session

The General Assembly,

Having reviewed the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, the first special session devoted to disarmament,

Recalling its resolutions S-10/2 of 30 June 1978, 34/83 C of 11 December 1979, 35/46 of 3 December 1980 and 35/152 E of 12 December 1980,

Reaffirming the importance of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, which constitutes a comprehensive basis for further efforts towards promoting international security, halting and reversing the arms race, and the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control,

Considering it imperative to achieve genuine progress in all negotiations dealing with disarmament issues,

Convinced that the success of disarmament negotiations, in which all peoples of the world have a vital interest, would be achieved through the active participation of Member States in such negotiations, thereby contributing to the maintenance of international peace and security,

Reaffirming that the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament,

Deeply concerned about the continuing arms race and, in particular, the nuclear-arms race, which constitutes a growing threat to international peace and security,

Mindful of a growing awareness among States and peoples of the dangers of the continuing arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race, and of the need to eliminate the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war,

Calling attention to the tasks set forth in the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, which demand intensified efforts to be taken in the Committee on Disarmament and other appropriate forums,

Stressing the need to promote the development, strengthening and intensification of international co-operation designed to achieve general and complete disarmament, as defined by the General Assembly at its tenth special session,

Noting with concern the lack of tangible progress with respect to the implementation of the measures set forth in the Programme of Action in section III of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly,

Bearing in mind that at its second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982, the General Assembly will undertake a review of the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the first special session on disarmament,

Conscious of the need to contribute to the success of the second special session through concrete accomplishments in the field of disarmament, thereby maintaining and further intensifying the momentum generated by the first special session,

1. Expresses its deep concern about the continued arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race, and about the constantly growing military budgets, which bear negative consequences and pose a growing threat to international peace and security as well as to the development of States, particularly developing countries;

2. Urgently calls upon all States, in particular nuclear-weapon States and other major military Powers, immediately to take steps in order to promote international security and lead to the effective halting and reversing of the arms race and to disarmament;

3. Urges those States also to intensify their efforts to bring to a successful end the negotiations which are currently taking place in the Committee on Disarmament and other international forums and to proceed to or resume negotiations on effective international agreements on items of the highest priority as laid down by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament;

4. Recommends that the Committee on Disarmament should concentrate its work on the substantive and priority items on its agenda with a view to achieving tangible results in order to contribute to the success of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and to the accomplishment of the tasks set forth in the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade;

5. Calls upon all States to refrain from any actions which have or may have negative effects on the implementation of the relevant recommendations and decisions of the first special session devoted to disarmament;

6. Invites all States which are engaged in disarmament and/or arms limitation negotiations outside the framework of the United Nations to keep the General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament informed of the results of such negotiations in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly;

7. Also calls upon States engaged in such negotiations outside the framework of the United Nations to implement the results achieved, so as to create favourable conditions for further progress;

8. Recommends that the General Assembly should keep under review at its forthcoming sessions the implementation of its recommendations and decisions on disarmament issues.

#### International co-operation for disarmament

In a resolution adopted on 9 December 1981 on international co-operation for disarmament<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly called on all States to observe the principles of its 1979 Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament<sup>(2)</sup> so as to secure a constructive mutual dialogue aimed at limiting armaments, particularly nuclear weapons. It called on Member States to be guided in all disarmament negotiations by the generally recognized principles of international law; to submit and constructively consider disarmament proposals; to refrain from action that could hamper, complicate or render impossible disarmament negotiations, particularly by discussing unrelated issues; and to disseminate widely the principles of international co-operation to achieve disarmament.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 116 to none, with 26 abstentions, following First Committee approval on 23 November by a recorded vote of 95 to none, with 25 abstentions.

Sponsored by 28 States, the resolution was introduced by Czechoslovakia, which stated that the principal aim of the text was to encourage co-operation among States aimed at the implementation of disarmament objectives, especially those emanating from the 1978 special session of the Assembly on disarmament.<sup>(4)</sup> Such co-operation should be based on clear principles, reflecting a political will to find acceptable, practical solutions.

The United Kingdom, explain in the abstention of the European Community (EC) member States in the vote, stated that the proposal added nothing to the principles of such international instruments as the Charter of the United Nations or the 1978 Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly.<sup>(1)</sup> Finland, Mexico and Turkey also abstained, recalling their reservations on the 1979 Declaration.

China, while favouring the concept of co-operation for disarmament, did not participate in the vote, since it regarded as ambiguous the phrase suggesting that "unrelated issues" should not be raised in disarmament negotiations.

Pakistan voted in favour but found difficulties with a preambular paragraph stating that a new round of the arms race would jeopardize international stability; Pakistan's view was that the increasing use of force led to international tension, of which the arms race was one manifestation.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>S-10/2, 30 June 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 39); <sup>(2)</sup>34/88, 11 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 86); <sup>(3)</sup>36/92 D, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1978, p. 17.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 31, 34, 38, 40 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/92 D

116-0-26 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) by recorded vote (95-0-25).  
23 November (meeting 40); 28-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.12): agenda item 51.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam, Yemen.

#### International co-operation for disarmament

The General Assembly,

Stressing again the urgent need for an active and sustained effort to intensify the comprehensive implementation of the recommendations and decisions unanimously adopted at its tenth special session, the first special session devoted to disarmament, as contained in the Final Document of that session,

Convinced that, to this end, effective, constructive and continuing co-operation among all States at all levels, including the highest, on the basis of mutual confidence and political will, is essential.

Deeply concerned over the growing danger of a new round of the arms race, which would seriously jeopardize international stability and increase the danger of a nuclear catastrophe,

Convinced that the halting of the arms race and adoption of effective disarmament measures, particularly in the field of nuclear disarmament, would release considerable financial and material resources to be used for the economic and social development of all States, in particular developing countries,

Taking into consideration the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in combining efforts and in supporting and developing active co-operation among States aimed at the solution of disarmament problems,

Recalling in this context the Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament, of 11 December 1979,

Noting that that Declaration may play a positive role in concerting efforts for the achievement of effective measures in the implementation of the goals set forth to this end in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session,

1. Calls upon all States to observe the principles and make active use of the ideas contained in the Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament so as to secure a constructive mutual dialogue aimed at limiting armaments, particularly nuclear weapons, through the conclusion of agreements, keeping in mind the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control:

2. Calls upon Member States to be guided in all disarmament negotiations by the generally recognized principles of international law and to submit and constructively to consider, with full responsibility and in the spirit of co-operation, proposals and initiatives aimed at promoting speedy progress in disarmament negotiations and facilitating the achievement of mutually acceptable concrete disarmament measures;

3. Calls upon Member States to refrain from any action that could hamper, complicate or render impossible the disarmament negotiations which are under way, the opening of new negotiations or the achievement of specific disarmament agreements and, in particular, not to hinder possible progress in negotiations on disarmament by the discussion of unrelated issues;

4. Recommends that the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament should make active use of the Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament in the preparations for the special session;

5. Calls upon Member States to disseminate widely, in connection with Disarmament Week, the principles of international co-operation designed to achieve the goals of disarmament.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenade, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Zaire.

#### Proposed World Disarmament Conference

**AD HOC COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES.** The Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference held two sessions in 1981, consisting of two meetings on 6 and 8 April, and three meetings between 6 and 10 July.

In its report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee stated that, through its Chairman, it had maintained close contact with representatives of the nuclear-weapon States so as to remain currently informed of their attitudes.

According to the report, the USSR believed the Assembly should take a decision that would contribute to the realization of previous recommendations for convening such a conference, which could adopt specific decisions on halting the arms race and realizing disarmament.

The four other nuclear Powers maintained their reservations on the practicability or value

of a conference. China's position remained unchanged: it had previously maintained as pre-conditions for a conference that the major nuclear Powers undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and that they end all forms of their military presence in other countries. France stated that the international situation was not conducive to real progress on such an initiative, and that account should be taken of the achievements of the Assembly's 1978 special session on disarmament<sup>(3)</sup> and the conclusions that would emerge from its second such session, in 1982 (p. 27). The United Kingdom maintained that, in the light of the deteriorating international situation in the past two years, it was not useful to continue to consider, for the time being, the idea of a world disarmament conference. The United States continued to believe it premature to set a date and begin preparations for a conference; insufficient political agreement on the issues would probably hinder rather than assist efforts to reach concrete and verifiable arms control measures.

For its part, the Committee reiterated that the idea of a world disarmament conference had wide support among the United Nations membership, though with varying degrees of emphasis and differences regarding conditions and certain aspects relevant to its convening, including the deteriorating international situation. It was also evident that no consensus on convening a conference under current conditions had been reached among the nuclear-weapon States, whose participation was widely deemed essential. The Committee suggested that the Assembly might decide that, after its 1982 disarmament session, a conference would take place as soon as the necessary consensus was reached.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** In a resolution on the World Disarmament Conference,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted without vote on 9 December, the General Assembly renewed the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee, requested it to maintain close contact with nuclear and all other States in order to remain informed of their attitudes, and asked it to report to the Assembly at its special session on disarmament as well as at its 1982 regular session. The 10-nation text, introduced by Sri Lanka, was approved by the First Committee on 25 November, also without vote.

Albania dissociated itself from the consensus, stating that the proposal for a world disarmament conference had been made by the USSR for propaganda purposes and that holding such a conference would adversely affect the significance of other United Nations disarmament activities. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, doubted whether further meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee at the current stage

would lead to the convening of a conference. The United States assumed that any expenditure flowing from the resolution would be made without prejudice to the United Nations zero-growth budget policy.

A number of Eastern European States and others, including Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and Viet Nam, emphasized the importance they attached to convening a conference following the 1982 special session. Bulgaria felt that the Assembly should play an active part at that session in speeding up talks on urgent disarmament questions, thus paving the way for a conference. Poland considered that the projected comprehensive disarmament programme (p. 22) must envisage the convening of a world disarmament conference at an early date, and the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Zambia viewed the special session as a step towards convening the conference. Zimbabwe held that such a conference would be in the interest of peace and security.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Ad Hoc Committee, A/36/28.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/91, 9 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1978, p. 17.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.5/36/71/Add.1; 5th Committee report, A/36/804; S-G statements, A/C.1/36/L.57, A/C.5/36/71. Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 34, 36, 38, 44 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.67 (8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/91

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/751) without vote, 25 November (meeting 44): 10-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.27); agenda item 50.

Sponsors: Burundi, Cuba, Madagascar, Mongolia, Niger, Panama, Peru, Poland, Spain, Sri Lanka.

#### World Disarmament Conference

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2833(XXVI) of 16 December 1971, 2930(XXVII) of 29 November 1972, 3183(XXVIII) of 18 December 1973, 3260(XXIX) of 9 December 1974, 3469(XXX) of 11 December 1975, 31/190 of 21 December 1976, 32/89 of 12 December 1977, 33/69 of 14 December 1978, 34/81 of 11 December 1979 and 35/151 of 12 December 1980.

Reiterating its conviction that all the peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations and that all States should be in a position to contribute to the adoption of measures for the achievement of this goal,

Stressing anew its conviction that a world disarmament conference, adequately prepared and convened at an appropriate time, could provide the realization of such an aim and that the co-operation of all nuclear-weapon Powers would considerably facilitate its attainment,

Taking note of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference,

Recalling that, in paragraph 122 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, it decided that, at the earliest appropriate time, a world disarmament conference should be convened with universal participation and with adequate preparation,

Recalling that, in paragraph 23 of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, contained in the

annex to its resolution 35/46 of 3 December 1980, the General Assembly considered it pertinent also to recall that in paragraph 122 of the Final Document it had stated that at the earliest appropriate time a world disarmament conference should be convened with universal participation and with adequate preparation,

Recalling further that the subject of the possible convening of a world disarmament conference has been included in the draft agenda for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982,

1. Notes with satisfaction that in its report to the General Assembly the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference stated, *inter alia*, the following:

"Having regard for the important requirements of a world disarmament conference to be convened at the earliest appropriate time, with universal participation and with adequate preparation, the General Assembly may wish to decide that, after its second special session devoted to disarmament, a world disarmament conference would take place as soon as the necessary consensus on its convening has been reached";

2. Renews the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee;

3. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee to maintain close contact with the representatives of the States possessing nuclear weapons in order to remain currently informed of their attitudes, as well as with all other States, and to consider any possible relevant proposals and observations which might be made to the Committee, especially having in mind paragraph 122 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly;

4. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee to report to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament and at its thirty-seventh session;

5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "World Disarmament Conference".

#### Preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament (1982)

In 1981 the General Assembly endorsed recommendations on the agenda and dates (7 June-9 July 1982) for its second special session on disarmament. The decision to convene the session in 1982 had been taken by the Assembly in 1978<sup>(5)</sup> following the first such session—the Assembly's tenth special session—held at United Nations Headquarters from 23 May to 1 July 1978.<sup>(9)</sup> The Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, which began work in 1980,<sup>(10)</sup> held its second and third sessions in 1981, at which it made recommendations that the Assembly endorsed in December.<sup>(7)</sup>

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION CONSIDERATION. In a recommendation adopted by consensus on 5 June,<sup>(2)</sup> the Disarmament Commission agreed on an outline for its report to the special session. It requested the Secretariat to prepare a draft, including an introduction on the Commission's establishment by the Assembly in 1978,<sup>(4)</sup> and sections on the Commission's organizational and substantive work. The Commission also agreed that the part of the report related to conclu-



sions and recommendations would be prepared at its next substantive session (in 1982).

**PREPARATORY COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES.** AS a result of two sessions held in 1981 at United Nations Headquarters, from 4 to 15 May and from 5 to 16 October, the 78-member Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament recommended in its report to the Assembly<sup>(3)</sup> that the special session be held at United Nations Headquarters between 7 June and 9 July 1982. It recommended also that every effort be made to ensure that, in so far as possible, decisions on matters of substance would be adopted by consensus at that session; that Member States should be represented at the highest possible political level; that the session have a committee of the whole, a working group on the comprehensive programme of disarmament and as many open-ended groups or subsidiary organs as necessary; and that non-governmental organizations and peace and disarmament institutions be accorded the same facilities at the 1982 session as at the previous disarmament session in 1978.

The Committee recommended a provisional agenda for the session, to include the following substantive items: review of implementation of the decisions and recommendations adopted at the 1978 disarmament session; consideration and adoption of the comprehensive programme of disarmament (p. 22); implementation of the Assembly's Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, adopted in 1980,<sup>(6)</sup> and consideration of proposals by Member States; enhancing the effectiveness of disarmament machinery and strengthening the United Nations role in that field, including the possible convening of a world disarmament conference; measures to mobilize world public opinion in favour of disarmament; and adoption, in an appropriate format, of the document or documents of the session. There would be a general debate, including a review and appraisal of the international situation in the light of the pressing need for specific, generally agreed measures to eliminate the danger of war, halt and reverse the arms race, and achieve substantial progress in disarmament.

The Committee also recommended that it hold one further session, from 26 April to 14 May 1982, to continue its preparatory work.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution on preparations for the second special session devoted to disarmament,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Assembly endorsed the report and recommendations of the Preparatory Committee and invited Member States to submit to the Secretary-General, by 31 March 1982, further views on substantive issues. In addition, the Assembly requested all Member

States engaged in bilateral, regional or multilateral negotiations on disarmament issues outside the United Nations framework to submit information on such negotiations to the Assembly before the special session. The Assembly adopted this resolution on 9 December without vote, following similar approval by the First Committee on 25 November of a 43-nation draft introduced by Yugoslavia.

In a resolution on the activities of the Disarmament Commission,<sup>(8)</sup> also adopted on 9 December, the Assembly requested the Commission to submit at the special session a substantive report on its work.

Greece, one of the sponsors of the resolution on preparations for the special session, believed that the debate at the session should be detailed and should focus on all forms of disarmament and on concrete proposals to ensure their verification. Lebanon hoped States would be represented at the highest possible political level and recalled its 1980 suggestion that heads of State should attend.

In the view of Bangladesh, the special session should help achieve an increased awareness by the public and Governments of the need to halt and reverse the arms race and of the urgency of progress towards disarmament. Uganda also stressed the role of the session in focusing public opinion on concrete action for disarmament.

Brazil said the session could be meaningful only if States, particularly the nuclear-weapon Powers, acknowledged the widespread concern for positive steps to replace procedural haggling, the empty rhetoric of declaratory resolutions and worn-out accusations of blame. The Byelorussian SSR stated that the session could be successful if all States attended with a serious desire to make honest and constructive attempts to solve the problems of restricting the arms race, and if they relinquished intentions to distract the Assembly from making such efforts. Chile thought success would be possible only by creating a climate of peace and harmony and achieving greater stability in international relations. In China's view, the session should find the root cause for the continued intensification of the arms race and the lack of progress in disarmament, so as to set a correct course for future efforts.

The German Democratic Republic hoped the session would provide fresh impetus for opening, resuming or continuing disarmament talks. The Federal Republic of Germany thought the session could lay the conceptual groundwork for future world-wide disarmament negotiations and play a part in bringing them to a conclusion. Zambia saw it as giving new impetus to negotiations on specific urgent problems.

France said it was important for the Assembly to take cognizance at the special session, if not of any far-reaching results, at least of clear and concrete signs of a willingness to act for disarmament. Ghana warned that the session's significance would be lost unless delegations, particularly of the super-Powers and their allies, showed a greater commitment to disarmament than in the past. In the view of Italy, the session's success would be measured by its ability to channel efforts into an agreed and dynamic framework which took account of the legitimate security requirements of States. Jamaica hoped the session would generate a new momentum towards general and complete disarmament.

Nigeria hoped the session would be used to reassess the attitudes of all States to disarmament, revamp disarmament machinery and adopt concrete instruments and measures. In Romania's opinion, the session could restore confidence in the possibility of disarmament; its goal should be to crystallize guidelines for action that would radically change the world situation. Togo thought the session should emphasize that nations and peoples could benefit immediately from disarmament.

Commenting on the activities of the Preparatory Committee, Argentina observed that it had engaged in sterile discussions which, though finally producing a draft agenda for the special session, had prevented members from preparing for the work of the session.

The USSR, in a letter to the Secretary-General dated 27 April from its Minister for Foreign Affairs,<sup>(1)</sup> considered that the special session should provide further stimulus for arms limitation and disarmament talks and serve as a landmark on the road to convening a world disarmament conference.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>USSR, 27 Apr., A/36/226.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Disarmament Commission, A/36/42; <sup>(3)</sup>Preparatory Committee, A/36/49 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>S-10/2, para. 118, 30 June 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 46); <sup>(5)</sup>33/71 H, sect. III, 14 Dec. 1978 (ibid., 128); <sup>(6)</sup>35/46, annex, 3 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 102); <sup>(7)</sup>36/81 A, 9 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(8)</sup>36/92 B, para. 4.9 Dec. (p. 30).

Yearbook references: <sup>(9)</sup>1978, p. 17; <sup>(10)</sup>1980, p. 97.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/801; S-G statements, A/C.I/36/L.49, A/C.5/36/87.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.I/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 27, 28, 30, 34, 38, 43 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.67 (8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/81 A

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/740) without vote. 25 November (meeting 43); 43-nation draft (A/C.I/36/L.5); agenda item 39.

Sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burma, Canada, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Sene-

gal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

#### Preparations for the session

The General Assembly,

Recalling section III of its resolution 33/71 H of 14 December 1978, in which it decided to convene a second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1982 at United Nations Headquarters in New York,

Having considered the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament,

1. Endorses the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament and the recommendations contained therein for the session to be held in New York from 7 June to 9 July 1982;

2. Endorses a/so the recommendation of the Preparatory Committee to meet in New York from 26 April to 14 May 1982 in order to continue consideration of substantive issues related to the session, including the implementation of the decisions and recommendations adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, the first special session devoted to disarmament, for incorporation in the document or documents to be adopted at the second special session devoted to disarmament, and any remaining organizational and procedural matters;

3. Expresses its appreciation to the members of the Preparatory Committee for their constructive contribution to its work;

4. Invites Member States to submit to the Secretary-General, not later than 31 March 1982, further views on the substantive issues related to the second special session devoted to disarmament, including the implementation of the decisions and recommendations adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session;

5. Requests all Member States engaged in bilateral, regional or multilateral negotiations on disarmament issues outside the framework of the United Nations to submit appropriate information on such negotiations to the General Assembly, in accordance with paragraph 27 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the Assembly, before the second special session devoted to disarmament;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to render to the Preparatory Committee all necessary assistance for the completion of its work.

#### Disarmament Commission

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMISSION. The Disarmament Commission, composed of all United Nations Member States, held its 1981 substantive session from 18 May to 5 June at United Nations Headquarters. Its agenda included two items carried over from previous sessions on which it adopted recommendations that were included in its 1981 report to the General Assembly:<sup>(1)</sup> aspects of the arms race (p. 21), particularly the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament (p. 34), with the aim of elaborating a general approach to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament; and reduction of military budgets (p. 89). It considered for the first time a matter pertaining to South Africa's nuclear capability (p. 46). New items appearing on the Commission's 1981 agenda concerned plans for a United Nations study on conventional weapons (p. 85) and preparation of the Commission's report for

the 1982 special session of the Assembly on disarmament (p. 27).

At an organizational session on 10 and 11 December 1981, the Commission reviewed the draft resolutions then before the Assembly having a bearing on its work, and discussed its schedule and agenda for 1982.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution on the report of the Disarmament Commission, adopted without vote on 9 December,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly noted that the Commission had not been able to conclude consideration of the items on its agenda. The Assembly requested the Commission to continue its work and to meet for up to four weeks in 1982. The Commission was also asked to submit a substantive report at the Assembly's 1982 special session on disarmament. The First Committee approved the text on 20 November, also without vote.

The resolution was sponsored by Barbados, Egypt and Uruguay. Introducing it, Egypt observed that, while important deliberations had taken place in the Commission on a number of items, further deliberations were required before that body could make substantive recommendations.

After approval of the resolution in Committee, Brazil expressed confidence that the Commission would complete discussion of the guidelines for a study on conventional weapons (p. 85), while the Federal Republic of Germany thought the Commission's 1982 session should be kept shorter than usual in view of the Assembly's special session.

In the Committee's debate, Australia said care should be taken to ensure that the Commission did not become another defunct United Nations body, meeting year after year without achievement or purpose. Austria suggested that the scope of the Commission's activities be discussed at the special session on disarmament. Nepal also thought the Commission's mandate should be reviewed at the Assembly's special session, as a repetition in the Commission of the First Committee's debate served no useful purpose. Believing that the Commission had not found a proper identity, Spain thought it necessary to examine whether the Commission's existence met a definite need. Yugoslavia said it could not agree with attempts to push the Commission to the sidelines and prevent it from dealing with substantive issues.

Several States expressed dissatisfaction with developments at the Commission's 1981 session. Brazil said the non-aligned, neutral and other States had not been given a fair chance to discuss the substance of items and to have their opinions taken into account. Guyana expressed concern about what it saw as the efforts of some States to

obstruct the Commission's work, and said it could not agree to leave disarmament negotiations to a small directorate. Nigeria complained that a few members of the Commission tended to exercise the semblance of a veto when consensus was sought on issues such as the nuclear capability of South Africa. Peru saw certain practices and the positions of some States as incompatible with the holding of proper negotiations. Venezuela stressed that the consensus rule should not become a tool used to advance the interests of the major Powers.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Disarmament Commission, A/36/42.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/92 B, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 28-31, 37, 38 (19 Oct.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/92 B

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981  
Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) without vote. 20 November  
(meeting 38): 3-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.4); agenda item 51 (a).

Sponsors: Barbados, Egypt, Uruguay.

#### Report of the Disarmament Commission

The General Assembly,  
Having considered the report of the Disarmament Commission,

Emphasizing again the importance of an effective follow-up to the relevant recommendations and decisions adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament,

Considering the important role that the Disarmament Commission has played and the significant contribution it has made in examining and submitting recommendations on various problems in the field of disarmament and in the promotion of the implementation of the relevant decisions of the tenth special session.

Recalling its resolutions 33/71 H of 14 December 1978, 34/83 H of 11 December 1979 and 35/152 F of 12 December 1980,

1. Takes note of the report of the Disarmament Commission;

2. Notes that the Disarmament Commission was not able to conclude its consideration of the items on its agenda;

3. Requests the Disarmament Commission to continue its work in accordance with its mandate, as set forth in paragraph 118 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, and to continue consideration of the items included in the agenda of its session in 1981 and, to that end, to meet for a period not exceeding four weeks during 1992;

4. Requests the Disarmament Commission to submit a substantive report on its work to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Disarmament Commission the report of the Committee on Disarmament, together with all the official records of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly relating to disarmament matters, and to render all assistance that it may require for implementing the present resolution;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

#### Committee on Disarmament

**ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE.** The 40-member Committee on Disarmament met at

Geneva from 3 February to 24 April and from 11 June to 21 August 1981. Holding 49 formal and 45 informal plenary meetings, it discussed substantially the same agenda items as in 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> concerning a nuclear-test ban (p. 64), cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament (p. 35), security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States (p. 58), chemical weapons (p. 69), new types of weapons of mass destruction (p. 77) and radiological weapons (p. 79), a comprehensive programme of disarmament (p. 22), and adoption of its report to the General Assembly.<sup>(1)</sup> It also dealt with the Israeli attack of 7 June on Iraqi nuclear installations (p. 53) and discussed the question of its own membership (p. 33).

On 12 February the Committee re-established the three ad hoc working groups set up in 1980, on security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States, chemical weapons and radiological weapons. All three groups met in 1981, as did the Ad Hoc Working Group on the comprehensive disarmament programme, also established in 1980. In addition, the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events continued its work in relation to a prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

The Committee was unable to reach agreement on the establishment of further subsidiary bodies, such as a working group on a nuclear-test ban. In this connection, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sweden and Yugoslavia submitted a paper for consideration at the 1982 session whereby the Committee's rules of procedure would be amended to ensure that the rule of consensus would not be used to prevent the establishment of subsidiary bodies.

Comments on the results of the Committee's work in 1981 were submitted in August in papers by China, a group of socialist States and the "Group of 21" (Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire). The group of socialist States said that even in the difficult international situation they had maintained an approach aimed at constructive negotiations and were convinced of the importance of intensifying efforts to limit the arms race. The Group of 21 considered it imperative to initiate negotiations to reduce international tensions and halt and reverse the arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race.

Introducing the Committee's report in the Assembly's First Committee, the representative of Indonesia, as its current Chairman, noted that the Committee on Disarmament and its subsidiary bodies had held 258 meetings in 1981, as

compared with 185 in the previous year. He cautioned against judging the work of the Committee solely on the basis of concrete results and suggested that it be assessed on the basis of the proposals considered and the ongoing discussions, which could give a clearer picture of the complex nature of the problems and of the obstacles in the path of progress.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Disarmament, A/36/27 (Committee documents, CD/228, appendix II, vols. I, II).  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 20.

#### Work programme of the Committee on Disarmament

In a resolution of 9 December 1981 on the work of the Committee on Disarmament,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly urged the Committee to continue or undertake substantive negotiations in 1982 on priority issues on its agenda, providing its existing ad hoc working groups with appropriate negotiating mandates and establishing groups on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament and on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. The Committee was requested to complete the elaboration of a comprehensive disarmament programme (p. 22) and to submit at the Assembly's 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27) a report on the state of negotiations on the questions it was considering. The Assembly invited Committee members involved in separate negotiations on specific disarmament questions to intensify their efforts and submit to the Committee a full report on the status of negotiations and the results achieved.

The Assembly adopted the resolution by a recorded vote of 136 to none, with 9 abstentions. The text was approved by the First Committee on 25 November by a recorded vote of 115 to none, with 8 abstentions.

In another resolution of 9 December,<sup>(5)</sup> on implementation of the recommendations and decisions of its tenth special session, held in 1978,<sup>(6)</sup> the Assembly recommended that the Committee on Disarmament concentrate on substantive and priority items with a view to achieving tangible results in order to contribute to the success of the 1982 special session on disarmament and to the accomplishment of the tasks set forth in the Assembly's Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, adopted in 1980.<sup>(2)</sup> In a third resolution of the same date, on prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, the Assembly urged Committee members to bear in mind that the consensus rule should not be used in such a manner as to prevent the establishment of subsidiary bodies.<sup>(3)</sup>

The resolution on the Committee on Disarmament, sponsored by 27 States, was introduced by Yugoslavia, which stated that, while the Com-

mittee and its working groups had worked intensively and striven for progress, they had not been able to achieve concrete results or even to begin substantive negotiations on the highest priority items on the Committee's agenda, concerning nuclear disarmament. Three and a half years after the Assembly's first special session on disarmament in 1978, at which the decision was taken to establish the Committee,<sup>(1)</sup> there was resistance on the part of some of its members, including some nuclear-weapon States, to negotiate in that body on specific issues or to establish working groups for that purpose.

The USSR, although voting in favour, considered that the work and mandates of the Committee's subsidiary bodies were its own prerogative; further, the content, volume and character of information on negotiations conducted outside the Committee fell within the competence of States parties to such talks. Australia, which also voted in favour, believed similarly that instructing the Committee how to conduct its work constituted unwarranted interference by the Assembly, while Belgium, France and the United States abstained for similar reasons; the United States added that the Committee was not the only forum for disarmament negotiations and its involvement at an inappropriate stage could even jeopardize other negotiations. Turkey, voting in favour, regarded the resolution as procedural and thought the Committee could not object to requests that it speed its work.

Explaining their abstention in the vote on the resolution concerning a nuclear-test ban, Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece and Japan considered that the text challenged the basic principle of consensus in the Committee on Disarmament. The USSR also had reservations concerning the text's reference to matters within the Committee's exclusive prerogatives.

In the First Committee's debate, Nigeria said the Committee on Disarmament should be able to justify its existence through its ability to function according to the machinery it had set up or wished to set up, including the establishment of ad hoc working groups, particularly on nuclear disarmament and a nuclear-test ban. Egypt, commenting that the consensus rule had been used in such a way as to prevent the Committee from realizing even procedural progress, said the Committee should consider freeing the establishment of subsidiary bodies from the application of that rule. India contended that the rule had been intended to apply to substantive questions, not procedural ones, and hoped it would not be used to obstruct the establishment of working groups.

Ghana and Uganda called for a reversal of

what they saw as a trend to change the consensus rule into a type of veto; Uganda added that, if the Committee could not take decisions, steps should be studied to ensure that its rules were not used to prevent it from conducting negotiations. The need to allow the Committee to function autonomously was also mentioned by Madagascar. Also critical of the Committee's inability to take decisions even on procedural matters, Jamaica said it should be more responsive to Assembly directions.

Algeria ascribed the absence of progress in the Committee largely to the determination of some Powers to reduce its role to that of a registry of accords negotiated in private clubs. Noting that not a single agreement had emerged from the Committee since its first session, Malaysia saw the lack of progress as testimony that the two super-Powers were unwilling to negotiate in good faith. Nepal stated that the deadlock in the Committee was due basically to the relations between the USSR and the United States; it was sceptical about any increase in membership and thought the Committee devoted too much time to procedural questions. Sweden said the Committee had achieved so few successes due to the fact that the leading military Powers, particularly the two super-Powers, had not demonstrated readiness or willingness to exploit its potential because of the way they interpreted their own security needs and interests. Venezuela expressed concern that in priority areas, where the Committee could accomplish useful work, its efforts had been obstructed by some Powers which were trying to divert attention to non-priority subjects.

The USSR asserted that the United States had blocked the establishment of working groups, and Mongolia said the Committee's lack of progress was due to the fact that Western States were blocking its substantive consideration of priority issues.

Austria and Finland thought ways to increase the Committee's effectiveness, including a review of its membership, should be discussed at the special session on disarmament. While improvements in organizational and procedural aspects would help, Indonesia stated, an improved international political climate and a genuine will to negotiate remained the key to successful performance.

No one believed the Committee could take over the role of all bilateral arms control negotiations, said Australia, but its work was crucial to future negotiations. Poland, while disappointed with the results, lauded the Committee as the only working disarmament body whose representative character had made it possible for the representatives of all the nuclear-weapon Powers

to remain on speaking terms in disarmament matters.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>S-10/2, para. 120, 30 June 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 47); <sup>(2)</sup>35/46, annex, 3 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, P. 102); <sup>(3)</sup>36/84, para. 4 (a), 9 Dec. 1981 (p. 67); <sup>(4)</sup>36/92 F, 9 Dec., text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/92 M, para. 4, 9 Dec. (p. 24).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1978, p. 17.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 31, 34, 36, 38, 44 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/92 F 136-0-9 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) by recorded vote (115-0-8), 25 November (meeting 44); 27-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.19): agenda item 51 (b).

Sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

#### Report of the Committee on Disarmament

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 34/83 B of 11 December 1979 and 35/152 J of 12 December 1980,

Having considered the report of the Committee on Disarmament,

Affirming that the establishment of ad hoc working groups offers the best available machinery for the conduct of multilateral negotiations on items on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament and contributes to the strengthening of the negotiating role of the Committee on Disarmament,

Regretting that, despite the expressed wish of the great majority of members of the Committee on Disarmament, the establishment of ad hoc working groups to undertake multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament and on prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests was prevented during the session of the Committee in 1981,

Expressing its deep concern that the Committee on Disarmament has not thus far been able to achieve concrete results on disarmament issues which have been under consideration for a number of years,

Convinced that the Committee on Disarmament, as the single multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, should play the central role in substantive negotiations on priority questions of disarmament and on the implementation of the Programme of Action set forth in section III of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament,

Stressing that negotiations on specific disarmament issues conducted outside the Committee on Disarmament should in no way serve as a pretext for preventing the conduct of multilateral negotiations on such questions in the Committee,

1. Urges the Committee on Disarmament to continue or undertake, during its session in 1982, substantive negotiations on the priority questions of disarmament on its agenda, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly and the other relevant resolutions of the Assembly on those questions and, in order to reach that goal, to provide the existing ad hoc working groups with appropriate negotiating mandates and to establish, as a matter of urgency, ad hoc working groups on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament and on the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests:

2. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to complete, during the first part of its session in 1992, the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and to submit the programme in time for consideration and adoption by the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982;

3. Also requests the Committee on Disarmament to intensify its negotiations on priority questions of disarmament,

so that it may be in a position to contribute, through concrete accomplishments, to the success of the second special session devoted to disarmament:

4. Invites the members of the Committee on Disarmament involved in separate negotiations on specific priority questions of disarmament to intensify their efforts to achieve without further delay a positive conclusion of those negotiations for submission to the Committee and, at the same time, to submit to the Committee a full report on their separate negotiations and the results achieved in order to contribute most directly to the negotiations in the Committee in accordance with paragraph 1 above;

5. Further requests the Committee on Disarmament to submit to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament a special report on the state of negotiations on the various questions under consideration by the Committee and also to submit a report on its work to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Report of the Committee on Disarmament".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Belorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, United Kingdom, United States.

#### Membership of the Committee on Disarmament

During a discussion at the 1981 session of the Committee on Disarmament on the question of its membership, many members considered the current membership to be adequate and representative of the world community, while some others favoured a small increase. Still another view was that any eventual change in membership could take the form of expansion, reduction or rotation of members within the respective regions or groups. Proposals on an improved functioning of the Committee were also discussed, and the Committee agreed to continue considering them in 1982.<sup>(1)</sup>

By a resolution on a review of the Committee's membership,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted on 9 December, the General Assembly recommended that the first review be completed during its 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27), following consultation among Member States. The Assembly also reaffirmed that States not members of the Com-

mittee should, at their request, continue to be invited by the Committee to participate in its work. The Assembly adopted this resolution by a recorded vote of 134 to none, with 12 abstentions, following its approval by the First Committee on 24 November by a recorded vote of 118 to none, with 10 abstentions.

Introducing the 19-nation resolution, Turkey remarked that, while the sponsors understood the tendency of the members of the Committee on Disarmament to conserve its present composition, they felt such an approach did not comply with the wish expressed in the Final Document of the 1978 special session on disarmament that the Committee's membership should be regularly reviewed.<sup>(2)</sup> The sponsors did not request the inclusion of the membership review issue in the agenda of the Assembly's next regular session, on what they considered the somewhat optimistic assumption that a satisfactory solution would be found at the 1982 special session.

Explaining their abstention in the vote, Hungary and the USSR stated that the Committee's membership was a question for the Committee on Disarmament itself and that many socialist, non-aligned and other members did not favour reviewing the membership during the next few years. Greece, while recognizing the delicate nature of the membership question, voted affirmatively in the hope of encouraging the Committee to adopt measures aimed at facilitating participation in its work by States outside its membership.

In the First Committee debate, Finland and Norway expressed interest in joining the Committee on Disarmament as full members. Portugal felt that all States which so desired should be able to participate in disarmament bodies and hoped that procedures would be worked out to enable interested States to exercise that right.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup> Committee on Disarmament, A/36/27.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup> S-10/2, para. 120, 30 June 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 47); <sup>(3)</sup> 36/97 J, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 34, 36-38, 42 (19 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/97 J

134--0-12 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/756) by recorded vote (118-0-10). 24 November (meeting 42): 19-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.44); agenda item 55 (h).

Sponsors: Bahamas, Chile, Ghana, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, New Zealand, Niger, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay.

#### Review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament

The General Assembly,

Recognizing that all the peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations,

Recognizing also that all States have the duty to contribute to and the right to participate in disarmament negotiations, as

acknowledged in paragraph 28 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament,

Recalling, to that effect, its resolutions 33/91 G of 16 December 1978 and 35/156 I of 12 December 1980,

Noting that under section IX of the rules of procedure of the Committee on Disarmament non-member States have been invited to participate in the work of the Committee,

Recalling also that the membership of the Committee on Disarmament is to be reviewed at regular intervals in accordance with paragraph 120 of the Final Document,

1. Takes note of the relevant part of the report of the Committee on Disarmament on its session in 1981, in which various options and different views were stated;

2. Recommends that the first review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament should be completed, following appropriate consultation among Member States, during the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament;

3. Reaffirms that States not members of the Committee on Disarmament should, upon their request, continue to be invited by it to participate in the work of the Committee.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

## Nuclear weapons

### Nuclear disarmament

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION ACTION. In its recommendations to the General Assembly adopted on 5 June 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Disarmament Commission, in the context of its consideration of the arms race and disarmament (P. 21), stated that the threat of destruction as a result of nuclear war was among the greatest perils facing the world. The special responsibility borne by nuclear-weapon States entailed respect for the security concerns of non-nuclear-weapon nations, refraining from action to intensify the nuclear-arms race, and the pursuit of concrete measures of nuclear disarmament.

The Commission regarded nuclear disarmament as the most effective assurance of security

against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Pending that, the nuclear-weapon States should give effective assurance in that regard to non-nuclear-weapon States (p. 58). The Commission recommended the strengthening of the existing nuclear-weapon-free zone (in Latin America) and the establishment of other such zones, as well as zones of peace.

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT. No consensus was reached in 1981 by the Committee on Disarmament<sup>(1)</sup> on a proposal by the Group of 21 (p. 31) for the establishment of an ad hoc working group on cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, or on a proposal by a group of socialist countries for the establishment of an ad hoc working group on prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons (p. 62).

In its paper, the Group of 21 stated that doctrines of nuclear deterrence, far from being responsible for the maintenance of peace and security, were at the root of the continuing escalation of nuclear armaments, and that the competitive accumulation of nuclear arms could not be condoned on the ground that it was indispensable to national security. China, in a working paper, asserted that the race between the two super-Powers for nuclear superiority accounted for lack of substantive progress in disarmament, and that those countries should take action in advance of others to halt the nuclear-arms race.

Two different approaches were advocated in the Committee's discussion. Several members, expressing grave concern over the nuclear-arms race, the risks inherent in nuclear deterrence doctrines and the danger of nuclear war, urged the Committee to initiate negotiations on nuclear disarmament as a matter of urgency. Others, while emphasizing their belief in the need to reduce the level of nuclear confrontation, believed that the existence of nuclear weapons had been a critical factor in preserving stability in much of the world for many years and considered that negotiations on nuclear disarmament should be undertaken initially by the nuclear-weapon States concerned.

The proposal for a working group on nuclear disarmament, reiterated by the Group of 21 in February at the start of the 1981 session, was discussed at informal meetings in March. A formal proposal by the Group was submitted to the Committee for decision on 14 July, but the Chairman announced that there was no consensus in favour of it. Following further consultations conducted by the Chairman at the suggestion of a group of socialist States, he announced that the members who did not agree to setting up a working group were willing to consider the

establishment of a contact group to deal with the questions raised by the proposal. The Committee agreed to the Chairman's suggestion that further consultations be deferred until the beginning of its 1982 session.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution on nuclear weapons in all aspects,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted on 9 December, the General Assembly said it believed that negotiations on cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and on gradual reduction of stockpiles, up to and including total destruction, must be initiated as a matter of high priority. The Assembly deemed it appropriate that the Committee on Disarmament begin by considering stages of nuclear disarmament and their tentative content, including the content of the first stage. Within the framework of discussion on first-stage measures, it would be appropriate to consider the cessation of development and deployment of new types and systems of nuclear weapons. The Committee on Disarmament was called on to continue consultations on the establishment of an ad hoc working group, with a clearly defined mandate, on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and on nuclear disarmament.

This 12-nation resolution, sponsored mainly by Eastern European States and introduced by the German Democratic Republic, was adopted by a recorded vote of 118 to 18, with 5 abstentions, after the First Committee approved the text on 23 November by a recorded vote of 83 to 17, with 8 abstentions. In Committee, the sponsors revised it in writing and also orally, the latter change deleting a preambular paragraph that would have had the Assembly express concern about intentions to gain strategic superiority and to resort to the first use of nuclear weapons.

Belgium, explaining its negative vote, said the text was polemical, took a unilateral view of the problem of nuclear weapons, and failed to mention the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which condemned the threat or use of force in international relations and confirmed just as solemnly the right of States to self-defence. Greece abstained for similar reasons.

Austria voted in favour in the belief that all approaches which could lead to progress in the nuclear area must be explored, even though it considered the preamble to be burdened by a number of sweeping and unbalanced elements concerning strategic doctrines and the intentions of nuclear-weapon States. Finland, which rejected all concepts of limited nuclear war, cast an affirmative vote as its expression of concern about all doctrines which might bring nearer the possibility of a nuclear war. Also voting in favour, Sweden emphasized its opposition to all formal doctrines as well as measures taken by the



nuclear-weapon States to develop and deploy weapons, but said it would have preferred the text to give an accurate and balanced description of the nuclear postures of the major nuclear-weapon States.

In the First Committee debate, most States continued to emphasize the primacy of the task of halting the nuclear-arms race and moving towards nuclear disarmament.

Among the nuclear Powers, China stressed the need for the super-Powers to take the lead in nuclear disarmament, after which the other nuclear countries, including China, would join them in reducing nuclear weapons until they were completely eliminated. France declared that it could not envisage any commitment regarding its nuclear forces unless, following reductions agreed among the major Powers, the massive disproportion between arsenals was to change; in the mean time, it was compelled to maintain its effectiveness at the levels required to ensure their deterrent effect, bearing in mind the quantitative and qualitative increase in the most important arsenals. The USSR expressed its readiness to discuss, for example in the Committee on Disarmament, possible stages for nuclear disarmament and their approximate content, including as a first step the question of putting an end to the design and deployment of new types and systems of nuclear weapons. The United States said the profound changes that had taken place during the past decade in the strategic environment had required it to review its arms control policies and take steps to restore its deterrent capability.

Austria, urging negotiations to achieve quantitative and qualitative limitations of nuclear arsenals, said both super-Powers had shifted to a doctrine emphasizing the targeting of military and nuclear installations; the result was greater pressure on decision-makers in time of crisis, increased risks of nuclear conflict through human error or technical malfunction, a premium for preemptive nuclear strikes, and the emergence of dangerous illusions that nuclear war could be limited and winnable. Brazil said the world must be satisfied that negotiations between the two super-Powers did not aim at perpetuating the nuclear threat by a handful of nations, thus freezing a power structure based on possession of the means to dictate one's will and make the law.

Chile cited two additional reasons for seeking nuclear disarmament: nuclear weapons gave the Powers possessing them the greatest destructive capacity ever seen, and within a few years many States would have the capacity to use nuclear energy for military purposes. Nuclear disarmament would be achieved, according to Denmark, not by augmenting nuclear stockpiles or creating new variations of nuclear arms, but by strength-

ening existing treaties and negotiating new ones. India stated that the concept of an arms balance between opposing camps had not helped cap the nuclear-arms race, and the doctrine of deterrence could not avoid war because a nation using nuclear weapons would invite its own annihilation. If a nuclear war was ignited, said Jordan, fear alone would make certain that all arsenals and peoples throughout the world would become involved. The Netherlands held that high priority should be given to de-emphasizing the role of nuclear weapons, with the aim of substantial reductions and eventual elimination of those arms.

The Byelorussian SSR told the Committee that more than 50,000 nuclear weapons had already been accumulated world-wide and that their destructive force was estimated to be enough to decimate more than 1 million cities the size of Hiroshima. Ireland remarked that the two super-Powers had more than 15,000 strategic nuclear warheads—three times as many as in 1970. In Nigeria's view, the accumulation of nuclear weapons bore no direct relevance or proportion to the realistic defence requirements of the States possessing them.

The Eastern European States urged that priority be given to nuclear disarmament in current international negotiations, including those in the Committee on Disarmament. The German Democratic Republic, stressing the dangers of a qualitative nuclear-arms race, considered that, among measures in the first stage of nuclear disarmament, prohibition of the development of new types and systems of nuclear weapons and their non-deployment should play a significant role. The Ukrainian SSR held the United States responsible for instigating every new round of the nuclear-arms race, including more recently the deployment of cruise missiles and the invention of the neutron weapon, while the USSR and other socialist States had consistently tried to do away with nuclear weapons.

Italy argued that nuclear disarmament could not be treated in isolation; it should proceed in parallel with conventional disarmament to maintain a balance compatible with the principle of undiminished security. Similarly, Portugal stated that it was unrealistic to concentrate on the nuclear element in disarmament efforts, since such a selective approach would create an imbalance that would weigh more heavily on some States than on others.

Bangladesh regarded arrangements to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons as only an interim measure, stating that the ultimate goal should be the destruction of all nuclear weapons; it also urged serious consideration for proposals to reduce nuclear weapons by 50 per cent and to impose a freeze on the introduction of new or

improved nuclear weapons. Pakistan, reiterating its commitment to nuclear non-proliferation, stated that peaceful nuclear programmes in several developing countries, including its own, had become a target of false and politically motivated propaganda.

The Byelorussian SSR and Poland, as well as a number of other States, favoured the establishment by the Committee on Disarmament of a subsidiary body on nuclear disarmament.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Disarmament, A/36/27 (Committee documents, CD/228, appendix II, vols. I, II); <sup>(2)</sup>Disarmament Commission, A/36/42.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/92 E, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 34-36, 38, 40 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/92 E

118-18-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) by recorded vote (83-17-8), 23 November (meeting 40); 12-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.14/Rev.1), orally revised; agenda item 51 (i).

Sponsors: Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

#### Nuclear weapons in all aspects

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming once again that nuclear weapons pose the most serious threat to mankind and its survival and that it is therefore essential to proceed with nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons,

Reaffirming also that all nuclear-weapon States, in particular those which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility for the fulfilment of the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament,

Stressing again that existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth, and bearing in mind the devastating results which nuclear war would have on belligerents and non-belligerents alike,

Recalling that at its tenth special session, the first special session devoted to disarmament, it decided that effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war had the highest priority and that it was essential to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons,

Recalling further that, in its resolution 35/152 B of 12 December 1980, it noted with alarm the increased risk of a nuclear catastrophe associated both with the intensification of the nuclear-arms race and with the adoption of the new doctrine of limited or partial use of nuclear weapons giving rise to illusions of the admissibility and acceptability of a nuclear conflict,

Noting with alarm that this dangerous doctrine leads to a new twist in the spiral of the arms race, which may seriously hamper the reaching of agreement on nuclear disarmament,

Noting, in this connection, an urgent need for the cessation of the development and deployment of new types and systems of nuclear weapons as a step on the road to nuclear disarmament,

Stressing again that priority in disarmament negotiations should be given to nuclear weapons, and referring to paragraphs 49 and 54 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 33/71 H of 14 December 1978, 34/83 J of 11 December 1979 and 35/152 B and C of 12 December 1980,

Noting that the Committee on Disarmament, during its session held in 1981, discussed the question concerning the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament

and, inter alia, the establishment of an ad hoc working group for negotiations on the subject,

Taking note of the proposals and statements made in the Committee on Disarmament, both during its formal and informal meetings, on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, and, inter alia, on prerequisites for the conduct of negotiations on nuclear disarmament,

Noting with regret that the Committee on Disarmament, during its session held in 1981, was not able to reach agreement on a basis for multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament or on prerequisites for such negotiations,

Convinced that the Committee on Disarmament is the most suitable forum for the preparation and conduct of the negotiations on nuclear disarmament,

1. Believes it necessary to initiate, as a matter of high priority, negotiations on the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and on the gradual reduction of their stockpiles up to and including their total destruction, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly;

2. Notes the decision of the Committee on Disarmament to resume intensive consideration, at its session in 1982, of the item on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament;

3. Calls upon the Committee on Disarmament, as a matter of priority and for the purpose of an early commencement of the negotiations on the substance of the problem, to continue consultations in which to consider, inter alia, the establishment of an ad hoc working group on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and on nuclear disarmament with a clearly defined mandate;

4. Deems it appropriate, as envisaged in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, that the Committee on Disarmament should proceed, as a first step, to the consideration of stages of nuclear disarmament and their tentative content, inter alia, the content of the first stage;

5. Also deems it appropriate to consider, within the framework of the discussion on the content of measures to be carried out during the first stage, the question of the cessation of the development and deployment of new types and systems of nuclear weapons;

6. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to report on the results of those negotiations to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Melts, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Greece, Israel, Mali, Morocco, Zaire,

#### Strategic arms limitation talks

By a resolution on the strategic arms limitation talks between the USSR and the United

States,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted without vote on 9 December 1981, the General Assembly noted that the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT II), signed in 1979, had not been ratified. The Assembly urged a continuation of the process begun by the 1972 SALT I Treaty and signature of the SALT II Treaty, and urged the two States to negotiate towards an agreement for substantial reductions and significant qualitative limitations of strategic arms. The Assembly welcomed the commencement of nuclear-arms negotiations at Geneva on 30 November 1981 between the USSR and the United States, trusted that the negotiations would facilitate the enhancement of stability and international security, and invited the two Governments to keep the Assembly informed of results. It stressed the need for both parties to bear in mind that the vital interests of all peoples were at stake.

The text, revised by its 12 sponsors, was approved by the First Committee on 4 December without vote. It included an oral revision dropping the word "control" from a reference to the object of the latest bilateral negotiations.

Introducing the text, Mexico noted that it was similar to the 1980 resolution on the question,<sup>(1)</sup> due to the unfortunate fact that the Assembly's exhortation asking the two major nuclear Powers to ratify the SALT II Treaty had remained a dead letter. The Assembly's interest in the SALT question, Mexico added, dated back to the origins of the SALT negotiations in 1969; since 1972, it had been reflected in an uninterrupted series of resolutions.

The USSR said it favoured the immediate resumption of talks with the United States on strategic arms limitation, which should be based on everything constructive and positive that had already been achieved. However, the United States had suspended the dialogue initiated in the 1970s on a number of questions relating to military detente, including limiting strategic arms and the arms trade, anti-satellite systems, banning chemical weapons and nuclear tests, and a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

The United States, calling the resolution forward-looking, stated that the two major Powers must look forward to negotiations which would result in substantial and militarily significant reductions in strategic arms, which the United States referred to as the strategic arms reduction talks (START). However, the United States goal was deterrence and a second-strike capability, whereas the USSR aimed not at stability but at threatening the survivability of the United States strategic forces.

The Byelorussian SSR remarked that the

United States had blocked the SALT process, thereby giving the go-ahead for the unrestrained development of the most devastating weapons. The United States was not seeking a military-strategic balance, said the German Democratic Republic, for a balance already existed; rather, it was concerned about so-called strategic superiority and the capability to strike first. Hungary and other Eastern European States, as well as Democratic Yemen and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, urged the early ratification of the SALT II Treaty by the United States.

Austria stated that the SALT negotiations had become the backbone of the entire detente process, and that a breakdown of the process would have disastrous consequences for international security. Similarly, Zambia feared a major disaster if the talks failed, including intensification of disputes, greater instability and the diminution of peaceful exchanges throughout the world.

Canada, Guyana, Norway, Pakistan and Turkey hoped the bilateral talks would be directed towards reducing rather than merely limiting nuclear missiles. The Bahamas trusted that the super-Powers would become more flexible and less preoccupied about which was the more powerful in terms of nuclear weapons. India stated that neither SALT I nor SALT II had done more than to define the parameters for USSR-United States competition in strategic armaments. Nigeria, appealing for continued negotiations, observed that it had taken 10 years for the super-Powers to agree to negotiate SALT I, while SALT II had taken another seven years before it was signed. In Rwanda's view, the spirit of negotiations must change; the good faith and readiness of the other side must be recognized, because it was not true that all evil was on one side and all virtue on the other. The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community members, said the encouraging prospects of a renewed dialogue between the USSR and the United States on strategic arms limitation was in keeping with the responsibility of the super-Powers to take the first steps in nuclear disarmament.

Albania dissociated itself from the consensus, on the ground that the two Powers had continued to expand the arms race and were acting in bad faith in dealing with strategic arms limitation.

Participants in the debate also commented on prospects for USSR-United States negotiations on medium-range nuclear-armed missiles, also called intermediate or theatre nuclear forces, which began at Geneva on 30 November.

Welcoming these talks, Denmark said efforts were needed to reduce nuclear arms in Europe, thereby limiting the trend towards an increasing

nuclear build-up with new and terrible weapons systems. The Federal Republic of Germany said the aim of the talks, as seen by the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), was to limit medium-range missiles at the lowest possible level on both sides, ideally at zero; if no agreement was reached by the autumn of 1983, when Western intermediate land-based nuclear missiles were to be deployed, the Federal Republic would honour its NATO commitment to take necessary measures for the security of itself and its defence alliance. Italy said the NATO decision was aimed at restoring the balance in theatre nuclear forces that had been seriously altered by the deployment of a steadily increasing number of highly precise, mobile, multiple-warhead SS-20 Soviet missiles. According to the United States, the USSR sought to prevent NATO from adopting countermeasures to the USSR deployment of 250 SS-20 missiles targeted at Western Europe and increasing at the rate of one missile every week.

Finland hoped these talks would be guided by fundamental political considerations and not be obsessed by technical data about military forces. Ireland stated that a serious approach to the negotiations by both sides, together with restraint in the development and deployment of new weapons, could increase confidence and improve the climate. Romania suggested that the Assembly speak out against the stationing and development in Europe of new nuclear medium-range missiles and in favour of starting negotiations among all European States to eliminate such missiles and nuclear weapons in general. Sweden rejected the argument that balance had to be achieved in each category of weapons; the objectives must be to reduce drastically the number of long-range nuclear theatre systems such as the Soviet SS-20 missiles, to avoid the deployment of the new NATO missiles and to negotiate a drastic reduction or even abolition of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

The German Democratic Republic, protesting against plans to deploy Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe, said such a move would force the socialist States to take appropriate steps to restore the balance. The Byelorussian SSR regretted that doubt had been cast on the USSR proposal for a moratorium on the deployment of new medium-range missiles by NATO and the USSR. In Czechoslovakia's view, it was in the interest of world peace to preserve the existing approximate parity in Europe, preferably at the lowest possible level.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>35/156 K, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 69); <sup>(2)</sup>36/97 I, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 27, 33, 36, 38, 39, 47, 42, 49, 53 (19 Oct.-4 Dec.); plenary. A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/97 I

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981  
Approved by First Committee (A/36/756) without vote, 4 December (meeting 53); 12-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.42/Rev.1), orally revised: agenda item 55 (j).

Sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Congo, Cuba, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Romania, Sweden, Yugoslavia.

#### Strategic arms limitation talks

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2602 A (XXIV) of 16 December 1969, 2932 B (XXVII) of 29 November 1972, 3184 A and C (XXVIII) of 18 December 1973, 3261 C (XXIX) of 9 December 1974, 3484 C (XXX) of 12 December 1975, 31/189 A of 21 December 1976, 32/87 G of 12 December 1977 and 35/156 K of 12 December 1980,

Recalling that the SALT I agreement—which bears the official title of “Interim Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms”—entered into force on 3 October 1972 following more than two years of bilateral negotiations,

Recalling that the SALT II agreement—which bears the official title of “Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms”—was finally signed on 18 June 1979, after six years of bilateral negotiations, and that its text, together with the texts of the Protocol to the Treaty and of the Joint Statement of principles and basic guidelines for subsequent negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms, both signed on the same date as the Treaty, and that of the Joint Communique, also issued on 18 June 1979, were reproduced as a document of the Committee on Disarmament,

Reaffirming once again its resolution 33/91 C of 16 December 1978, in which it, *inter alia*:

(a) Reiterated its satisfaction at the solemn declarations made in 1977 by the heads of State of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America in which they stated that they were ready to endeavour to reach agreements which would permit starting the gradual reduction of existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons and moving towards their complete and total destruction, with a view to a world truly free of nuclear weapons,

(b) Recalled that one of the disarmament measures deserving the highest priority, included in the Programme of Action set forth in section III of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, was the conclusion of the bilateral agreement known as SALT II, which should be followed promptly by further strategic arms limitation negotiations between the two parties, leading to agreed significant reductions of and qualitative limitations on strategic arms,

(c) Stressed that in the Programme of Action—it was established that, in the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament, all nuclear-weapon States, in particular those among them which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility,

Reaffirming that, as stated in its resolution 34/87 F of 11 December 1979, it shares the conviction expressed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America in the joint statement of principles and basic guidelines for subsequent negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms that early agreement on the further limitation and further reduction of strategic arms would serve to strengthen international peace and security and to reduce the risk of outbreak of nuclear war,

Recalling that, at its first special session devoted to disarmament, it proclaimed that existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone were more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth, that the increase in weapons, especially nuclear weapons, far from helping to strengthen international security, on the contrary weakened it, and that the existence of nuclear weapons and the continuing arms race posed a threat to the very survival of mankind, for which reasons the General

Assembly declared that all the peoples of the world had a vital interest in the sphere of disarmament.

Recalling also that in the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, annexed to its resolution 35/46 of 3 December 1980, it recommended that special priority be given to the ratification of the SALT II Treaty,

1. Notes that the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT II) has not yet been ratified;

2. Urges that the process begun by the SALT I Treaty and signature of the SALT II Treaty should continue and be built upon;

3. Trusts that the signatory States will continue to refrain from any act which would defeat the object and purpose of that process;

4. Urges the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, with reference to resolutions 34/87 F and 35/156 K, to pursue negotiations, in accordance with the principle of equality and equal security, looking towards the achievement of an agreement which will provide for substantial reductions and significant qualitative limitations of strategic arms;

5. Welcomes the commencement of negotiations at Geneva on 30 November 1981 between representatives of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on nuclear arms in accordance with the joint communiqué issued by Secretary of State Haig and Foreign Minister Gromyko on 23 September 1981, and trusts that such negotiations will facilitate the enhancement of stability and international security;

6. Stresses the need for both parties to bear constantly in mind that not only their national interests but also the vital interests of all the peoples of the world are at stake in this question;

7. Invites the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to keep the General Assembly appropriately informed of the results of their negotiations, in conformity with the provisions of paragraphs 27 and 114 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly;

8. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Strategic arms limitation talks".

## Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war

### Prevention of nuclear war

Expressing alarm at the threat which the existence of nuclear weapons posed to the survival of mankind and labelling as matters of highest priority the prevention of nuclear war and reduction of the risks of such war, the General Assembly, in a resolution adopted without vote on 19 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> urged all nuclear-weapon States and all other Member States that so desired to submit to the Secretary-General, for consideration at its 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27), their views, proposals' and practical suggestions for ensuring the prevention of nuclear war.

The revised draft resolution, sponsored by 17 States, was approved by the First Committee on 25 November, also without vote. The text incorporated the essence of amendments submitted by Mexico,<sup>(1)</sup> according to which all Member

States rather than just nuclear-weapon States were urged to submit their views and proposals. The revised text also included a preambular paragraph proposed by Mexico, reiterating the vital interest of all peoples in disarmament. Mexico withdrew its amendments after the draft resolution was revised.

Introducing the draft, Argentina asserted that the Powers possessing nuclear weapons must state clearly, in writing and in detail, their views and proposals for preventing nuclear war, after which non-nuclear States had the right and duty to assess those positions and make their own proposals. The latter States could not delegate to others the quest for solutions.

In the First Committee debate, some countries, such as Nigeria and the USSR, rejected the idea of a limited or winnable nuclear war as either suicidal and adventuristic or lacking in validity and evidence. With the quantity and quality of weapons spread throughout the world, said Cuba, it was illusory to believe that a nuclear war could be concentrated in a given territory. Mauritius stated that, while the world's leaders might not envisage a nuclear war by design, no human activity could be accident-free, as evidenced in a report by the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate that, four times in 18 months, nuclear bomber crews and intercontinental ballistic missile units had been ordered to be ready for action as a result of alarms that later proved false.

In an appeal of 23 June from the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to the parliaments and peoples of the world, transmitted to the Secretary-General by a letter from the USSR dated 24 June,<sup>(3)</sup> legislatures were urged to support negotiations, without preliminary conditions or attempts to dictate a point of view, to prevent a new phase of the nuclear missile race. Support for a proposal by the USSR for the establishment of an international committee of scientists for the defence of mankind from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe was expressed in a Declaration of the General Assembly of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, adopted at Sofia in May and forwarded in a note verbale of Bulgaria dated 25 June.<sup>(2)</sup>

Amendments withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Mexico, A/C.1/36/L.50.

Letter and note verbale (nv): <sup>(2)</sup>Bulgaria, 25 June, A/36/344 (nv). <sup>(3)</sup>USSR, 24 June, A/36/347.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/81 B, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10. 12-26, 27, 33, 34, 38, 39, 44 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

### General Assembly resolution 36/81 B

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/740 and Corr.1) without vote. 25 November (meeting 44); 17-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.43/Rev.1); agenda item 39.

Sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Ireland, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia,

#### Prevention of nuclear war

The General Assembly,

Alarmed by the threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the existence of nuclear weapons and the continuing arms race,

Recalling that removal of the threat of a world war—a nuclear war—is the most acute and urgent task of the present day,

Reiterating that it is the shared responsibility of all Member States to save succeeding generations from the scourge of another world war,

Recalling the provisions of paragraphs 47 to 50 and 56 to 58 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, regarding procedures designed to secure the avoidance of nuclear war,

Considering that prevention of nuclear war and reduction of the risks of nuclear war are matters of the highest priority, which should be considered by the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament,

Reiterating the vital interest of all the peoples of the world in disarmament,

Aware of the special responsibility of nuclear-weapon States,

1. Urges all nuclear-weapon States to submit to the Secretary-General by 30 April 1982, for consideration at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, their views, proposals and practical suggestions for ensuring the prevention of nuclear war;

2. Invites all other Member States that so desire to do likewise;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament a report containing the views, proposals and practical suggestions referred to in paragraph 1 above, as well as those received from other Member States.

#### Non-use of nuclear weapons

On 9 December 1981, by a resolution on the non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly declared again that the use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a crime against humanity, and that the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should therefore be prohibited, pending nuclear disarmament. The Assembly urged consideration, at its 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27), of the question of an international convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war, or some other agreement on the subject.

The Assembly took this action by a recorded vote of 121 to 19, with 6 abstentions. The text, sponsored by 30 States, was approved by the First Committee on 23 November by a recorded vote of 99 to 18, with 5 abstentions.

India, in introducing the text, emphasized that the nuclear-arms race had acquired a new momentum, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and there was greater apprehension than ever that a nuclear war, with all its catastrophic consequences, might break out. Thus; States shared

the collective responsibility to undertake all possible measures to reduce such a threat. Although the United Nations Charter permitted self-defence, it would be a mockery of the Charter to suggest that, in pursuing its security concerns, a State might jeopardize the survival of all, and that a State's choice of weapons and means of warfare, even in the exercise of individual and collective self-defence, was not unlimited.

Ireland, though opposed to any use of nuclear weapons, voted against the resolution because of misgivings about the approach it adopted. Greece abstained in the vote because of the proclamatory nature of the text and because it thought the paragraph declaring the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons a violation of the Charter, and prohibiting such action alone, left a serious vacuum and a vagueness of interpretation. While agreeing with the objectives of the text, Sweden abstained because it thought the resolution's interpretation of the Charter was not legally correct. The German Democratic Republic, which voted in favour, remarked that among those which had voted against were nuclear-weapon States and their allies, whose co-operation was essential in the endeavour to prevent nuclear war.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/92 I, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 32, 34, 36, 40 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/92 I

121-19-6 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981  
Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) by recorded vote (99-18-5).  
23 November (meeting 40); 30-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.29); agenda item 51 (g).

Sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Colombia, Congo, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Yemen, Yugoslavia,

#### Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war

The General Assembly,

Alarmed by the threat to the survival of mankind and to the life-sustaining system posed by nuclear weapons and by their use, inherent in concepts of deterrence,

Convinced that nuclear disarmament is essential for the prevention of nuclear war and for the strengthening of international peace and security,

Recalling its declaration, contained in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, that all States should actively participate in efforts to bring about conditions in international relations among States in which a code of peaceful conduct of nations in international affairs could be agreed upon and which would preclude the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons,

Recalling its resolutions 1653(XVI) of 24 November 1961, 33/71 B of 14 December 1978, 34/83 G of 11 December 1979 and 35/152 D of 12 December 1980.

Taking note of the Comprehensive Study on Nuclear Weapons prepared by the Secretary-General with the assistance of a group of experts,

1. Declares once again that:

(a) The use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a crime against humanity;

(b) The use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should therefore be prohibited, pending nuclear disarmament;

2. Urges the consideration, at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, of the question of an international convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war or some other agreement on the subject, taking into account the proposals and views of States in this regard;

3. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Austria, Comoros, Finland, Greece, Israel, Sweden,

#### Declaration on the

#### Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe

In recognition that all the horrors of past wars and other calamities would pale in comparison with what a nuclear catastrophe could bring to humanity, the General Assembly, on 9 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> proclaimed on behalf of United Nations Member States: that States and statesmen that resorted first to the use of nuclear weapons would be committing the gravest crime against humanity; that there would be no justification or pardon for the decision to be the first to use such weapons; that any doctrines allowing first use of nuclear weapons were incompatible with moral standards and the ideals of the Organization; that the leaders of nuclear-weapon States had the duty to act so as to eliminate the risk of nuclear conflict; and that nuclear energy should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

This Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe was adopted by the Assembly by a recorded vote of 82 to 19, with 41 abstentions. The twice-revised text, sponsored by Angola, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia and the USSR, was approved by the First Committee on 25 November by a recorded vote of 67 to 18, with 37 abstentions. The sponsors incor-

porated an oral amendment proposed by Mexico, adding to a reference to negotiations on the nuclear-arms race, contained in paragraph 4, a phrase specifying that the ultimate goal was the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Declaration was originally proposed by the USSR which requested in a letter of 22 September<sup>(1)</sup> that an item on this subject be put on the Assembly's agenda at its 1981 session. The request was endorsed by the General Committee on 6 October<sup>(3)</sup> and added to the agenda by the Assembly on the same day.

The USSR stated in its letter that the United Nations should adopt the proposed text so as to exert a restraining influence on the dangerous development of world events. In the First Committee, the USSR said the task of preventing a nuclear catastrophe commanded the highest priority in international relations, particularly because the United States, banking on force as an instrument for achieving political goals, continued to strive for a position of military supremacy. Further, by a letter of 21 October,<sup>(2)</sup> the USSR transmitted to the Assembly the text of a statement by Premier Leonid I. Brezhnev, given to a Pravda correspondent, rejecting the concept of a winnable nuclear war and expressing hope that the United States President would also reject as criminal the idea of nuclear attack.

Several States, particularly from Eastern Europe, voiced strong support for the USSR initiative. Bulgaria saw it as having a moderating influence in the face of mad notions of a limited nuclear war or a pre-emptive attack. In the view of the Byelorussian SSR, the Declaration would remind statesmen involved in the use of nuclear weapons that each of them bore personal responsibility for the fate of humanity. The proposal expressed the vital interests of all peoples, said Hungary, against the background of an intensified arms race generated by those who advocated the acceptability of nuclear war. No country could oppose such a declaration, said the Lao People's Democratic Republic, unless it nurtured the illusion of victory in a limited or widespread nuclear conflict. Mongolia viewed the proposal as a serious warning to those who could not give up the times of the "cold war" and the doctrine of a pre-emptive strike. Such a declaration was needed, said the Ukrainian SSR, because of the unprecedented build-up of nuclear arms, the whipping-up of war psychosis and the reliance on force in international relations.

Explaining its favourable vote, Cyprus warned that the concepts of a limited nuclear war and of victory resulting from a first strike brought the world closer to a nuclear conflagration. Also voting in favour, Jordan expressed sur-

prise that there had been so much polarization on an issue on which all were agreed— that any resort to nuclear war was a crime against humanity.

Some Western States, however, questioned the value and motivation of the proposal. The Federal Republic of Germany found it inconsistent with various statements of Soviet military doctrine, and thought that, by implication, it sanctioned non-nuclear warfare and could force States to choose between violation of an accepted international obligation and unconditional surrender. The Netherlands also pointed to what it regarded as inconsistencies with earlier USSR commitments, and added that the right of self-defence included the right to determine what level of force was needed to dissuade the aggressor. The United States said the proposal fell into a pattern of propaganda initiatives by the USSR dating back to the mid-1950s, aimed at masking its own weapons build-up and forestalling the development of deterrent countermeasures by the Western alliance; meaningful arms control was prudently feasible only when all States refrained from the threat or use of force against the territory or political independence of other States.

China said the aim of the proposal was to give full advantage to USSR superiority in conventional weapons, allowing it to threaten neighbouring States which could do no more than submit to its superiority in that area. France opposed the Declaration for three reasons: it would benefit a State that used force in international relations by guaranteeing that nuclear weapons would not be used for defence; it deprived the principle of non-use of force of its highest place among the obligations of States; and it would deprive the nuclear component of its deterrent effect. Portugal said it could not support such vague, purely declaratory and unrealistic proposals. The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community members, said they could not support vague proposals such as those for no first use of nuclear weapons, which were unrealistic, unenforceable and declaratory; disarmament would come about only through negotiation of concrete agreements on measures to limit and reduce armaments, taking account of the principles of parity and equality. Zaire stated that the suggestion for preventing the first use of nuclear weapons solved nothing, since some States saw it as tantamount to exposing their flanks.

Egypt expressed the view that the most effective way to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, pending the achievement of nuclear disarmament, was to prohibit the use or threat of nuclear weapons—not the first use alone.

Responding to the argument that the Declaration would enable the members of the Warsaw

Treaty Organization to make use of their superiority in conventional weapons, Czechoslovakia called this a false allegation and recalled that the Warsaw Treaty members had proposed to their counterparts in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization the conclusion of an agreement to prohibit the first use of conventional as well as nuclear weapons. Poland noted in this regard that the USSR had previously made other proposals on the non-use of force in international relations. The German Democratic Republic, responding to another argument by opponents of the Declaration, said the threat of use of nuclear weapons could never create stability, but only fears of an unprovoked preventive strike.

Several of those voting for the resolution—India, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sierra Leone and Sri Lanka—stressed that prohibition of the first use of nuclear weapons was only one aspect of the larger issues of a total ban on their use and of nuclear disarmament in general.

Abstaining in the vote, Argentina, Austria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Brazil, Finland, Ireland, Kenya, Malaysia, Senegal, the Sudan and Sweden expressed a number of reservations: that the Declaration did not deal with the more general problem of banning the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and the use of force in international relations (Austria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Kenya, Malaysia, Senegal); that the two sides were too deeply divided over the proposal (Argentina, Bahamas, Finland, Ireland); that the matter should have been studied more closely before a declaration was pressed (Bahamas, Sudan); that the problem must be dealt with by arms limitation and reduction agreements, not by declarations (Austria, Ireland); that the subject was dealt with adequately in other resolutions (Senegal); and that it was incongruous to talk of first strike in a committee dedicated to disarmament (Bahamas).

Albania did not participate in the vote, stating that the proposal was aimed at diverting attention from the substance of the problem, which was the divide-and-dominate policies of the two super-Powers and China.

Letters: USSR: <sup>(1)</sup>22 Sep., A/36/241; <sup>(2)</sup>21 Oct., A/C.1/36/7

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>General Committee, A/36/250/Add.1

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/100, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.3 (6 Oct.); 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1-4-10, 12-26, 27, 29, 32, 34-37, 39, 41, 43 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.28,91 (6 Oct., 9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/100

82-19-41 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981  
Approved by First Committee (A/36/759) by recorded vote (67-18-37).  
25 November (meeting 43); 4-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2); agenda item 135.

Sponsors: Angola, German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, USSR,



### Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe The General Assembly,

Bearing in mind that the foremost task of the United Nations, born in the flames of the Second World War, has been, is and will be to save present and succeeding generations from the scourge of war,

Recognizing that all the horrors of past wars and all other calamities that have befallen people would pale in comparison with what is inherent in the use of nuclear weapons capable of destroying civilization on earth,

Reaffirming that the universally accepted objective is to eliminate completely the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons through the cessation of their production, followed by the destruction of their stockpiles, and that, to this end, priority in disarmament negotiations should be given to nuclear disarmament,

Convinced that, as the first step in this direction, the use of nuclear weapons and the waging of nuclear war should be outlawed,

Solemnly proclaims, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations:

1. States and statesmen that resort first to the use of nuclear weapons will be committing the gravest crime against humanity.

2. There will never be any justification or pardon for statesmen who would take the decision to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

3. Any doctrines allowing the first use of nuclear weapons and any actions pushing the world towards a catastrophe are incompatible with human moral standards and the lofty ideals of the United Nations.

4. It is the supreme duty and direct obligation of the leaders of nuclear-weapon States to act in such a way as to eliminate the risk of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict. The nuclear-arms race must be stopped and reversed by joint efforts, through negotiations conducted in good faith and on the basis of equality, having as their ultimate goal the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

5. Nuclear energy should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and only for the benefit of mankind.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka; Suriname, Swaziland,<sup>a</sup> Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia,

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Malaysia, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Zaire.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

### Establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones

As in previous years, the General Assembly adopted resolutions in 1981 on the proposed establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in

Africa (see below), the Middle East (p. 49) and South Asia (p. 55), as well as on Latin America (p. 48) –the only region where such a zone had been established by treaty. It also took action with respect to a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean (p. 94).

Aside from these regions, support for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Nordic area was expressed by Finland and Sweden, with the latter asserting that such arrangements would have to include concrete commitments by the USSR and the United States. The Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia and the USSR supported the establishment of such zones in northern Europe and in the Balkan region, as well as zones of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean and South-East Asia. Hungary also favoured the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Balkans and the Mediterranean, and Bulgaria and Romania supported the establishment of such a zone in the Balkans.

By a letter of 11 November,<sup>(1)</sup> Bulgaria transmitted a speech of 20 October by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of its Communist Party and President of its State Council, proposing a 1982 meeting in Sofia of the leaders of the Balkan States to discuss the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Balkans.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Bulgaria, 11 Nov., A/C.1/36/11.

### Africa

#### Implementation of the 1964 Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa

By a resolution of 9 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly reiterated its call on all States to consider and respect Africa-including surrounding islands and Madagascar—as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. It requested the Secretary-General to assist the Organization of African Unity (OAU) towards the realization of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, adopted by OAU in 1964, and it condemned nuclear collaboration with South Africa as frustrating the objective of that Declaration. Most of the text dealt with nuclear weapons and South Africa (p. 46).

The resolution, sponsored by 29 African States, was adopted by a recorded vote of 132 to none, with 12 abstentions, after approval by the First Committee on 24 November by a recorded vote, requested by the United States, of 113 to none, with 11 abstentions. Paragraph 4, calling for the termination of military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, was adopted by a separate vote.

The text was introduced by Nigeria, which said the objective of a denuclearized Africa remained fundamental to the continent's efforts

for collective self-defence, and hoped that all nuclear and non-nuclear countries would refrain from any action or inaction which might frustrate the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free Africa.

Portugal and the United Kingdom, explaining their abstentions in the vote, cited difficulties with provisions on South Africa (p. 47). A number of States which voted in favour—Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Japan, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Turkey—expressed general agreement with its main thrust but objected to some language as intemperate or overly polemical. Albania voted in favour but maintained its reservations with regard to nuclear-weapon-free zones.

In the First Committee debate, Chad and Madagascar said that only a treaty on the denuclearization of Africa, whereby African States undertook not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons, could guarantee the security of those States, prevent nuclear proliferation and channel the savings to development. Liberia opposed having nuclear weapons of any kind in Africa.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/86 B, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 30, 34, 36-39, 41 (19 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/86 B

132-0-12 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/746) by recorded vote (113-0-11).  
24 November (meeting 41): 29-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.16); agenda item 45.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire, Zambia.

#### Implementation of the Declaration

##### The General Assembly,

Bearing in mind the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its first ordinary session, held at Cairo from 17 to 21 July 1964,

Recalling its resolutions 1652(XVI) of 24 November 1961, 32/81 of 12 December 1977, 33/63 of 14 December 1978, 34/76 A of 11 December 1979 and 35/146 B of 12 December 1980, in which it called upon all States to consider and respect the continent of Africa, comprising the continental African States, Madagascar and other islands surrounding Africa, as a nuclear-weapon-free zone,

Recalling also that in its resolution 33/63 it vigorously condemned any attempt by South Africa to introduce in any way whatsoever nuclear weapons into the continent and demanded that South Africa refrain forthwith from conducting any nuclear explosion in the continent of Africa or elsewhere,

Reaffirming that the nuclear programme of the racist regime of South Africa constitutes a very grave danger to international peace and security and, in particular, jeopardizes the security of African States,

Noting with concern that South Africa has persistently refused to conclude adequate and comprehensive safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency with a view to preventing the diversion of nuclear materials from peaceful uses to the manufacture of nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices,

Taking note of the report of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421(1977) concerning the question of South Africa on ways and means of making the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa more effective, in particular its recommendation that all forms of nuclear collaboration with South Africa should cease, and the report of the international Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held at Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981,

Gravely concerned over the possibility that South Africa has acquired nuclear weapons,

Convinced that the acquisition of such weapons by South Africa would endanger the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa as well as the maintenance of international peace and security,

Expressing its indignation that certain Western countries and Israel have continued to collaborate with South Africa in the nuclear field despite the risk of proliferation of nuclear weapons which the South African nuclear programme represents,

Recalling its decision taken at the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament, that the Security Council should take appropriate effective steps to prevent the frustration of the decision of the Organization of African Unity for the denuclearization of Africa,

1. Once again reiterates its call upon all States to consider and respect the continent of Africa, comprising the continental African States, Madagascar and other islands surrounding Africa, as a nuclear-weapon-free zone;

2. Reaffirms that the nuclear programme of the racist regime of South Africa constitutes a very grave danger to international peace and security and, in particular, jeopardizes the security of African States and increases the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons;

3. Condemns any form of nuclear collaboration by any State, corporation, institution or individual with the racist regime of South Africa since such collaboration frustrates, inter alia, the objective of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa adopted by the Organization of African Unity to keep Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone;

4. Calls upon such States, corporations, institutions and individuals, therefore, to terminate forthwith such military and nuclear collaboration with the racist regime of South Africa, including the provision to it of such related materials as computers, electronic equipment and corresponding technology;

5. Requests the Security Council, in keeping with the recommendation of its Committee established by resolution 421(1977) concerning the question of South Africa, to prohibit all forms of co-operation and collaboration with the racist regime of South Africa in the nuclear field;

6. Demands that South Africa submit all its nuclear installations to inspection by the international Atomic Energy Agency;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to render all necessary assistance to the Organization of African Unity towards the realization of its solemn Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa;

8. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania,

Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

### Nuclear weapons and South Africa

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION CONSIDERATION. The question of South Africa's capability to produce nuclear weapons and the related issue of nuclear collaboration with South Africa were discussed in the Disarmament Commission at its May/June 1981 session,<sup>(1)</sup> primarily under an agenda item concerning a letter from the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid transmitting to the Commission the report of the United Nations Seminar on Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa, held in London in February 1979.<sup>(11)</sup>

The Commission first studied a working paper submitted by Cuba on behalf of the non-aligned countries, asserting that evidence pointed to South Africa's achievement of nuclear capability through the active collaboration and collusion of certain countries. On the basis of that document, an informal working group produced a working paper which stressed, among other things, the need to prevent further acquisition of arms or arms technology by racist régimes, especially through strict adherence by all States to relevant Security Council decisions. No agreement was reached in the Commission, however; the two papers were annexed to the Commission's report to the General Assembly.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In a report issued on 3 September,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that he had given maximum publicity, as requested by the General Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(5)</sup> to the report he submitted in September 1980 on South Africa's plan and capability in the nuclear field.<sup>(12)</sup> He had identified no further information on South Africa's nuclear developments to add to his 1980 report.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 9 December, under its agenda item on the denuclearization of Africa, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the nuclear capability of South Africa<sup>(6)</sup> by a recorded vote of 129 to 4, with 10 abstentions.

Deploing the massive build-up of South Africa's military machine and reaffirming that the régime's nuclear plans and capability gravely endangered peace and security, the Assembly requested the Security Council to intensify its

efforts to prohibit all forms of nuclear co-operation and collaboration with South Africa and to institute effective enforcement action so as to prevent that régime from endangering peace and security through acquisition of nuclear weapons. The Assembly called on States, corporations, institutions and individuals to terminate military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, including the provision of such materials as computers, electronic equipment and related technology. It demanded that South Africa submit all its nuclear installations to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

The text, sponsored by 27 African States and Qatar, was approved by the First Committee on 24 November by a recorded vote of 108 to 4, with 9 abstentions.

In a resolution, also adopted on 9 December,<sup>(7)</sup> on implementation of the 1964 OAU Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, the Assembly condemned nuclear collaboration with South Africa by any State, corporation, institution or individual. This resolution, like the 28-nation text, included provisions reaffirming that South Africa's nuclear programme was a grave danger to peace and security, calling for an end to military and nuclear collaboration, requesting the Security Council to prohibit such collaboration and demanding that South Africa submit to IAEA inspection. Paragraph 4 of the text, containing the call for termination of military and nuclear collaboration, was adopted in Committee by a separate recorded vote, requested by the United States, of 101 to 6, with 16 abstentions.

Under the agenda item on apartheid and South Africa, the Assembly, on 17 December, condemned specified Western States and Israel for nuclear collaboration with South Africa, and urged the Security Council to take mandatory measures to ensure the immediate cessation of any military and nuclear collaboration with that régime.<sup>(9)</sup> On the same date, it urged the Security Council to strengthen the arms embargo against South Africa and called on States to ensure the cessation of all military relations with that country.<sup>(10)</sup>

In a resolution of 9 December on strengthening peace and security, the Assembly called on the Security Council to promote the denuclearization of Africa in order to avert the serious danger posed by South Africa's nuclear capability to the African States as well as to international peace and security.<sup>(8)</sup>

Introducing the resolution on South Africa's nuclear capability, Nigeria felt it unacceptable that the glitter of gold or other geopolitical or geostrategic interests of South Africa's supporters should become a more convincing con-

sideration than the lives, liberty and well-being of Africans. The sponsors also regarded as ominous the use of the veto in the Security Council by certain States on southern African issues, and stressed the Council's duty to promote peace and security.

Several States explained their vote against the resolution on South Africa's nuclear capability and their abstention on the other resolution on the denuclearization of Africa. Israel recalled that it had voted for the Assembly's 1978 resolution on denuclearization of Africa<sup>(4)</sup> but observed that it had been singled out by name in later resolutions for alleged nuclear collaboration with South Africa, although such accusations were unfounded and false. The United Kingdom emphasized that it did not collaborate in any way with South Africa towards that country's development of a nuclear-weapon capability. The United States felt that the two resolutions, with their intemperate language and unproved allegations, would discourage South Africa from implementing a non-proliferation policy rather than serve their intended purposes; also, it rejected efforts to include all high-technology items under the arms embargo against South Africa.

France, which voted against the nuclear capability resolution, and the Netherlands, which abstained, said the two texts failed to distinguish between peaceful and military uses of nuclear energy; France also regarded the Assembly request for enforcement action as at variance with the Charter and the criticism of vetoes in the Security Council as a breach of the principle of respect for the sovereignty of States.

Canada abstained on both texts, stating that they contained questionable assumptions and unsubstantiated allegations; further, it doubted the appropriateness of requesting the Security Council to institute enforcement action. Australia abstained on the resolution on nuclear capability, objecting to the tendentious naming of States and the failure to distinguish between military and peaceful uses of nuclear energy. New Zealand did likewise, finding the text less accurate and more tendentious than in previous resolutions. Portugal abstained on both texts because it considered the global condemnation of any nuclear co-operation with South Africa excessive; condemnation should cover only military co-operation.

Many delegations, while voting in favour of both resolutions, expressed reservations regarding various paragraphs. The reservations of Austria, Bolivia, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Norway and Spain concerned the request to the Security Council, which these States did not regard as in keeping with the respective functions of the Assembly and the Council under the Charter. Aust-

ria, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Turkey objected to preambular provisions in both resolutions referring to continued support and collaboration by certain Western countries and Israel. Finland also regretted the lack of reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons,<sup>(3)</sup> and Ireland was concerned about the failure to distinguish between peaceful and military nuclear uses.

Although voting in favour of both resolutions, Argentina did not agree with some of their language and voiced reservations with regard to nuclear safeguards requirements. Japan voted for the resolution on the denuclearization of Africa but thought conclusive evidence was lacking for some of its assertions.

In the First Committee debate, many States reiterated their concern about 'the nuclear plans and capability of South Africa which, in their view, could constitute a serious threat to peace and security and increase the danger of nuclear-weapon proliferation. A number of African States said their fears had been reinforced by the 1980 report of the Secretary-General and the possibility that South Africa might indeed have acquired nuclear weapons.

Nigeria, referring to the Disarmament Commission's discussion of this subject, said a few of the Commission's members tended to exercise the semblance of a veto when consensus was sought on substantive issues such as this.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Disarmament Commission, A/36/42; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/430.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>2373(XXII), annex, 12 June 1968 (YUN 1968, p. 17); <sup>(4)</sup>33/63, 14 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 91); <sup>(5)</sup>35/146A, para. 9, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 65); <sup>(6)</sup>36/86A, 9 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(7)</sup>36/86 B, 9 Dec. (p. 45); <sup>(8)</sup>36/102, para 11, 9 Dec. (p. 145); <sup>(9)</sup>36/172 E, 17 Dec. (p. 185); <sup>(10)</sup>36/172 F, 17 Dec. (p. 174).

Yearbook references: <sup>(11)</sup>1979, p. 173; <sup>(12)</sup>1980, p. 45.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1. 4-10, 12-26, 30 34, 36, 38, 39, 41 (19 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/86 A

129-4-10 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981  
Approved by First Committee (A/36/746) by recorded vote (108-4-9), 24 November (meeting 41): 28-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.15): agenda item 45.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire, Zambia,

#### Nuclear capability of South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 34/76 B of 11 December 1979 and 35/146 A of 12 December 1980.

Bearing in mind the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its first ordinary session, which was held at Cairo from 17 to 21 July 1964,

Recalling that, in its resolution 33/63 of 14 December 1978, it vigorously condemned any attempt by South Africa

to introduce in any way whatsoever nuclear weapons into the continent and demanded that South Africa refrain forthwith from conducting any nuclear explosion in the continent of Africa or elsewhere.

Alarmed by the content and growing sophistication of South Africa's military and nuclear programme,

Alarmed also at the fact that South Africa's nuclear programme has enabled it to acquire nuclear-weapon capability enhanced by the continued support and collaboration which certain Western countries and Israel have given to it,

Noting with grave concern that South Africa's capacity to produce nuclear weapons has been established, inter alia, by the content of its nuclear programme, as well as by the report of the Secretary-General on South Africa's plan and capability in the nuclear field following the reported detonation by that country of a nuclear device on 22 September 1979, and that it might indeed have acquired nuclear weapons,

Taking note of the report of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa on ways and means of making the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa more effective, as well as the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolution 473(1980).

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General of 9 September 1980, as well as his report of 3 September 1981, submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 35/146 A on the nuclear capability of South Africa,

Noting with concern that South Africa has persistently refused to conclude adequate and comprehensive safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency with a view to preventing the diversion of nuclear materials from peaceful uses to the manufacture of nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices,

Gravely concerned that South Africa, in flagrant violation of the principles of international law and the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, has continued its military attacks against independent States of southern Africa, in particular Angola, and has increased its acts of subversion aimed at destabilizing those States,

Equally concerned that the acquisition of military equipment and nuclear-weapon capability by the racist regime of South Africa, with its abhorrent system of apartheid and its record of violence and aggression, poses a serious danger to international peace and security,

Recalling its decision taken at the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament, that the Security Council should take appropriate effective steps to prevent the frustration of the decision of the Organization of African Unity for the denuclearization of Africa,

Expressing its indignation at the fact that some Western countries, by a ready recourse to the use of the veto, have continually frustrated every effort at the United Nations to deal with the question of South Africa,

1. Deplores the massive build-up of South Africa's military machine, including its frenzied acquisition of a nuclear-weapon capability for repressive and aggressive purposes and as an instrument of blackmail;

2. Reaffirms that the racist régime's plans and capability in the nuclear field constitute a very grave danger to international peace and security and, in particular, jeopardize the security of African States and increase the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons;

3. Requests the Security Council to intensify its efforts to prohibit all forms of co-operation and collaboration with the racist regime of South Africa in the nuclear field and, in particular, to institute effective enforcement action against that régime so as to prevent it from endangering international peace and security through its acquisition of nuclear weapons;

4. Calls upon all States, corporations, institutions and individuals to terminate forthwith all military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime, including the provision to it of such related materials as computers, electronic equipment and corresponding technology;

5. Demands that South Africa submit all its nuclear installations to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to follow closely South Africa's evolution in the nuclear field and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

7. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia,

Against: France, Israel, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal,

#### Latin America

By a resolution adopted on 9 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly, noting with satisfaction that the United States, on 23 November, had become a party to Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco), expressed regret that France had not done so although it had signed the Protocol in 1979. The Assembly noted that non-sovereign territories could receive the benefits of the Treaty if the States internationally responsible for them adhered to the Protocol, and it recalled that the Netherlands and the United Kingdom had previously done this.

The resolution was adopted by a non-recorded vote of 138 to none, with 5 abstentions, following its approval by the First Committee on 25 November by a recorded vote of 121 to none, with 3 abstentions (Cuba, France, Guyana). The text was sponsored by the 21 Latin American/Caribbean States parties to the Treaty.

Introducing the resolution, Mexico, the Treaty's depositary Government, expressed hope that France would ratify the Protocol by the time of the Assembly's 1982 session.

France rejected the thrust of the text, stating that it called into question that country's responsibility although the Treaty had not been ratified, or even signed, by all the States in the region it covered; France maintained that it was

not for the Assembly to interfere in the treaty ratification procedures of States. Guyana considered it incomprehensible and contradictory that a treaty seeking to make Latin America a nuclear-free zone should arbitrarily deny Guyana's membership through a discriminatory clause (specifying that no decision could be taken on the admission of a political entity involved in a territorial dispute).

The United States, while voting in favour, regretted that the resolution singled out one country rather than calling on all eligible States to sign and ratify. Argentina, which also voted in favour, expressed reservations on the preambular paragraph mentioning the adherence of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, since it related to a fundamental question of territorial sovereignty.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/83, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 27, 32, 35, 44 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/83

138-0-5 Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/742) by recorded vote (121-0-3). 25 November (meeting 44); 21 -nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.41/Rev.2); agenda item 41.

Sponsors: Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Grenade, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/143 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2288(XXII) of 5 December 1967, 3262(XXIX) of 9 December 1974, 3473(XXX) of 11 December 1975, 32/76 of 12 December 1977, S-10/2 of 30 June 1978, 33/58 of 14 December 1978, 34/71 of 11 December 1979 and 35/143 of 12 December 1980 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).

Taking into account that within the zone of application of that Treaty, to which twenty-two sovereign States are already parties, there are some territories which, in spite of not being sovereign political entities, are nevertheless in a position to receive the benefits deriving from the Treaty through its Additional Protocol I, to which the States that de jure or de facto are internationally responsible for those territories may become parties,

Recalling with satisfaction that the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Netherlands became parties to Additional Protocol I in 1969 and 1971, respectively,

Noting with satisfaction that the United States of America likewise became a party to Additional Protocol I on 23 November 1981, when its instrument of ratification was deposited,

1. Regrets that the signature of Additional Protocol I by France, which took place on 2 March 1979, has not yet been followed by the corresponding ratification, notwithstanding the time already elapsed and the pressing invitations addressed to France by the General Assembly and which it reiterates with special urgency in the present resolution;

2. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item entitled "Implementation of

General Assembly resolution 36/83 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

## Middle East

### Proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone

COMMUNICATIONS. In a letter dated 26 February 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> Egypt informed the Secretary-General that on that date it had ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons;<sup>(8)</sup> annexed to the letter was a statement issued on the occasion by Egypt's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stating that Egypt's commitment to non-proliferation should not impair its right to develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in conformity with the Treaty. In a further letter dated 20 April,<sup>(3)</sup> Egypt suggested that a study exploring the modalities for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East might be undertaken to help facilitate the realization of that goal.

In a letter to the Secretary-General dated 9 June<sup>(5)</sup> and a similar letter to the Security Council President dated 15 June,<sup>(6)</sup> Israel requested all States in and adjacent to the Middle East to indicate during 1981 their consent to holding a preparatory conference to discuss the modalities of a conference aimed at negotiating a multilateral treaty on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East; Israel also welcomed the Egyptian proposal for a study and suggested that it be undertaken by experts from the States in the region, including Israel. In a subsequent letter dated 26 October,<sup>(7)</sup> Israel stated that, without prejudice to any political or legal claim by the States of the region, it behooved them, for the sake of their common future, to take concrete steps towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Israel, in a letter dated 27 May,<sup>(4)</sup> responded to a Pakistani letter of 3 February<sup>(11)</sup> which stated that Pakistan's nuclear research and development programme was entirely geared to peaceful purposes, and quoted a February 1980 news report to the effect that Israel had carried out a nuclear explosion in 1979 off South Africa's coast and with its co-operation. Israel replied that there was abundant evidence indicating that Pakistan aimed at producing nuclear weapons; as to the purported explosion, Israel cited a comment to the press by its Prime Minister on 24 February 1981 rejecting newspaper reports concerning the event.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 9 December, the General Assembly, in a resolution<sup>(10)</sup> sponsored by Egypt and adopted without vote, requested the Secretary-General to transmit to the Assembly at its 1982 special session on disarmament

mament (p. 27) the text of the 1980 resolution<sup>(9)</sup> by which it had urged all parties directly concerned to consider taking practical and urgent steps to implement the proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The resolution, revised by its sponsor, was approved on 25 November 1981 by the First Committee, also without vote.

Egypt's initial draft would have had the Secretary-General appoint a special representative to ascertain the attitudes of parties in the Middle East on procedures for establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Qatar submitted amendments<sup>(1)</sup> to this proposal which would have replaced the paragraphs on a special representative with a request to the Secretary-General for a report, and added references to Israel's attack of 7 June on Iraqi nuclear installations (p. 53). When Egypt revised its proposal to include only a request to transmit the 1980 resolution to the special session, Qatar did not press its amendments.

Introducing its original proposal, Egypt stated that the appointment of a special representative of the Secretary-General would maintain the momentum for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and transmute the theoretical concept into a practical one without infringing on basic positions. The proposal for a special representative was endorsed by Lebanon.

Many countries expressed support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East as a practical approach towards enhancing the security of States in that region. Supporters included the United States, which offered to assist the States of the region to resolve problems in regard to such a zone. Oman stated that the Middle East must become a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The Syrian Arab Republic said it was ready to implement such a zone if Israel made such a commitment, but it held no hope that an entity which had violated international law would commit itself to a resolution in opposition to its strategy of expansion.

A number of Middle Eastern states—including Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and the United Arab Emirates—expressed deep concern that the development of nuclear weapons by Israel (p. 51) would constitute a serious threat to regional security and jeopardize the effort to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Some advocated that, pending establishment of such a zone, all parties in the region should pledge to refrain on a reciprocal basis from producing, acquiring or in any other way possessing nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices. Iraq remarked

that, in discussing a nuclear-weapon-free zone for the Middle East, it was not valid to make a comparison with Latin America, as the Zionist entity had not signed the non-proliferation Treaty and had refused to place its nuclear facilities under international control.

Commenting on the initial Egyptian proposal, Israel remarked that it omitted reference to the indispensable negotiating process and did not deal realistically with a number of fundamental and practical aspects; a committee of experts could generate a more realistic momentum than could the itinerant efforts of a special representative.

The Sudan stated that Israel, which already possessed a nuclear-weapon capability, had ulterior motives in supporting a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East; it should first demonstrate its readiness to abide by international instruments and resolutions and adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty.

Explaining their positions, Finland, the United Kingdom (for the European Community members) and the United States said they would have supported Egypt's original proposal and regretted that it had not been possible to consider a text that would have dealt with the matter substantively. Iraq noted that the original text had failed to take into account the Israeli attack on Iraq's nuclear installations; while it regarded the revised text as unsatisfactory, it had gone along with the consensus.

Amendments not pressed: <sup>(1)</sup>Qatar, A/C.1/36/L.53.  
Letters: Egypt: <sup>(2)</sup>26 Feb., A/36/112-S/14387; <sup>(3)</sup>20 Apr., A/36/220. Israel: <sup>(4)</sup>27 May, A/36/298; <sup>(5)</sup>9 June, A/36/315; <sup>(6)</sup>15 June, S/14534; <sup>(7)</sup>26 Oct., A/36/630.  
Resolutions: GA: <sup>(8)</sup>2373(XXII), annex, 12 June 1968 (YUN 1968, p. 17); <sup>(9)</sup>35/147, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 66); <sup>(10)</sup>36/87 A, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(11)</sup>1980, p. 48.  
Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.1/36/L.52.  
Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 37, 38, 44 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/87 A

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/747) without vote. 25 November (meeting 44); draft by Egypt (A/C.1/36/L.34/Rev.1); agenda item 46.

The General Assembly.

Recalling its resolutions 3263(XXIX) of 9 December 1974, 3474(XXX) of 11 December 1975, 31/71 of 10 December 1976, 32/82 of 12 December 1977, 33/64 of 14 December 1978, 34/77 of 11 December 1979 and 35/147 of 12 December 1980 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit General Assembly resolution 35/147 to the Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982;

2. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

## Nuclear weapons and Israel

REPORT BY THE GROUP OF EXPERTS. The Group of Experts to Prepare a Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament, appointed by the Secretary-General in accordance with a 1979 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(3)</sup> submitted its study to the Secretary-General on 19 June 1981<sup>(1)</sup> and he transmitted it to the Assembly in September. The five-member Group held four sessions: one in 1980<sup>(5)</sup> and the rest in 1981- 19 to 30 January and 20 April to 4 May at United Nations Headquarters, and 15 to 19 June at Geneva.

The study consisted of an introduction, four main chapters—on Israel's nuclear development, its nuclear-weapon potential, factors affecting its nuclear policy and international reports concerning its nuclear armament—and conclusions.

The experts observed that Israel had failed to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty<sup>(2)</sup> and to submit all of its nuclear facilities to international inspection, and had also appeared to undermine the credibility of the nuclear safeguards supervised by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), particularly by the bombing of an Iraqi nuclear reactor which was under IAEA safeguards (p. 53).

The report stated that although Israeli authorities had not supplied information on the major part of Israel's nuclear programme and activities, there was no doubt, given its technical skills and infrastructure, that the country had the technical capability to manufacture nuclear weapons and possessed the means of delivering such weapons to targets in the area. Whereas Israel could be moved by a number of cogent arguments to refrain from acquiring nuclear weapons, various considerations might be thought to prompt it to acquire them. Israel's apparent posture of deliberate ambiguity in that regard might contribute to instability in the region and could be an obstacle to creating the confidence necessary for a political settlement there.

The Group of Experts stated that, on the basis of available authoritative information, it was not able to conclude definitively whether or not Israel currently possessed nuclear weapons. However, the experts did not doubt that, if Israel had not already crossed the threshold, it had the capability to manufacture nuclear weapons within a short time. The Group believed that it would contribute to avoiding the danger of a nuclear-arms race in the Middle East if Israel should renounce the possession of or any intention to possess nuclear weapons and agree to submit all its nuclear activities to international safeguards.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In a resolution on Israeli nuclear armament,<sup>(4)</sup> adopted on 9 December by a recorded vote of 101 to 2, with

39 abstentions, the General Assembly expressed deep alarm that the Secretary-General's report (to which the study by the Group of Experts was annexed) had established Israel's technical capability to manufacture nuclear weapons and its possession of means of delivery. Expressing concern that Israel had undermined the credibility of IAEA nuclear safeguards, the Assembly reaffirmed that Israel's attack on Iraqi nuclear facilities and Israel's capability were a serious destabilizing factor in the Middle East. It requested the Security Council to prohibit all nuclear co-operation with Israel and to institute enforcement action to prevent it from endangering peace and security by its nuclear-weapon capability, and called on States and others to terminate such co-operation. It demanded that Israel renounce any possession of nuclear weapons and place all its nuclear activities under international safeguards.

The text, sponsored by 18 Arab and other States, was approved by the First Committee on 24 November by a recorded vote of 93 to 2, with 32 abstentions.

Before acting on the text as a whole, the Assembly took a separate recorded vote on operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, on nuclear co-operation with Israel and Security Council enforcement action, and adopted them by 89 to 21, with 30 abstentions. The same paragraphs were approved in Committee by a recorded vote of 82 to 17, with 25 abstentions.

Introducing the proposal, Iraq remarked that it was based principally on the report of the Group of Experts and was a culmination of efforts to condemn Israeli nuclear armament.

Israel, voting against the resolution, described it as one-sided and hypocritical. The resolution establishing the Group had been discriminatory in selecting Israel alone for study, and the terms of reference, referring to "Israeli nuclear armament", had been prejudicial. The Group consisted of four political scientists and only one nuclear physicist, who happened to be an Arab. Iraq's insistence in forcing resolutions condemning Israel was inspired by the contingencies of inter-Arab rivalry and the need to divert attention from its own frenetic nuclear activities.

The United States, also voting against, said that targeting one country for sanctions was not an appropriate approach to the goal of non-proliferation, and objected to any attempt to engage the Security Council in what it called an unbalanced and politically motivated activity.

Several States which abstained in the vote, namely Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, New Zealand, Portugal and Sweden, regretted the formulations of the three paragraphs put to a separate vote. The objections



were that the text failed to respect the division of responsibilities between the Assembly and the Security Council (Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, New Zealand, Sweden); did not differentiate between military and peaceful applications of nuclear energy when it called for an end to nuclear co-operation (Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Portugal); did not adequately reflect the conclusions by the Group of Experts (Belgium, Federal Republic of Germany); and referred to a question—the Israeli attack on Iraqi nuclear facilities—that had no bearing on the nuclear capability of Israel (Belgium). The Ivory Coast said it had abstained because nuclear disarmament, regional or world-wide, required a balanced approach.

Other States which supported the resolution as a whole—Argentina, the Bahamas and Spain—also expressed reservations regarding some of the language of the three paragraphs, on which they abstained; Argentina also recalled its reservations regarding the non-proliferation Treaty, as did Spain regarding the leeway given to States to choose whether to adhere to that Treaty.

Egypt, which abstained in the Committee vote but voted in favour in the Assembly, said the recent attitude of certain Arab countries could jeopardize efforts to put an end to any nuclear armament in the region. Voting in favour, the USSR stated that IAEA safeguards were sound and effective, and that Israel's bandit-like attack on the Iraqi nuclear centre could not be taken as an indication of their inadequacy.

Mexico, Panama, Peru and Venezuela, though they voted affirmatively in the vote on three paragraphs, stated that if there had been a separate vote on each paragraph they would have abstained on paragraph 7, requesting Security Council enforcement action against Israel.

In the First Committee debate, Iraq asserted that the report of the Group of Experts had confirmed that the Zionist entity had enough political reasons to produce nuclear weapons so as to annex further Arab territories and establish Zionist settlements; it possessed nuclear weapons and had established a nuclear alliance with Taiwan and South Africa. Somalia believed Israel should not be afforded the benefits of nuclear or military co-operation while it continued to flaunt its contempt for international law. According to the Sudan, available information about Israel's reactor at Dimona confirmed that Israel possessed nuclear weapons of the capacity of the bomb dropped on Nagasaki, Japan, in 1945, as well as the capability of producing more bombs and developing delivery systems.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup> Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament, Disarma-

ment Study Series 6 (A/36/431), Sales No. E.82.IX.2.  
Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2373(XXII), annex, 12 June 1968 (YUN 1968, p. 17); <sup>(3)</sup>34/89, 11 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, P. 59); <sup>(4)</sup>36/98, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 43.  
Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 34, 36, 37, 42 (19 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/98

101-2-39 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981  
Approved by First Committee (A/36/757) by recorded vote (93-2-32), 24 November (meeting 42); 18-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.30); agenda item 56.

Sponsors: Bahrain, Chad, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

#### Israeli nuclear armament

The General Assembly.

Recalling its relevant resolutions on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East,

Recalling also its resolutions 33/71 A of 14 December 1978 on military and nuclear collaboration with Israel and 34/89 of 11 December 1979 and 35/157 of 12 December 1980 on Israeli nuclear armament,

Alarmed by the increasing evidence regarding Israel's attempts to acquire nuclear weapons,

Noting with concern that Israel has persistently refused to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons despite repeated calls by the General Assembly and the Security Council to place its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards,

Recalling Security Council resolution 487(1981) of 19 June 1981,

Recalling the resolution adopted on 12 June 1981 by the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency and resolution GC(XXV)/RES/381 adopted on 26 September 1981 by the General Conference of the Agency, in which the Conference, inter alia, considered the Israeli act of aggression as an attack against the Agency and its safeguards regime and decided to suspend the provision of any assistance to Israel.

Recalling its repeated condemnation of the nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General transmitting the study of the Group of Experts to Prepare a Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his report on Israeli nuclear armament;

2. Expresses its deep alarm at the fact that the report has established that Israel has the technical capability to manufacture nuclear weapons and possesses the means of delivery of such weapons;

3. Also expresses its deep concern that Israel has undermined the credibility of the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards, in particular by the bombing of the Iraqi nuclear facilities which were under Agency safeguards;

4. Reaffirms that Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear facilities and Israel's capability constitute a serious destabilizing factor in an already tense situation in the Middle East, and a grave danger to international peace and security;

5. Requests the Security Council to prohibit all forms of co-operation with Israel in the nuclear field;

6. Calls upon all States and other parties and institutions to terminate forthwith all nuclear collaboration with Israel;

7. Requests the Security Council to institute effective enforcement action against Israel so as to prevent it from endangering international peace and security by its nuclear-weapon capability;

8. Demands that Israel should renounce, without delay, any possession of nuclear weapons and place all its nuclear activities under international safeguards;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to give maximum publicity to the report on Israel nuclear armament and to distribute it to Member States, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency and non-governmental organizations, so that the international community and public opinion may be fully aware of the danger inherent in Israel's nuclear capability;

10. Also requests the Secretary-General to follow closely Israeli military nuclear activity and to report thereon as appropriate;

11. Further requests the Secretary-General to transmit the report on Israeli nuclear armament to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament;

12. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Israeli nuclear armament".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, & Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom, Uruguay.

#### Israeli attack on Iraqi nuclear facilities

In the Committee on Disarmament,<sup>(1)</sup> many members condemned the Israeli air attack of 7 June 1981 against Iraq's nuclear facilities near Baghdad (p. 275). The Group of 21 (p. 31) said the attack challenged the inherent right of States to develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes; the Group rejected the idea that peaceful nuclear energy programmes in developing countries inevitably led to nuclear-weapon proliferation. A group of socialist States called for a halt to nuclear assistance to Israel and urged examination of the question of strengthening international provisions for the protection of civilian nuclear installations against military attacks.

The Security Council condemned the Israeli attack on 19 June.<sup>(7)</sup>

On 13 November, the General Assembly condemned Israel for a premeditated and unprecedented act of aggression, warned Israel to cease its threats and commission of armed attacks against nuclear facilities, reiterated its call that States cease providing arms which enabled Israel to commit aggression, and requested the Security Council to investigate Israel's nuclear

activities and the collaboration of others in those activities.<sup>(4)</sup> Also, in an 11 November resolution on IAEA,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly described the attack as a serious threat to IAEA safeguards and to the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and called on all States to refrain from armed attacks on nuclear installations.

On 9 December, by a resolution<sup>(6)</sup> introduced by Iraq on behalf of the Arab Group under the item on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East (p. 49), the Assembly stated that the Israeli military attack on Iraqi nuclear installations adversely affected prospects for establishment of such a zone. The Assembly declared it imperative that Israel forthwith place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 107 to 2, with 31 abstentions.

When Iraq introduced the 9 December resolution at a plenary meeting, it asserted that the resolution on a Middle East zone which the Assembly also adopted on that date<sup>(5)</sup> was purely procedural and did not take due account of the dangerous developments in the region, particularly the unprecedented Israeli act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations. That assault had grave effects on the non-proliferation Treaty<sup>(2)</sup> and on the IAEA safeguards system. Israel, having taken the law into its own hands, should not be allowed to repeat such destructive actions or to dictate its own formula as to the proper modalities for establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region.

Israel, which voted against the resolution, viewed the proposal as a revival of the amendments Qatar had submitted to the Egyptian draft resolution on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East; since no zone would be established without consensus, Iraq's action raised doubts about its intentions. The United States, also voting against, considered the Iraqi text to be improper and disruptive; harping on a subject already dealt with at length in the Security Council served no good purpose.

Argentina did not participate in the vote, stating that it did not share the aim of the text to impose full-scope safeguards on a country by means of an Assembly resolution. India, while condemning the Israeli attack, abstained in the vote because of its opposition to discriminatory agreements such as the non-proliferation Treaty and to nuclear safeguards deriving therefrom.

Canada, though condemning the attack, abstained in the vote as it did not believe that the incident should be allowed to affect either the future of the non-proliferation Treaty or the prospects for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East—a view shared by the United Kingdom, speaking

for the European Community members. Costa Rica, which supported the establishment of the zone, abstained because it did not believe the Israeli attack was the only threat to non-proliferation in the region. Finland felt that the attack made the establishment of the zone more urgent, but that the Iraqi proposal did not contribute to that objective.

Albania voted in favour in order to condemn the attack, but reaffirmed its continuing reservations in respect of nuclear-weapon-free zones and the non-proliferation Treaty. Austria voted affirmatively in the conviction that adequate safeguard arrangements for all nuclear installations in all States of the Middle East would greatly facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Brazil, while supporting the text and its condemnation of the attack, remarked that the non-proliferation Treaty could not constitute the basis for serious steps to achieve the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

During the First Committee debate on establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, Austria, Japan, Malaysia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Somalia and Tunisia regarded the Israeli attack as a challenge to or as undermining the IAEA safeguards system, while Mauritania and Oman asserted that the incident demonstrated the ineffectiveness or failure of that system. Ireland saw it as an attack on the effort to consolidate an international regime against nuclear proliferation. According to China, the assault had created new difficulties for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Poland saw the attack as hindering efforts to draft a treaty banning radiological weapons.

Austria said that any unilateral military action to prevent nuclear activities of other countries posed a severe threat to the regime of the non-proliferation Treaty and might even provoke regional nuclear-arms races. Belgium stated that when a verification mechanism existed, as was the case under the Treaty, it could not accept calling into question the validity of controls such as those exercised by IAEA.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Disarmament, A/36/27 (Committee documents, CD/228, appendix II, vols. I, II).

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2373(XXII), annex, 12 June 1968 (YUN 1968, P. 17); <sup>(3)</sup>36/25, 11 Nov. 1981 (p. 713); <sup>(4)</sup>36/27, 13 Nov. (p. 282); <sup>(5)</sup>36/87 A, 9 Dec. (p. 50); <sup>(6)</sup>36/87 B, 9 Dec., text following. <sup>(7)</sup>SC: 487(1981), 19 June (p. 282).

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26 (19 Oct.-4 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/87 B

107-2-31 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Draft by Iraq (A/30/L.53); agenda item 46.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East,

Recalling also the recommendations for the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East consistent with paragraphs 60 to 63, in particular paragraph 63 (d) of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament,

Recalling further Security Council resolution 487(1981) of 19 June 1981,

Taking into consideration the resolution adopted on 12 June 1981 by the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency and resolution GC(XXV)/RES/381 adopted on 26 September 1981 by the General Conference of the Agency,

Recalling further the report of the Secretary-General concerning Israeli nuclear armament,

Realizing that adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons by all parties of the region will be conducive to a speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone,

Deeply concerned that the future of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in the region has been gravely endangered by the attack carried out by Israel, which is not a party to the Treaty, on the nuclear installations of Iraq, which is a party to that Treaty,

1. Considers that the Israeli military attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations adversely affects the prospects of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East;

2. Declares that it is imperative, in this respect, that Israel place forthwith all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the present resolution to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom.

#### South Asia

In September 1981 the Secretary-General submitted a report,<sup>(1)</sup> as requested by the General Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> on the proposed establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. He said he had been in contact with States of the region and that there had been no request by them for his assistance regarding the subject. In the course of those contacts, a view

had been expressed that he should continue to be available for that purpose.

On 9 December 1981, the Assembly reaffirmed its endorsement, in principle, of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.<sup>(3)</sup> It again urged States in the region and interested neighbouring non-nuclear-weapon States to continue to make all possible efforts to establish such a zone and to refrain, in the mean time, from any action contrary to that objective. Also by this resolution, adopted by a recorded vote of 93 to 3, with 44 abstentions, the Assembly called on nuclear-weapon States to respond positively to the proposal and to co-operate in efforts to establish the zone.

The First Committee approved the text on 25 November by a recorded vote of 82 to 2, with 38 abstentions.

The resolution was sponsored by Pakistan, which asserted that South Asia was a distinct region, fully qualified to pursue the objective of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Moreover, as countries of the region had more than once unilaterally declared their commitment to nuclear non-proliferation, it should be possible to translate those commitments into a joint declaration.

India cast a negative vote, stating that the proposal did not meet internationally recognized principles for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, particularly in that the initiative must come from the States of the region; in its view, South Asia was a contiguous and integral part of the Asia-Pacific region, where foreign bases were being maintained and different countries had different perceptions and security concerns. Also voting against the text, Bhutan stressed the importance of consultation to bring about an agreement among all the States concerned, which even after eight years had not been achieved.

Among States which abstained in the vote, the Bahamas and Sweden cited the lack of agreement among all States of the region, although the two States accepted the concept of a zone in principle. Australia and Brazil considered it essential that all States of the region participate on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at and negotiated among themselves; Australia believed that the zone should respect accepted principles of international law and be fully verifiable, while Brazil added that there should be a commitment among the nuclear Powers not to interfere in the negotiations.

Bangladesh, which voted in favour, stated that contacts and consultations must take place among the States concerned in order to ensure unanimity on the issue, including such aspects as defining the limits of such a zone. Sri Lanka,

which also supported the text, believed the zone could be viable provided that it had the consent, support and co-operation of all countries in the region. Japan and the United States reiterated their support of nuclear-weapon-free zones initiated by the States concerned, and considered that under appropriate conditions the zone could contribute to both non-proliferation and the promotion of peace and security. The Netherlands, supporting the proposal, called on the States in the region and other interested States to start consultations on arrangements to ensure that nuclear explosions were ruled out, and to refrain in the mean time from action contrary to that goal; but it wondered whether requirements such as geographical delimitation and full participation by the States concerned could be met under current circumstances.

During the First Committee debate, Democratic Kampuchea declared that the situation resulting from the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea and the USSR invasion of Afghanistan prevented the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/408.

Resolutions: GA: (2)35/148, para. 4, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 68); <sup>(3)</sup>36/88, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee. A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 31, 44 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/88

93-3-44 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981  
Approved by First Committee (A/36/748) by recorded vote (82-2-38), 25 November (meeting 44); draft by Pakistan (A/C.1/36/L.18); agenda item 47.

#### Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3265 B (XXIX) of 9 December 1974, 3476 B (XXX) of 11 December 1975, 31/73 of 10 December 1976, 32/83 of 12 December 1977, 33/65 of 14 December 1978, 34/78 of 11 December 1979 and 35/148 of 12 December 1980 concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia,

Reiterating its conviction that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world is one of the measures which can contribute most effectively to the objectives of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and general and complete disarmament,

Believing that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as in other regions, will strengthen the security of the States of the region against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons,

Noting the declarations issued at the highest level by Governments of South Asian States reaffirming their undertaking not to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons and to devote their nuclear programmes exclusively to the economic and social advancement of their peoples,

Recalling that in the above-mentioned resolutions it called upon the States of the South Asian region and such other neighbouring non-nuclear-weapon States as might be interested to make all possible efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and to refrain, in the mean time, from any action contrary to this objective.

Further recalling that, in its resolutions 3265 B (XXIX),

31/73 and 32/83, it requested the Secretary-General to convene a meeting for the purpose of the consultations mentioned therein and to render such assistance as might be required to promote the efforts for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Bearing in mind the provisions of paragraphs 60 to 63 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, regarding the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, including in the region of South Asia.

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia,

1. Reaffirms its endorsement, in principle, of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia;

2. Urges once again the States of South Asia and such other neighbouring non-nuclear-weapon States as may be interested to continue to make all possible efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and to refrain, in the mean time, from any action contrary to this objective;

3. Calls upon those nuclear-weapon States which have not done so to respond positively to this proposal and to extend the necessary co-operation in the efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to render such assistance as may be required to promote the efforts for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and to report on the subject to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament as well as at its thirty-seventh session;

5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bhutan, India, Mauritius.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Norway, Poland, Samoa,<sup>a</sup> Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sweden, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to vote in favour.

### Non-stationing of nuclear weapons

Expressing regret that little progress had been made in the Committee on Disarmament, the General Assembly, by a resolution adopted on 9 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> again requested the Committee to proceed without delay to talks with a view to elaborating an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there were no such weapons. The Assembly called on all nuclear-weapon States to refrain from further action involving the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territo-

ries of other States. This resolution, sponsored by 19 States, was adopted by a recorded vote of 84 to 18, with 42 abstentions, following its approval by the First Committee on 25 November by a recorded vote of 67 to 17, with 38 abstentions.

Introducing the resolution, Hungary stated that the conclusion of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons would strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation régime and could contribute to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and to reducing the danger of nuclear war. Recent decisions to deploy nuclear weapons in States where there were none and to deploy additional nuclear weapons in States where they already existed had increased the importance and timeliness of the question. As the Committee on Disarmament had been unable to deal appropriately with the question, efforts must continue towards the elaboration and conclusion of an international agreement.

Belgium explained its negative vote on the ground that the text would prevent States from exercising the right of collective self-defence as provided for in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. Japan also cast a negative vote, asserting that the measures proposed might destabilize the international military balance and thereby prove detrimental to the maintenance of peace and security.

Of the States which abstained, Brazil observed that the proposal failed to include the specific requirement of withdrawal and elimination of nuclear weapons from the territories of States where such weapons already existed. Brazil, Peru and Yugoslavia considered that an international agreement such as the one contemplated in the resolution could, therefore, confer legality on the existence of nuclear weapons on the territories of countries that already possessed them. Peru thought the right approach was the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Greece felt that the subject of the resolution should be dealt with in a broader, global context, founded on the sovereign right of every country freely to decide on questions concerning its own collective or individual defence. Ireland wished to avoid taking sides on strategic issues between the two alliances. Sweden considered that the question of non-stationing could not be dealt with in isolation, since it was related to the world military situation and security arrangements; also, a serious problem of credibility and consistency arose when the USSR co-sponsored a resolution against the stationing of nuclear weapons on new territories after a Soviet submarine, in all probability carrying a nuclear warhead, had recently violated Swedish territorial waters and penetrated into a militarily restricted area.

Albania did not participate in the vote, as it considered the resolution to be part of the rivalry between the two major nuclear Powers, aimed at securing advantages over the adversary.

India stated that its affirmative vote was without prejudice to its consistent support for the total elimination of all nuclear weapons, wherever deployed; consequently, it viewed the proposal as only one aspect of the problem of achieving nuclear disarmament and not as an end in itself. Similarly, the Sudan declared that its support should not be construed as acceptance of the existence of nuclear weapons currently on some territories or acceptance of any attempt to legalize such existence. Finland, while voting in favour, took exception to the request that nuclear-weapon States refrain from stationing nuclear weapons on the territories of other States and to a preambular paragraph by which the Assembly expressed alarm at nuclear weapon build-ups in other States; those clauses, it said, were intended to prejudice the Geneva talks on intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe. The Niger said its affirmative vote did not diminish its resolve not to accept foreign dictation on the means of ensuring its security.

In the First Committee debate, Czechoslovakia supported a USSR initiative for an agreement not to increase the number of nuclear weapons where such arsenals already existed. Also endorsing this idea, the German Democratic Republic said the introduction of additional foreign nuclear weapons in States which already had some on their territory would do great harm to confidence and stability, and undermine the security of the areas of deployment. The USSR said the 1980 General Assembly call for the beginning of talks on the question<sup>(1)</sup> had not been heeded owing to the obstructionist position of a number of Western States and China.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>35/156 C, para. 1, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 68); <sup>(2)</sup>36/97 E, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 31, 34, 43 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/97 E

84-18-42 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981  
Approved by First Committee (A/36/756) by recorded vote (67-17-38), 25 November (meeting 43); 19-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.20); agenda item 55 (d).

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present

The General Assembly,

Conscious that a nuclear war would have devastating consequences for the whole of mankind,

Recalling its resolution 33/91 F of 16 December 1978, which contains an appeal to all nuclear-weapon States to

refrain from stationing nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, and to all non-nuclear-weapon States which do not have nuclear weapons on their territories to refrain from any steps which would directly or indirectly result in the stationing of such weapons on their territories,

Recalling further its resolution 35/156 C of 12 December 1980, in which it requested the Committee on Disarmament to proceed without delay to talks with a view to elaborating an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present,

Noting with regret that this appeal by the General Assembly remains unheeded,

Considering that the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would constitute a step towards the larger objective of the subsequent complete withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territories of other States, thus contributing to the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons and leading eventually to the total elimination of nuclear weapons,

Bearing in mind the clearly expressed intention of many States to prevent the stationing of nuclear weapons on their territories,

Deeply alarmed by plans and practical steps leading to a build-up of nuclear-weapon arsenals on the territories of other States,

1. Requests once again the Committee on Disarmament to proceed without delay to talks with a view to elaborating an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present;

2. Calls upon all nuclear-weapon States to refrain from further action involving the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of other States;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Committee on Disarmament all documents relating to the discussion of this question by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session;

4. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to submit a report on the question to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present: report of the Committee on Disarmament".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Algeria, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belize, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lebanon, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

### Security guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT. In 1981, the Committee on Disarmament<sup>(1)</sup> considered an agenda item entitled "Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", both in plenary meetings and in an Ad Hoc Working Group re-established for that purpose on 12 February.

The Ad Hoc Working Group on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-Nuclear-Weapon States against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons held 23 meetings between 17 February and 13 August. It decided to concentrate on the substance of assurances and followed a two-stage approach: (1) identification of the various features of assurances; and (2) consideration of possible alternatives which could be explored in the search for a "common approach" or "formula".

In the conclusions and recommendations of its report, which the Committee adopted on 20 August, the Working Group reaffirmed that non-nuclear-weapon States should be effectively assured by nuclear-weapon States in this regard. However, negotiations on the substance of effective arrangements had revealed differing perceptions by some nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States as well as the complexities involved in finding a common formula. The Group recognized that adequate consideration must be given to the security interests of non-nuclear-weapon States, and regarded the efforts devoted to the search for a common approach or formula as a positive step towards agreement on the question of security assurances.

Against that background, the Working Group recommended that a similar group be established at the beginning of the Committee's 1982 session to explore alternatives and seek a common formula which could be included in a legally binding international instrument.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 9 December, the General Assembly adopted two resolutions concerning security guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States. By the first, it called for declarations by nuclear-weapon States as a first step towards an international convention; by the second, it recommended continued negotiations to find a common approach or formula.

The call addressed to nuclear-weapon States in the first of these resolutions<sup>(2)</sup> was that they make declarations on the non-use of nuclear weapons against States having no such weapons on their territories, as a first step towards an international convention. The declarations, if they all met their objective, would be approved by the Security Council. Meanwhile, the Committee on Disarma-

ment was requested to continue negotiations on the subject, and participating States were called on to make efforts for the elaboration and conclusion of a convention.

The Assembly adopted this resolution by a recorded vote of 115 to 17, with 12 abstentions. The text was approved in the First Committee on 23 November by a recorded vote of 93 to 16, with 14 abstentions. It had 10 sponsors and was introduced by Bulgaria.

By the second resolution,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly appealed to all States, especially the nuclear-weapon States, to demonstrate the necessary political will to reach agreement on a common approach, and particularly a common formula which could be included in a legally binding international instrument. The Assembly recommended a further search for such a common approach or formula, including continued negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament, taking into account the widespread support for an international convention and giving consideration to any other proposals having the same objective.

This resolution, sponsored and revised by Pakistan, was adopted by a recorded vote of 145 to none, with 3 abstentions, following its approval in the First Committee on 25 November by a recorded vote of 121 to none, with 4 abstentions.

When Bulgaria introduced the first of these resolutions, it stated that total nuclear disarmament would be the most effective and credible security guarantee to non-nuclear-weapon and all other States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Pending attainment of that objective, banning the use of nuclear weapons concurrently with the renunciation of the use of force in international relations would be a radical solution to the problem of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

Pakistan, introducing the second resolution, stated that interim assurances were needed pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In the effort to arrive at a common formula for such assurances, the strategic doctrines of the major nuclear Powers had thus far presented insurmountable obstacles. Their unilateral declarations expressed their narrowly conceived security concerns, whereas effective assurances would have to be unconditional and legally binding. Pakistan thought the most reasonable modality could be the adoption of an international convention, and disagreed with the suggestion that incorporating the existing unilateral declarations of the major nuclear Powers in a Security Council or General Assembly resolution could serve as the effective arrangement sought by the non-nuclear-weapon States.

Turkey voted against the resolution calling for declarations by nuclear-weapon States; referring

to a preambular paragraph expressing concern at plans for stationing nuclear weapons on other States' territories, it said provisions relating to the defence posture of the two alliances were alien to the concept of security assurances.

Explaining its abstention in the vote on this resolution, Austria said the Working Group's difficulties in finding a common approach stemmed from placing too much emphasis on the security concerns of the nuclear-weapon States. Austria and Ireland, which also abstained, objected that the resolution favoured the idea of an international convention, which seemed to imply further obligations for non-nuclear-weapon States. Sweden abstained for similar reasons, remarking that most non-nuclear-weapon States had adhered to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons<sup>(2)</sup> and there was no reason for them to undertake further obligations. The Niger said that merely calling for declarations from the nuclear-weapon States did not offer all the necessary guarantees that would be contained in the text of a convention recommended by the Committee on Disarmament.

Among those which voted for the resolution, Argentina none the less had doubts about the value of either unilateral declarations or a Security Council resolution and said that, had separate votes been taken on the paragraphs referring to such concepts, it would have abstained in those votes. Brazil reiterated that the reference in the text to non-stationing of nuclear weapons on territories of States where none existed should not be understood as legitimizing the presence of such weapons in States where they already existed.

Austria voted for the resolution calling for continued negotiations towards a common formula because it found the reference to the idea of a convention more balanced and moderate than in the other text or in past Assembly resolutions. Sweden supported the resolution for similar reasons. Canada and France also voted affirmatively, though they feared that some provisions could prejudice the responsibility of the Committee on Disarmament for determining its own procedures. While voting in favour, Japan voiced reservations about the resolution's references to a specific modality of security assurances. Finland voted for both resolutions in the conviction that all approaches to non-use assurances—also referred to as “negative security guarantees”—should continue to be explored, including unilateral declarations and multilateral agreements. The Ivory Coast, which abstained in the First Committee vote but voted in favour in the Assembly action on security assurances, asserted that the best guarantee lay in disarmament itself.

In the First Committee debate, a number of non-nuclear-weapon States were critical of the assurances which nuclear Powers had given or might be willing to give in future. Algeria remarked that negotiations on this topic were focused on the extensive restrictions most nuclear Powers intended to impose on non-nuclear-weapon States rather than on the assurances to be given to those States. Finland asserted that the current unilateral assurances fell short of the goal of effective international arrangements, not to speak of legally binding instruments, and that they were functions of the respective military doctrines and diluted by political and legal reservations. Pakistan said it could not accept any proposition which provided the illusion rather than the substance of security assurances while attempting to secure additional obligations on the part of non-nuclear-weapon States. Observing that the Working Group of the Committee on Disarmament had been trying to reconcile the unilateral declarations of the major Powers with the just demands for security of the non-nuclear-weapon States, Venezuela remarked that, if different viewpoints were to be reconciled, it must be realized that all States had the right to security and not just a few because of their military power.

Since many non-nuclear-weapon States were facing a serious nuclear threat, said China, the nuclear-weapon countries should unconditionally guarantee not to use or threaten to use such weapons against any such State. France, however, was of the view that, in the absence of nuclear disarmament, assurances of the non-use of nuclear weapons could be granted only to States which did not possess such weapons, especially those in nuclear-weapon-free zones. Norway, arguing that existing guarantees were not sufficient for non-aligned States, held that such States which had been asked to renounce their own option to acquire nuclear weapons had a legitimate claim to guarantees against nuclear attack, and that the nuclear-weapon States bore a special responsibility for finding a solution.

Regarding the form and legal character of security assurances, Egypt, Kenya, Lebanon, Nepal, Qatar and Uganda emphasized the need for unconditional guarantees that would be unequivocal and legally binding. Austria asserted that only co-ordinated, binding commitments free of conditions and escape clauses would have the desired confidence-building effect; however, it had reservations on the idea of a convention. Italy and New Zealand confirmed their interest in identifying a common formula to be incorporated in a binding international instrument; Italy preferred this approach to either individual declarations by nuclear Powers or a single inter-



national juridical instrument embodying such declarations. The Netherlands noted that it had proposed such a formula for a Security Council resolution; while some non-nuclear-weapon States favoured a more ambitious approach, it was better to be satisfied with what was obtainable rather than reach for the impossible. Sweden suggested that the Assembly consider urging the Council to embody existing negative assurances in a resolution so as to make them legally binding.

Poland stated that consideration should be given to the adoption, as an interim measure, of identical declarations by the five nuclear Powers, confirmed by the Council. This approach was supported by Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary and Nepal. The German Democratic Republic remarked that some nuclear-weapon States obviously did not want to admit any restriction on their options to use nuclear weapons.

The USSR continued to hold that, in the absence of nuclear disarmament, the most effective means to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States would be a convention to assure the non-use of nuclear weapons against States which had no such weapons on their territory; States which made their territory available for the deployment of nuclear weapons undermined their own security, because they could not guarantee that a nuclear strike would not be launched from their territory, possibly provoking nuclear retaliation. The Byelorussian SSR remarked that the emphasis placed by certain Western Powers on the supposed impossibility of drafting a convention reflected a lack of desire and political will to give clear-cut guarantees. Mongolia regretted that the Committee on Disarmament had been unable to reach agreement on such a convention because of the negative position of certain Western nuclear Powers.

Romania and the United Republic of Cameroon called for action in 1982 to work out international arrangements for a system of guarantees covering all non-nuclear-weapon States.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Disarmament, A/36/27 (Committee documents, CD/228, appendix II, vols. I, II).

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2373(XXII), annex, 12 June 1968 (YUN 1968, p. 17); <sup>(3)</sup>36/94, 9 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(4)</sup>36/95, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 31, 32, 35, 38, 39, 44 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/94

115-17-12 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/754) by recorded vote (93-16-14), 23 November (meeting 39); 10-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.10); agenda item 53.

Sponsors: Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Mongolia, Nicaragua, USSR.

Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons  
The General Assembly,

Convinced of the need to take effective measures for the strengthening of the security of States and prompted by the desire shared by all nations to eliminate war and prevent nuclear conflagration,

Taking into account the principle of non-use of force or threat of force enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and reaffirmed in a number of United Nations declarations and resolutions,

Noting with satisfaction the desire of States in various regions to prevent nuclear weapons from being introduced into their territories, including through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, and being anxious to contribute to the attainment of this objective,

Considering that, until nuclear disarmament is achieved on a universal basis, it is imperative for the international community to develop effective measures to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons from any quarter,

Recognizing that effective measures to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons can constitute a positive contribution to the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons,

Mindful of the statements made and views expressed by various States on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States,

Concerned at the continuing escalation of the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race, and the increased danger of recourse to the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons,

Deeply concerned at the plans for further stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States that could directly affect the security of non-nuclear-weapon States,

Desirous of promoting the implementation of paragraph 59 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, in which it urged the nuclear-weapon States to pursue efforts to conclude, as appropriate, effective arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons,

Recalling its resolutions 33/72 of 14 December 1978, 34/84 and 34/85 of 11 December 1979, 35/154 and 35/155 of 12 December 1980 and the relevant provisions of its resolution 35/46 of 3 December 1980,

Noting the consideration by the Committee on Disarmament in 1981 of the item entitled "Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons" and the setting up of an Ad Hoc Working Group to continue the negotiations on this item,

Recalling the drafts of an international convention submitted on that item to the Committee on Disarmament in 1979 and noting with satisfaction that the idea of concluding such a convention has received widespread international support,

Taking note of the report of the Committee on Disarmament, including the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-Nuclear-Weapon States against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons,

Wishing to promote an early and successful completion of the negotiations on the elaboration of a convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons,

Noting further that the idea of interim arrangements as a first step towards the conclusion of such a convention has also been considered in the Committee on Disarmament, particularly in the form of a Security Council resolution on this subject, and recalling the recommendation made in that respect by the General Assembly in paragraph 6 of its resolution 35/154,

Mindful of the second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982, at which the General Assembly will review the progress achieved in the field of disarmament, including the implementation of paragraph 59 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly,

1. Welcomes the conclusion of the Committee on Disarmament that there is continuing recognition of the urgent need to reach agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons;

2. Notes with satisfaction that in the Committee on Disarmament there is once again no objection, in principle, to the idea of an international convention on this subject;

3. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to continue the negotiations on the question of strengthening the security guarantees of non-nuclear-weapon States during its session in 1982;

4. Calls upon all States participating in these negotiations to make efforts for the elaboration and conclusion of an international convention on this matter;

5. Calls once again upon all nuclear-weapon States to make solemn declarations, identical in substance, concerning the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States having no such weapons on their territories, as a first step towards the conclusion of an international convention, and recommends that the Security Council should examine such declarations and, if they all meet the above-mentioned objective, should adopt an appropriate resolution approving them;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Austria, Burma, Greece, Guatemala, India, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Morocco, Sweden, Tunisia, Zaire.

#### General Assembly resolution 38/95

145-0-3 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/755) by recorded vote (121-0-4), 25 November (meeting 44): draft by Pakistan (A/C.1/36/L.17/Rev.1); agenda item 54.

Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons

The General Assembly,

Bearing in mind the need to allay the legitimate concern of the States of the world with regard to ensuring lasting security for their peoples,

Convinced that nuclear weapons pose the greatest threat to mankind and to the survival of civilization.

Deeply concerned at the continuing escalation of the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race,

Convinced that nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons are essential to remove the danger of nuclear war,

Taking into account the principle of the non-use of force or threat of force enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations,

Deeply concerned about the possibility of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons,

Recognizing that the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of non-nuclear-weapon States need to be safeguarded against the use or threat of use of force, including the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons,

Considering that, until nuclear disarmament is achieved on a universal basis, it is imperative for the international community to develop effective measures to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons from any quarter,

Recognizing that effective measures to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons can constitute a positive contribution to the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons,

Recalling its resolution 3261 G (XXIX) of 9 December 1974, Further recalling its resolution 31/189 C of 21 December 1976,

Bearing in mind paragraph 59 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, in which it urged the nuclear-weapon States to pursue efforts to conclude, as appropriate, effective arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons,

Desirous of promoting the implementation of the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session,

Recalling its resolutions 33/72 of 14 December 1978, 34/85 of 11 December 1979 and 35/155 of 12 December 1980,

Further recalling paragraph 12 of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, contained in the annex to its resolution 35/46 of 3 December 1980, in which it is stated, *inter alia*, that all efforts should be exerted, therefore, by the Committee on Disarmament urgently to negotiate with a view to reaching agreement, and to submit agreed texts, where possible, before the second special session devoted to disarmament, on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons,

Welcoming the in-depth negotiations undertaken in the Committee on Disarmament and its Ad Hoc Working Group on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-Nuclear-Weapon States against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons, with a view to reaching agreement on this item,

Noting the proposals submitted under that item in the Committee on Disarmament, including the drafts of an international convention,

Taking note of the decision of the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana from 3 to 9 September 1979, as well as the relevant recommendations of the Eleventh and Twelfth Islamic Conferences of Foreign Ministers, held at Islamabad from 17 to 22 May 1980 and at Baghdad from 1 to 5 June 1981, respectively, calling upon the Committee on Disarmament to elaborate and reach an agreement on an international basis to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons,

Further noting the support expressed in the Committee on Disarmament and in the General Assembly for the elaboration of an international convention to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, as well as the difficulties pointed out in evolving a common approach acceptable to all,

1. Reaffirms the urgent need to reach agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons;

2. Notes with satisfaction that in the Committee on Disarmament there is no objection, in principle, to the idea of an international convention to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, although the difficulties as regards evolving a common approach acceptable to all have also been pointed out;

3. Appeals to all States, especially the nuclear-weapon States, to demonstrate the political will necessary to reach agreement on a common approach and, in particular, on a common formula which could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character;

4. Recommends that further intensive efforts should be devoted to the search for such a common approach or common formula and that the various alternative approaches, including in particular those considered during the session of the Committee on Disarmament held in 1981, should be further explored in order to overcome the difficulties;

5. Recommends that the Committee on Disarmament should actively continue negotiations with a view to reaching early agreement and concluding effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, taking into account the widespread support for the conclusion of an international convention and giving consideration to any other proposals designed to secure the same objective;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Against: None.

Abstaining: India, United Kingdom, United States.

### Proposed prohibition of the neutron bomb

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT. During the 1981 session of the Committee on Disarmament,<sup>(1)</sup> the question of the nuclear neutron weapon, also known as the enhanced radiation weapon, was raised in connection with the agenda item on nuclear disarmament. A group of socialist countries proposed

the establishment of an ad hoc working group on prohibition of production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons, to negotiate a draft convention. The United States and other Western countries saw the enhanced radiation weapon as part of the general problem of nuclear disarmament; there was no reason to give it special treatment. Members of the Group of 21 (p. 31) emphasized the need for a working group on nuclear disarmament (p. 35).

Following consideration on 20 August of the proposal for a working group on the neutron weapon, the Chairman announced that there was no consensus for its adoption.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 9 December on prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Committee on Disarmament to start without delay negotiations in an appropriate organizational framework with a view to concluding a convention on prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons. In adopting this text by a recorded vote of 68 to 14, with 57 abstentions, the Assembly further requested the Committee to report on the question to the Assembly in 1982.

The First Committee approved the 18-nation resolution on 23 November by a recorded vote of 58 to 13, with 40 abstentions.

Introducing the text, the German Democratic Republic said the idea that a qualitatively new type of weapon was to be added to an arsenal of the most dreadful weapons had prompted many Governments to call for its prohibition. The effects of that weapon were especially cruel and inhumane, and its production and deployment would aggravate the arms race and considerably increase the danger of a nuclear war. The sponsors viewed the decision to produce such weapons as a reflection of the doctrine of limited nuclear war.

Among those which voted against the text, France held that, since the weapon was part of the overall problem of nuclear disarmament, there was no reason to give it special consideration or provide for a special convention. The United States, calling the text misguided and hypocritical, declared that its own motivation to begin assembling the weapon lay in the massive USSR arms build-up, sustained over many years, which had turned the European military balance against democratic societies; contrary to what the resolution implied, the reduced-blast weapon, rather than making nuclear war more thinkable, would make aggression less so by adding to the credibility of deterrence and thus reducing the likelihood that nuclear weapons would be used in a conflict.

Albania did not participate in the vote because it felt the proposal was an attempt to use the

neutron weapon in polemics or bargaining which had nothing to do with real nuclear disarmament; neither the resolution nor a convention would serve any useful purpose, since neutron weapons were already part of the super-Powers' nuclear arsenals. Also not participating, China stated that the USSR's motive for giving separate prominence to the neutron weapon, instead of including it in overall negotiations on nuclear disarmament, was the fear of losing military superiority in Europe and a favourable position in future disarmament negotiations; further, China viewed past USSR proposals on prohibition of a particular type of weapon as attempts to camouflage its own development of that weapon.

Cyprus and Indonesia explained their affirmative votes as reflecting their support for any measure that would help prevent the development and production of another weapon of mass destruction. India, which voted in favour in line with its opposition to all nuclear weapons, said it was up to the Committee on Disarmament to determine the best means of dealing with the subject. The Niger, which supported the text in the First Committee but abstained in the Assembly vote, remarked that all nuclear weapons, whether they were termed offensive or defensive, represented the same danger for humanity.

Denmark and the Netherlands, which abstained in the vote, said that, while they would not accept the weapon on their soil, the resolution was politically inspired and sought to split the Western alliance. Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Egypt, Greece, Ireland, Pakistan, Peru, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, which also abstained, found essentially that the resolution's approach in singling out one type of nuclear weapon did not serve a useful purpose and that the matter should be dealt with in the general context of nuclear disarmament. For similar reasons, Senegal did not participate in the vote.

In the First Committee debate, Afghanistan demanded that the United States reverse its decision to begin large-scale production of the neutron weapon. The Byelorussian SSR, Cuba and Poland stated that the weapon was unacceptable because it dangerously lowered the nuclear threshold and made nuclear war more likely. The Ukrainian SSR recalled that the socialist States of Eastern Europe and Mongolia had presented to the Committee on Disarmament in 1978 a draft convention to prohibit the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of neutron bombs.<sup>(3)</sup> The USSR said it was ready to conclude an agreement prohibiting the manufacture and deployment of the neutron weapon, and favoured the adoption of a resolution to ban that weapon, not out of fear that the United States would come to possess it but because its intro-

duction would open the door to a new spiral in the arms race; the USSR would not begin to manufacture the weapon if other States did not possess it.

Rwanda said the neutron bomb must be banned, because it was certainly no gift to mankind. Sweden stated that there was every reason to denounce the decision to produce the neutron bomb, designed specifically for use in Europe.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Disarmament, A/36/27 (Committee documents, CD/228, appendix II, vols. I, II).

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/92 K, 9 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1978, p. 51.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 33, 34, 36, 38, 40 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/2 K

68-14-57 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) by recorded vote (56-13-40), 23 November (meeting 40): 18-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.33); agenda item 51.

Sponsors: Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam.

#### Prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon

The General Assembly,

Recalling paragraph 47 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, in which it is stated that nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and that it is essential to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons,

Stressing that the termination of the qualitative arms race and the use of scientific and technological achievements solely for peaceful purposes are in the interest of all States and peoples,

Sharing the world-wide concern over the production and intended deployment of nuclear neutron weapons expressed by numerous Member States and by many non-governmental organizations,

Considering that the introduction of the nuclear neutron weapon in the military arsenals of States escalates the nuclear-arms race and significantly lowers the threshold of nuclear war, thereby increasing the danger of such a war,

Aware of the inhumane effects of that weapon, which constitutes a grave threat, particularly for the unprotected civilian population,

Recalling the proposals for the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons,

Desiring to contribute to halting the arms race, particularly in the field of weapons of mass destruction.

1. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to start without delay negotiations in an appropriate organizational framework with a view to concluding a convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Committee on Disarmament all documents relating to the discussion of this question by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session;

3. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to submit a report on this question to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

4. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item entitled "Prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Jamaica, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

### Prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT. No consensus emerged in the Committee, on Disarmament during 1981 on proposals by the Group of 21 (p. 31) and by a group of socialist States to establish an ad hoc working group on a nuclear-test ban. Several Western members expressed a preference for leaving the topic to tripartite negotiations among the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States, which had begun in 1977 with the aim of formulating a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests.

During an initial discussion in February, many Committee members supported a 1980 proposal to establish a working group.<sup>(6)</sup> At subsequent informal meetings, the Group of 21 submitted on 24 April a proposal for the establishment of an ad hoc working group to negotiate provisions relating to the scope, verification of compliance and final clauses of a draft treaty. In a statement on 13 July, a group of socialist States, including the USSR, advocated the early conclusion of a treaty on the complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests and the establishment of an ad hoc working group, with the participation of all nuclear Powers, to elaborate a draft. Of the other participants in the tripartite negotiations, the United Kingdom reaffirmed its view that those talks offered the most realistic way forward, while the United States said it could not agree to the establishment of a working group because it was reviewing its policy concerning nuclear testing, including the question of negotiations on a test ban.

The Group of 21 proposal was put formally to the Committee on 14 July, and the proposal by the group of socialist States on 23 July. On both occasions the Chairman noted a lack of con-

sensus. Five members of the Group of 21 subsequently proposed that the consensus rule in the Committee's rules of procedure not be used to block establishment of subsidiary organs (p. 31).

In its report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee, recognizing that this item was of highest priority, expressed its intention of pursuing efforts at its 1982 session towards the conclusion of a nuclear test-ban treaty. The United States reserved its position on this point, observing that it was not in a position to say what its intentions might be in 1982.

Also in connection with this item, the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events held its eleventh session from 3 to 12 February 1981 and its twelfth from 3 to 12 August. The Group's Chairman reported that it had started to assess a number of national investigations into the international transmission of seismological messages. On 10 March and 18 August, the Committee adopted the largely procedural recommendations contained in the Group's two progress reports.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 9 December, the General Assembly adopted two resolutions on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

By the first,<sup>(4)</sup> sponsored by 11 nations, the Assembly urged members of the Committee on Disarmament to support the establishment of an ad hoc working group to start multilateral negotiations on a treaty to prohibit all nuclear-weapon tests. It also urged Committee members to bear in mind that the consensus rule should not be used to prevent the establishment of subsidiary bodies (p. 31). Further, the Assembly called on the depositary States (USSR, United Kingdom, United States) of the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons,<sup>(2)</sup> to halt without delay all nuclear-test explosions, either jointly or unilaterally.

The resolution as a whole was adopted by a recorded vote of 118 to 2, with 23 abstentions, after its paragraph 5, calling for action by the three depositary States, was adopted by a separate vote of 95 to 2, with 42 abstentions. The First Committee, on 23 November, approved paragraph 5 by a recorded vote of 84 to 2, with 38 abstentions, before approving the text as a whole by a recorded vote of 103 to 2, with 21 abstentions.

By the second resolution,<sup>(5)</sup> sponsored by 22 nations, the Assembly called on the three negotiating nuclear-weapon States to resume negotiations, exert their best efforts for early success and report on the state of the negotiations in time for the Assembly's 1982 special session on

disarmament (p. 27). It requested the Committee on Disarmament to take the necessary steps, including the establishment of a working group, to initiate substantive negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty as a matter of the highest priority. The Committee was asked to determine, in the context of those negotiations, the institutional and administrative arrangements necessary for establishing, testing and operating an international seismic monitoring network and an effective verification system.

This resolution was adopted by a non-recorded vote of 140 to none, with 5 abstentions. The First Committee approved the text on 24 November by a recorded vote of 121 to none, with 5 abstentions (Argentina, China, France, United Kingdom, United States).

The 11-nation resolution was introduced by Mexico, which observed that the non-nuclear-weapon States in the Committee on Disarmament had exhibited impatience, not to say justifiable indignation, at the inexplicable reluctance of some of the nuclear-weapon States to respond to the Assembly's repeated appeals.

When Australia introduced the 22-nation resolution, it expressed deep disappointment that, despite the Assembly's request in 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> the Committee on Disarmament had not begun consideration of the question nor had the trilateral negotiations been resumed. Australia looked for a treaty leading to the cessation of all nuclear-test explosions, for both military and peaceful purposes.

The United States voted against the first resolution on the ground that it contained a number of unacceptable provisions, in particular a call for an unverified moratorium.

Explaining its abstention in the vote on this text, the Federal Republic of Germany felt that no useful purpose was served by singling out some nuclear-weapon States for accusation. New Zealand objected that the text called for negotiation by the Committee on Disarmament of a treaty for the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests rather than a comprehensive test-ban treaty, and advocated only a partial moratorium rather than one covering so-called peaceful nuclear explosions as well. Samoa remained opposed to any explosions of nuclear weapons in any environment, and felt that the resolution condoned, by omission, test explosions of nuclear weapons by some States in some environments. Australia, Fiji and Japan abstained for similar reasons. France thought the proposed measure was not a step towards nuclear disarmament and would consecrate the qualitative and quantitative advantages already enjoyed by the two major nuclear Powers. Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece and

Japan considered that the text challenged the basic principle of consensus in the Committee on Disarmament.

India and the USSR voted for the resolution as a whole but abstained on paragraph 5 because of the selective nature of the moratorium requested; the USSR also had reservations concerning the text's reference to matters within the Committee's exclusive prerogatives.

The United States, which abstained in the vote on the second resolution, considered it inappropriate for the Assembly to suggest how the Committee on Disarmament should handle its agenda items. Similar reservations were voiced by two States that voted in favour: Belgium, which also feared that the resolution could be used as a pretext to prevent progress towards limited solutions falling short of a global solution; and the USSR, which also had misgivings about the appeal to the three Powers for a report on negotiations which were not currently taking place.

Argentina abstained in the belief that the text left a shadow of doubt about the right of nations to access to peaceful applications of nuclear energy. Brazil, although voting affirmatively, stressed the importance it attached to a multilateral treaty on the prohibition of further testing of nuclear weapons; such a treaty should contain an unequivocal commitment to nuclear disarmament and promote freedom of access by all nations to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Bulgaria, also voting in favour, felt that the resolution could have been improved if a clear distinction had been drawn between the positions of the nuclear Powers as to their willingness to negotiate and conclude a treaty.

In the First Committee debate, China viewed a nuclear-test ban as an integral part of disarmament, to be linked with other measures such as a ban on the development, production and use of nuclear weapons and their reduction and destruction. France believed that a prohibition of tests could not be isolated from, or precede, nuclear disarmament. The United States contended that international conditions were not propitious for immediate action; moreover, for a test ban to be effective, it must be verifiable and be concluded under conditions which would enhance rather than diminish international security and stability.

The USSR remarked that the trilateral talks had produced agreement on most provisions for a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing, yet no treaty had been concluded, due not to the difficulty of resolving outstanding issues but to lack of political will and readiness on the part of the United States. The Lao People's Democratic Republic

and Mongolia held that obstructionism and negativism on the part of certain nuclear Powers and their allies was the main reason for continued failure. The Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Ireland, Japan and Mongolia appealed for a resumption of the talks without delay. Afghanistan did likewise, and added that a one-year moratorium on all nuclear explosions by all nuclear Powers would prove helpful.

Asserting that more than 1,200 nuclear tests had taken place, Japan stressed the importance of universal adherence to the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963, particularly by China and France, the two nuclear-weapon States which had not done so. Ireland stated that 783 nuclear tests had taken place since 1963 as compared with 488 between 1945 and 1963, and that 49 nuclear-test explosions had been carried out in 1980 alone; it favoured a moratorium followed by a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Also endorsing a moratorium, Guyana said that if negotiating efforts were genuine, there should be no hesitation in agreeing to an immediate halt to all nuclear-weapon testing, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty.

Commenting on efforts in the Committee on Disarmament to establish a working group on a nuclear-test ban, Mexico noted that the United Kingdom and the United States had been the only members of that Committee to oppose its creation. Brazil was puzzled by the two Powers' argument that the Committee should not set up a working group because of the trilateral negotiations, as those negotiations had not led to concrete agreements. The Byelorussian SSR, Nepal and the Netherlands favoured the establishment of such a working group with the participation of all nuclear Powers. Cuba accused the United Kingdom and the United States of imposing a double veto on the Committee's work. India argued that the negotiations should be entrusted to the Committee on Disarmament, the sole multilateral negotiating body. Negotiations in the Committee were also urged by a number of other States, including Ecuador, the German Democratic Republic and Malaysia.

Nigeria rejected the notion that the trilateral negotiations constituted the only valid basis for a comprehensive test ban, as nuclear disarmament was a concern of all nations. Pakistan said it was unlikely that the tripartite negotiations could produce a generally acceptable treaty while seeking to impose an unequal arrangement on non-nuclear-weapon States; multilateral negotiations on an equitable and universally acceptable treaty should commence without delay.

Spain, while understanding the objections of some nuclear Powers to the creation of a multi-

lateral working group, said they should demonstrate that their procedure was the more effective method. Sweden noted that the tripartite talks had been suspended since mid-1980 and added that certain States were using the consensus rule to deny the Committee its right to start negotiations in a working group.

Several States, including Canada, Japan, the Netherlands and Spain, saw encouragement in the work of the Group of Scientific Experts and particularly in its trial exchange of seismic data. In this connection, Finland observed that it had an unparalleled seismic detection capability in its part of the world, due to its technical capability and location. Commenting on another aspect of verification, India remarked that the trilateral negotiators envisaged one set of verification provisions applicable only among themselves and another set for other States parties.

Austria stated that the link between disarmament and non-proliferation lent urgency to the conclusion of a test-ban treaty as a logical first step towards nuclear disarmament. Similar remarks were made by Australia, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Italy, Jamaica, New Zealand and Norway.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Disarmament, A/36/27 (Committee documents, CD/228, appendix II, vols. I, II).

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2373(XXII), annex, 12 June 1968 (YUN 1968, p. 17); <sup>(3)</sup>35/145 B, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 56); <sup>(4)</sup>36/84, 9 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/85, 9 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 20.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 27, 32, 34, 38, 39, 41 (19 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/84

118-2-23 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/744) by recorded vote (103-2-21). 23 November (meeting 39): 11-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.22); agenda item 43.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Ecuador, Ireland, Kenya, Mexico, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Yugoslavia.

Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons

The General Assembly,

Bearing in mind that the complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, which has been examined for more than twenty-five years and on which the General Assembly has adopted more than forty resolutions, is a basic objective of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament, to whose attainment it has repeatedly assigned the highest priority,

Stressing that on seven different occasions it has condemned such tests in the strongest terms and that, since 1974, it has stated its conviction that the continuance of nuclear-weapon testing will intensify the arms race, thus increasing the danger of nuclear war,

Reiterating the assertion made in several previous resolutions that, whatever may be the differences on the question of verification, there is no valid reason for delaying the conclusion of an agreement on a comprehensive test ban,

Recalling that since 1972 the Secretary-General has declared that all the technical and scientific aspects of the problem have been so fully explored that only a political decision is now necessary in order to achieve final agreement, that

when the existing means of verification are taken into account it is difficult to understand further delay in achieving agreement on an underground test ban, and that the potential risks of continuing underground nuclear-weapon tests would far outweigh any possible risks from ending such tests,

Recalling also that the Secretary-General, in his foreword to the report entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test ban", reiterated with special emphasis the opinion he expressed nine years ago and, after specifically referring to it, added: "I still hold that belief. The problem can and should be solved now",

Noting that in the same report, which was prepared in compliance with General Assembly decision 34/422 of 11 December 1979, the experts emphasized that non-nuclear-weapon States in general have come to regard the achievement of a comprehensive test ban as a litmus test of the determination of the nuclear-weapon States to halt the arms race, adding that verification of compliance no longer seems to be an obstacle to reaching agreement,

Taking into account that the three nuclear-weapon States which act as depositaries of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water undertook in that Treaty, almost twenty years ago, to seek the achievement of the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time and that such an undertaking was explicitly reiterated in 1968 in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons,

Recalling that in its resolution 35/145 A of 12 December 1980 it urged all States members of the Committee on Disarmament to support the establishment by the Committee from the beginning of its session in 1981, of an ad hoc working group which should start the multilateral negotiations of a treaty for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests,

Deploing that the Committee on Disarmament, as stated in paragraph 44 of its report to the Assembly, was prevented from responding to that exhortation owing to the negative attitude of two nuclear-weapon States,

1. Reiterates once again its grave concern that nuclear-weapon testing continues unabated against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of Member States;

2. Reaffirms its conviction that a treaty to achieve the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon-test explosions by all States for all time is a matter of the highest priority and constitutes a vital element for the success of efforts to prevent both vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons and a contribution to nuclear disarmament;

3. Urges all States that have not yet done so to adhere without further delay to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and, meanwhile, to refrain from testing in the environments covered by that Treaty;

4. Urges likewise all States members of the Committee on Disarmament:

(a) To bear in mind that the consensus rule should not be used in such a manner as to prevent the establishment of subsidiary bodies for the effective discharge of the functions of the Committee;

(b) To support the establishment by the Committee, from the beginning of its session in 1982, of an ad hoc working group which should start the multilateral negotiations of a treaty for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests;

(c) To exert their best endeavours in order that the Committee may transmit the multilaterally negotiated text of such a treaty to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982;

5. Calls upon the States depositaries of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, by virtue of their special responsibilities under those two treaties and as a provisional measure, to bring to a halt without delay all nuclear-test explosions, either through a trilaterally agreed moratorium or through three unilateral moratoria;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Belize, Canada, China, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Turkey, Zambia.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/85

140-0-5 Meeting 919 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/745) by recorded vote (121-0-5), 24 November (meeting 41); 22-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.31); agenda item 44.

Sponsors: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Canada, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand.

#### Implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/145 B The General Assembly,

Recalling its previous resolutions on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, in particular resolution 32/78 of 12 December 1977, paragraph 51 of resolution S-10/2 of 30 June 1978, resolution 33/60 of 14 December 1978, section IV of resolution 33/71 H of 14 December 1978, resolution 34/73 of 11 December 1979 and resolution 35/145 B of 12 December 1980,

Reaffirming its conviction that it is in the interest of all people that nuclear-weapon testing by all States in all environments should cease, as this would be a major step towards ending the qualitative improvement, development and proliferation of nuclear weapons, a means of relieving the deep apprehension concerning the harmful consequences of radioactive contamination for the health of present and future generations and a measure of the utmost importance in bringing the nuclear-arms race to an end,

Recalling that the parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons expressed their determination in those treaties to continue negotiations to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time,

Expressing the belief that, to be effective and capable of attracting the widest possible adherence, a treaty prohibiting nuclear testing should include provision for an effective verification system,

Recognizing, accordingly, the importance to such a treaty of the work assigned by the Committee on Disarmament to the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events on a global network of stations for the exchange of seismological data,

Deeply concerned about the fact that the three negotiating nuclear-weapon States have not resumed their negotiations



on a treaty prohibiting nuclear-test explosions in all environments and its protocol covering nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes,

Emphasizing the urgent need for a complete cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons,

Recognizing the indispensable role of the Committee on Disarmament in the negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty capable of attracting the widest possible international support and adherence,

Expressing regret that it did not prove possible for the Committee on Disarmament to commence negotiations on such a treaty,

Convinced that the proceedings of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982, would benefit substantially from positive progress towards the conclusion of such a treaty,

1. Reiterates its grave concern that, despite the express wishes of the overwhelming majority of Member States, nuclear-weapon testing continues unabated;

2. Reaffirms its conviction that a treaty to achieve the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon-test explosions by all States for all time is a matter of the greatest urgency and highest priority;

3. Expresses the conviction that such a treaty constitutes a vital element for the success of efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race and the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries;

4. Calls upon the three negotiating nuclear-weapon States to resume their negotiations and to exert their best efforts to bring them to an early successful conclusion and invites them to prepare a report on the state of negotiations in good time for submission to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament;

5. Reiterates its conviction that the Committee on Disarmament has an indispensable role in the negotiation of a treaty prohibiting nuclear testing;

6. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to take the necessary steps, including the establishment of a working group, to initiate substantive negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty as a matter of the highest priority at the beginning of its session in 1982;

7. Also requests the Committee on Disarmament to determine, in the context of its negotiations on such a treaty, the institutional and administrative arrangements necessary for establishing, testing and operating an international seismic monitoring network and an effective verification system;

8. Further requests the Committee on Disarmament to exert all efforts in order that the draft of such a treaty may be submitted to the General Assembly at the earliest possible date;

9. Urges all members of the Committee on Disarmament, in particular the nuclear-weapon States, to co-operate with the Committee in fulfilling its mandate;

10. Calls upon the Committee on Disarmament to report on progress to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament and at its thirty-seventh session;

11. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item relating to implementation of the present resolution.

### Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons

By a resolution of 9 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly, considering that the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices would help prevent their proliferation, requested the Committee on Disarmament, at an appropriate stage, to pursue the question of an adequately

verified cessation and prohibition of production of fissionable material for such weapons and devices.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 125 to 14, with 6 abstentions. The First Committee approved the text on 24 November by a recorded vote of 99 to 13, with 6 abstentions.

The 19-nation resolution was introduced by Canada, which recalled that the Assembly had made similar requests to the Committee on Disarmament each year since 1978. The subject was one of the most significant areas for nuclear disarmament and agreement on it would underwrite, support and guarantee other agreements on nuclear-weapon control.

The USSR voted against the text, declaring that the problem of prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes could not be separated from that of cessation of all nuclear-weapon production and the gradual reduction of stockpiles. Mexico, although voting in favour, observed that two objectives would have to be pursued: cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, and cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

In the First Committee debate, Australia saw an agreement on this subject as an important brake on nuclear proliferation, since it would help restrict the production of existing types of nuclear weapons, limit nuclear arsenals to approximately their current size and so contribute to scaling down the arms race. Ireland stated that since the production of fissionable material would henceforth be for civilian purposes only, the same International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards could be applied to all States, thus helping to make the non-proliferation regime more attractive to those States which had so far chosen to remain outside it. Making a similar point, Norway stated that such a ban, by requiring nuclear-weapon States to accept much the same IAEA safeguards as non-nuclear-weapon States, would eliminate an important element of discrimination between the two categories of States. The Netherlands observed that the safeguards system could provide verification for an agreement on this subject. New Zealand, while not expecting early progress, urged the Committee on Disarmament to keep the question under review.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/97 G, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 33, 34, 36, 41 (19 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/97 G

125-14-6 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/756) by recorded vote (99-13-6), 24 November (meeting 41); 19-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.28): agenda item 55.

Sponsors: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Canada, Denmark, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Romania, Singapore, Sweden.

Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 33/91 H of 16 December 1978, 34/87 D of 11 December 1979 and 35/156 H of 12 December 1980, in which it requested the Committee on Disarmament, at an appropriate stage of the implementation of the Programme of Action set forth in section III of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, and of its work on the item entitled "Nuclear weapons in all aspects", to consider urgently the question of adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices and to keep the Assembly informed of the progress of that consideration.

Noting that the agenda for 1981 of the Committee on Disarmament included the item entitled "Nuclear weapons in all aspects" and that the Committee's programme of work for both parts of its session held in 1981 contained the item entitled "Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament",

Recalling the proposals and statements made in the Committee on Disarmament on these items,

Considering that the cessation of production of fissionable material for weapons purposes and the progressive conversion and transfer of stocks to peaceful uses would be a significant step towards halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race,

Considering that the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices also would be an important measure in facilitating the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and explosive devices,

Requests the Committee on Disarmament, at an appropriate stage of its work on the item entitled "Nuclear weapons in all aspects", to pursue its consideration of the question of adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices and to keep the General Assembly informed of the progress of that consideration.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab, Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Seychelles,<sup>a</sup> Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, France, India, United Kingdom, United States.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

## Nuclear safeguards

In a resolution on IAEA adopted on 11 November 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly commended the

Agency for its continuing efforts to ensure the safe and secure use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The Assembly noted with satisfaction the steady improvement of the Agency's safeguards system, and welcomed its conclusion that nuclear material under those safeguards remained in peaceful activities or was otherwise adequately accounted for. States were urged to continue to support IAEA endeavours to improve the effectiveness of safeguards.

Addressing the General Assembly on 10 November at the start of its annual discussion of IAEA, the Agency's Director-General said that more than 95 per cent of all nuclear material outside the nuclear-weapon States was under IAEA safeguards.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/25, paras. 3 & 5, 11 Nov. (p. 714).

## Non-nuclear weapons

### Chemical weapons

#### Proposed prohibition of chemical weapons

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT. Negotiations towards a multilateral instrument on the total prohibition of chemical weapons, called for by the General Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> continued during 1981 in the Committee on Disarmament. Much of the work was conducted in the Committee's Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons, which was re-established on 12 February. The Group held 23 meetings from 18 February to 22 April and from 17 June to 17 August, as well as additional informal consultations, during which time it formulated and discussed for the first time wording for 18 future articles or elements of a convention on chemical weapons.

The Working Group began its 1981 activities with a detailed examination of the issues involved in negotiating a multilateral convention. It then considered draft elements of a chemical weapons convention suggested by its Chairman, who later submitted revised versions on the basis of delegation comments. The Group's report, which the Committee adopted on 20 August and incorporated into its own report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> set out the Chairman's text and various comments, including dissenting views. Some delegations did not wish to discuss certain elements, including those relating to verification, until general agreement had been reached on the scope of the prohibitions to be verified.

Among the elements suggested by the Chairman for inclusion in a chemical weapons convention were the following:

Chemical weapons would be defined to include harmful chemicals and their precursors intended for

hostile or military purposes, and the munitions and devices which released such chemicals. States parties to the convention would be prohibited from transferring such weapons to anyone. They would have to declare any stocks of chemical weapons in their possession, and undertake to destroy those stocks or divert them to permitted uses, along with means of production. A 1,000-kilogramme limit would be placed on any State's stock of super-toxic lethal chemicals for non-military uses. International co-operation for peaceful and protective uses of chemicals would be encouraged, and a substantial part of any savings resulting from chemical disarmament would be allocated to economic and social development, particularly of the developing countries.

National and international measures would be taken to verify compliance with the convention. Recommendations and guidelines for the functions and organization of national verification systems would eventually be annexed to the convention. Deliberate concealment to impede national verification measures would be prohibited. States parties would consult one another when problems arose, and States suspecting violations could request clarifications from those concerned. An expert body known as the Consultative Committee, with one member from each State party, would be established to monitor the situation and undertake on-site inspections, in consultation with the State to be inspected; that State could decline to be inspected if it considered that its supreme national interests would be jeopardized.

The convention would enter into force after 20 States ratified or acceded to it. A review conference would be held at least every five years.

The Working Group informed the Committee that despite the convergence of views on many issues emerging from its work in 1980 and 1981, some important divergencies of opinion still existed. The Group recommended that it be re-established in 1982 with a revised mandate that would enable it to resolve differences and achieve agreement on a convention at the earliest date.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. Two resolutions calling for continued negotiations on a convention to prohibit chemical weapons were adopted by the General Assembly on 9 December 1981. By the first of these,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly urged the Committee on Disarmament to continue negotiations on a multilateral chemical weapons convention as a matter of high priority, taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives, and to re-establish its Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons with a revised mandate enabling the Committee to achieve agreement on a convention at the earliest date. The Committee was requested to report on the results in 1982.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 147 to none, with 1 abstention. The First Committee approved the text on 24 November

by a recorded vote of 127 to none, with 1 abstention, following the approval of paragraph 3, on the Working Group, by a recorded vote of 101 to 2 (Canada, United States), with 19 abstentions. This paragraph was approved in the form of a 10-nation amendment introduced by Sweden. It added to the original 37-nation text, whose sponsors were from both East and West, the phrase urging the re-establishment of the Working Group with a revised mandate so as to achieve agreement on a convention at the earliest date.

By the second resolution on this topic,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly reaffirmed the necessity of the earliest elaboration and conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. In a provision with the same wording as the amended paragraph of the first resolution, the Assembly urged continued negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament and the re-establishment of the Working Group with a revised mandate. It called on the USSR and the United States to resume bilateral negotiations on the subject at the earliest possible date, and to submit their joint initiative to the Committee on Disarmament. The Assembly called on all States to refrain from action which could impede negotiations and specifically to refrain from production and deployment of binary and other new types of chemical weapons.

The resolution, with 13 sponsors from Eastern Europe and elsewhere, was adopted in the Assembly by a recorded vote of 109 to 1, with 33 abstentions. The text, as revised by its sponsors, was approved by the First Committee on 24 November by a recorded vote of 95 to 1, with 30 abstentions.

The first resolution was introduced by Canada, which believed that the text took into account the views of those who wished to see the Assembly give more precise direction regarding the Working Group's mandate, as well as the wishes of those who hoped to see a stronger statement on the resumption of bilateral discussions. Sweden, introducing the amendment, recalled the efforts of many Committee members over the past two years to obtain a mandate for the Working Group that would enable it to carry out genuine negotiations, and their disappointment at the failure of those efforts so far.

The second resolution was introduced by the German Democratic Republic, which described the two texts as complementary and said that having multilateral and bilateral negotiations at the same time might enhance the effectiveness of both. It added that the production and deployment of binary chemical weapons would greatly worsen prospects for achieving a prohibition of chemical weapons and tend to promote their use.

The United States voted against the amendment to the first resolution because it could not support any infringement on the authority of the Committee on Disarmament, which was authorized to decide its own internal procedures. Canada voted against because the specificity of the amendment was not acceptable to all delegations.

While not disagreeing with the aim of the amendment, Japan and Poland abstained in the vote out of concern that its wording would hinder consensus on the resolution as a whole. Finland also mentioned the importance it attached to consensus in explaining why it had abstained. Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the USSR, all voting for the amendment and the text as a whole, shared the reservations expressed by Canada. Regret that the amendment had made it impossible to achieve consensus on the resolution was expressed by several States which voted for both—Belgium, Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom, the last speaking for the members of the European Community (EC).

In explanation of its negative vote on the second resolution, the United States declared that it had unilaterally ceased production of chemical weapons in 1969 and that its only production facility was inactive, while the USSR maintained and operated at least 14 such facilities and had a much larger chemical warfare organization in the armed forces; accordingly, the United States saw the proposal as one-sided, superfluous and an attempt to inhibit countermeasures required by the Soviet programme.

Japan abstained in the vote, arguing that the call to States to refrain from certain actions could have a detrimental effect by prejudging the outcome of the negotiations on chemical weapons prohibition in the Committee on Disarmament. Democratic Kampuchea did not participate in the vote on this resolution because, it said, those who were massacring its people were among the sponsors.

During the debate in the First Committee, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the USSR and Viet Nam saw a link between delays in reaching a negotiated agreement and the growing military chemical arsenals of the United States and other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as well as the launching of large-scale production programmes for such weapons. The German Democratic Republic stated that while refusing to continue bilateral negotiations with the USSR on a chemical weapons ban, the United States was allocating \$6 billion for the production of binary weapons over the next five years;

the introduction of such weapons made verification more difficult because their components hardly differed from those used for chemical products for civilian use. The USSR asserted that the United States continued to develop chemical weapons, including binary weapons, and possessed some 400,000 tons of lethal poisonous substances in its arsenals. Afghanistan also mentioned the allocation of funds for chemical weapons by the United States.

Austria, expressing concern about reported actions by some States to upgrade and increase their chemical warfare capabilities, appealed to all nations to refrain from any activities incompatible with efforts to reach agreement in the negotiations.

Responding, the United States said that, while the USSR had given chemical-warfare training to 100,000 of its troops and its military doctrine provided for large-scale employment of offensive chemical weapons, there had been no allocation for such weapons in the United States military budget since 1969; also, binary weapons, which became toxic only on launching, were designed to protect the personnel handling them as well as the environment.

Australia saw a need for international machinery to investigate allegations of the use of chemical weapons and to test or confirm denials of such use. Finland observed that since 1972 it had worked on a project aimed at developing a national chemical-weapons-control capacity and had periodically presented reports to the Committee on Disarmament. The Federal Republic of Germany attached particular importance to reliable verification provisions in a chemical weapons convention. India observed that verification measures would necessarily be imperfect, as the purpose of a ban on chemical weapons was not to regulate the production of lethal and even super-toxic chemicals, many of which had legitimate peaceful uses, but rather to prevent their diversion for chemical weapons; collective security would be better served by an immediate ban on such weapons with the means of verification currently available.

Japan saw the question of on-site inspections as one of the more difficult problems awaiting solution; attempts to establish too strict a verification system would make it too complicated and difficult to implement and lessen the chance of universal consent. Kenya thought there could be no mutual confidence in the convention without an international verification mechanism. Poland thought that verification should combine national control measures and international procedures, through a mechanism that would be both effective and consistent with the scope of prohibition.

While noting that appropriate verification was essential, Norway observed that the political costs of breaking away from an internationally agreed ban on chemical weapons should not be underestimated. Portugal asserted that the difficulties encountered by the United Nations Group of Experts to Investigate Reports of the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons (p. 74) gave a striking illustration of the drawbacks and dangers inherent in omitting verification machinery in disarmament agreements, and that consultations should start on the creation of effective verification machinery for the obligations entered into under the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. The Ukrainian SSR stated that the convention should be written so as not to impinge on the peaceful activities of States.

China stated that, since prohibition of the use of chemical weapons was at the heart of the question, the Committee on Disarmament should proceed with negotiations on a convention on the complete prohibition and total destruction of those weapons, including a ban on their use. Hungary, on the other hand, asserted that the main stumbling-block to achieving more substantial progress had been the insistence of some countries on including in the convention a ban on the use of chemical weapons, which Hungary considered was already fully covered by the 1925 Geneva Protocol. In Sweden's view, the effectiveness of the convention would be significantly improved if loopholes that would allow maintenance of a chemical warfare capability were closed.

The United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of the EC members, remarked that good progress had been made in the Committee on Disarmament during the past year in the negotiations on a verifiable convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. Many delegations, including those of Austria, Belgium, Egypt, France, Japan, Romania, Sweden and Venezuela, supported the proposal by the Working Group on Chemical Weapons that its mandate should be revised in order to permit negotiations in 1982 on the text of a convention.

Bulgaria, Hungary, Japan, the Netherlands and Poland urged the USSR and the United States to reopen their suspended bilateral negotiations at an early date.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Disarmament, A/36/27 (Committee documents, CD/228, appendix II, vols. I, II).

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/144 B, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 84); <sup>(3)</sup>36/96 A, 9 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(4)</sup>36/96 B, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 29, 30, 34-36, 38, 42 (19 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/96 A

147-0-1 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/743) by recorded vote (127-0-1). 24 November (meeting 42); 37-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.35), amended by 10 nations (A/C.1/36/L.48); agenda item 42.

Sponsors of draft: Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Mongolia, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Poland, Qatar, Spain, Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam.

Sponsors of amendment: Brazil, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

#### Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming its resolutions 2454 A (XXIII) of 20 December 1968, 2603 B (XXIV) of 16 December 1969, 2662 (XXV) of 7 December 1970, 2827 A (XXVI) of 16 December 1971, 2933 (XXVII) of 29 November 1972, 3077 (XXVIII) of 6 December 1973, 3256 (XXIX) of 9 December 1974, 3465 (XXX) of 11 December 1975, 31/65 of 10 December 1976, 32/77 of 12 December 1977, S-10/2 of 30 June 1978, 33/59 A of 14 December 1978, 34/72 of 11 December 1979 and 35/144 B of 12 December 1980, relating to the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and to their destruction.

Reaffirming also the necessity of strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives of the Protocol for Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925, and of the adherence by all States to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction,

Having considered the report of the Committee on Disarmament, which embodies, inter alia, the report of its Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons.

Taking note of the recommendation in the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons that the Committee on Disarmament should re-establish, at the beginning of its session in 1982, the Ad Hoc Working Group with an appropriately revised mandate, which would enable the Committee to build upon the areas of convergence and to resolve the differences of views which were identified by the Group during its sessions held in 1980 and 1981, so as to achieve agreement on a chemical weapons convention at the earliest date.

Considering it necessary that all efforts be exerted for the resumption and successful conclusion of the bilateral and multilateral negotiations on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the work of the Committee on Disarmament during its session held in 1981 regarding the prohibition of chemical weapons, in particular the progress in the work of its Ad Hoc Working Group on that question;

2. Expresses its regret that an agreement on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction has not yet been elaborated;

3. Urges the Committee on Disarmament to continue, from the beginning of its session in 1982, negotiations on such a multilateral convention as a matter of high priority, taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives, and in particular to re-establish its Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons with an appropriately revised mandate enabling the Committee to achieve agreement on a chemical weapons convention at the earliest date;

4. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to report on the results of its negotiations to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982, and at its thirty-seventh session.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenade, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States.

General Assembly resolution 36/96 B

109-1-33 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/743) by recorded vote (95-1-30).  
24 November (meeting 42); 13-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1): agenda item 42.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam.

The General Assembly,

Recalling that, in paragraph 75 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, it stated that the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction represented one of the most urgent measures of disarmament.

Convinced of the need for the earliest conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction, which would contribute to general and complete disarmament under effective international control,

Taking into consideration the work done in this area in the Committee on Disarmament as well as in the bilateral negotiations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, which regrettably had been suspended and did not take place in 1981.

Deeming it desirable for States to refrain from taking any action that could delay or further complicate such negotiations.

Expressing profound concern over the production of new types of chemical weapons and other actions that would intensify the chemical arms race and compromise international efforts on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction.

1. Reaffirms the necessity of the earliest elaboration and conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction;

2. Appeals to all States to facilitate in every possible way the conclusion of such a convention;

3. Urges the Committee on Disarmament to continue, from the beginning of its session in 1982, negotiations on such a multilateral convention as a matter of high priority, taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives, and in particular to re-establish its Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons with an appropriately revised mandate enabling the Committee to achieve agreement on a chemical weapons convention at the earliest date;

4. Calls upon the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to resume at the earliest possible date bilateral negotiations on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction and to submit their joint initiative to the Committee on Disarmament;

5. Calls upon all States to refrain from any action which could impede negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons and specifically to refrain from production and deployment of binary and other new types of chemical weapons, as well as from stationing chemical weapons in those States where there are no such weapons at present.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Against: United States.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, Upper Volta, Zaire.

#### Alleged use of chemical weapons

Several Governments sent communications to the United Nations in 1981 alleging that chemical weapons had been used in recent or current armed conflicts. The Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons presented, for submission to the General Assembly, what it described as an inconclusive report. The Assembly, in December, decided to continue the Group's mandate.

COMMUNICATIONS. Letters and notes verbales included 14 communications from Democratic Kampuchea, 2 from the United States, 2 from Viet Nam and 1 from the USSR.

The letters from Democratic Kampuchea concerned instances of what it called the use of toxic chemical weapons by the Vietnamese aggressors to massacre the Kampuchean population. Specific instances, including the firing of poison gas shells, the spreading of toxic chemical products, the addition of toxic substances to water supplies and the poisoning of food, were cited in letters of 26 January,<sup>(1)</sup> 17 February,<sup>(2)</sup> 9 March,<sup>(3)</sup> 6 April,<sup>(5)</sup> 14 April,<sup>(6)</sup> 27 April,<sup>(7)</sup> 8 June,<sup>(10)</sup> 9 November,<sup>(11)</sup> 13 November<sup>(12)</sup> and 3 December.<sup>(14)</sup> The incidents were said to have occurred between December 1980 and November 1981.

Annexed to a letter of 27 March<sup>(4)</sup> was an open letter, dated 22 March, from the people of

Kampuchea addressed to the international community, asking the United Nations to send its Group of Experts to collect on-site evidence of the use of chemical weapons by Viet Nam, so that measures could be taken in time to save the nation and its people. A letter of 5 May<sup>(8)</sup> annexed a statement of 30 April by a Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman protesting the escalation of chemical warfare by Viet Nam. A Ministry of Public Health statement of 10 April, annexed to a letter dated 14 May,<sup>(9)</sup> placed the number of Kampucheans killed by chemical weapons at more than 1,100 since April 1980, out of 2,900 victims. On 24 November,<sup>(13)</sup> Democratic Kampuchea transmitted a 20 November statement by its Foreign Ministry spokesman supporting a call for an international conference aimed at preventing Viet Nam and the USSR from pursuing chemical warfare.

In a note verbale dated 14 September,<sup>(16)</sup> the United States reiterated its concern over reports that lethal and incapacitating chemical weapons were being used in the conflicts in Laos and Kampuchea and, since the USSR invasion in December 1979, in Afghanistan; urged the Group of Experts to visit refugee camps and the areas of reported attacks in order to obtain first-hand information and evidence; and informed the Secretary-General that analysis of vegetation obtained from the site of a chemical attack in Kampuchea had revealed evidence of the use of lethal mycotoxins (poisons associated with fungi). Analyses of additional samples from areas of reported chemical attacks in Laos and Kampuchea were presented in a United States note verbale dated 12 November,<sup>(17)</sup> in which it was stated that test results and eyewitness testimony supported the judgement that trichothecene mycotoxins had been used as chemical warfare agents in those countries.

In a statement of 17 September, transmitted by a letter of 22 September,<sup>(18)</sup> a spokesman for the Foreign Ministry of Viet Nam asserted that the United States was conducting bacteriological warfare against Cuba, supplying toxic chemicals to the reactionaries in Afghanistan and elsewhere, and trying to cover up its use of chemical warfare for more than 10 years during its aggression against Viet Nam. Responding to United States allegations, Viet Nam transmitted, by a letter dated 9 October,<sup>(19)</sup> an article written by a Vietnamese scientist stating that the American campaign of slander against the USSR might be designed to cover up United States efforts to increase its chemical weapons stockpile.

The USSR, in a letter of 3 December,<sup>(15)</sup> said irresponsible references and a noisy propaganda campaign by the United States on alleged USSR participation in the use of chemical and toxin

weapons in South-East Asia and Afghanistan were inherently absurd, lacked physical evidence and did not stand the test of elementary scientific analysis; the United States itself had resorted to the widespread use of chemical weapons in South-East Asia, while in Afghanistan chemical weapons prepared in the United States had been used against civilians by American-backed bands of Afghan counter-revolutionaries.

ACTIVITIES OF THE GROUP OF EXPERTS. The Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons, composed of four experts, submitted a report<sup>(20)</sup> in response to a December 1980 request by the General Assembly for an impartial investigation to ascertain facts pertaining to reports regarding the alleged use of chemical weapons and to assess the extent of the damage caused by such use.<sup>(21)</sup> The Group held three sessions in New York during 1981: 20 to 24 April, 13 to 28 July and 20 October to 19 November. The third session included a visit (31 October-10 November) to holding centres for Indo-Chinese refugees in Thailand, for on-site collection and examination of evidence.

The report of the Group, submitted to the Secretary-General on 19 November, included background to the problem of the alleged use of chemical weapons and sources of information on which the investigation was based, general observations on such weapons and parameters of the investigation, evaluation of written submissions, a section on mycotoxins, a section on on-site collection and examination of evidence, and conclusions. The Group concentrated on submissions by Canada in respect of Laos and by the United States in respect of Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Laos; it noted charges by Viet Nam of United States use of toxic chemicals in Kampuchea, Laos and Viet Nam but said it felt unable to investigate on the territories of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam in view of communications from those Governments indicating that they would not co-operate with the Group.

The Group described its report as inconclusive, stating that, from the submissions it had received, and in assessing the individual cases presented to it, it had been unable to reach a final conclusion as to whether or not chemical warfare agents had been used.

The Group pointed out that, despite its expressed desire to carry out investigations on the territories where chemical attacks had allegedly occurred and where alleged victims and eyewitnesses of such attacks were being hosted, it had only been able to visit some refugee camps in Thailand. During that visit, the Group had unsuccessfully sought to meet individuals mentioned in submissions by the United States.

While the medical personnel interviewed in the refugee camps claimed they had not come across cases attributable to chemical warfare agents, refugees related stories similar to those appearing in the submissions by Canada and the United States. However, all those interviewed had related alleged chemical attacks occurring several months earlier, and the Group had been unable to detect signs and symptoms suggestive of exposure to chemical warfare agents; further, routine blood biochemical, haematological and urine analyses obtained by the Group had yielded no significant abnormalities. Although the Group had received some samples for analysis by qualified and impartial laboratories, it could not base final conclusions on the results of such analyses since it could not ascertain the source of the samples.

The Group stated that any investigation designed to lead to definitive conclusions regarding the alleged use of chemical weapons and to an assessment of the extent of damage caused by such weapons would require timely access to the areas of alleged use in order to establish the facts. Such an exercise had so far been impossible.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In a resolution of 9 December,<sup>(22)</sup> the General Assembly took note with appreciation of the Secretary-General's report annexing the findings of the Group of Experts. Noting that the Group had not completed its investigations, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue his investigations, with the Group's assistance, and to report back to the Assembly in 1982.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 86 to 20, with 34 abstentions. The First Committee approved the text on 4 December by a recorded vote of 74 to 18, with 30 abstentions.

The resolution was sponsored by Australia, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain and Turkey. Introducing the text, New Zealand expressed appreciation to the Group of Experts for the objectivity of its inquiry and the integrity of its conclusions. It added that, as certain aspects of the investigation had not been completed, the Group should receive additional time.

This view was supported by Canada, China, Fiji, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Nigeria and Senegal. Canada and France, in particular, observed that the resolution was procedural and non-polemical and did not imply any accusation; rather, it reflected the great importance attached to the 1925 Geneva Protocol banning the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons. The United States viewed the resolution as one of the most important-perhaps the most important-adopted at the 1981 Assembly

session; the United Nations, with further evidence accumulated, had again accepted the responsibility to conduct an immediate, impartial investigation of the use of chemical weapons.

Other States did not share this view. Czechoslovakia felt the need to close the chapter on the Assembly's activities on the matter, and thereby release resources for solving more important and real issues, such as the conclusion of a convention on prohibition of chemical weapons and destruction of their stockpiles. In its opinion, the investigation of so-called reports of the alleged use of chemical weapons detracted from the main issue by creating an atmosphere of uncertainty, suspicion and propagandistic hysteria, and played into the hands of those who opposed the prohibition of chemical weapons. Similar

views were expressed by Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and Viet Nam, none of which saw need or justification for extending the Group's mandate. The USSR stated that the report of the Group, as well as other documents, facts and events, led to the conclusion that none of the Governments or competent international organizations possessed any data that could confirm the United States assertions about the alleged combat use of chemical substances in Kampuchea, Laos and Afghanistan. Viet Nam said chemical weapons were not currently being used in the three countries, and that the determination of the resolution's sponsors to institutionalize investigative machinery amounted to an illegal revision of the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

New Zealand rejected the notion advanced by several opponents of the text that the Group of Experts had been appointed to reach certain definite conclusions, or that it had not reached the expected conclusions; the international community had an obligation to try to ascertain the facts, and the resolution contained a simple request that the Group complete its work to the best of its ability.

Bangladesh, China, Fiji, the Ivory Coast, the Niger, Nigeria and Senegal, which voted for the resolution, shared the view that the Group should be allowed to continue its work so as to assess the facts and complete its mandate; China added that no one should be allowed to obstruct the Group's investigations. Guinea, Mexico, Peru and Yugoslavia stated that they had abstained, as in 1980, because in general they regarded the text as containing confrontational or inconsistent elements which they could not accept. Afghanistan and Mozambique, which voted against, considered the proposal to be



insincere and saw no reason to renew the mandate, as the Group had found no evidence of the use of chemical weapons.

In the First Committee debate, Afghanistan said the United States provided chemical ammunition to bands of mercenaries in that country. Cuba asserted that United States imperialism had unleashed an undeclared biological war against Cuban territory, seriously affecting its cattle, tobacco and sugar-cane crops, and people. The United States, said the Lao People's Democratic Republic, was the only country that had used chemical weapons on a massive scale. Viet Nam declared that the United States had used more than 100,000 tons of chemical toxins in almost all the provinces of South Viet Nam, causing the death of 3,500 people and affecting 2 million others; it was, therefore, ironic and revolting that the United States should whip up a campaign of slander against the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the USSR and Viet Nam with regard to the use of chemical weapons.

The United States termed the Cuban and Vietnamese charges totally false and without foundation, adding that it had destroyed all of its biological weapons stocks; it also said that for five years lethal chemical weapons had been used against unsophisticated and defenceless people in Laos and Kampuchea, and more recently in Afghanistan. Democratic Kampuchea said Vietnamese military deserters had corroborated their use of toxic gases and other chemical weapons against civilian and military targets in Kampuchea; the atrocious death of tens of thousands of Kampuchians caused by Vietnamese-USSR chemical weapons could not go unpunished.

Singapore remarked that there could be no final word on the question at the moment and that it would be futile to make charges and countercharges which only reduced the issue to a propaganda war.

The sub-item relating to the Secretary-General's report was included in the agenda by decision of the Assembly on 18 September, after the General Committee, on 16 September, rejected a motion of the USSR to delete it by a vote of 18 to 4, with 2 abstentions.

Letters and notes verbales (nv): Democratic Kampuchea:

(<sup>1</sup>)26 Jan., A/36/81; (<sup>2</sup>)17 Feb., A/36/104; (<sup>3</sup>)9 Mar., A/36/121; (<sup>4</sup>)27 Mar., A/36/157; (<sup>5</sup>)6 Apr., A/36/173; (<sup>6</sup>)14 Apr., A/36/207; (<sup>7</sup>)27 Apr., A/36/229; (<sup>8</sup>)5 May, A/36/232-S/14473; (<sup>9</sup>)14 May, A/36/254; (<sup>10</sup>)8 June, A/36/312; (<sup>11</sup>)9 Nov., A/36/664; (<sup>12</sup>)13 Nov., A/36/687; (<sup>13</sup>)24 Nov., A/36/721-S/14770; (<sup>14</sup>)3 Dec., A/36/769. (<sup>15</sup>)USSR: 3 Dec., A/C.1/36/16. United States: (<sup>16</sup>)14 Sep., A/36/509 (nv); (<sup>17</sup>)12 Nov., A/C.1/36/10 (nv). Viet Nam: (<sup>18</sup>)22 Sep., A/36/549; (<sup>19</sup>)9 Oct., A/C.1/36/5.

Report: (<sup>20</sup>)S-G and Group of Experts, A/36/613.

Resolutions: GA: (<sup>21</sup>)35/144 C, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 85); (<sup>22</sup>)36/96 C, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.1/36/L.62/Add.1; 5th Committee report, A/36/802; S-G statements, A/C.1/36/L.62, A/C.5/36/92. Meeting records: GA: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.1 (16 Sep.); 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4.10, 12-26, 29, 30-32, 44, 52, 53 (19 Oct.-4 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.68 (9 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 30/96 C

86-20-34 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/743) by recorded vote (74-18-30), 4 December (meeting 53); 9-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.54): agenda item 42.

Sponsors: Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Turkey.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/144 C of 12 December 1980 in which, inter alia, it decided to carry out an impartial investigation to ascertain the facts pertaining to reports regarding the alleged use of chemical weapons and requested the Secretary-General to carry out such an investigation with the assistance of qualified medical and technical experts,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General, to which is annexed the report prepared by the Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons,

Noting that, as indicated by the conclusions of its report, the Group of Experts has not yet completed the investigation called for under paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 35/144C,

Noting also the views of the Group of Experts concerning the importance of prompt on-site investigations of allegations of the use of chemical weapons and the need to devise appropriate procedures for impartial collection and analysis of samples that may be obtained in the course of any such investigations,

Considering, accordingly, that the Group of Experts should continue its investigations,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General,

2. Requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of the Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons, to continue his investigation pursuant to General Assembly resolution 35/144 C and to report to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, a Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, Seychelles, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahrain, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mali, Malts, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Sri Lanka, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

### Proposed prohibition of weapons of mass destruction

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT. On 30 June 1981, the Committee on Disarmament,<sup>(1)</sup> acting on a proposal by Hungary, agreed by consensus to hold informal meetings on the question of new types of weapons of mass destruction, with the understanding that it was a normal practice for every delegation to have the right to utilize experts at any time. In the three informal meetings that followed, experts from some member States made statements concerning possible areas of new weapons development and gave an account of their potential in certain fields. No new weapons were reported to have appeared and the possibility of their development remained a matter of controversy.

No consensus was reached on a proposal for a group of governmental experts to keep the question of new weapons of mass destruction under continuing review. Another proposal was for the General Assembly to establish a group of experts to review recent trends in scientific developments, to identify any possible new weapons of mass destruction and to recommend the most appropriate means to prevent their emergence. It was also proposed, as another alternative, that the Committee hold annual informal meetings with experts. The Committee felt that the question should be kept under continuing review.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 9 December,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Committee on Disarmament to intensify negotiations, assisted by governmental experts, with a view to preparing a draft comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, and to draft possible agreements on particular types of such weapons. The Assembly again urged States to refrain from action which could adversely affect talks aimed at working out agreements on this subject. It also called on the permanent members of the Security Council, as well as other militarily significant States, to make identical declarations, to be approved by the Council, on the refusal to create new types and systems of such weapons, as a first step towards a comprehensive agreement.

The Assembly adopted this resolution by a recorded vote of 116 to none, with 27 abstentions. The text was approved in the First Committee on 23 November by a recorded vote of 95 to none, with 27 abstentions.

Introducing the 28-nation draft, the Byelorussian SSR stated that it took into account both approaches to the problem, namely, preparation of a comprehensive agreement to prohibit the development and manufacture of all new types of

weapons of this kind, and the drafting of agreements on particular types of such weapons.

On behalf of the European Community members, the United Kingdom explained their abstention on the ground that specific, verifiable agreements were necessary for an effective prohibition of new weapons and their technologies; that the special importance given in the proposal to negotiation of a single blanket prohibition did not appear warranted; that a comprehensive agreement could not distinguish between peaceful and military-oriented research; and that the proposed Security Council action would not be a step towards a comprehensive agreement or an effective measure to prevent such weapons from emerging.

Among the others abstaining, Japan considered it inappropriate for the Committee on Disarmament to negotiate on a comprehensive agreement whose scope and application was far from clear and presented difficulties in such areas as verification; moreover, an approach based on declarations by militarily significant States was unrealistic. Portugal also questioned the comprehensive agreement approach, noted that the resolution failed to mention verification and remarked that the concept of weapons of mass destruction had not been sufficiently defined. Sweden recalled its doubts about a general prohibition and its continuing support for the elaboration of specific agreements relating to such weapons as were identified.

India stated that its affirmative vote did not signify support for the establishment of a working group of governmental experts in the Committee on Disarmament, since the means of dealing with the question was a matter for that Committee to decide; India also had reservations on the call for interim measures. Of the others which voted in favour, Argentina stated that it would have abstained had a separate vote been taken on the paragraph calling for declarations by militarily significant States, in view of its position concerning unilateral and non-verifiable declarations. Finland supported the proposal in the belief that all approaches should be explored.

In the First Committee debate, many Eastern European and other States called for the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty on the prohibition of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. Czechoslovakia said there was an urgent need to prevent the emergence of such weapons in view of the United States decision to manufacture the neutron bomb. The USSR suggested that the militarily significant States, as a first step towards a comprehensive agreement, should make similar or identical statements renouncing the development of new types and systems of such weapons, to be approved later by

the Security Council. This idea was endorsed by Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and the Ukrainian SSR.

The Byelorussian SSR said that, as a result of the position of certain States, the Committee on Disarmament had not even begun talks on the subject. Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR and Mongolia stated that it would be helpful if that Committee made it possible for a group of governmental experts to work on the problem. Hungary and the Ukrainian SSR thought such a group should work on a comprehensive agreement as well as special agreements on individual weapons.

Afghanistan and Uganda expressed concern at the lack of progress in such an important area. Bhutan stated that the diversion of tremendous resources to such purposes as the production of more sophisticated weapons of mass destruction would diminish the already inadequate resources available for combating poverty in the developing countries.

The United States, on the other hand, described the proposed treaty as a meaningless proposal which addressed undefined and non-existent weapons and which would be impossible to implement or verify; such a propaganda ploy should not mask the build-up of the USSR offensive threat against the United States.

Report: ("Committee on Disarmament, A/36/27 (Committee documents, CD/228, appendix II, vols. I, II).

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/89, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1 4-10, 12-26, 34, 35, 38, 40 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/89

1 16-0-27 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/749) by recorded vote (95-0-27).  
23 November (meeting 40); 28-nation draft A/C.1/36/L.13; agenda item 48.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Hungary, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Niger, Poland, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam, Yemen.

Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3479(XXX) of 11 December 1975, 31/74 of 10 December 1976, 32/84 A of 12 December 1977, 33/66 B of 14 December 1978, 34/79 of 11 December 1979 and 35/149 of 12 December 1980 concerning the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction,

Bearing in mind the provisions of paragraph 39 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, according to which qualitative and quantitative disarmament measures are both important for halting the arms race and efforts to that end must include negotiations on the limitation and cessation of the qualitative improvement of armaments, especially weapons of mass destruction, and the development of new means of warfare,

Recalling the decision contained in paragraph 77 of the

Final Document to the effect that, in order to help prevent a qualitative arms race and so that scientific and technological achievements might ultimately be used solely for peaceful purposes, effective measures should be taken to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles and achievements, and that efforts aimed at the prohibition of such new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction should be appropriately pursued,

Expressing once again its firm belief, in the light of the decisions adopted at the tenth special session, in the importance of concluding an agreement or agreements to prevent the use of scientific and technological progress for the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons,

Noting that in the course of its session in 1981 the Committee on Disarmament considered the item entitled "New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons",

Noting with satisfaction that in the course of its session in 1961 the Committee on Disarmament held informal meetings on this item with the participation of qualified governmental experts,

Convinced that all ways and means should be utilized to prevent the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons,

Taking into consideration the part of the report of the Committee on Disarmament relating to this question,

1. Requests the Committee on Disarmament, in the light of its existing priorities, to intensify negotiations, with the assistance of qualified governmental experts, with a view to preparing a draft comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, and to draft possible agreements on particular types of such weapons;

2. Once again urges all States to refrain from any action which could adversely affect the talks aimed at working out an agreement or agreements to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons;

3. Calls upon the States permanent members of the Security Council, as well as upon other militarily significant States, to make declarations, identical in substance, concerning the refusal to create new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, as a first step towards the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement on this subject, bearing in mind that such declarations would be approved thereafter by a decision of the Security Council;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Committee on Disarmament all documents relating to the consideration of this item by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session;

5. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to submit a report on the results achieved to the General Assembly for consideration at its thirty-seventh session;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Committee on Disarmament".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua,

gua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

### Radiological weapons

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT. In dealing with its agenda item on "New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons", the Committee on Disarmament<sup>(4)</sup> re-established on 12 February 1981, for the duration of the 1981 session, its Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons. The Group's mandate remained the same as in 1980: to seek agreement on a convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons.<sup>(5)</sup> The Group held 21 meetings between 20 February and 14 August 1981, in addition to informal consultations. The subject was also discussed in the Committee.

The Group reported at the conclusion of its 1981 work that divergences still existed, particularly on the scope of prohibition, the definition of radiological weapons, the procedure for verifying compliance, peaceful uses, and the relationship of the proposed treaty with other international agreements and disarmament measures.

Concerning the scope of prohibition, some members thought that, while the development of specific radiological weapons was a remote possibility, any treaty should deal with the real danger of mass destruction from dissemination of radioactive substances resulting from attacks on nuclear facilities. Others considered that the possible threat of radiological weapons should be dealt with before they came into existence, and that an attempt to deal in the same negotiations with radiological weapons and the protection of nuclear facilities could lead to confusion.

In regard to definition, differences persisted over whether the proposed agreement should exclude nuclear weapons. With regard to peaceful uses, some felt that the treaty should recognize the right of all States to develop and apply programmes for the peaceful use of radioactive materials, while others considered that provisions on peaceful uses should not be too detailed, given the main purpose of the treaty and the goal of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. As to verification of compliance, there were different views as to whether the Security Council should deal with complaints of viola-

tions and some countries wished to see provisions for on-site inspection.

On 20 August, the Committee adopted the Working Group's report. There was no consensus, however, on the Group's recommendation that its work be resumed in 1982.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 9 December on conclusion of a convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly called on the Committee on Disarmament to continue negotiations with a view to early conclusion of the elaboration of a treaty, in order that it might be submitted if possible at the Assembly's 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27).

The First Committee approved the text in similar fashion on 20 November, after its sponsor, Hungary, accepted an oral amendment by Argentina-supported by China, India and Yugoslavia- to add the words "if possible" to the paragraph on submission of a treaty in 1982.

Introducing the resolution, Hungary stated that, as a consequence of the spread of nuclear power production, material which could be used in radiological weapons was now found in many facilities and in many countries. Thus, prevention of the appearance of a new type of weapon of mass destruction-radiological weapons-had become timely and important. Hungary added that the proposal was practically a reproduction of the Assembly's 1980 resolution<sup>(2)</sup> and was of a procedural nature, designed to enable the Committee on Disarmament to continue its work on radiological weapons in 1982.

India, while joining the consensus, noted that serious divergencies still existed, particularly concerning the scope of the future treaty and the definition of radiological weapons; hence, adoption of the resolution should in no way be used to upset existing priorities in the Committee on Disarmament.

During the First Committee's debate, the USSR stated that prospects were good for the early conclusion of negotiations on this topic, under way since 1979 in the Committee on Disarmament. The United States said it was prepared to participate in that Committee with a view to completing negotiations on a radiological weapons convention.

The idea that negotiation of a draft agreement should be concluded in the near future was supported by Bulgaria, France, Hungary and the Ukrainian SSR. However, Hungary conceded that serious difficulties continued to exist on vital questions.

Sweden remarked that the USSR-United States proposal on major elements of a treaty, presented to the Working Group in 1979,<sup>(4)</sup> totally

lacked substance as it failed to include a ban against attacks on civilian nuclear installations. Egypt, Finland, Japan, Pakistan and Somalia believed that, the Swedish proposal had been rendered more relevant by the Israeli attack in June on Iraqi nuclear facilities (p. 53). Poland, on the other hand, believed the two-Power document remained a good starting point.

Belgium suggested that the principles contained in the Swedish proposal be embodied in the convention, along with a commitment to negotiate later a legal instrument covering all possible implications. Expressing hope that negotiations on radiological weapons would be completed in 1982, France suggested that the difficulties raised by proposals aimed at settling in that convention questions alien to its true purpose might be considered in another framework.

Nepal supported the view expressed in the Committee on Disarmament by the Group of 21 (p. 31) that the definition of radiological weapons should not include an exclusion clause with respect to nuclear weapons.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Disarmament, A/36/27 (Committee documents, CD/228, appendix II, vols. I, II).

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/156 G, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 86); <sup>(3)</sup>36/97 B, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(4)</sup>1979, p. 25; <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 27.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 29, 35, 38 (19 Oct.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/97 B

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/756) without vote, 20 November (meeting 38); draft by Hungary (A/C.1/36/L.6), orally amended by Argentina; agenda item 55 (g).

Conclusion of an international convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons

The General Assembly,

Recalling the resolution of the Commission for Conventional Armaments of 12 August 1948, which defined weapons of mass destruction to include atomic explosive weapons, radioactive material weapons, lethal chemical and biological weapons and any weapons developed in the future which have characteristics comparable, in destructive effect to those of the atomic bomb or the other weapons mentioned above,

Recalling its resolution 2602 C (XXIV) of 16 December 1969,

Recalling paragraph 76 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, in which it is stated that a convention should be concluded prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons,

Reaffirming its resolutions 34/87 A of 11 December 1979 and 35/156 G of 12 December 1980 on the conclusion of such a convention,

Convinced that such a convention would serve to spare mankind the potential dangers of the use of radiological weapons and thereby contribute to strengthening peace and averting the threat of war,

Noting that negotiations on the conclusion of an international convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons have been conducted in the Committee on Disarmament,

Taking note of that part of the report of the Committee on

Disarmament which deals with these negotiations, including the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons,

Recognizing that divergent views continue to exist in connection with various aspects relating to a convention prohibiting radiological weapons,

Noting with satisfaction the wide recognition of the need to reach agreement on the text of a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons,

1. Calls upon the Committee on Disarmament to continue negotiations with a view to an early conclusion of the elaboration of a treaty prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, in order that it may be submitted if possible to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982;

2. Takes note, in this connection, of the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Working Group, on Radiological Weapons, in the report adopted by the Committee on Disarmament, to set up at the beginning of its session in 1982 a further ad hoc working group, under an appropriate mandate to be determined at that time, to continue negotiations on the elaboration of a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Committee on Disarmament all documents relating to the discussion by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session of the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons;

4. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons".

### Prohibition of weapons and prevention of an arms race in outer space

In 1981, concern was expressed during the General Assembly session that rapid advances in science and technology had made the extension of the arms race into outer space a real possibility, and that new kinds of weapons were still being developed despite the existence of international agreements such as the 1966 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies,<sup>(2)</sup> which prohibited nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction from being placed in orbit or elsewhere in space.

On 9 December 1981, the Assembly adopted two resolutions aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space: one by Western European and other States asking the Committee on Disarmament to consider the question of negotiating effective and verifiable agreements, starting with an agreement on anti-satellite systems; and another by Eastern European and other States requesting that body to embark on negotiations on an international treaty against the stationing of any weapons in space. The latter resolution resulted from an initiative by the USSR to place the subject on the Assembly's agenda as a separate item.

By the first of these resolutions on prevention of an arms race in outer space,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly requested the Committee on Disarmament to

consider, from the beginning of its 1982 session, the question of negotiating effective and verifiable agreements in that regard, taking into account all existing and future proposals. As an important step towards that end, the Committee was asked to consider as a matter of priority the question of negotiating an effective and verifiable agreement to prohibit anti-satellite systems. This resolution, sponsored by 17 Western European and other States, was adopted by a recorded vote of 129 to none, with 13 abstentions, following its approval in the First Committee on 23 November by a recorded vote of 110 to none, with 14 abstentions.

By the second resolution, on the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of weapons in outer space,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly expressed the view that it was necessary to take effective steps, by concluding an international treaty, to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space. It requested the Committee on Disarmament to embark on negotiations with a view to achieving agreement on the text of such a treaty. The Assembly adopted the resolution, sponsored by 13 Eastern European and other States, by a recorded vote of 123 to none, with 21 abstentions, after the First Committee approved the text on 23 November by a recorded vote, requested by the Netherlands, of 105 to none, with 20 abstentions.

Italy introduced the first of these resolutions, stating that a much broader involvement of the international community was desirable on an issue likely to affect the future security of the whole world. Noting the complexity of the subject, Italy recommended that priority be accorded to elements such as anti-satellite systems designed to impair the functioning of, interfere with, damage or destroy satellites of other nations. The comparatively early stage of development of such capabilities presented an opportunity to negotiate a realistic and verifiable agreement.

The item entitled "Conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space" was inscribed in the 1981 Assembly agenda on 18 September, at the request of the USSR. That country, in a letter of 10 August to the Secretary-General,<sup>(5)</sup> stated that no existing international instrument excluded the possibility of stationing in outer space weapons not covered by the definition of weapons of mass destruction; consequently, the danger of militarizing outer space still existed and had recently been increasing. A nine-article draft treaty annexed to the letter would prohibit objects carrying any kind of weapons from being placed in earth orbit, on celestial bodies, on reusable manned space vehicles or anywhere else in space.

Introducing the resolution submitted under this item, Mongolia remarked that, as there were varying approaches to the problem and in view of its complexity, the sponsors proposed that the Assembly should, without prejudging the content of an agreement, request the Committee on Disarmament to embark on negotiations.

A number of countries, particularly from Eastern Europe, welcomed the USSR initiative, asserting that increased production of so-called "potential" weapons, especially by the United States, made it important to secure general approval of the draft treaty. Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR and Hungary referred to the possible military use of the United States reusable manned space vehicle Columbia (known as the space shuttle) and the potential use of laser and particle beams as weapons in space. Poland, noting that the proposal to bring the question to the United Nations had been made by a nation with considerable technological capability in space, said its readiness to forgo part of that capability should be emulated by those with a comparable capability.

The Ukrainian SSR observed that existing agreements did not exclude the placement in space of weapons which were no less destructive than the weapons of mass destruction already banned from outer space. In a similar vein, Czechoslovakia viewed the proposed treaty as a device to fill the gaps in the system of norms and principles governing the conduct of States in space.

The Netherlands, while welcoming the draft treaty, criticized it for failing to prohibit the testing, production or use of space weapons under certain circumstances, for lacking a clear definition of the term "weapon" and for leaving verification to exclusively national means. A similar view was put forward by Sweden, which felt that the USSR draft omitted some aspects of the militarization of outer space which were as important as those it covered, and that it needed additional provisions on verification, complaints and review.

Sweden, supported by Argentina, Ghana, Nigeria and Sri Lanka, suggested that the two proposals be amalgamated so as to avoid having two different resolutions on the same subject, two sets of instructions to the Committee on Disarmament and two items on the same subject in the provisional agenda of the Assembly's 1982 session. Both Italy and Mongolia, although agreeing to consider the suggestion to consult before the vote in the Assembly, maintained that each resolution had its own identity and approach, and was therefore appropriate for discussion as a distinct item.

India, Mexico, Nigeria and Yugoslavia voted in favour of both resolutions but with the under-

standing that consideration of the subject in the Committee on Disarmament would have to be determined in the light of existing priorities. India further stated that measures to prevent an arms race in outer space should cover both the deployment and the testing of weapons of any kind in that environment, and that demilitarization of outer space should not become a pretext for preventing developing countries from deriving the full benefits of space research. Sierra Leone, while supporting the text introduced by Italy, feared that requesting the Committee on Disarmament to consider the question rather than immediately embark on negotiations could mean that the item might be shelved indefinitely.

Argentina declared that its support of both resolutions did not mean concurrence with all the language used or acceptance in advance of certain priorities in the consideration of items or treaty texts which had not yet been studied in depth. Egypt, which also voted for both resolutions, stated that it concurred with their objective but did not think it advisable to be specific on either the draft treaty or the issue of priority for anti-satellite systems. The Philippines supported both texts, as it favoured all proposals aimed at keeping outer space for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

China voted in favour of both proposals, which it regarded as basically procedural; it was concerned about the increasing military rivalry between the super-Powers in outer space and therefore supported any effort which might lead to the peaceful use of that environment and against its militarization.

The USSR abstained on the proposal introduced by Italy on the ground that it over-emphasized the prohibition of anti-satellite systems and thus tended to shift the focus away from the general problem of preventing an arms race in outer space, and because the preamble erroneously suggested that the USSR-United States talks on limiting anti-satellite systems were in progress although they had been broken off by the United States and the prospects of their resumption remained unclear.

The United States supported the resolution introduced by Italy as an adequate basis for consideration of the question in the Committee on Disarmament; but it abstained in the vote on the proposal introduced by Mongolia, stating that primary emphasis in outer-space arms-control discussions would have to be placed on the threat posed by the USSR anti-satellite system, as that country was the only one which had already deployed a weapons system for destroying satellites.

Albania did not participate in the vote on

either text and stated that it would not support the idea of concluding a treaty based on the USSR proposal; it questioned the sincerity of the proposal and said that outer space had been turned into an arena of military competition between the USSR and the United States.

In the First Committee debate, Austria regarded development by both super-Powers of space-stationed anti-satellite and anti-ballistic-missile technology as threatening a wasteful and destabilizing arms race. Egypt warned that space technology would provide greater reliability and accuracy to strategic weapons, with the result that existing strategic doctrines would be replaced by more aggressive ones. India stated that demilitarization of outer space should not become a pretext for perpetuating an exclusive space club or preventing developing nations from deriving the full benefits of space research. Nepal said it would support any proposal for an effective and verifiable control mechanism to stop the militarization of outer space.

Several States urged the prompt resumption of the anti-satellite talks between the USSR and the United States, suspended since 1979. Finland, Ireland and the Netherlands, while acknowledging the need for agreement between the two major space Powers, saw a parallel role for multilateral negotiations in a body such as the Committee on Disarmament. Canada, Mongolia and the Ukrainian SSR also thought that Committee should start work on a draft convention. Norway expressed the view that a treaty prohibiting anti-satellite weapons would have a stabilizing influence on super-Power relations and enhance the possibilities of verifying disarmament treaties. Also urging the conclusion of an anti-satellite-weapons treaty were Bangladesh and Italy.

Brazil argued that, by entrusting negotiation of the proposed treaty to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the General Assembly would allow the Committee on Disarmament to concentrate on the priority items already on its agenda, while ensuring that the question of the militarization of outer space was handed over to a body which had adequate representation as well as technical and legal expertise. Chile saw the need for both Committees to study the military aspects of the use of outer space, where 80 per cent of all human activities had been for military purposes. The Netherlands, on the other hand, did not believe it appropriate or opportune to refer the matter to the Committee on outer space in view of that body's heavy work programme and because a decision to bypass the single multilateral disarmament body would involve a serious question of principle.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>USSR, 10 Aug., A/36/192.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2222(XXI), annex, 19 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 41); <sup>(3)</sup>36/97 C, 9 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/99, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.1 (16 Sep.); 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 29, 30, 32-35, 38, 39 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/97 C

129-0-13 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/756) by recorded vote (110-0-14), 23 November (meeting 39): 17-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.7); agenda item 55.

Sponsors: Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, Uruguay.

#### Prevention of an arms race in outer space

The General Assembly,  
inspired by the great prospects opening up before mankind as a result of man's entry into outer space,

Believing that any activity in outer space should be for peaceful purposes and carried on for the benefit of all peoples, irrespective of the degree of their economic and scientific development,

Recalling that the States Parties to the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, have undertaken in article III to carry on activities in the exploration and use of outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, in accordance with international law and the Charter of the United Nations, in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and promoting international co-operation and understanding,

Recalling also article IV of the Treaty,

Recalling further paragraph 80 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, in which it is stated that, in order to prevent an arms race in outer space, further measures should be taken and appropriate international negotiations held in accordance with the spirit of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies,

Noting the important and growing contribution of satellites both for civilian purposes and the verification of disarmament agreements and aware of the possibilities of their use to promote peace, stability and international co-operation,

Mindful of the widespread interest expressed by Member States to ensure that the exploration and use of outer space should be for peaceful purposes, inter alia, in the course of the negotiations on and following the adoption of the above-mentioned Treaty, and taking note of proposals submitted to the General Assembly at its tenth special session, devoted to disarmament, and at its regular sessions and to the Committee on Disarmament,

Aware of the need to prevent an arms race in outer space and in particular of the threat posed by anti-satellite systems and their destabilizing effects on international peace and security,

Convinced that further measures are needed to prevent outer space from becoming an area of military confrontation, contrary to the spirit of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies,

Considering it necessary for the international community to give attention, in the Committee on Disarmament, to specific measures regarding the question of anti-satellite systems,

Bearing in mind that the restraint of anti-satellite systems has already been a subject of negotiations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America,

1. Considers that further effective measures to prevent an arms race in outer space should be adopted by the international community:

2. Urges all States, in particular those with major space capabilities, to contribute actively to the goal of preventing an arms race in outer space and to refrain from any action contrary to that aim;

3. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to consider, as from the beginning of its session in 1982, the question of negotiating effective and verifiable agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space, taking into account all existing and future proposals designed to meet this objective;

4. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to consider as a matter of priority the question of negotiating an effective and verifiable agreement to prohibit anti-satellite systems, as an important step towards the fulfilment of the objectives set out in paragraph 3 above;

5. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to report on its consideration of this subject to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Committee on Disarmament all documents relating to the consideration of this subject by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session;

7. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space and prohibition of anti-satellite systems".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/99

123-0-21 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/758) by recorded vote (105-0-20), 23 November (meeting 39): 13-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.8); agenda item 128.

Sponsors: Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

Conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space

The General Assembly,

Guided by the goals of strengthening peace and international security,

Expressing the common interest of all mankind in the further 'exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes for the good of all States and in the interest of developing friendly relations and mutual understanding between them,

Conscious of the danger which would threaten mankind if outer space became an arena for the arms race,

Desiring not to allow outer space to become an arena for the arms race and a source of strained relations between States,



Taking into account the draft treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space, submitted to the General Assembly by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the views and comments expressed during the consideration of this item at its thirty-sixth session,

1. Considers it necessary to take effective steps, by concluding an appropriate international treaty, to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space:

2. Requests the Committee on Disarmament to embark on negotiations with a view to achieving agreement on the text of such a treaty;

3. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

## Conventional weapons and forces

Convention against excessively injurious conventional weapons

The first international arms regulation agreements negotiated at a special United Nations conference, the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and its three annexed Protocols, concluded in October 1980,<sup>(8)</sup> were opened for signature on 10 April 1981. These instruments provided new rules for the protection of military personnel, civilians and civilian objects from injury or attack by means of incendiary weapons, landmines, booby traps and other devices, as well as fragments that cannot be readily detected in the human body by X-rays.

The Convention was signed by 34 States on the day it was opened for signature and by a total of 46 countries as at 31 December 1981: Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of,

Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

In communications to the Secretary-General, five signatory States—Belgium<sup>(1)</sup> (28 May), the Federal Republic of Germany<sup>(2)</sup> (22 April) Ireland<sup>(3)</sup> (18 June), Italy<sup>(4)</sup> (10 April) and the Netherlands<sup>(5)</sup> (23 April)—pledged to continue efforts for the establishment of measures and mechanisms to ensure implementation of and compliance with the Convention.

A report of the Secretary-General,<sup>(6)</sup> as depositary of the Convention and Protocols, contained the list of signatories as at 31 August 1981, along with the declarations and reservations submitted by France, Italy and the United Kingdom.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution adopted without vote on 9 December,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Assembly urged States to sign and ratify the Convention and its Protocols as early as possible so as to obtain its entry into force and ultimately its universal adherence. The Assembly noted that, under the Convention, conferences might be convened to consider amendments to the Convention or its Protocols, to consider additional protocols relating to further categories of conventional weapons, or to review the scope and operation of the Convention and its Protocols. The First Committee approved the text on 23 November, also without vote.

The resolution was introduced by Nigeria on behalf of 26 sponsors from all geographical regions. Although the Convention and Protocols were not disarmament measures, Nigeria observed, they were useful for their humanitarian considerations. As they had not come into force, nothing should be done at the current stage to disturb the delicate balance achieved during negotiations; any proposals or amendments could be considered later.

Democratic Yemen was among several States welcoming the conclusion of negotiations on the Convention. Ecuador viewed its adoption as proof that the United Nations could reach agreements which not only strengthened humanitarian international law but also encouraged arms control and disarmament. Sweden, appealing for signatures and ratifications, favoured the outlawing of all incendiary weapons and the international regulation of small-calibre weapons.

Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, New Zealand, Sweden and the United Kingdom, the last speaking for the European Community (EC) members, stressed the importance of establishing a mechanism for investigat-

ing alleged breaches of the Convention, while China hoped that inadequacies such as the failure to provide for control and verification could be rectified. Ireland and the United States reiterated their support for the establishment of a consultative committee to investigate facts if doubts arose about compliance.

Letter (I) and notes verbales: <sup>(1)</sup>Belgium, 28 May, A/36/309; <sup>(2)</sup>Germany, Federal Republic of, 22 Apr., A/36/221; <sup>(3)</sup>Ireland, 18 June, A/36/334; <sup>(4)</sup>Italy, 10 Apr., A/36/224 (I); <sup>(5)</sup>Netherlands, 23 Apr., A/36/225. Report: <sup>(6)</sup>S-G, A/36/406.

Resolution: <sup>(7)</sup>GA, 36/93, 9 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(8)</sup>1980, p. 76.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 33, 37-39 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/93

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/753) without vote, 23 November (meeting 39); 26-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.40): agenda item 52.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Spain, Sweden, USSR, United Kingdom, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 32/152 of 19 December 1977, 33/70 of 14 December 1978, 34/82 of 11 December 1979 and 35/153 of 12 December 1980.

Recalling the successful conclusion of the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, which resulted in a convention and three protocols, adopted by the Conference on 10 October 1980, namely, the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, the Protocol on Non-Detectable Fragments (Protocol I), the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II) and the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of incendiary Weapons (Protocol III),

Reaffirming its conviction that the suffering of civilian populations and of combatants would be further significantly reduced if general agreement could be attained on the prohibition or restriction for humanitarian reasons of the use of specific conventional weapons, including any which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects,

Taking note with satisfaction of the report of the Secretary-General, in which indication was given that many States have already signed the Convention, which was opened for signature in New York on 10 April 1981,

1. Urges those States which have not yet done so to exert their best endeavours to sign and ratify the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and the Protocols annexed thereto as early as possible so as to obtain the entry into force of the Convention, and ultimately its universal adherence;

2. Notes that, under article 8 of the Convention, conferences may be convened to consider amendments to the Convention or any of the Protocols annexed thereto, to consider additional protocols relating to other categories of conventional weapons not covered by the existing annexed Proto-

cols, or to review the scope and operation of the Convention and the Protocols annexed thereto and to consider any proposal for amendments to the Convention or to the existing Protocols and any proposals for additional protocols relating to other categories of conventional weapons not covered by the existing annexed Protocols;

3. Requests the Secretary-General, as depositary of the Convention and the three Protocols annexed thereto, to inform the General Assembly from time to time of the state of adherence to the Convention and its Protocols;

4. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects".

## Study on conventional disarmament

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION CONSIDERATION. On 28 May 1981, the Disarmament Commission established an informal open-ended Working Group to elaborate the general approach, structure and scope of a study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on conventional disarmament—a task entrusted to it by the General Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(3)</sup> Working papers were submitted by China, Denmark, the German Democratic Republic and India. The Working Group also considered two papers by its Chairman containing suggested guidelines, which were later annexed to the Commission's report to the Assembly.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Chairman's suggested guidelines, which some delegations were ready to accept as a mandate for the study, listed several provisions and principles to underlie its general approach, including the need of States to protect their security, the objective of promoting or enhancing stability at a lower military level, the need for verification in agreements on reduction of armed forces and armaments, and the need to take account of both global and regional aspects. Among the elements suggested for the scope and structure of the study were identification of the main causes of the conventional arms race, a factual account of the arms build-up, the nature of military alliances, international conventional-arms transfers, use of conventional arms against States, the impact of technology, a description of social and economic consequences, and the contribution of confidence-building measures. The experts who were to assist the Secretary-General in carrying out the study, as stipulated in the 1980 resolution, would be asked to assess the effects of the conventional arms race on prospects for disarmament and to identify areas in which measures to curb the race were most urgent and feasible.

After five meetings of the Working Group between 28 May and 5 June, the Commission concluded, in a text adopted on 5 June, that a significant divergence of views prevented it at that stage from discharging the responsibility

assigned to it by the Assembly. It recommended that Member States consider the matter further with the aim of reconciling the differences.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution on the study on conventional disarmament,<sup>(4)</sup> adopted on 9 December, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to establish a Group of Experts on All Aspects of the Conventional Arms Race and on Disarmament relating to Conventional Weapons and Armed Forces. It asked the Disarmament Commission to complete in 1982 its consideration of the general approach to the study, its structure and scope, and to transmit its conclusions to the Group of Experts. The Assembly agreed that the Group should pursue its work after the Disarmament Commission met, taking into consideration such conclusions as the Commission might submit and, if necessary, its 1981 deliberations. The Secretary-General was requested to submit a final report in 1983.

The Assembly adopted the resolution by a recorded vote of 114 to none, with 26 abstentions. The text, sponsored and revised by Denmark and incorporating an amendment by Brazil, was approved in the First Committee on 25 November by a recorded vote of 98 to none, with 21 abstentions.

The initial draft resolution would have had the Assembly request the Secretary-General to initiate the work of the Group, taking the Commission's 1981 deliberations as guidance, and to submit a progress report in 1982 prior to the final report in 1983. As the sponsor, Denmark, explained it, this would have meant that the Group would begin work as soon as the resolution was adopted. After objections by some States that the Disarmament Commission should be given another chance to agree on the mandate, the text was revised by Denmark to allow the Commission to complete its consideration of the matter before the Group met. The revised text was further altered to incorporate a Brazilian amendment inserting the words "if necessary" before the reference to the Commission's 1981 deliberations.

Commenting on the original Danish draft, Brazil, India and Peru saw it as eroding the competence of the Disarmament Commission, to which the Assembly had assigned responsibility for working out the general approach, structure and scope of the proposed study. Emphasizing their support for enhancing the Commission's role, these States called on others to avoid actions that might adversely affect that role. Brazil and India recommended that the draft resolution be withdrawn so that the Commission could give further consideration to working out generally approved guidelines for the study.

Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Spain and the United Kingdom, the last speaking for the EC members, supported the original Danish proposal. The United Kingdom said the Assembly should not impose upon the experts detailed guidelines on every aspect of their work, and that delaying action on the study and referring the matter back to the Commission could detract from the standing of that body. The Federal Republic of Germany thought that, in deciding on its organization of work and mode of operation, the Group would find useful and sufficient the guidelines that could be derived from the list of topics presented in the Commission; a later substantive input to their work by the Commission was not ruled out. Spain commented that returning the question to the Commission would be tantamount to preventing the study from being carried out.

Explaining their positions on the revised text, a number of States which voted in favour, including the Bahamas, Ecuador, Pakistan and Peru, agreed that it had removed the preoccupations which the initial version had created regarding the Commission's mandate to work out the general approach to the study. Italy expressed confidence that, if the Commission experienced difficulties, the Group of Experts would be in a position to pursue its work. The United States assumed that expenditures in connection with the proposed study would be made without prejudice to the zero-growth budget policy of the United Nations.

India, which abstained in the vote, felt that, although the revised text addressed some of its preoccupations, the study should be undertaken only after the Commission had fully discussed and agreed on guidelines. The USSR also abstained, stating that the proposed guidelines given in the Commission's report were one-sided in that they emphasized such questions as the nature of military alliances, political doctrines, data collection and questions related to the qualitative aspects of the conventional arms race, instead of focusing on the task of promoting disarmament.

Several States commented favourably on the potential usefulness of the study. Nepal, for example, believed that it could form the basis for efforts to control international conventional-arms transfers. Egypt said the study must recognize that nuclear disarmament took priority; it should take into account the root causes of the conventional armaments race and it should not be used to infringe the rights of peoples and States to self-determination, sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence. Nor-

way attached special importance to the recommendations for compilation and dissemination of data on the military use of human and material resources and military transfers.

In the First Committee debate, many States supported a limitation of the build-up and transfer of conventional weapons. In general, Western States continued to see conventional arms control and disarmament as an important question that should be pursued simultaneously with nuclear disarmament, while developing countries largely regarded it as important but secondary to nuclear disarmament.

Italy saw a direct relationship between the nuclear and conventional arms races, since the growth of conventional arsenals of one side could provide an impetus for the other side to expand its nuclear arsenals. Belgium voiced a similar concern, holding that the uncontrolled growth of conventional weapons could lead to a risk of nuclear proliferation. Austria, the Netherlands and Spain regretted that the United Nations had not devoted sufficient attention to the problem.

A number of arguments for conventional disarmament were advanced. Chile remarked that 80 per cent of military expenditures was devoted to the production of conventional weapons, while Ireland said that 25 million people had been killed by conventional weapons since the Second World War, most of them in the third world. China, stating that conventional disarmament should proceed in conjunction with nuclear disarmament, observed that all the wars of aggression launched directly or indirectly by the super-Powers had been fought with conventional weapons. Singapore, remarking that conventional arms had been used in several invasions of small countries by their bigger and stronger neighbours, said there could be no certainty that a third world war would not have broken out if the balance of nuclear terror had not existed.

Guyana recognized that States must equip themselves for defence but said some which faced no obvious external enemy or threat had made preparations which far exceeded the normal requirements of legitimate self-defence. New Zealand, observing that all States were entitled to maintain armed forces for defence, said that while this had a restraining effect in some cases, conventional armaments and armed forces sometimes increased the potential for conflict, with the risk of great-Power involvement. The Philippines contended that increased acquisition of conventional arms could raise the level of fear and threat in the minds of neighbours and possible adversaries, encouraging them to take steps to eliminate the perceived dangers. Zambia saw the conventional arms race, especially in devel-

oping countries, as threatening world peace and security.

The Byelorussian SSR observed that only the USSR had declared its readiness to adhere to a ceiling on the armed forces and conventional armaments of the permanent members of the Security Council, as called for by the Assembly in 1980<sup>(2)</sup>

Several States stressed the socio-economic advantages that would accrue from conventional disarmament. Greece expressed a widely shared view that progress in this area would have favourable consequences on the economies and development efforts of all countries, especially the smaller ones.

Support for the limitation of international arms sales and other types of transfers of conventional weapons was expressed by a number of States, including Chile, the German Democratic Republic, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Rwanda, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and the United States. Sweden cited figures showing that the international arms trade had reached a value of \$35 billion a year, of which 75 per cent represented imports by developing countries.

Several developing countries, including Barbados, Bhutan, Jamaica, Lebanon, Mauritania, Nigeria and Rwanda, deplored transfers of armaments to developing countries, in particular because they consumed resources vitally needed for development and provided opportunities for regional mistrust and conflict. With regard to the Middle East, Iraq, Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic believed that United States arms transfers to Israel threatened peace and security, while Israel contended that Arab States were engaged in a costly programme of arms acquisition aimed at Israel. Viet Nam condemned United States arms transfers to certain Asian countries, arguing that they encouraged subversion and destabilization, particularly in South-East Asia. Cuba and Nicaragua similarly deplored United States arms supplies to certain Latin American countries, and Cuba denied allegations that weapons it had acquired from the USSR for its defence had been redistributed in Latin America.

The United States contended that the USSR surpassed any other country in the transfer of weapons to developing countries, having signed arms sales agreements with such countries in 1980 worth \$15 billion. The USSR stated that the United States, in 1978, had unilaterally broken off talks with the USSR aimed at limiting conventional arms transfers.

Several measures proposed in previous years were reiterated during the 1981 debate. These included proposals by the Federal Republic of Germany to establish a United Nations register

of conventional arms exports and imports, by Warsaw Treaty Organization members to freeze the conventional armaments and armed forces of the permanent members of the Security Council and their military allies as the first step towards reduction, by Italy for a United Nations body to monitor and control the international arms trade, and by Turkey to control arms sales by private companies with the aim of countering terrorist activities.

India reiterated its view that nuclear disarmament must not be based on progress in conventional disarmament and that the nuclear Powers and their allies, bearing primary responsibility for the conventional arms race; had to take the first step towards conventional disarmament.

Report: ("Disarmament Commission, A/36/42.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/152 G, para. 1, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 100); <sup>(3)</sup>35/156 A, 12 Dec. 1980 (ibid., p. 115); <sup>(4)</sup>36/97 A, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.1/36/L.51/Add.1; 5th Committee report, A/36/805; S-G statements, A/C.1/36/L.51/Rev.1, A/C.5/36/93.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 28-32, 34, 36, 37, 42, 43 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.68 (9 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/97 A

114-0-26 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/756) by recorded vote (98-0-21).

25 November (meeting 43): draft by Denmark (A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1). amended by Brazil (A/C.1/36/L.55); agenda item 55.

#### Study on conventional disarmament

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/156 A of 12 December 1960 in which it approved, in principle, the carrying out of a study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces, to be undertaken by the Secretary-General with the assistance of a group of qualified experts appointed by him on a balanced geographical basis,

Recalling the discussions at the substantive session of the Disarmament Commission in 1981 on the general approach to, and the structure and scope of, the study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to establish the Group of Experts on All Aspects of the Conventional Arms Race and on Disarmament relating to Conventional Weapons and Armed Forces, in accordance with the provisions contained in paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 35/156 A;

2. Requests the Disarmament Commission, at its substantive session in 1982, to complete its consideration of the general approach to, and the structure and scope of, the study and to transmit the conclusions of its deliberations to the Group of Experts;

3. Agrees that the Group of Experts should pursue its work after the above-mentioned session of the Disarmament Commission, taking into consideration such conclusions as the Commission may submit to it, and, if necessary, the deliberations at the substantive session of the Commission in 1981, in particular those reflected in paragraph 21 and annex III of the report on that session;

4. Requests the Secretary-General, in accordance with paragraph 4 of resolution 35/156 A, to submit a final report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bahrain, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

#### Study on regional disarmament

By a resolution adopted without vote on 9 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit at its 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27) the study on regional disarmament completed in 1980 by a group of governmental experts established at the Assembly's request.<sup>(3)</sup> The Assembly requested similar treatment for a 1981 report by the Secretary-General containing views on the study presented by 32 States.<sup>(1)</sup> This resolution, sponsored by 31 States from all geographical regions, was approved by the First Committee on 20 November, also without vote.

Introducing the resolution, Belgium noted that the views which States had submitted revealed broad areas of agreement on some essential points: first, security requirements, were most easily perceived at the regional level; second, States in a region would have to take the initiative for regional disarmament; and third, as the region should not be dissociated from the global context, relations with third States should be closely examined. Belgium added that a number of topics had been identified as particularly suitable for regional action, notably the creation of denuclearized zones, cessation of the conventional arms race and implementation of confidence-building measures.

India stated that it would have abstained had a vote been taken, as it believed that partial disarmament measures had a rationale only as integral components of general and complete disarmament on a global basis.

In the First Committee debate, Chad remarked that regional disarmament would prove useful only within a framework leading towards general and complete disarmament; the disarmament of

some parts of the world while others continued to accumulate weapons would not serve the cause of peace and stability. France suggested that potential confrontations might be mitigated through the establishment of a regional or subregional system for the evaluation of military forces, or by concluding agreements, backed by control and verification measures, on the self-limitation of armaments in a regional framework. Portugal said that two elements were essential for regional disarmament: verification of compliance and the agreement of all States concerned. Israel suggested the establishment of United Nations regional disarmament commissions, composed of all States in the region, which would concentrate on two aspects: limitation of military budgets and confidence-building measures.

Eastern and Western European States emphasized the importance of the Vienna Talks on Mutual Reduction of Forces and Armaments and Associated Measures in Central Europe. Austria hoped they would lead to at least a first-phase agreement for reducing USSR and United States troop strength in the area. The Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom, the latter speaking for the EC members, saw the goal of the Vienna Talks as mutual reductions in conventional forces in the region to improve military stability and rid central Europe of the fear of possible surprise attack, starting with reductions in the level of USSR and United States forces. The German Democratic Republic said it should be possible to agree on a proposal by the socialist States of Eastern Europe for the simultaneous withdrawal of 20,000 USSR military personnel and 13,000 United States military personnel, while other parties froze the strength of their troops pending a further agreement. Nigeria noted the universal interest in the Vienna Talks and said it would help build confidence if the rest of the international community was periodically briefed on their status.

Nations of both Eastern and Western Europe voiced support for the idea of convening a conference on disarmament in Europe and noted that the mandate for such a meeting was under discussion at the session at Madrid, Spain, of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Poland said it would shortly confirm its readiness to offer Warsaw as the site for beginning such a conference, and Romania also favoured a conference on strengthening confidence and disarmament in Europe. Finland hoped that, while the conference would begin by examining concrete confidence-building measures, attention would later focus on a comprehensive view of arms control and disarmament in Europe. Similarly, Yugoslavia stated that

negotiations at such a conference should concern disarmament and not only confidence-building.

France mentioned the proposal it had made at Madrid for a two-stage conference, dealing first with militarily significant confidence-building measures and later with the reduction of conventional weapons. Turkey saw this proposal as providing an opportunity to deepen the military dimension of detente, through such measures as advance notification of military manoeuvres and troop movements, and mutual military visits to build trust. The United Kingdom, for the EC members, renewed their support for the French proposal as a means of negotiating confidence-building measures binding on the whole of Europe up to the Urals. The proposal was also supported by Denmark and Norway.

Report: "S-G, A/36/343 & Add. 1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/97 H, 9 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 111.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 32-34, 36-38 (19 Oct.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/97 H

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/756) without vote, 20 November (meeting 38): 31 -nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.37): agenda item 55 (e).

Sponsors: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, Viet Nam.

Study on all the aspects of regional disarmament

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/156 D of 12 December 1980 concerning the study on all the aspects of regional disarmament,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General containing the views of Member States on the study:

2. Requests the Secretary-General to submit the Study on All the Aspects of Regional Disarmament and his report containing the views of Member States to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament, so that it may consider their substance and any action on them that may be required.

## Other aspects of disarmament and related matters

### Military budgets

Reduction of military budgets

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION CONSIDERATION. In 1981, the Disarmament Commission continued to consider two aspects of the reduction of military budgets: (a) harmonization of views on concrete steps to be undertaken by States regarding a gradual, agreed reduction of military budgets and reallocation to economic and social development of resources currently being used

for military purposes; and (b) examination and identification of effective ways of achieving agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain military expenditures in a balanced manner, including adequate measures of verification.

Romania and Sweden presented a working paper calling for moderation in States' military expenditures until agreements were concluded on the freezing and reduction of military budgets; the savings would be reallocated for economic and social development.

The Commission established a working group on the subject, which met three times between 28 May and 4 June. In addition, the group's Chairman conducted consultations and, at the request of the group, compiled a background paper containing some principles and ideas put forward by delegations on the freezing and reduction of military expenditures. The paper dealt with such points as the right of States to security, the special responsibility of nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States, release of resources for economic and social development, reporting procedures, verification and the role of the United Nations.

The discussion revealed that no agreement could be reached at that stage on the content of the background paper. Consequently, the Commission agreed to recommend<sup>(1)</sup> to the General Assembly that it be allowed to continue consideration of this question in 1982, with a view to identifying and elaborating the principles that should govern further actions of States in regard to freezing and reduction of military expenditures.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution adopted without vote on 9 December,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly reaffirmed the need to reinforce action regarding reduction of military budgets, and reiterated its appeal that States, in particular the most heavily armed States, pending agreement on reductions, exercise self-restraint in their military expenditures with a view to reallocating the funds thus saved to economic and social development, particularly for developing countries. The Assembly requested the Disarmament Commission to continue consideration of this question in 1982, keeping in mind the possibility of embodying in a suitable document the governing principles for the freezing and reduction of military expenditures. The First Committee approved the text on 20 November, also without vote.

The resolution, sponsored by 14 States, was introduced by Romania, which believed that self-restraint in regard to military budgets would create a favourable climate for negotiations on the subject and would support efforts for

economic and social development and international assistance to developing countries. Subsequently, Romania orally revised the first preambular paragraph of the text by deleting the word "unprecedented" before the phrase "growing military expenditures".

The United States expressed a reservation about the resolution, stating that the need for verification had regrettably been relegated to a position of lesser importance by being placed in the preamble. India explained that it would have abstained had a vote been taken on the text, as it did not believe concepts such as military balance and so-called parity could serve as the basis for measures of arms limitation or disarmament, and they were equally untenable as the basis for reduction of military budgets. Brazil, which supported the resolution, shared the view of India that the reduction of military budgets was first and foremost incumbent on the nuclear-weapon States, which accounted for the bulk of global military expenditures.

In the debate, Bangladesh attached importance to any proposal that would lead to savings from disarmament which could be reallocated for development. Egypt urged the super-Powers, when they resumed their bilateral talks on arms limitation, to consider freezing and then cutting their military expenditures by an agreed amount. Italy believed it would not be excessively difficult to reduce defence expenditures if States could rely on the absolute reciprocity of neighbouring countries, or at least of those countries from which they perceived a potential threat. Nepal supported the development of an international instrument to monitor the reduction of military expenditure, while ensuring verifiability and comparability. Romania urged the immediate conclusion of an agreement to freeze military budgets at the 1981 level, and the adoption by the Assembly, at its 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27), of a declaration of principles governing actions by States to halt and reduce military expenditures. Zambia believed that unilateral reductions of military budgets would contribute to disarmament.

Chile, on the other hand, believed that military budgets could not be reduced as long as international tension persisted and super-Power confrontation became more acute because of the need to curb USSR imperialism. Portugal, while supporting efforts to elaborate principles that could guide States in this area, remarked that effective action which could have a lasting effect on the rise of military expenditures must be directed against the causes that impelled States to increase their military budgets. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, said the approach to military budget reduction should be

based on generally accepted procedures providing for adequate comparability and verification, while safeguarding the right of States to individual and collective self-defence.

In several statements during the Assembly session, the United States criticized what it regarded as a unilateral Soviet arms build-up of great proportions in the 1970s, said its own military expenditures had declined in real terms by 25 per cent since 1968, and called on the USSR to publish data on its military budget and equipment in order to establish a basis for enduring agreements. The USSR, for its part, maintained that by inflating the myth of the Soviet military threat as an ideological underpinning for the build-up of its defence potential, the United States was sharply increasing military appropriations and intended to spend \$1.5 trillion for military purposes in the next five years.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Disarmament Commission, A/36/42.  
Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/82 A, 9 Dec., text following.  
Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 27, 33-36, 38 (19 Oct.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/82 A

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/741) without vote. 20 November (meeting 38): 14-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.38). orally revised: agenda item 40 (a).

Sponsors: Austria, Bangladesh. Ecuador. Indonesia, Ireland, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden, Uruguay.

The General Assembly,

Deeply concerned about the ever-spiralling arms race and growing military expenditures, which constitute a heavy burden for the economies of all nations and have extremely harmful consequences for international peace and security,

Reaffirming the provisions of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, according to which gradual reduction of military budgets on a mutually agreed basis, for example, in absolute figures or in terms of percentage points, particularly by nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States, would be a measure that would contribute to the curbing of the arms race and increase the possibilities of reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries,

Reaffirming that it is possible to achieve continued and systematic reductions in military budgets without affecting the military balance to the detriment of the national security of any State,

Recalling its resolution 34/83 F of 11 December 1979, in which it considered that a new impetus should be given to endeavours to achieve agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain, in a balanced manner, military expenditures, including adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all parties concerned,

Recalling also the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, which provides that during this period renewed efforts should be made to reach agreement on the reduction of military expenditures and the reallocation of resources thus saved to economic and social development especially for the benefit of developing countries,

Recalling further its resolution 35/142 A of 12 December 1980, in which it requested the Disarmament Commission to continue at its session to be held in 1981 the consideration of the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets" and, in

particular, to identify and elaborate on the principles which should govern further actions of States in the field of the freezing and reduction of military expenditures, keeping in mind the possibility of embodying such principles into a suitable document at an appropriate stage,

Having considered the report of the Disarmament Commission on the work accomplished during its session in 1981 and taking into account the proposals and ideas submitted by Member States concerning the principles which should govern further actions of States in the field of the freezing and reduction of military expenditures, and which are contained in the working document annexed to the Commission's report,

Aware of the various proposals submitted by Member States and of the activities carried out so far within the framework of the United Nations in the field of the reduction of military budgets,

Considering that the identification and elaboration of the principles which should govern further actions of States in the field of the freezing and reduction of military budgets and the other current activities within the framework of the United Nations related to the question of the reduction of military budgets should be regarded as having the fundamental objective of reaching international agreements on the reduction of military expenditures,

1. Reaffirms the urgent need to reinforce the endeavours of all States and international action in the area of the reduction of military budgets, with a view to reaching international agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain military expenditures;

2. Reiterates the appeal to all States, in particular the most heavily armed States, pending the conclusion of agreements on the reduction of military expenditures, to exercise self-restraint in their military expenditures with a view to real-locating the funds thus saved to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries;

3. Requests the Disarmament Commission to continue at its session to be held in 1982 the consideration of the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets", taking into account the provisions of General Assembly resolution 35/142 A as well as those of the present resolution and other relevant proposals and ideas, with a view to identifying and elaborating on the principles which should govern further actions of States in the field of the freezing and reduction of military expenditures, keeping in mind the possibility of embodying such principles into a suitable document at an appropriate stage;

4. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets".

#### Reporting procedures for military budgets

In August 1981, the Secretary-General submitted the first of a series of annual reports,<sup>(1)</sup> requested by the General Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> containing information from States on their military expenditures. Of the 21 reporting States, 16 filled out a table, in matrix form, based on a standardized reporting instrument devised in 1980 by the Ad Hoc Panel on Military Budgeting.<sup>(5)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 9 December, by a resolution on the reporting system on military expenditures,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly stressed the need to increase the number of reporting States with a view to the broadest participation from different geographic regions and budgeting systems. It reiterated its recommendation that all Member States make use of the reporting instrument devised in 1980 and report



their military expenditures to the Secretary-General by 30 April of each year. It requested him to examine ways of making the collection and assembling of such data an integral part of the United Nations statistical services, and to arrange and publish the data according to statistical practice.

The resolution was adopted by a non-recorded vote of 120 to none, with 19 abstentions, following the First Committee's approval of the text on 20 November by a recorded vote of 102 to none, with 15 abstentions (Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam, Zambia).

In introducing the resolution, sponsored by 19 States, Sweden stressed the urgent need to reach agreements on the freezing and reduction of military expenditures, asserting that such agreements could be concluded without affecting the military balance to the detriment of any State's security. Sweden further believed that agreements on such measures would have the advantage of imposing constraints, not only on certain kinds of weapons but on all kinds of military activities. However, without generally accepted procedures for comparing military expenditures, it would probably be difficult to arrive at long-lasting and substantial agreements to limit expenditures.

India explained its abstention on the resolution by stating that the reduction of military expenditures could not be based on untenable concepts such as military balance, and that the international reporting system needed further refining before all States could accept it. The USSR, recalling that it had initiated the 1973 Assembly resolution aiming at a 10 per cent reduction of the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council and the allocation of part of the savings to developing countries,<sup>(2)</sup> abstained as it believed the abstract research conducted in recent years by the United Nations was removed from reality and did not serve the cause of reducing military budgets.

Among those voting in favour, the United States said that a certain openness as well as means of verification were necessary in regard to military expenditures and, ultimately, disarmament. Yugoslavia stated that the recommended action could be useful and efficient only if all States used the reporting instrument.

In the First Committee debate, the Federal Republic of Germany reiterated its proposal for a United Nations register of each industrial country's per capita expenditures on armaments

and on development assistance, and regretted that no Eastern State had answered the questionnaire on military budgets. The same regret was voiced by the United Kingdom on behalf of the EC members. Italy mentioned the problems of comparability and verifiability. Portugal, while attaching importance to the principle of the openness of military budgets, pointed out that comparability entailed many practical problems, not only between States having different political and social systems but even between States with similar systems.

Brazil held that nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States should take the lead in utilizing the reporting instrument, thus showing their willingness to reduce their arms expenditures. Egypt remarked that, since the Assembly's 1973 recommendation that the permanent members of the Security Council reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent, global military expenditure had increased tremendously while the Assembly remained engaged in a marginal exercise in accounting and reporting; reductions in military budgets should not depend solely on the comparability of military expenditures.

The socialist States of Eastern Europe did not share the positive assessment of United Nations efforts to set norms for military budget cost accounting; in their view, that exercise tended to obfuscate what they considered the true cause of the continued arms race, namely the lack of political will on the part of some States to undertake genuine disarmament measures. Poland viewed as unfounded the contention that the lack of information about the military efforts of States was one of the main factors contributing to the arms race; it added, on behalf of a number of socialist States, that efforts in the United Nations to collect data on military expenditures and elaborate a military spending comparability system were being used by some to cover up their unwillingness to agree to the reduction of their military expenditures.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/353 & Corr.1,2 & Add.1,2.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>3093 A (XXVIII), 7 Dec. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 13); <sup>(3)</sup>35/142 B, para. 1, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 89); <sup>(4)</sup>36/82 B, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 79.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 27, 33-38 (19 Oct.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/82 B

120-0-19 Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/741) by recorded vote (102-0-15). 20 November (meeting 38); 19-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.39): agenda item 40 (b).

Sponsors: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Romania, Rwanda, Sudan, Sweden.

The General Assembly,

Deeply concerned about the arms race, its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security and its deplorable waste of human and economic resources,

A/armed by present tendencies to increase further the rate of growth of military expenditures,

Considering that gradual reductions of military expenditures on a mutually agreed basis would be a measure that would contribute to curbing the arms race and would increase the possibilities of reallocating resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries,

Convinced that such reductions could and should be carried out on a mutually agreed basis without affecting the military balance to the detriment of the national security of any state.

Reaffirming its conviction that provisions for comparability and verification will have to be basic elements of any agreement to reduce military expenditures,

Recalling the fact that these matters are being studied by the Group of Experts on the Reduction of Military Budgets, established in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 35/142 B of 12 December 1980, and that this Group is expected to submit its report before the second special session of the Assembly devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982,

Recalling further that a standardized system for international reporting of military expenditures has been recommended for use and that the first national reports have been received this year,

Emphasizing the value of a full implementation of such a reporting instrument and of its further refinement as a means to increase confidence between States by contributing to greater openness in military matters, which is particularly important for arriving at international agreements to reduce military expenditures,

Reaffirming also its conviction that the reporting of military data and the examination of problems concerning comparability and verification have the fundamental objective of making possible the conclusion of international agreements to reduce military expenditures,

Taking note with appreciation of the first report of the Secretary-General on these matters,

Considering that the activities related to the reporting of military expenditures as well as to the questions of comparability and verification and other current activities within the framework of the United Nations related to the question of the reduction of military budgets should be regarded as having the fundamental objective of reaching international agreements on the reduction of military expenditures,

1. Stresses the need to increase the number of reporting States with a view to the broadest possible participation from different geographic regions and representing different budgeting systems;

2. Reiterates its recommendation that all Member States should make use of the reporting instrument and report annually, by 30 April, to the Secretary-General their military expenditures of the latest fiscal year for which data are available;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to examine ways and means to make the collection and assembling of data on military expenditures, reported by States on the basis of the reporting instrument, an integral part of the regular United Nations statistical services and to arrange and publish these data according to statistical practice;

4. Also requests the Secretary-General to include these matters in his next annual report on military budgets to the General Assembly.

### Indian Ocean as a zone of peace

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN. In 1981, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean held two sessions, from 17 February

to 6 March and from 1 to 19 June, as a preparatory committee for the projected Conference on the Indian Ocean; a regular session from 17 to 28 August; and additional meetings between 21 October and 16 November to conclude its work for the year. All 50 meetings were held at United Nations Headquarters.

At its preparatory sessions, the Committee sought unsuccessfully to harmonize views on issues related to the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean and the political and security climate in the region. In its report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee stated that two broad views had emerged during the debate on dates for the Conference, which the Assembly had decided in 1979 to convene during 1981.<sup>(5)</sup> A large number of Committee members favoured convening the Conference in 1981 as scheduled. While conceding that further harmonization of views was preferable, they felt that complete harmonization of views was not essential since the Conference itself would be a stage in the process of reaching the objective of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, and that the grave deterioration of the political and security climate in the area compelled the urgent convening of the Conference. Other members, however, considered it premature to set the dates, believing that adequate progress had to be made on the harmonization of views before a Conference could be convened. These members felt that a Conference convened in the current adverse political and security climate in the area would be unlikely to succeed and would therefore jeopardize the eventual realization of the concept of a zone of peace there.

The Committee concluded that, while there was agreement on the need to hold the Conference, the question of setting a new date was open. It was also noted that the Committee's mandate should be maintained unless there was a consensus for changing it. Some members did not believe that this estimation accurately reflected the range of views expressed in the Committee.

Following discussion at its regular session in August, the Committee approved on 16 November a draft resolution for adoption by the Assembly, proposing the renewal of the Committee's mandate and requesting the Committee to make efforts to accomplish the preparatory work for the Conference, including consideration of convening it not later than the first half of 1983 (p.94).

On the Committee's recommendation, the Assembly President, on 5 March, appointed Thailand, which had applied for membership the previous year, as the forty-sixth member of the Committee. The Committee reached no consensus on

membership applications from Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Hungary, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Swaziland and Viet Nam.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 9 December, the General Assembly adopted without vote the resolution recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. By this text, the Assembly expressed regret at the lack of consensus on the dates for the Conference on the Indian Ocean and emphasized its decision to convene the Conference. It requested the Committee to continue work on the harmonization of views on remaining issues related to convening the Conference and to make every effort to accomplish the preparatory work for the Conference, including consideration of its convening not later than the first half of 1983. Renewing the Committee's mandate, the Assembly requested it to hold six weeks of meetings in 1982, including a meeting outside New York at a place to be decided. The First Committee approved the text on 25 November, also without vote.

In a resolution on strengthening international security,<sup>(5)</sup> also adopted on 9 December, the Assembly reiterated its support for its 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace,<sup>(2)</sup> expressed hope that the Conference would be held no later than the first half of 1983 and called on all States to contribute to the Conference's success.

The First Committee debate saw a reiteration of the divergence of opinion between those who thought the Conference should be convened as soon as possible, without awaiting further harmonization of views, and those who believed that the political and security climate in the area militated against the early convening of the Conference.

Among those which favoured an early Conference, India said it would have preferred a resolution more appropriately reflecting the concerns of the littoral and hinterland States of the area but joined the consensus in the hope that the Ad Hoc Committee would be able to complete preparations to convene the Conference well before the first half of 1983; setting pre-conditions with regard to harmonization of views or the political and security climate in the Indian Ocean area were merely pretexts to kill the proposal for a conference. Seychelles expressed reservations with regard to the paragraph mentioning 1983; it felt that arguments about the need to harmonize views and faulty and outmoded declarations harboured ill-intentioned manoeuvres, and that the Conference should be held during the first half of 1982.

Sri Lanka observed that the non-aligned countries did not expect the Conference to establish overnight a viable and effective zone of peace in

the Indian Ocean; they could not understand the argument that insecurity and instability in the area necessitated postponement. Support for an early Conference was also voiced by Afghanistan, the Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Indonesia, Oman, Uganda and Yemen.

Madagascar, stating that complete agreement need not be achieved before the Conference, asserted that its joining the consensus on the resolution did not signify its acceptance of the argument that the Afghanistan situation justified postponement; it added that 30 positive replies had been received to its invitation to a summit meeting in Tananarive to draw up a convention on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, as a complementary measure to the projected United Nations Conference. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Uganda supported the Madagascar initiative. Democratic Yemen mentioned that it had taken an initiative at the beginning of 1981 to convene a summit conference for the Gulf, the Horn of Africa and other concerned countries, to discuss measures to dismantle foreign bases.

Afghanistan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam said the United States and its allies were impeding the work of the Ad Hoc Committee and working against the convening of the Conference. Iran questioned why States which did not fully agree with the Ad Hoc Committee's mandate or which blocked its work were participating in that body. Pakistan believed the Committee should start substantive discussion on the principles of agreement to be adopted at the Conference, in elaboration of the 1971 Declaration. Rwanda called for an end to the presence of a foreign military force in the area which had promoted manoeuvres that had prevented the convening of the Conference. The Sudan said the manoeuvring in the Ad Hoc Committee was not in keeping with the security interests of the countries in the region or with their need for peace, free from the threats posed by the bases and fleets of the world Powers. Yemen stated that the pre-conditions set by certain Western countries for convening the Conference were an attempt to impose a fait accompli and make the area a field for military rivalry.

China favoured the earliest possible convening of the Conference but said such action was being impeded by the hegemonism, aggression and expansion practised in the region by the super-Powers, one of which had occupied a hinterland State of the Indian Ocean and thus undermined the climate of trust necessary for convening the Conference. Malaysia, while stressing the need for a spirit of compromise between the super-Powers to narrow the divergence of views, called on the littoral and hinterland States to exercise

restraint and responsibility and act in a manner consistent with the spirit of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean. Nepal felt that the current military build-up and rivalry in the area could only worsen the situation.

Afghanistan said the peoples of Asia were being endangered by stepped-up militaristic activities of the United States, including the building of facilities for the rapid deployment force and the expansion of the naval and air force bases on Diego Garcia. Iraq called on the major Powers to dismantle their military bases in the area, particularly the Diego Garcia base, and referred to threats by successive United States administrations to use so-called rapid deployment forces, particularly against the oil-producing countries of the area.

Oman hoped that foreign forces which had invaded land near the Ocean would withdraw and that foreign military presence and the desire for hegemony would be ended. Somalia said that regional instability had been increased by a super-Power's military intervention in a local conflict in the Horn of Africa, its introduction of surrogate forces there, its establishment of naval bases and a strong military presence in a littoral State, and its military occupation of Afghanistan.

Canada, Japan, the United States and the EC members questioned the validity of the existing concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, and called for a change in the Ad Hoc Committee's mandate to enable it to explore elements for a zone of peace and facilitate co-operation within the region as well as with outside Powers. The United States pointed out that it had never accepted the 1971 Declaration, which it regarded as faulty and outmoded, inconsistent with the right of States to individual and collective self-defence, and difficult to reconcile with freedom of navigation; the United States future participation in the Ad Hoc Committee would be guided by the ability of that body to continue to operate on the basis of consensus. France and the United States also cited their reservations about the reference to the Declaration when explaining their position on the 9 December resolution on strengthening international security.

The suggestion for widening the established concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace was supported by Canada, Japan and the Netherlands. Canada saw a need for accompanying measures designed to improve regional trust and confidence, as well as a broader framework that would contribute to removing such causes of tension as poverty, lack of mutual comprehension and inequality of individual rights. The Netherlands suggested that provisions for economic co-operation and assistance should complement a declaration setting down rules of conduct be-

tween States of the region and others, based on non-interference in internal affairs.

Australia found it difficult to imagine how a conference on the Indian Ocean could succeed when a non-aligned hinterland State of the region had been invaded and continued to be occupied by the military forces of a major Power whose co-operation would be essential to creating a zone of peace. Similarly, Japan and the United Kingdom, the latter speaking for the EC members, considered it inappropriate to convene a conference while Afghanistan continued to be occupied by foreign troops and in the absence of any real progress in the harmonization of views on many fundamental issues. France hoped the Ad Hoc Committee would make substantive progress in 1982, particularly in harmonizing views on the Conference's goals, so that its convening might not be deferred indefinitely.

Ethiopia and India disagreed with objections to the zone of peace concept for the Indian Ocean, remarking that the 1971 Declaration reflected the interests and aspirations of the littoral and hinterland States.

Czechoslovakia supported the efforts of the regional States to establish a zone of peace and liquidate foreign military bases. The German Democratic Republic held that the Conference would ease tensions and opposed attempts to prevent its convening. The USSR, asserting that States should refrain from imposing pre-conditions for convening the Conference, said the United States was using the events in Afghanistan as a pretext to justify introducing its military, naval and air forces into the region; the USSR was ready to discuss, in international negotiations, the situation around Afghanistan, either together with the problem of ensuring security in the Gulf area or separately.

Albania dissociated itself from the consensus on the resolution and reiterated its disapproval of the concept of zones of peace, on the ground that there could not be islands of peace in an ocean of armament and war practices resulting from super-Power policies.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Indian Ocean, A/36/29.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2832(XXVI), 16 Dec. 1971 (YUN 1971, p. 34); <sup>(3)</sup>34/80 B, para. 3, 11 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 67); <sup>(4)</sup>36/90, 9 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/102, para. 12, 9 Dec. (p. 145).

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.5/36/72/Add.1; 5th Committee report, A/36/803; S-G statements, A/C.1/36/L.56, A/C.5/36/72. Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr-1, 4-10, 12-26, 34-38, 44 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.67 (8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/90

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/750) without vote. 25 November (meeting 44); draft by Committee on Indian Ocean (A/36/29); agenda item 49.

### Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace

The General Assembly,

Recalling the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, contained in its resolution 2832(XXVI) of 16 December 1971, and recalling also its resolutions 2992(XXVII) of 15 December 1972, 3080(XXVIII) of 6 December 1973, 3259 A (XXIX) of 9 December 1974, 3468(XXX) of 11 December 1975, 31/88 of 14 December 1976, 32/86 of 12 December 1977, S-10/2 of 30 June 1978, 33/68 of 14 December 1978, 34/80 A and B of 11 December 1979 and 35/150 of 12 December 1980, and other relevant resolutions,

Recalling a/s/o that at its tenth special session, the first special session devoted to disarmament, it stated that the establishment of zones of peace in various regions of the world under appropriate conditions to be clearly defined and determined freely by the States concerned in the zone, taking into account the characteristics of the zone and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and in conformity with international law, can contribute to strengthening the security of States within such zones and to international peace and security as a whole,

Recalling further the report of the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean,

Reaffirming its conviction that concrete action for the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace would be a substantial contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security,

Recalling its decision, taken at the thirty-fourth session in resolution 34/80 B, to convene a Conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo during 1981,

Recalling further its decision, at the thirty-fifth session in resolution 35/150, to make every effort, in consideration of the political and security climate in the Indian Ocean area, particularly recent developments, as well as the progress made in the harmonization of views, to finalize, in accordance with its normal methods of work, all preparations for the Conference, including the dates for its convening,

Recalling the exchange of varied views in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and noting that, while progress has been made, a number of issues remain to be resolved,

Noting the exchange of views on the adverse political and security climate in the region,

Noting that the Ad Hoc Committee has failed to reach consensus on the dates for the convening, during 1981, of the Conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo,

Convinced that the continued military presence of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean area, conceived in the context of their confrontation, gives urgency to the need to take practical steps for the early achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace,

Considering that all other foreign military presence in the area, whenever it is contrary to the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, gives even greater urgency to the need to take practical steps towards the early achievement of the objectives of the Declaration,

Considering a/s/o that the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean requires the active participation of and full co-operation among the littoral and hinterland States, the permanent members of the Security Council and major maritime users to ensure conditions of peace and security based on the purposes and principles of the Charter as well as the general principles of international law,

Considering further that the creation of a zone of peace requires co-operation and agreement among the States of the region to ensure conditions of peace and security within the area, as envisaged in the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, and respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the littoral and hinterland States,

Calling for the renewal of genuinely constructive efforts through the exercise of the political will necessary for the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace,

Deeply concerned at the danger posed by the grave and ominous developments in the area and the resulting sharp deterioration of peace, security and stability which particularly seriously affect the littoral and hinterland States, as well as international peace and security,

Convinced that the continued deterioration of the political and security climate in the Indian Ocean area is an important consideration bearing on the question of the early convening of the Conference and that the easing of tension in the area would enhance the prospect of success being achieved by the Conference,

1. Takes note of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and the exchange of views in the Committee;

2. Regrets that the Ad Hoc Committee has failed to reach consensus on the finalization of dates for the convening, during 1981, of the Conference on the Indian Ocean;

3. Emphasizes its decision to convene the Conference at Colombo as a necessary step for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, adopted in 1971;

4. Emphasizes a/s/o, in pursuance of this decision and in consideration of the political and security climate in the Indian Ocean area, its decision to request the Ad Hoc Committee to continue its efforts for the necessary harmonization of views on the remaining issues related to the convening of the Conference;

5. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee to continue its work on the necessary harmonization of views on the relevant issues, including those set forth in paragraph 4 above, and to make every effort to accomplish the necessary preparatory work for the Conference, including consideration of its convening not later than the first half of 1983;

6. Renews the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee as defined in the relevant resolutions;

7. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee to hold further sessions in 1982 of a total duration of six weeks, including the holding of a meeting at a venue outside New York to be decided upon;

8. Requests the Ad Hoc committee to submit to the General Assembly, at its second special session devoted to disarmament and at its thirty-seventh session, reports on its work and on the implementation of the present resolution;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to render all necessary assistance to the Ad Hoc Committee, including the provision of summary records.

### Disarmament and development

STUDY BY THE GROUP OF EXPERTS. The Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, appointed by the Secretary-General at the request of the General Assembly at its 1978 special session on disarmament,<sup>(4)</sup> submitted its study<sup>(1)</sup> on 3 September 1981. The 27-member Group held 10 sessions between September 1978 and August 1981, of which all three sessions in 1981 were held at Geneva: 19 to 30 January, 21 April to 1 May and 17 to 28 August.

In presenting the study to the Assembly, the Secretary-General pointed out that, while the observations and recommendations contained in the report were those of the experts, he considered it to be an important attempt by the international community to investigate thoroughly the proposition that a balanced and generally acceptable pattern of global economic and social development was inextricably related to disarmament.

The study contained six substantive chapters: framework and scope of the relationship between disarmament and development; present-day utilization of resources for military purposes; economic and social effects of a continuing arms race and of the implementation of disarmament measures; conversion and redeployment of resources released from military purposes through disarmament measures to economic and social development purposes; possible institutional measures for international reallocation of resources from armaments to development; and summary, conclusions and recommendations.

The Group argued that the arms race had developed into a threat to the security of nations and that failure to control it was likely to be associated with a vicious circle of confrontation and mutual denial, with declining prospects for mutually advantageous economic co-operation and shrinking options for all nations.

The Group stated that steadily high or increasing military outlays were likely to have a depressing effect on economic growth, directly through displacement of investment and indirectly through constraints on productivity resulting from insufficient research and development in the civilian sector. While identifying inflation-stimulating and employment-depressing consequences of military expenditures in the developed countries of East and West, the experts observed that the developing countries were the worst affected victims of an adverse strategic environment dominated by the seemingly endless arms race. On the other hand, diversion to developing countries of a part of any resources released by disarmament would substantially improve their gross domestic product, industrial employment and capital stock, and provide significant economic gains for all regions, including the most developed.

In the experts' view, the opportunity to apply science and technology more directly and systematically to economic and social problems was one of the most important dividends of disarmament. They saw a need to plan for conversion from military to civilian production by thinking through the problems that would be faced by workers, industries and communities.

The Group of Experts unanimously adopted nine specific recommendations. It called on Governments to: assess the nature and magnitude of the economic and social costs attributable to their military preparations; identify and publicize the benefits to be derived from reallocating military resources, in a balanced and verifiable manner, to address national and global economic and social problems; compile and disseminate systematically data on the military use of human and material resources and military transfers, so

as to avoid having excessive secrecy and the arms race reinforce each other; facilitate the conversion to civilian purposes of resources freed by disarmament; and consider making available to the General Assembly the results of their experiences and preparations for solving conversion problems.

The Group also suggested: incorporation of the disarmament-development perspective into the activities of the United Nations system, with the help of co-ordination initiatives by the Secretary-General; consideration of the establishment of an international disarmament fund for development; and increased emphasis by United Nations organs and agencies, in their disarmament-related public information activities, on the social and economic consequences of the arms race and the corresponding benefits of disarmament.

Introducing to the First Committee the report of the Group of Experts, its Chairman, Inga Thorsson, Under-Secretary of State in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden, said the study documented the fact that at least 50 million people were directly or indirectly engaged in military activities world-wide, including some 25 million in armed forces, 10 million in paramilitary forces, an estimated 500,000 scientists and engineers in research and development for military purposes, and at least 5 million workers directly engaged in the production of weapons and other specialized military equipment. She added that, according to conservative estimates, global industrial production for military purposes in 1980 amounted to more than \$127 billion, 95 per cent of which was in industrialized countries; that some 20 per cent of the world's scientists and engineers were engaged in military work, at a cost of some \$35 billion in 1980; and that virtually all such research and development took place in the industrialized countries, 85 per cent in the United States and the USSR. World-wide military expenditures by 1981 would exceed \$520 billion, representing 6 per cent of world output, roughly equal to the value of all investment capital in the developing countries.

Mrs. Thorsson cited the Group's estimate that the international arms trade comprised more than \$35 billion annually, 75 per cent of which represented imports by developing countries. Five Middle East countries had accounted for over one third of all major weapons imported by developing countries in the period 1977-1980. On the supplier side, the United States, the USSR, France and the United Kingdom had accounted for 80 per cent of the cumulative value of arms exports in 1974-1978.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution on the study on the relationship between

disarmament and development,<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly commended the report, its conclusions and recommendations to the attention of all Member States and invited them to submit their views. The Assembly also decided to transmit the report for action at its 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27) as well as to the Committee on Disarmament, and recommended that it be taken into account in future disarmament negotiations. Governments were asked to distribute the report widely, having it translated into their national languages where appropriate, and specialized agencies and national and non-governmental organizations were invited to use their facilities to make the report widely known.

The Assembly adopted the resolution on 9 December without vote. The First Committee approved the text in like manner on 24 November.

Sponsored by 31 States, the resolution was introduced by Sweden, which pledged to cooperate in efforts to establish a public and governmental awareness of the relationship between disarmament and development so that action could be taken at the proper moment.

Brazil asserted that the study was the subject of innumerable reservations by some of the major Powers, which did not agree with the report's treatment of the pressing issues of disarmament. Belgium, France and the Federal Republic of Germany indicated that they had reservations on some methodological shortcomings and on some of the substance of the study, though France hoped the study would help promote the French proposal for a disarmament fund for development. The United Kingdom regretted that the study had not been produced on a consensus basis, that the Group had voted on amendments to the text and that the report failed to give a clear picture of the Warsaw Pact countries due to insufficient data. Japan believed a number of the report's suggestions should be considered in depth and said it would be pleased if more resources could be released through disarmament resulting from the collective will of all States.

Poland-speaking also for Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR-stated that the report drew correct conclusions but it underestimated the positive significance of agreements on strategic arms limitation, should have tied any international disarmament fund for development to military budget reductions and contained the unfounded contention that lack of information about the military efforts of States was a main factor in the arms race. The USSR regretted that its expert's viewpoint had not been duly

reflected in the report because the members of the Group had been given little time to study the final draft and propose amendments.

In the First Committee debate, many developing countries noted with special satisfaction that the study had projected the disarmament-development relationship as being of mutual benefit to both developed and developing countries. Algeria described the study as a timely reminder of the tragedy of a world working on its own destruction through unacceptable waste of resources while blind to any serious solution for its socio-economic problems. Bangladesh noted with satisfaction that the Second Disarmament Decade had been proclaimed almost simultaneously with the declaration of the 1980s as the Third United Nations Development Decade. Ghana viewed the study as confirming that disarmament and the reallocation of released resources to socio-economic development was no longer just a moral issue but an inescapable international obligation.

The Congo remarked that \$20 billion of the \$550 billion spent annually for military purposes would be enough to resolve most of the world's economic and social problems. Making a similar point, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya observed that 5 per cent of the world's annual military expenditure would have been sufficient to attain the official development assistance targets set forth in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade (1980-1990).<sup>(5)</sup>

Angola noted that even developing countries which could least afford it were building arsenals beyond their legitimate defence requirements and at the expense of their people's need for food, education and employment. Nigeria remarked that the pattern of conventional arms transfer to the third world and the consequent lopsided distribution of scarce resources to armaments constituted a disservice to the order of national priorities and a flight from realities. Rwanda observed that arms producers and merchants had found a fertile field in exporting to third world countries weapons far in excess of their needs.

In Canada's view, the study had shown that military spending wasted resources, did not generate capital assets and promoted inflation. Ecuador, too, spoke of the economic effects of arms expenditure at the rate of more than \$1 million a minute, including inflation, international trade disturbances and distortion of economic principles. Kenya remarked that the arms race did not provide more jobs; in fact, there was ample evidence that it prevented more jobs from being provided. Noting that the military spending of developing countries had nearly doubled

during the past decade, Ireland said it was tragic that scarce resources were squandered on increasingly sophisticated weapons when a fraction of the cost could achieve so much if diverted to alleviating hunger and disease. The world could arm itself to death, said Trinidad and Tobago, or it could use resources in more productive and beneficial directions; it could not do both.

The United States said that during the entire quarter of a century from 1954 to 1979, the USSR had disbursed only \$8 billion in economic assistance to developing countries, while the United States had extended approximately \$100 billion; further, the USSR recognized that much of its political influence in the developing countries derived from its role as an arms peddler.

CONSIDERATION BY OTHER UN BODIES. At its 1981 session (New York, 23 March-1 April), the Committee for Development Planning declared<sup>(2)</sup> that the rising levels of armaments expenditures not only threatened the security of mankind but also represented a serious economic burden, by increasing inflationary pressures and the burden of public expenditure at a time when less inflationary forms of public expenditure—which generated more employment and contributed directly to community and family welfare—were being sharply cut back. The Committee considered it the duty of all nations to seek ways of reducing the tensions and distrust which occasioned that disastrous course.

The Group of Governmental Experts to Study the Institutional Arrangements relating to the Process of Disarmament (p. 105) recommended in July that the Secretary-General submit, at the Assembly's 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27), proposals on possible institutional implications for the United Nations in regard to the relationship between disarmament and development.

The Trade and Development Board of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), after hearing a statement by the UNCTAD observer at the meetings of the Group of Experts on disarmament and development, decided on 9 October<sup>(3)</sup> to consider at its twenty-fifth (1982) session the future UNCTAD activity in this area in the light of the recommendations of the 1982 special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>The Relationship between Disarmament and Development. Disarmament Study Series 5 (A/36/356 & Corr.1), Sales No. E.82.IX.1.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27; <sup>(3)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>S-10/2, para. 94, 30 June 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 45); <sup>(5)</sup>35/56, annex, sect. II, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 505); <sup>(6)</sup>36/92 G, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10. 12-26, 27, 34, 36, 38, 39, 42 (19 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/92 G

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) without vote, 24 November (meeting 42); 31 - nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.21); agenda item 51 (d).

Sponsors: Austria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

#### Study on the relationship between disarmament and development

The General Assembly,

Recalling paragraph 94 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, in which it decided to undertake a study on the relationship between disarmament and development and requested the Secretary-General to carry out the study with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental experts,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General containing the study,

1. Welcomes with satisfaction the report of the Secretary-General and the study contained therein;

2. Expresses its thanks to the Secretary-General and to the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, as well as to the Governments, international organizations and non-governmental organizations that have rendered assistance in the preparation of the report;

3. Commends the report, its conclusions and its recommendations to the attention of all Member States;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for the reproduction of the report as a United Nations publication and to give it the widest possible distribution;

5. Invites all Member States to inform the Secretary-General, not later than 15 April 1982, of their views regarding the report and, in particular, its recommendations;

6. Decides to transmit the report to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament for its substantive consideration and appropriate action;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the report to the Committee on Disarmament and recommends that it be taken into account in future disarmament negotiations;

8. Notes with appreciation that arrangements have been made for the preparation of a short version of the report aimed at a mass audience;

9. Recommends to all Governments the widest possible distribution of the report, including, where appropriate, its translation into their national languages, so as to acquaint public opinion in their countries with its content, and invites specialized agencies and national and non-governmental organizations to use their facilities to make the report widely known.

#### Disarmament and international security

STUDY BY THE GROUP OF EXPERTS. The Group of Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and International Security, consisting of 10 persons appointed by the Secretary-General pursuant to a 1978 request by the General Assembly,<sup>(5)</sup> submitted the results of its three-year study on 6 November 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> The Group held nine sessions between June 1979 and November 1981, the last four of which were in 1981: at Geneva, 30 March to 10 April and



29 June to 17 July, and New York, 17 to 28 August and 2 to 6 November. The Chairman was Carlos P. Romulo, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines.

The study consisted of seven chapters, on the following aspects: the detrimental consequences of the arms race; analysis of the interrelationship of disarmament and international security; the process of disarmament and international security; detente and international co-operation as means of strengthening international security and promoting disarmament; the relationship between specific disarmament measures and international security; disarmament, international security and the role of the United Nations system in the maintenance of peace and the implementation of the system of international legal order and security; and conclusions.

The study stressed the importance of consolidating and expanding detente, strengthening international co-operation in all aspects, making decisive progress towards the elimination of underdevelopment and oppression, creating more equitable international relations, and achieving just and peaceful settlements of outstanding conflicts.

Stating that ways had to be found for States to protect their security without engaging in an arms race, the Group suggested two interrelated approaches, to be pursued in parallel, for achieving security without reliance on armaments: agreements among States for mutual regulation, limitation and reduction of armaments and armed forces; and collective arrangements, such as a system based on United Nations organs and bodies, primarily the Security Council with its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and its mandate for taking enforcement action if necessary.

The study also pointed out that, in order to create an effective system of collective security, the United Nations system should be used more consistently than in the past and that it was important to increase the confidence of States in the readiness of the Security Council for effective and prompt action.

One member of the Group, Zenon Rossides, from Cyprus, submitted what he termed a complementary set of conclusions and recommendations on the study.<sup>(2)</sup>

Also on the question of disarmament and international security, the Secretary-General submitted a report,<sup>(3)</sup> in compliance with a 1980 Assembly recommendation<sup>(6)</sup> that United Nations organs responsible for peace and security should consider requirements for halting the arms race and developing modalities for the effective application of the system of international security provided for in the Charter of the United

Nations. In the report, he stated that he had seized every opportunity to reiterate the need for halting the arms race and developing modalities for applying such a security system.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 9 December 1981,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Assembly called on States to act promptly in implementing its 1980 resolution on disarmament and international security,<sup>(6)</sup> which would render effective the decisions of the Security Council and thereby be conducive to meaningful disarmament negotiations. The Assembly deemed it necessary that the Council take measures towards implementing Chapter VII of the Charter (on threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression), which would reinforce the foundations of peace, security and order through the United Nations and avert the growing threat of nuclear conflagration. The Assembly took this action by a recorded vote of 132 to none, with 11 abstentions, following approval by the First Committee on 25 November by a recorded vote of 114 to none, with 9 abstentions.

By another resolution adopted on the same date,<sup>(8)</sup> the Assembly noted with satisfaction the study prepared by the Secretary-General with the assistance of the Group of Experts, commended it to all Member States and invited them to inform him of their views. The study and the views of States would be transmitted to the Assembly at its 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27). This resolution was adopted without vote following its approval by the First Committee in similar fashion on 24 November.

The first of these resolutions was sponsored in the First Committee by 12 States after an original draft submitted by Cyprus had been revised, mainly in its preamble, to gain wider acceptance. Before the vote, the draft was further revised orally by Cyprus on behalf of the sponsors, so that paragraph 2 referred to the implementation of Chapter VII of the Charter as a whole rather than of Article 43 only, as had been the case in the original version. (Article 43 concerns agreements for making available to the Security Council armed forces and facilities for the maintenance of peace and security.)

Introducing this resolution, Cyprus stated that the sponsors were convinced that progress on arms reduction required first a halt to the arms race, which could not be done while the doctrine of deterrence and strategic balance were regarded as the sole means of security. The alternative was to develop the measures and modalities for collective security mandated by the Charter. The resolution was aimed at stimulating co-operation among Security Council members, particularly the permanent members, in implementing the Charter system of international security.

The second resolution, on the study, was sponsored by Cyprus, Ecuador and the Philippines. Introducing the text, the Philippines referred to a parallelism between disarmament and international security, observing that most members of the Group of Experts had endorsed the view that there could not be substantial progress in one area without progress in the other. It had been recognized that, as a first step towards the parallel achievement of substantial measures of international security and of disarmament, progress would be required in the development of detente and confidence-building measures.

Canada and Japan, while voting in favour of the first resolution, objected to the fifth preambular paragraph, which stated that the arms race could not be stopped as long as the concepts of balance of weapons or of deterrence continued to be regarded as the sole means of security; Canada remarked that arms reduction agreements could be negotiated while maintaining prudent deterrent capability. Italy abstained because of this paragraph.

In the view of Cyprus, the study's conclusions were incomplete and inadequate, and did not reflect the two essential elements for peace and security and their interrelationship, identified in the Final Document of the 1978 special session on disarmament:<sup>(4)</sup> genuine and lasting peace could be created only through effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter and the speedy and substantial reduction of armaments and armed forces.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community (EC) members, asserted that some points in the report might not be entirely satisfactory to those States; their position would be communicated to the Secretary-General in accordance with the terms of the resolution. The United States said it had not had time to analyse the study.

Commenting on issues of disarmament and security, the Philippines warned against four false assumptions: that increased armament meant increased security, that delaying negotiations in order to build more military strength would result in a better outcome, that disarmament would in itself provide security, and that States would disarm without a workable and proven system for maintaining peace and security. Lebanon hoped the Assembly would take up at its forthcoming special session the proposal Lebanon had submitted at the 1978 special session - that small States whose stability was affected by external rivalries should have their neutrality internationally guaranteed and should be protected by a permanent United Nations peace-keeping force.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Relationship between Disarmament and International Security, Disarmament Study Series 8 (A/36/597), Sales No. E.82.IX.4.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Conclusions and recommendations by Zenon Rossides, A/C.1/36/17; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/612.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>S-10/2, para. 13, 30 June 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 40); <sup>(5)</sup>33/91 I, 16 Dec. 1978 (ibid., p. 119); <sup>(6)</sup>35/156 J, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 101); <sup>(7)</sup>36/97 K, 9 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(8)</sup>36/97 L, 9 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 36, 38, 41, 44 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/97 K

132-0-11 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/756) by recorded vote (114-O-9), 25 November (meeting 44); 12-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.45/Rev.1), orally revised; agenda item 55 (i).

Sponsors: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Kenya, Niger, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Yugoslavia.

#### Disarmament and international security

The General Assembly,  
Recalling its resolutions 34/83 A of 11 December 1979 and 35/156 J of 12 December 1980.

Alarmed by the present grave state of international affairs characterized by marked deterioration in the relationship between the major military Powers, which seriously jeopardizes the process of detente and results in the flaring up of new, and in the continuation of old, conflicts in various parts of the world,

Deeply concerned over the long stagnation in the disarmament process, the intensification of the arms race, both quantitative and qualitative, and the increased threat of a nuclear conflagration,

Convinced that to achieve progress on the reduction of arms and armaments, the arms race must first be stopped,

Convinced further that the arms race cannot be stopped as long as the concepts of balance of weapons or of deterrence continue to be regarded as the sole means for the security of nations,

Aware that the best hope for arresting the pernicious spiral of the arms race is by the provision of alternative means of security for nations rather than through reliance on the balance of armaments or of deterrence,

Aware further that the rational alternative means for such security is to move towards a halt in the arms race by developing in a parallel way the measures and modalities for collective security as mandatorily required by the Charter of the United Nations,

Recalling paragraph 13 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, in which it is stated that genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces by international agreement and mutual example,

Considering that it is of essential importance to create a climate of confidence in the United Nations which will open the way to co-operation among Member States, in fulfilling the common and basic obligations under the Charter,

Noting with satisfaction the references to statements made by representatives of a number of Member States, including the two major Powers, in the First Committee during the current session of the Assembly, indicating positive attitudes towards effective use of the United Nations in improving the international situation and preventing war,

Reaffirming its resolution 35/156 J, adopted by consensus, in which, inter alia, it recommended that the main organs of the United Nations responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security should give early consideration to the requirements for halting the arms race, particularly

the nuclear-arms race, and developing the modalities for the effective application of the system of international security provided for in the Charter,

Reiterating its request to the permanent members of the Security Council to facilitate the work of the Council towards carrying out this essential responsibility under the Charter,

1. Calls upon all States to take prompt action for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/156 J, which would render effective the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the charter of the United Nations and thereby be conducive to meaningful disarmament negotiations;

2. Deems it necessary, as a first step in this direction, that the Security Council take the required measures towards the implementation of Chapter VII of the Charter, which would reinforce the foundations of peace, security and order through the United Nations and avert the growing threat of nuclear conflagration.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In Favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, China, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

General Assembly resolution 36/97 L

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/756) without vote, 24 November (meeting 41); 3-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.46); agenda item 55 (f).

Sponsors: Cyprus, Ecuador, Philippines.

#### Study on the relationship between disarmament and international security

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 32/87 C of 12 December 1977, in which it requested the Secretary-General to initiate a study on the relationship between disarmament and international security,

Recalling also paragraph 97 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, in which it requested the Secretary-General, with the assistance of consultant experts appointed by him, to continue the study on the relationship between disarmament and international security,

Recalling further its resolutions 34/83 A of 11 December 1979, by which it took note of the progress report of the Secretary-General, as well as resolution 35/156 E of 12 December 1980, in which it requested the Secretary-General to submit the final report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General transmitting the study prepared by the Group of Experts between Disarmament and International Security,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the study on the relationship between disarmament and international security;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General and the Group of Experts which assisted him in the preparation of the study;

3. Commends the study and its conclusions to the attention of all Member States;

4. Invites all Member States to inform the Secretary-General, not later than 15 April 1982, of their views regarding the study;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for the reproduction of the study as a United Nations publication and to give it the widest possible distribution;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the study, together with the views of Member States, to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982.

#### Confidence-building measures

STUDY BY THE GROUP OF EXPERTS. The Group of Governmental Experts on Confidence-building Measures, consisting of 14 experts appointed by the Secretary-General in response to a 1979 request by the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> submitted its unanimously adopted study to the Secretary-General on 14 August 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> Of the four sessions the Group held in 1980 and 1981, two were in 1981, in New York from 26 May to 5 June and at Geneva from 3 to 14 August. Gerhard Pfeiffer of the Federal Republic of Germany chaired the Group.

Among the issues considered in the study were the characteristics of and opportunities for confidence-building measures, a historical survey of their evolution, principles to be considered in the establishment and implementation of such measures, various approaches to negotiating and eventually implementing them, and the role of the United Nations in the process.

A foreword by the Secretary-General defined the aims of confidence-building measures as strengthening peace and security and fostering a climate of trust and international co-operation in order to facilitate progress in disarmament. An illustrative list in the report divided such measures into two categories: military and security-related measures (including information exchange and publication, notification of military activities, reduction of military budgets, personnel exchanges and visits, consultation, establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace, verification, improved communication and dispute settlement) and broader political, economic and social measures (including respect for State sovereignty and territory, termination of aggressive and colonialist policies, respect for human rights and for sovereignty over natural resources, international economic co-operation and joint economic development projects).

The Group stated that measures for building confidence and facilitating disarmament negotiations were urgently needed in the light of a serious deterioration in international relations. The

study emphasized measures related to military concerns, as these made up the bulk of proposals made by Governments. Among causes of mistrust and fear, it noted, were a lack of reliable information on the military activities of States and matters related to mutual security.

However, the Group recognized that international confidence could not be achieved through the building of military confidence alone and that political, economic and social efforts were also needed. Moreover, confidence-building measures could not replace disarmament and hence should not be used as a pretext for avoiding real progress in arms control or even legitimizing a continuing arms build-up. Although all experts agreed in principle on the need for an exchange of information on military activities and mutual security matters, there were differences of view concerning the degree of openness necessary for building confidence.

The experts concluded that the United Nations could help promote governmental and public awareness of the value of confidence-building measures for the strengthening of peace and security. It might be useful if the Secretary-General kept a voluntary register of the types of such measures applied around the world. The Group hoped that the United Nations might build on the study, focusing more on non-military approaches.

By a letter of 23 November,<sup>(1)</sup> Austria submitted a working paper on measures to improve the reliability and objectivity of military information. Stating that the inadequacy of reliable information often led Governments to initiate arms programmes on the basis of "worst-case" estimates, which further escalated the arms race, Austria suggested that confidence-building through dissemination of reliable information could be promoted through such steps as a refined standardized reporting instrument for military expenditures and the establishment of an international satellite monitoring agency.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 9 December, the General Assembly adopted without vote a resolution on confidence-building measures<sup>(4)</sup> by which it took note of the Secretary-General's study and recommended that further efforts be made, within and outside the United Nations, to widen the scope of such measures to include non-military approaches. The Assembly believed that the promotion of confidence-building measures, where appropriate conditions existed, would significantly contribute to facilitating disarmament, and invited States to consider the possible introduction of confidence-building measures in their regions.

The First Committee approved the proposal on 25 November, also without vote. The text

was sponsored by 32 States and was revised twice before its adoption.

Introducing the resolution, the Federal Republic of Germany said it presented the concept of confidence-building measures as a useful approach in reducing and eventually eliminating potential causes for mistrust and misunderstanding, thereby helping to facilitate disarmament.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, said that one essential element of confidence-building measures was transparency in military matters, which could effectively reduce or eliminate miscalculations or misapprehensions that might lead to the creation or exacerbation of tensions. Yugoslavia supported the basic thrust of the text while pointing out that confidence-building measures could not replace real disarmament measures. India, which shared a similar view, also stated that, because it had not had the opportunity to study the report carefully, it would have preferred a procedural resolution taking note of the study and referring it to States for further consideration. Japan, while supporting the idea contained in the resolution, remarked that, in the light of the situation in the region to which it belonged, it did not consider conditions to be ripe for the introduction of specific confidence-building measures there.

Cuba indicated that, had the text been put to a vote, it would have abstained because the list of sponsors included the United States, which it regarded as the originator of the deteriorating international situation. Albania would not have participated if there had been a vote, as it maintained that the root causes of the arms race and wars lay not in misunderstandings but in the nature of imperialism and social-imperialism.

In the First Committee debate, Canada expressed disappointment that the study had stopped short of recommending an open door to military activity, planning and doctrine, which Canada viewed as the only way to reduce fear and suspicion about the military intentions of potential adversaries. France and the United Kingdom stressed the importance of verification provisions as necessary conditions of mutual confidence in disarmament agreements, while Nigeria said that the impregnable margin of information disadvantage of a certain State was not conducive to the generation of mutual confidence necessary for disarmament.

The Netherlands subscribed to the Group's recommendation that the United Nations and States should encourage further exploration of ways in which confidence-building measures could strengthen peace and security. Peru thought such measures should be seen as encompassing all rules of inter-State behaviour.

Ecuador hoped the guidelines emerging from the study would serve as a basis for the negotiation of concrete regional, interregional and international measures. The Federal Republic of Germany suggested that regional organizations concern themselves with confidence-building measures, with a view to setting up negotiating mechanisms or other arrangements that could stimulate practical steps.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Austria, 23 Nov., A/C.1/36/14.

Publication: <sup>(2)</sup>Comprehensive Study on Confidence-building Measures, Disarmament Study Series 7 (A/36/474 & Corr.1). Sales No. E.82.IX.3.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>34/87 B, 11 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 91); <sup>(4)</sup>36/97 F, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 27, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, 44 (19 Oct.-25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/97 F

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/756) without vote, 25 November (meeting 44); 32-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.2); agenda item 55 (c).

Sponsors: Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Mauritania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Zaire.

#### Confidence-building measures

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 33/91 B of 16 December 1978, in which it invited Member States to submit their views and experiences regarding confidence-building measures,

Noting with satisfaction that numerous Member States responded to that invitation and provided the Secretary-General with substantive information,

Recalling also its resolution 34/87 B of 11 December 1979, in which it requested the Secretary-General to carry out a comprehensive study on confidence-building measures with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental experts appointed by him on an equitable geographical basis,

Expressing its concern about the deterioration of the international situation and the further escalation of the arms race, which both reflects and aggravates the unsatisfactory international political climate, tension and mistrust,

Desirous of strengthening international security and, at the same time, creating and improving conditions conducive to further measures of disarmament,

Mindful of the fact that, while confidence-building measures cannot serve as a substitute for disarmament measures, they play a very significant role in achieving disarmament,

Convinced of the usefulness of confidence-building measures freely arrived at by the States concerned and agreed upon, taking into account the particular conditions and requirements of the regions concerned,

Expressing its conviction of the need for the exchange of pertinent and timely information on military activities and other matters pertaining to mutual security, which would contribute to an improved climate of trust and confidence among States, and the conviction that agreement can be reached on measures to this end,

Noting with satisfaction the encouraging results of some confidence-building measures agreed upon and implemented in some regions,

1. Takes note of the comprehensive study on confidence-building measures, prepared by the Secretary-General;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General

and to the Group of Governmental Experts on Confidence-building Measures which assisted in the preparation of the study;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for the reproduction of the study as a United Nations publication and to give it the widest possible distribution;

4. Recognizes that confidence reflects a set of interrelated factors of a military as well as of a non-military character and that a plurality of approaches is needed to overcome fear, apprehension and mistrust between States and to replace them by confidence;

5. Recommends that, building on the experience gained from the application and development of confidence-building measures, further efforts should be made, both within and outside the United Nations, to widen their scope, so that account is also taken of non-military approaches;

6. Regards the concept of confidence-building measures as a useful approach in reducing and eventually eliminating potential causes for mistrust, misunderstanding, misinterpretation and miscalculation;

7. Believes that the promotion of confidence-building measures where appropriate conditions exist will significantly contribute to facilitating the process of disarmament;

8. Invites all States to consider the possible introduction of confidence-building measures in their respective regions and, where possible, to negotiate on them in keeping with conditions and requirements prevailing in each particular region;

9. Decides to submit the study to its second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982, for further consideration.

#### Proposed international agency for monitoring disarmament agreements

The Group of Governmental Experts on the Question of the Establishment of an International Satellite Monitoring Agency submitted a report to the Secretary-General on 10 June 1981<sup>(1)</sup> containing the results of a study requested by the General Assembly in 1979.<sup>(2)</sup> The report was transmitted to the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, prior to its submission to the Assembly at the 1982 special session (p. 27). The unanimous report was prepared during four sessions of the Group between February 1980 and February 1981, and was adopted at the final session, held at Geneva from 16 to 20 February 1981. Hubert G. Bortzmeyer of France was Chairman of the 13-member Group.

The report dealt with the technical, legal and financial implications of establishing an international agency that would use satellites to monitor compliance with international disarmament agreements—an idea originally placed before the General Assembly by France in 1978.

The Group concluded that observations from satellites to gather information related to verification of compliance with treaties and for crisis monitoring was technically feasible. Satellites and other technical facilities might be acquired in three stages, comprising: first, an image processing and interpretation centre; second,

stations to receive data from national satellites; and finally, a number of satellites belonging to the agency. Regarding legal aspects, the Group stated that there was no provision in international law that would prohibit an intergovernmental organization from monitoring by satellite.

As to the financial implications, the Group said a number of technical options were possible, with a broad range of cost estimates. An image processing and interpretation centre might cost \$8 million to acquire and \$25-30 million a year to operate. A 10-station ground-receiving network might require an initial investment of \$60-80 million and entail annual operating expenses of \$20 million. Launching three satellites for area monitoring might cost \$900-1,200 million, with \$50-200 million needed each year to manage the system and replace the satellites every two or three years. Launching and operation of a single low-altitude manoeuvrable satellite for "close-look" might cost approximately \$1,500 million, spread over 10 years. Even the most expensive phase, the experts noted, would cost, well under 1 per cent of the total annual expenditure on armaments.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>The Implications of Establishing an International Satellite Monitoring Agency (A/AC.206/14), Sales No. E.83.IX.3.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 34/83 E, 11 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 99).

### Study of institutional arrangements

STUDY BY THE GROUP OF EXPERTS. The 20-member Group of Governmental Experts to Study the Institutional Arrangements relating to the Process of Disarmament, appointed by the Secretary-General in accordance with a 1979 General Assembly request,<sup>(2)</sup> held four sessions in 1980 and 1981, the last two of which were in New York, 19 to 29 January and 22 June to 2 July 1981. The study was transmitted to the Secretary-General on 2 July by the Group's Chairman, Carlos Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina.

In the study,<sup>(1)</sup> the experts stated that, however adequately the United Nations serviced disarmament efforts, it was ultimately the will of States to make the best use of them and their readiness to negotiate which would determine the extent of progress. Some of the important measures that had followed the Assembly's 1978 special session on disarmament,<sup>(4)</sup> such as the re-establishment of the Disarmament Commission and the enlargement of the Committee on Disarmament, had offered wider opportunities for deliberations and negotiations. The Group did not wish to express an opinion on those bodies.

The Group considered that the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, despite its limited resources, had satisfactorily coped with the additional responsibilities arising from the

increasing length of sessions of the deliberative and negotiating organs. It found, however, that a clearer co-ordination of functions was desirable between the Centre and the Department of Public Information as regards dissemination of information on disarmament.

In view of the central role of the United Nations and its primary responsibility in disarmament, the Group thought the Secretary-General's co-ordinating responsibility for disarmament activities in the United Nations system should be clearly reaffirmed. The most appropriate official for that role was the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Centre for Disarmament, who should strive to ensure better use of limited human and material resources, avoid duplication, and thus improve the effectiveness of efforts in such a multidisciplinary sphere.

The Group recommended that the Secretary-General consider possibilities for strengthening the Centre with an appropriate number of additional staff, within existing United Nations resources, to meet anticipated growing needs. Other recommendations concerned the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (p. 107), possible institutional arrangements in regard to the relationship between disarmament and development (p. 99), and disarmament training and fellowship programmes (p. 108).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 9 December, by a resolution on institutional arrangements relating to disarmament,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly took note of the study on this subject and invited Member States to transmit their comments. The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to transmit the study to the Committee on Disarmament and decided to transmit the report and States' comments to the Assembly at its 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27) for consideration and action. The First Committee approved the resolution, sponsored by 24 States, on 20 November, also without vote.

Introducing the resolution, Argentina said the basically procedural text was aimed at ensuring that Governments gave the study the consideration it deserved.

During the Committee debate, Mexico reiterated a position first expressed in 1980 that the Centre for Disarmament should be changed to a Department headed by an Under-Secretary-General, and that after a few years the United Nations should consider whether to establish a specialized agency for disarmament. Egypt and Nigeria also favoured the idea of a disarmament department, while France favoured a review of the Centre's status within the Secretariat. Austria,

Greece and Sweden saw merit in the proposed creation of a United Nations disarmament agency, to reflect what Greece referred to as more ambitious goals and priorities, and the Netherlands recalled its 1978 proposal on an international disarmament organization.<sup>(5)</sup> On the other hand, India said the Centre was adequately equipped and fully competent to carry out both a promotional role with respect to disarmament and preparatory work in support of disarmament activities; it saw no need for a separate United Nations disarmament organization.

Italy thought consideration should be given to entrusting the United Nations with specific new functions in such areas as verification of compliance with disarmament agreements. Austria, Canada, France, Nepal and New Zealand also hoped the United Nations would have an increasing role in verification.

Israel considered that the United Nations should create regional bodies to negotiate on reducing the scale and speed of a regional arms race (p. 89); it questioned whether organizational proliferation had influenced the substance of disarmament negotiations.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G and Group of Experts, A/36/392.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>34/87 E, 11 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 100); <sup>(3)</sup>36/97 D, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references: 1978, <sup>(4)</sup>p. 17, <sup>(5)</sup>p. 56.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 29, 30, 34, 36-38 (19 Oct.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/97 D

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/756) without vote. 20 November (meeting 38); 24-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.9); agenda item 55 (b).

Sponsors: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Cuba, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia.

#### Institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 34/87 E of 11 December 1979, in which it requested the Secretary-General, with the assistance of qualified governmental experts, to carry out a comprehensive study assessing current institutional requirements and future estimated needs in the United Nations management of disarmament affairs and outlining possible functions, structure and institutional framework that could meet those requirements and needs, including legal and financial implications, and formulating recommendations for possible later decisions on the matter.

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General transmitting the study prepared by the Group of Governmental Experts to Study the Institutional Arrangements relating to the Process of Disarmament,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General and of the study of the institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General and the Group of Experts which assisted him for the efficient manner in which the report was prepared;

3. Recommends that all Member States should study the report;

4. Invites all Member States to transmit to the Secretary-General by 31 March 1982 their comments on the study and its conclusions and recommendations;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the study to the Committee on Disarmament;

6. Decides to transmit the report and the comments of Member States to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament for substantive consideration and the adoption of appropriate decisions;

7. Further decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item entitled "Institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament".

#### Research and studies

Seven United Nations studies on various aspects of disarmament were completed in 1981. Six of them were presented to the General Assembly and dealt with the following topics: Israeli nuclear armament (p. 51), the relationship between disarmament and development (p. 96), the relationship between disarmament and international security (p. 99), confidence-building measures (p. 102), institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament (p. 105) and a World Disarmament Campaign (p. 109). The seventh study, dealing with the implications of establishing an international satellite monitoring agency (p. 104), was submitted to the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament.

One study in progress during the year dealt with the economic and social consequences of the arms race and of military expenditures. In addition, a study on conventional disarmament was initiated by the Assembly in 1981 (p. 86).

ACTIVITIES OF THE ADVISORY BOARD. In 1981 the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies held its sixth and seventh sessions at United Nations Headquarters, from 4 to 15 May and from 28 September to 9 October. According to a report on its activities which the Secretary-General submitted to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the Board considered proposals for new studies, its own mandate and functions, the work of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), and a proposal for a study of a new philosophy on disarmament.

Regarding possible new studies, the Board said it continued to attach importance to three topics which it had identified as suitable for study in the near future: zones of peace and co-operation, the verification problem, and cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and means of delivery and of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

The Board devoted a substantial part of its 1981 sessions to consideration of its mandate and functions, in view of the fact that institutional arrangements relating to disarmament (p. 105) were to be discussed at the General Assembly's

1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27) and since the terms of appointment of the Board members expired at the end of 1981.

Board members generally agreed that its original mandate as laid down by the Assembly in 1978,<sup>(2)</sup> which was to advise the Secretary-General on various aspects of United Nations disarmament studies, left sufficient flexibility to cover additional activities. The Board believed that, since it was in the unique position of discussing and formulating conceptual aspects in the disarmament field, it could be requested by the Secretary-General and the Assembly to give advisory opinions.

It was generally felt that the Board's name did not adequately reflect its range of activities, which included: initiation and recommendation of studies; elaboration of a comprehensive programme of studies; advising the Secretary-General on planning and executing studies; rendering advice, on request, to delegations intending to submit study proposals; co-ordination of study activities; recommendation of ways to provide greater efficiency and cost savings in conducting studies; promotion of the work of UNIDIR; and assisting the Secretary-General regarding the World Disarmament Campaign.

The Board held an exchange of views on a proposal for the elaboration of a new philosophy on disarmament—a topic on which it had submitted its advice in 1979<sup>(5)</sup> as requested by the Assembly in 1978.<sup>(3)</sup> The Board recognized the subject as vast, complicated and at times nebulous, and concluded that it could not, within the time at its disposal, complete a fruitful discussion on the subject. It therefore recommended to the Secretary-General that continued consideration be given to the question.

The Group of Governmental Experts to Study the Institutional Arrangements relating to the Process of Disarmament, in a report for the General Assembly adopted in July 1981 (p. 105), called for development of the co-ordinating role of the Advisory Board. It also suggested five factors to be borne in mind in considering proposals for new studies: the extent to which the study would help the conclusion of disarmament agreements, the opinion of the Board, the studies already available in that area, the assistance which United Nations bodies could give and the estimated cost.

ACTIVITIES OF THE UN INSTITUTE FOR DISARMAMENT RESEARCH. The initial work programme of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, established in 1980,<sup>(6)</sup> was approved in 1981 by the Institute's Advisory Council, which held two sessions during the year. The programme consisted of: the compilation of a repertory of disarmament research

(completed in 1981); a general conceptual analysis of the disarmament field; and projects entitled "Security of States and the lowering of the levels of armaments", "Prevention of accidental nuclear war", "Science and technology for disarmament", "Disarmament data base", "Disarmament and development: continued research on various aspects of the problem in the light of the report of the Group of Experts on Disarmament and Development" and "Negotiating disarmament".

The Institute organized at Geneva, from 16 to 18 November, a conference of directors of disarmament research institutes, with the objective of strengthening international co-operation on disarmament research. The aims were to make better use of resources, avoid unnecessary parallelism and duplication, and strengthen the impact of research on government policies, deliberations and negotiations. More than 50 officials of national and international institutes participated.

The Group of Experts on institutional arrangements for disarmament recommended that the future status of UNIDIR should be decided at the 1982 special session on disarmament.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 9 December 1981, by a resolution on the programme of research and studies on disarmament,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly took note with appreciation of the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Advisory Board and requested him to submit the report to the Assembly at its 1982 special session on disarmament for further consideration. This resolution was adopted without vote following its approval by the First Committee in similar fashion on 23 November.

In introducing the resolution, also sponsored by Argentina, Canada, the Philippines and Poland, Pakistan noted that the text was purely procedural and that the Assembly, at its special session, was already scheduled to review institutional arrangements relating to disarmament.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/654.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>S-10/2, para. 124, 30 June 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 47); <sup>(3)</sup>33/71 N, 14 Dec. 1978 (ibid., p. 118);

<sup>(4)</sup>36/92 L, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(5)</sup>1979, p. 97; <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 113.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee. A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 37, 40 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/92 L

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981  
Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) without vote, 23 November (meeting 40): 5-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.47); agenda item 51 (c).  
Sponsors: Argentina, Canada, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland.

Programme of research and studies on disarmament

The General Assembly,

Taking note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies in 1981,



Requests the Secretary-General to submit that report to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament for its further consideration.

### Disarmament fellowships

The Secretary-General, reporting to the General Assembly on the third year of operation of the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament,<sup>(1)</sup> stated that 20 fellows, selected from among 39 nominations received from Member States, participated in the 1981 programme from 29 June to 30 November.

The programme included lectures, seminars, observation of the proceedings of disarmament bodies, submission of research papers, a four-day course at the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna (25-28 August), and study visits to the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary and Sweden. The major portion of the programme took place at Geneva and in New York.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution on the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly decided to continue the programme and requested the Secretary-General to make adequate arrangements for 1982 in accordance with guidelines approved by the Assembly in 1978.<sup>(3)</sup> It also requested him to submit to the Assembly at its 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27) an assessment of the programme since its inception in 1979.<sup>(4)</sup>

The resolution was adopted on 9 December without vote. The First Committee approved it on 20 November in similar fashion. Nigeria introduced the text on behalf of 23 sponsors and, when the resolution was adopted, expressed its understanding, as did Turkey, that 20 fellowships would be awarded in 1982, as in 1981.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/606.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>36/92 A, 9 Dec., text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(3)</sup>1978, p. 110; <sup>(4)</sup>1979, p. 98.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 27, 30, 34, 38 (19 Oct.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

### General Assembly resolution 36/92 A

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) without vote, 20 November (meeting 38): 23-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.1); agenda item 51 (e).

Sponsors: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Congo, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament  
The General Assembly,

Recalling its decision, taken at the tenth special session, the first special session devoted to disarmament, to establish a programme of fellowships on disarmament,

Recalling also its resolution 35/152 A of 12 December 1980, in which it requested the Secretary-General to make adequate arrangements relating to the programme for 1981 in accordance with the guidelines approved by the General Assembly at its thirty-third session,

Expressing its satisfaction at the fact that Governments, particularly those of developing countries, have continued to manifest serious interest in the programme,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament for 1981,

1. Decides to continue the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to make adequate arrangements relating to the programme for 1982 in accordance with the guidelines approved by the General Assembly at its thirty-third session;

3. Also requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament a report containing an assessment of the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament since its inception in 1979;

4. Commends the Secretary-General for the diligence with which the programme has been conducted;

5. Expresses its appreciation to the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary and Sweden for inviting the fellows to their capitals to study selected activities in the field of disarmament, thereby contributing to the fulfilment of the overall objectives of the programme, as well as providing additional information sources and practical knowledge for the fellows.

### Status of multilateral disarmament agreements

The General Assembly, by a resolution adopted on 9 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> requested Member States depositaries of multilateral disarmament agreements to furnish the Secretary-General with information regarding their status by the beginning of each of its regular sessions. The Assembly also requested the Secretary-General to prepare for each of its regular sessions a composite table of signatories of and parties to such agreements with a view to enabling the Assembly to take up the question of their status if it deemed it appropriate.

The Assembly adopted this resolution by a recorded vote of 115 to none, with 23 abstentions. The First Committee approved the text on 23 November by a recorded vote of 91 to none, with 22 abstentions.

The resolution was sponsored by Bulgaria, which recalled that the Assembly, in the Final Document of its 1978 special session on disarmament,<sup>(3)</sup> had stated that universality of disarmament agreements helped create confidence among States. Bulgaria hoped the information to be supplied each year would be a reminder that the participation of States in such agreements was important for the attainment of their objectives and might help in achieving their universality.

In explanation of vote, China stated that since it had different views regarding certain disarmament agreements, it had not participated in them and, accordingly, it could neither agree with the resolution nor participate in the vote. Brazil abstained, asserting that the text did not take into full account the sovereign right of

States to decide whether to adhere to agreements and dealt only with the quantitative aspect of participation while leaving aside the more important aspect of the absence of compliance by the nuclear-weapon States with provisions of agreements to which they were parties. India abstained because it continued to maintain that the Treat on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons<sup>(1)</sup> was discriminatory and therefore unacceptable.

Guinea, which voted affirmatively, announced that it would have abstained had a separate vote been taken on paragraph 1, reaffirming the importance of the provisions of the 1978 Final Document concerning the universality of multilateral disarmament agreements; Guinea believed that States parties to agreements should persuade other States to join them. Mexico voted in favour because the text reaffirmed the importance of universality of multilateral agreements, although Mexico did not consider the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques<sup>(2)</sup> to be universally acceptable.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>2373(XXII), annex, 12 June 1968 (YUN 1968, p. 17); <sup>(2)</sup>31/72, annex, 10 Dec. 1976 (YUN 1976, p. 45); <sup>(3)</sup>S-10/2, para. 40, 30 June 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 42); <sup>(4)</sup>36/92 H, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 32, 40 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/92 H

115-0-23 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981  
Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) by recorded vote (91-0-22).  
23 November (meeting 40): draft by Bulgaria (A/C.1/36/L.24); agenda item 51.

#### Status of multilateral disarmament agreements

The General Assembly,  
Recalling the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament,

Having in mind that a number of multilateral disarmament agreements have been concluded so far,

Considering that the participation in the above-mentioned agreements of as many States as possible is of special importance to the attainment of their objectives,

Taking note with satisfaction of the special supplement to the United Nations Disarmament Yearbook, entitled Status of multilateral arms regulations and disarmament agreements, as well as of the information on this matter included in the yearbooks,

1. Reaffirms the importance of the provisions concerning the question of the universality of multilateral disarmament agreements contained in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, in particular paragraph 40;

2. Requests Member States depositaries of such agreements to furnish the Secretary-General with information regarding their status by the beginning of each regular session of the General Assembly;

3. Further requests the Secretary-General to prepare for each regular session of the General Assembly a composite table of signatories of and parties to such agreements with a view to enabling the Assembly to take up the question of their status, if it deems it appropriate.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In Favour: Afghanistan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

### Study on a World Disarmament Campaign

STUDY BY THE GROUP OF EXPERTS. The Group of Experts on the Organization and Financing of a World Disarmament Campaign under the Auspices of the United Nations, established in pursuance of a 1980 request by the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> submitted a unanimously adopted report to the Secretary-General on 26 August 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> The report was prepared at two sessions held at United Nations Headquarters, from 3 to 6 March and from 22 to 26 June. The six-member Group, appointed by the Secretary-General, included three United Nations Secretariat officials. Its Chairman was Ingrid Lehmann, Political Affairs Officer in the United Nations Centre for Disarmament.

The Group stated in its report that the objectives of a World Disarmament Campaign would be to inform, to educate and to generate public understanding and support. Although the Campaign would be universal, the Group suggested that particular and sustained attention should be paid to certain constituencies, including elected representatives, parliamentarians and public officials, information media, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), educational communities and peace research institutes.

The experts considered the United Nations system to be a major source of initiative, materials, co-ordination and guidance, using to the fullest its network of information centres and other field offices. Further, Disarmament Week, observed each October (p. 112), could provide an annual focus for the Campaign.

The Group suggested that the Campaign be placed under the overall guidance and co-ordination of the Secretary-General, who would report annually to the General Assembly; that

a voluntary fund for the Campaign be established to finance the increased activities; and that pledging conferences could be held, starting at the Assembly's 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 9 December, by a resolution on the World Disarmament Campaign,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly commended the study by the Group of Experts and invited Member States to transmit to the Secretary-General suggestions and comments for implementing its recommendations. The Secretary-General was requested to transmit to the Assembly at its 1982 special session on disarmament both the study and the opinions of Governments, so that decisions might be taken at that time to launch the Campaign, including a pledging conference at the initial stage of the special session.

The resolution, revised by its sponsors, was adopted by a recorded vote of 143 to none, with 2 abstentions. The First Committee approved the text on 20 November by a recorded vote of 119 to none, with 3 abstentions.

The resolution had nine sponsors: Cuba, Mexico, Nigeria, Panama, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia. It was introduced by Mexico, which stated that the benefits of the Campaign would be felt equally in all parts of the world, irrespective of political, economic and social systems.

Some States which voted affirmatively—Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom, the last speaking for the European Community (EC) members—as well as the United States, which abstained in the vote, found it difficult to support the idea of a pledging conference at the initial stage of the special session. Canada felt that the organization of the Campaign should be considered prior to such a conference, as did Japan, which abstained in the Committee but voted affirmatively in the Assembly. The United Kingdom reserved the right of the EC members to comment later on the recommendations contained in the study, including the idea of a pledging conference.

France and the Federal Republic of Germany, which voted in favour, stated that a World Disarmament Campaign could be of value only if it was based on balanced, objective and relevant information, and if there was a free flow of information world-wide. The United States said it could not accept a financial burden for an impractical public-opinion initiative that would inevitably focus only on free societies, since it would have no effect on public opinion in closed societies. Responding to this point, Mexico noted that information dissemination on disarmament was a concept adopted by consensus in 1978 in the

Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> and that a World Disarmament Campaign would be guided and co-ordinated by the Secretary-General, through United Nations information centres around the world.

The USSR, which voted for the resolution, was gratified at seeing demonstrations in various parts of the world, including Europe, against the threat of nuclear and other types of weapons; it thought detailed consideration would have to be given to the study and to other proposals regarding the Campaign.

In the Committee's general debate, Chile saw a need to disseminate information about the horrors of a war waged with available means of destruction, so that world public opinion would back disarmament measures. Cuba thought the World Disarmament Campaign should assemble convincing proof of the dangers of war, the cost of the arms race and the great harm which could be done by the war-mongering campaign waged by imperialist spokesmen. Understanding the intricacies of the arms race was crucial, Lebanon felt, if public opinion was to influence policy. Romania suggested that the Campaign take into account the special role that could be played by scientists, who were well aware of the destructive force of modern weapons. Sierra Leone's view was that the Campaign should provide objective information on the arms race and disarmament to Governments, NGOs and individuals, for the purpose of building a world-wide disarmament constituency. If world opinion was fully aware of the many aspects of competition in weapons production, said Venezuela, that could be of invaluable assistance in promoting disarmament.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G and Group of Experts, A/36/458.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>S-10/2, paras. 99-107, 30 June 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 45); <sup>(3)</sup>35/152 I, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 117); <sup>(4)</sup>36/92 C, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26, 30, 34, 38 (19 Oct.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/92 C

143-0-2 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) by recorded vote (119-0-3), 20 November (meeting 38): 9-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1): agenda item 51 (i).

Sponsors: Cuba, Mexico, Nigeria, Panama, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Yugoslavia.

#### World Disarmament Campaign

The General Assembly,

Recalling that, in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, it stressed the importance of mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament.

Recalling its resolution 35/152 I of 12 December 1980, in which, for the achievement of that purpose, it requested the Secretary-General to carry out a study on the organization and financing of a World Disarmament Campaign under the auspices of the United Nations,

Having examined the study transmitted by the Secretary-General as an annex to his report of 17 September 1981.

1. Notes with satisfaction the contents of the study on the World Disarmament Campaign and commends its conclusions:

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General and to the experts who assisted him for the prompt and effective manner in which the study was prepared;

3. Invites all Member States to transmit to the Secretary-General, not later than 15 April 1982, the suggestions and comments which they deem appropriate to formulate for the implementation of the recommendations contained in the study;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament both the study on the World Disarmament Campaign and the opinions thereon received from Governments, in order that the Assembly may take the decisions it considers advisable for the solemn launching of the Campaign, including a pledging conference to take place at the initial stage of the special session.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenade, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel, United States.

### Proposed collection of signatures in support of disarmament

On 9 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly invited Member States to communicate to the Secretary-General their views and suggestions concerning a world-wide collection of signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, to curb the arms race and for disarmament. It requested him to report, at its 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27), on a format and methods of carrying out such action under United Nations auspices.

The Assembly adopted this resolution by a recorded vote of 78 to 3, with 56 abstentions. The First Committee approved the text on 24 November by a recorded vote of 68 to 3, with 46 abstentions.

The resolution was sponsored by Bulgaria, Cuba and Mongolia. Introducing the text, Bulgaria noted the recognition given by the Assembly at its 1978 special session on disarmament to the potential influence of world public opinion and to the importance of Disarmament Week (p. 112) for promoting public awareness of arms and disarmament issues.<sup>(1)</sup> Bulgaria added that the sponsors of the resolution felt it was more important than ever that the peoples of the world clearly expressed their will to foster implementation of practical disarmament measures.

The Byelorussian SSR and Czechoslovakia supported the idea of a world-wide collection of signatures, as did the German Democratic Republic, which recalled that an NGO-sponsored campaign in that country two years earlier had yielded 13 million signatures in favour of arms limitation and disarmament. Guinea shared the view that the resolution would promote, in a dynamic way, the task of informing world opinion. Hungary believed the proposal would also contribute to the Second Disarmament Decade (1980-1990) and the World Disarmament Campaign in mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament. Mexico voted affirmatively on the understanding that the Assembly, at its 1982 special session on disarmament, would act to prevent duplication of activities under the World Disarmament Campaign (p. 109).

Among those which abstained in the vote, Austria regarded it as highly problematical to involve Governments in a practice designed to facilitate input into the political process from the grass-roots level; at the same time, it doubted whether the proposed measure could usefully contribute to disarmament. The Netherlands called the resolution redundant and propagandistic, and stated that mass demonstrations in Western Europe provided evidence that public opinion there was not in need of government guidance to be mobilized for disarmament. Finland and Pakistan considered that the proposed action could have been more appropriately dealt with in the context of the World Disarmament Campaign; Finland added that the proposed action fell within the compass of NGOs. Also believing that this was a matter for private organizations, China did not participate in the vote.

Japan, which voted in favour, similarly stressed that such matters should be left to private initiative, and recalled in this connection the voluntary effort made at the time of the 1978 special session on disarmament by Japanese NGOs which had brought to United Nations Headquarters some 20 million signatures in support of nuclear disarmament. Brazil voted against the resolution, believing that it was not incumbent on the United Nations to engage in such activities.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>S-10/2, paras. 99-107, 30 June 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 45); <sup>(2)</sup>36/92 J, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.3 & Corr.1, 4-10, 12-26 37, 38, 41 (19 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/92 J

78-3-56 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/752) by recorded vote (68-3-46). 24 November (meeting 41): 3-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.32): agenda item 51.

Sponsors: Bulgaria, Cuba, Mongolia.

World-wide action for collecting signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, to curb the arms race and for disarmament

The General Assembly,

Deeply concerned over the growing threat of a nuclear war and the continuation and escalation of the arms race,

Conscious of the need to mobilize world public opinion on behalf of disarmament, as called for in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament.

Considering that world-wide action for collecting signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, to curb the arms race and for disarmament would be an important manifestation of the will of the world public and would contribute to the creation of a favourable climate for achieving progress in the field of disarmament.

Considering also that it is desirable to carry out such world-wide action under the auspices of the United Nations and with the active participation of non-governmental organizations and other public institutions.

1. Invites Member States to communicate to the Secretary-General their views and suggestions concerning world-wide action for collecting signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, to curb the arms race and for disarmament:

2. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the most appropriate format and methods of carrying out such world-wide action under the auspices of the United Nations, taking into account the views and suggestions of Member States, and to submit it for consideration to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan,

Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against: Brazil, Canada, United States.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Central African Republic, Colombia, Comoros, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

### Disarmament Week (24-30 October)

Disarmament Week 1981 was observed at United Nations Headquarters on 26 October at a special meeting of the First Committee, where messages were read on behalf of the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General, and statements were made by the representatives of regional groups. The President said that disarmament could be accomplished only if States that were devoting so much effort to the arms race decided to stop. The Secretary-General appealed to Governments to help make the Assembly's 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27) the start of a new and productive phase of disarmament negotiations.

By a resolution of 9 December on international co-operation for disarmament, the Assembly called on Member States to disseminate widely, in connection with Disarmament Week, the principles of international co-operation designed to achieve the goals of disarmament.<sup>(2)</sup> The Secretary-General submitted to the Assembly the replies received from 10 Governments concerning their activities in connection with Disarmament Week.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/568 & Add.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>36/92 D, para. 5, 9 Dec. (p. 26).

Meeting record: GA, 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.11 (26 Oct.).

## Chapter II

## Peaceful uses of outer space

By two resolutions adopted without vote on 18 November 1981, the General Assembly made several recommendations on international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space<sup>(3)</sup> and on preparations for the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (UNISPACE-82), scheduled for August 1982 at Vienna.<sup>(4)</sup> Both resolutions were approved by the Assembly's Special Political Committee (SPC), also without vote, on 30 October 1981. Most of the Assembly's recommendations were based on the work of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its two sub-committees.

The Committee on outer space held its twenty-fourth session at United Nations Headquarters from 22 June to 2 July. Of the 14 meetings held, four were devoted to the Committee's functions as Preparatory Committee for UNISPACE-82. In accordance with a 1980 Assembly resolution,<sup>(2)</sup> the membership of the Committee was increased from 47 to 53. The Committee's two subsidiary bodies, the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and the Legal Sub-Committee, met prior to the Committee's annual session.

The Assembly's resolution on international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space was sponsored by 42 States in SPC, where it was introduced by Austria. By this resolution, the Assembly endorsed the report of the Committee on outer space<sup>(1)</sup> and requested it to continue its work and to report in 1982 with its views on which subjects should be studied in future. The Assembly decided on the continuation of United Nations work on scientific and technical aspects (p. 114) and on legal aspects (p. 118) of the peaceful uses of outer space.

In connection with its consideration of disarmament issues, the Assembly requested negotiations to elaborate a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons in outer space.<sup>(5)</sup> Nearly all speakers in the outer space debates, in both the Committee on outer space and SPC, expressed concern about the increasing militarization of outer space, and a number of delegations proposed that an item on ensuring the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes be included in the provisional agenda of the 1982 session of the Committee on outer space.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/16, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 135); <sup>(3)</sup>36/35 18 Nov. 1981, text following; <sup>(4)</sup>36/36, 18 Nov. (p. 125); <sup>(5)</sup>36/99, 9 Dec. (p. 83).

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR. 15-20 (27-30 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.63 (18 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/35

Adopted without vote Meeting 63 18 November 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/657 and Corr.1) without vote, 30 October (meeting 20); 42-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.4); agenda Items 61 and 62.

Sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

#### International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/14 of 3 November 1980,

Deeply convinced of the common interest of mankind in promoting the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes and in continuing efforts to extend to all States the benefits derived therefrom, as well as the importance of international co-operation in this field, for which the United Nations should continue to provide a focal point,

Reaffirming the importance of international co-operation in developing the rule of law in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space,

Taking note with satisfaction of the progress achieved in various national and co-operative space projects, such as the launch of the Ariane rocket by the European Space Agency, the flight of the United States Space Shuttle Orbiter Columbia and the completion of the first stage of the Voyager II mission, the Salyut Soyuz orbital research programme of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the successful outer space missions by the first Mongolian and Romanian cosmonauts, the successful launching of the Rohini II and Apple satellites by India and the placing into orbit of a group of three satellites with a single carrier rocket by China,

Having considered the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space on its twenty-fourth session,

1. Endorses the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space;

2. Invites States which have not yet become parties to the international treaties governing the use of outer space\* to give consideration to ratifying or acceding to those treaties;

3. Takes note with appreciation of the progress in the preparation of the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, to be held at Vienna from 9 to 21 August 1982, achieved by the committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and by its Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, acting as Preparatory Committee for the Conference and Advisory Committee to the Preparatory Committee, respectively;

4. Notes that the Legal Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space at its twentieth session:

(a) Continued its efforts to formulate draft principles relating to the legal implications of remote sensing of the earth from space;

(b) Continued its efforts to complete the elaboration of principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting;

(c) Continued its discussion of matters relating to the definition and/or delimitation of outer space and outer space activities, bearing in mind, inter alia, questions relating to the geostationary orbit;

(d) Considered the possibility of supplementing the norms of international law relevant to the use of nuclear power sources in outer space and established a working group in connection with this item;

5. Decides that the Legal Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space at its twenty-first session should:

(a) Continue on a priority basis its detailed consideration of the legal implications of remote sensing of the earth from space, with the aim of formulating draft principles relating to remote sensing;

(b) Continue its consideration of:

(i) The possibility of supplementing the norms of international law relevant to the use of nuclear power sources in outer space through its working group;

(ii) Matters relating to the definition and/or delimitation of outer space and outer space activities, bearing in mind, *inter alia*, questions relating to the geostationary orbit, and devote adequate time for a deeper consideration of this question;

6. Decides to convene the twenty-first session of the Legal Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space at Geneva from 1 to 19 February 1982, with the possibility of extending that session to 26 February 1982;

7. Decides that further attempts to complete the elaboration of a draft set of principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting shall be made by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space during its twenty-fifth session;

8. Decides to consider at its thirty-seventh session the adoption of a draft set of principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting;

9. Notes that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space at its eighteenth session continued:

(a) Its consideration of questions relating to remote sensing of the earth by satellites;

(b) Its consideration of the United Nations Programme on Space Applications and the co-ordination of space activities within the United Nations system;

(c) Its examination of the physical nature and technical attributes of the geostationary orbit;

(d) Its consideration of technical aspects of, and safety measures relating to, the use of nuclear power sources in outer space and adopted the report of the Working Group;

(e) Its consideration of questions relating to space transportation systems and their implications for future activities in space;

(i) Preparations for the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space as Advisory Committee to the Preparatory Committee;

10. Endorses the recommendation of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee at its nineteenth session should:

(a) Consider the following items on a priority basis:

(i) Consideration of the United Nations Programme on Space Applications and the co-ordination of outer space activities within the United Nations system;

(ii) Questions relating to remote sensing of the earth by satellites;

(iii) Preparations for the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space;

(iv) Use of nuclear power sources in outer space;

(b) Consider the following items:

(i) Questions relating to space transportation systems and their implications for future activities in space;

(ii) Examination of the physical nature and technical attributes of the geostationary orbit;

11. Endorses the United Nations Programme on Space Applications for 1982 as proposed to the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee by the Expert on Space Applications:

12. Requests the Secretary-General to appoint a new Expert on Space Applications without delay, taking into account the important role of the Expert in the preparation of the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space;

13. Expresses its appreciation to all Governments as well as specialized agencies and other international organizations which acted as hosts to, offered fellowships for, or otherwise assisted in the holding of, international training seminars and workshops on space applications, particularly for the benefit of developing countries;

14. Requests the specialized agencies and other international organizations to continue their co-operation with the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and to provide it with progress reports on their work relating to the peaceful uses of outer space;

15. Requests the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to continue its work, in accordance with the present resolution and previous resolutions of the General Assembly, to consider, as appropriate, new projects in outer space activities and to submit a report to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, including its views on which subjects should be studied in the future.

Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (General Assembly resolution 2222 (XXI), annex); Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space (General Assembly resolution 2345 (XXII), annex); Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects (General Assembly resolution 2777 (XXVI), annex); Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space (General Assembly resolution 3235 (XXIX), annex); Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (General Assembly resolution 34/68, annex).

## Scientific and technical aspects

The Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee of the Committee on outer space held its eighteenth session from 2 to 13 February 1981 at United Nations Headquarters. As in 1980, the Sub-Committee gave priority consideration to the United Nations Programme on Space Applications (p. 115), co-ordination of space activities in the United Nations system (p. 118), technical aspects of remote sensing (p. 116) and the use of nuclear power sources in outer space (p. 116). It also considered space transportation systems and their implications for future space activities (p. 117), and examined the technical attributes and physical nature of the geostationary orbit (p. 117). In addition, it acted as Advisory Committee to the Preparatory Committee for UNISPACE-82 (p. 125).

The views and recommendations of the Sub-Committee were set out in its report to the Committee on outer space,<sup>(2)</sup> considered by the Committee at its June/July session.<sup>(1)</sup> By its resolution on the peaceful uses of outer space, the Assembly noted the work of the Sub-Committee and endorsed the Committee's recommendation that the Sub-Committee continue to consider the same items at its 1982 session, again giving priority to remote sensing, use of nuclear power

sources in space, UNISPACE-82 preparations, co-ordination of United Nations activities and the Programme on Space Applications.<sup>(3)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20; <sup>(2)</sup>Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, A/AC.105/287 & Corr.1,3.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/35, paras. 9 & 10, 18 Nov. (p. 114).

#### UN Programme on Space Applications

##### Programme for 1981

Activities of the United Nations Programme on Space Applications for 1981, described in a December report of the United Nations Expert on Space Applications to the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee,<sup>(1)</sup> included three regional seminars and one international seminar on remote sensing applications and satellite communications for education and development, in preparation for UNISPACE-82 (p. 124). The seminars for the regions of the Economic Commission for Africa, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific were held, respectively, at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 11 to 19 March,<sup>(2)</sup> at Buenos Aires, Argentina, from 7 to 14 April,<sup>(3)</sup> and at Jakarta, Indonesia, from 18 to 25 November.<sup>(4)</sup> The seminar for developing countries from various regions was held at Toulouse, France, from 21 to 25 April.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Programme also sponsored two training courses to provide participants with practical exercises in applying remote sensing techniques to development needs. The Sixth United Nations International Training Course on Remote Sensing Applications to Pasture and Rangeland Development, conducted in co-operation with the Government of Italy and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), was held at Rome from 27 April to 15 May.<sup>(6)</sup> A Joint United Nations/FAO Regional Training Seminar on Remote Sensing Applications to Land Resources, mainly for the benefit of developing countries in the Economic Commission for Western Asia and Mediterranean regions, was held at Sofia, Bulgaria, from 16 to 26 September.<sup>(7)</sup> In addition, Austria and Italy provided fellowships, and the Netherlands and Sweden offered grants of \$25,000 each in support of the seminars.

The General Assembly, by its resolution of 18 November on international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space, expressed appreciation to the Governments and organizations which had assisted in regard to these seminars and workshops.<sup>(8)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Expert on Space Applications, A/AC.105/302. Seminars on remote sensing and satellite communications: <sup>(2)</sup>Addis Ababa, A/AC.105/289; <sup>(3)</sup>Buenos Aires, A/AC.105/290; <sup>(4)</sup>Jakarta, A/AC.105/300; <sup>(5)</sup>Toulouse, A/AC.105/282. <sup>(6)</sup>Training Course on

Remote Sensing Applications to Pasture and Rangeland Development: A/AC.105/296. <sup>(7)</sup>Training Seminar on Remote Sensing Applications to Land Resources: A/AC.105/295.

Resolution: <sup>(8)</sup>GA, 36/35, para. 13, 18 Nov. (p. 114).

##### Programmes for 1982 and future years

The Programme on Space Applications for 1982, as set forth in a December 1980 report of the Expert on Space Applications,<sup>(2)</sup> included three regional seminars on remote sensing applications and space communications for education and development, an international seminar on the applications of remote sensing to development, and international training seminars on applications of remote sensing to agriculture and to meteorological problems associated with arid lands and desertification.

In response to the Assembly's 1980 request for a preliminary list of activities further to assist Member States in applying space technology to development,<sup>(4)</sup> the Expert recommended that the Programme provide technical advisory services, administer a programme of practical training in developing countries, and serve as a clearing-house for information on technological developments and on training and education.

In considering the Expert's report at its 1981 session,<sup>(3)</sup> the Sub-Committee noted the preliminary character of the list of future activities and requested the Secretariat to submit a detailed proposal, including financial implications. It reiterated its view that the Programme should be expanded to accommodate the needs of developing countries better.

At its June/July session,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee on outer space endorsed the Programme for 1982, noting a statement by the Secretary-General of UNISPACE-82 that the rest of the Programme for 1981 and 1982 would be reoriented to focus on the Conference. It also expressed satisfaction at Italy's decision to increase its financial contribution to the training courses held at FAO headquarters in Rome, and appreciation to the USSR for its readiness to hold United Nations training seminars on remote sensing regularly.

On 18 November, the General Assembly endorsed the 1982 Programme and recommended that the Sub-Committee give priority consideration to the Programme on Space Applications at its 1982 session.<sup>(5)</sup>

During discussions in the Special Political Committee and the Committee on outer space, a number of delegations remarked that it would be increasingly difficult to provide significant services under the Programme within the limited funds available. According to the Chairman of the Committee on outer space, the budget for 1980-1981 had been cut by 30 per cent, instead of remaining stable in real terms. Several delega-



tions, including Egypt, India, Indonesia and Yugoslavia, urged that the Programme be broadened and strengthened. Bangladesh suggested that the United Nations organize long-term academic programmes in addition to the existing short-term training activities. Pakistan called for increased funding and repeated its suggestion, supported by Bangladesh, for the establishment of an international space agency.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20; <sup>(2)</sup>Expert on Space Applications, A/AC.105/285; <sup>(3)</sup>Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, A/AC.105/287 & Corr.1,3.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/14, para. 10, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 129); <sup>(5)</sup>36/35, paras. 10 (a) (i) & 11, 18 Nov. 1981 (p. 114).

#### Expert on Space Applications

In the report on its 1981 session,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee on outer space expressed gratitude to Ahmed D. Padang, the United Nations Expert on Space Applications from 1 November 1979 to 1 April 1981, for having directed the Programme on Space Applications and it recommended that the Secretary-General appoint a new Expert as soon as possible. On 18 November, the General Assembly requested that the Secretary-General fill the post without delay, taking into account the importance of the Expert's role with regard to preparations for UNLSPACE-82.<sup>(2)</sup> Adigun Ade Abiodun was appointed with effect from 16 November.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/35, para. 12, 18 Nov. (p. 114).

#### Scientific and technical aspects of remote sensing

During 1981, the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee continued its priority consideration of remote sensing of the earth by satellites and measures to promote international co-operation in this area.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Sub-Committee encouraged the establishment and strengthening of regional remote sensing centres in order to create an indigenous capacity within developing countries and urged the United Nations to continue co-operating with such centres. It noted with satisfaction the activities of the Programme on Space Applications (p. 115) and other United Nations efforts to assist developing countries in applying remote sensing techniques. It also noted a catalogue of remote sensing applications, appended to the report of the Expert on Space Applications,<sup>(2)</sup> and recommended steps to improve the compilation of future catalogues through preparation of a detailed outline for the information to be sought from Governments and organizations and the format to be followed.

At its 1981 session, the Committee on outer

space endorsed the Sub-Committee's view that the United Nations should continue to co-operate with regional remote sensing centres.<sup>(1)</sup> On 18 November, the Assembly endorsed the Committee's recommendation that its Sub-Committee continue in 1982 to give priority consideration to remote sensing.<sup>(4)</sup>

During discussion in the Special Political Committee, most developing countries stressed the importance of remote sensing applications in the discovery and exploitation of natural resources, environmental monitoring and the maintenance of an effective communications system. They expressed hope that more technical assistance in using remote sensing techniques would be provided. In this regard, the importance of regional training centres was emphasized by a number of delegations, including Bolivia, Egypt, Nigeria and Yugoslavia.

Chile hoped it would be possible to continue to increase the information that States submitted on national activities in the field of remote sensing, and that the range and distribution of data could be defined more clearly. Japan criticized the notion that data be classified according to degree of resolution, stating that criteria for classification were not clear and that classification was not necessary.

Australia pointed out that the failure of launching States to make their systems compatible would seriously restrict the ability of other countries to benefit from remote sensing information; also, many countries tended to disregard the value of more conventional and normally less expensive data due to inflated expectations as to the benefits to be gained from outer space. Bangladesh noted that compatibility of satellite systems and ground segments was especially important to developing countries, where large investments on the ground could not be repeated to accommodate changes in space segments.

The legal implications of remote sensing were discussed in the Legal Sub-Committee and the Committee on outer space (p. 120).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20; <sup>(2)</sup>Expert on Space Applications, A/AC.105/257/Add.1/Rev.1; <sup>(3)</sup>Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, A/AC.105/287 & Corr.1,3.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/35, para. 10 (a) (ii), 18 Nov. (p. 114).

#### Use of nuclear power sources in outer space

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP. The Working Group on the Use of Nuclear Power Sources in Outer Space, established by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee in 1979,<sup>(4)</sup> held its third session at United Nations Headquarters from 2 to 6 February 1981. The Group continued its consideration of technical aspects and safety relating to the use of nuclear power sources,

specifically radio-isotopic generators and nuclear reactors, in outer space.

In its report, the Group stated that the risks inherent in a particular project should be assessed in terms of both the probability of failure or malfunction and the severity of the consequences. It felt that the launching State should be responsible for minimizing adverse effects on the environment and population, and that the recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection should be followed in that regard. It outlined measures to be taken in the event of possible re-entry or malfunction of a spacecraft carrying a nuclear power source, including notification and search and recovery procedures in areas that might be affected.

Emphasizing that every effort should be made to determine the technical feasibility of early notification to affected States and to the Secretary-General when there was the risk of re-entry of radioactive materials to earth, the Working Group formulated a format of notification specifying the information to be provided about re-entering space vehicles containing nuclear power sources that might give rise to radiological hazards. With regard to orbit predictions, the Group noted that accuracy could be improved by the implementation of additional degrees of control and by co-operative use of tracking stations and communications lines.

According to the Group's report, some delegations believed that agreed standards of safety should be defined, while others considered this impossible because of the great differences between spacecraft used by different countries.

The Group reaffirmed its conclusion, first stated in 1979, that nuclear power sources could be used safely in space if all necessary safety requirements were met. It encouraged Member States to continue studies concerning the uses of nuclear power in space. The report of the Working Group, annexed to the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, was adopted by the Sub-Committee on 11 February.<sup>(2)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. At its 1981 session, the Committee on outer space noted the conclusions of the Working Group, endorsing the Group's request that its work be suspended and that any material on nuclear power sources in space be circulated among Member States by the Secretariat, as well as its recommendation that the use of nuclear power in space be retained as a priority item on the Sub-Committee's 1982 agenda.<sup>(1)</sup> This recommendation was also endorsed by the Assembly in its resolution of 18 November on international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space.<sup>(3)</sup>

Legal aspects of the use of nuclear power

sources were discussed by the Legal Sub-Committee and the Committee on outer space (p. 122).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20; <sup>(2)</sup>Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, A/AC.105/287 & Corr.1,3.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/35, para. 10 (a) (iv), 18 Nov. (p. 114). Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1979, p. 116.

#### Space transportation

At its June/July 1981 session,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee on outer space noted the progress achieved in operative and planned space transportation programmes as reported by China, France, India, Japan, Mongolia, the USSR, the United States and the European Space Agency, and endorsed the request of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, contained in its February report,<sup>(2)</sup> that the Secretariat update its 1979 study on the international implications of new space transportation systems. During the Sub-Committee's consideration of this subject, some delegations noted the importance of large-scale activities in outer space and the consequences to the environment due to increased use of these systems. The Committee's recommendation that the Sub-Committee continue consideration of this item in 1982 was endorsed by the Assembly on 18 November.<sup>(3)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20; <sup>(2)</sup>Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, A/AC.105/287 & Corr.1,3.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/35, para. 10 (b) (i), 18 Nov. (p. 114).

#### Geostationary orbit

In discussing questions related to the geostationary orbit at the 1981 session of the Committee on outer space<sup>(1)</sup> and its Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee,<sup>(2)</sup> a number of delegations indicated the growing concern of developing countries with regard to the manner in which the orbit was being used and the urgent need to avoid its saturation. Others noted that constructive efforts were under way through existing mechanisms to ensure fair and efficient use of the orbit. Most delegations elaborated on views expressed in 1980<sup>(4)</sup> concerning methods of avoiding saturation and assuring the most effective use of the orbit, including establishment of compatibility criteria for satellite networks, application of interference-resistant methods of transmission and use of quasi-stationary orbits and geosynchronous orbits with small inclinations.

The Sub-Committee noted that a comprehensive study on the physical nature and technical attributes of the geostationary orbit, undertaken by the Secretariat with the assistance of the International Astronautical Federation, would be presented as a background paper to the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration

and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. It requested that the Secretariat's 1978 study on the subject be updated as required. It also decided to continue consideration of the geostationary orbit in 1982—a decision which was endorsed by the Committee and by the Assembly's resolution of 18 November.<sup>(3)</sup>

Legal aspects of the geostationary orbit were discussed by the Legal Sub-Committee in regard to the definition of outer space (p. 123).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20; <sup>(2)</sup>Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, A/AC.105/287 & Corr.1,3.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/35, para. 10 (b) (ii), 18 Nov. (p. 114).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 132.

#### Co-ordination of outer space activities in the UN system

Noting the progress achieved in co-ordinating outer space activities among organizations within the United Nations system, the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, at its 1981 session,<sup>(2)</sup> stressed the need to ensure continuous and effective consultations and co-ordination. It expressed satisfaction at plans for a third Inter-Agency Meeting on Outer Space Activities (Vienna, 14-16 September).

The Committee on outer space, at its mid-year session,<sup>(1)</sup> concluded that the reports submitted by United Nations bodies, specialized agencies and other international organizations had assisted the Committee and its subsidiary bodies in fulfilling their role as a focal point for international co-operation in the application of space science and technology.

On 18 November, the General Assembly endorsed the Committee's decision that co-ordination of outer space activities be among the topics given priority consideration by the Sub-Committee in 1982.<sup>(3)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20; <sup>(2)</sup>Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, A/AC.105/287 & Corr.1,3.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/35, para. 10 (a) (i), 18 Nov. (p. 114).

## Legal aspects

The twentieth session of the Legal Sub-Committee of the Committee on outer space, held at Geneva from 16 March to 10 April 1981, marked the conclusion of two decades of the Sub-Committee's work in the development and codification of the law of outer space. At that session, the Sub-Committee continued its priority consideration of draft principles relating to remote sensing (p. 120) and to the use by States of satellites for direct television broadcasting (see below). It also considered the possibility of supplementing the norms of international law relevant to the use of nuclear

power sources in outer space (p. 122) and continued studying matters relating to the definition and/or delimitation of outer space and outer space activities, bearing in mind questions relating to the geostationary orbit (p. 123). Working groups, open to all Sub-Committee members, were set up to consider legal aspects of nuclear power source use and the two priority items.

The Sub-Committee's report,<sup>(2)</sup> and the annexed reports of the three working groups, were considered by the Committee at its June/July session.<sup>(1)</sup> As the Committee could not agree on the agenda for the Sub-Committee's next session, the decision was deferred to the General Assembly's 1981 session. On 18 November,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly decided that the Committee should attempt again in 1982 to elaborate draft principles for the use of direct-broadcast satellites and that the Sub-Committee should continue to consider the three other items, giving priority to the legal implications of remote sensing. The Assembly fixed the dates of the Sub-Committee's 1982 session at 1 to 19 February, with a possible extension to 26 February.

During discussion in the Special Political Committee (SPC) in October, Canada stated that serious consideration should be given to streamlining the work of the Sub-Committee, including shortening the time allowed for its meetings. Australia believed that the Sub-Committee would not need more than three weeks in 1982, since the item on direct television broadcasting had been removed from its agenda. On the other hand, Czechoslovakia and Mongolia emphasized the importance of the Sub-Committee's having four full weeks for the successful continuance of its work. After the approval in Committee of the resolution on the peaceful uses of outer space, the USSR stated that it did not agree with the provision for a three-week session, since it would reduce the effectiveness of one of the most productive United Nations bodies. Also by its resolution of 18 November, the Assembly invited States to consider ratifying or acceding to the five treaties on outer space concluded under United Nations auspices between 1966 and 1979.<sup>(3)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20; <sup>(2)</sup>Legal Sub-Committee, A/AC.105/288.

Resolution: GA, 36/35, 18 Nov. (p. 113): <sup>(3)</sup>para. 2, <sup>(4)</sup>paras. 4-8.

#### Draft principles for the use of direct-broadcast satellites

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON OUTER SPACE. The Working Group established by the Legal Sub-Committee to elaborate draft principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting met from 17 March to 7 April 1981. Discussions

in both the Group and the Sub-Committee were based on the incomplete text of draft principles as it appeared at the end of the 1980 session-containing square brackets around provisions on which agreement had not been reached. The Group discussed the principles relating to State responsibility and to consultation and agreements between States, but it reached no consensus. Other principles to be finalized by the Group concerned the duty and right of States to consult, dispute settlement, programme content and unlawful or inadmissible broadcasts.

During preliminary discussion of the principles on State responsibility and consultation and agreements between States, the main point of contention centred on the problem of reconciling the sovereign rights of States, particularly non-interference in their internal affairs, with the right to freedom of expression, including the right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas, regardless of frontiers. Since contrasting views remained essentially the same as those set out in the 1980 report of the Working Group,<sup>(7)</sup> the Group adjourned its meetings in favour of informal consultations open to all members of the Sub-Committee, with the hope of resolving the remaining differences. Following these consultations, which failed to yield consensus, a negotiating text intended as a basis for concluding elaboration of the principles at the 1981 session of the Committee on outer space was submitted as a working paper by Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mexico, the Niger and Venezuela. It was annexed, together with the report of the Working Group's Chairman, to the Legal Sub-Committee's report.<sup>(2)</sup>

The report of the Sub-Committee, including the recommendation that the Committee on outer space decide whether further progress could be achieved in elaborating the draft principles, was considered by the Committee at its June/July session. Taking note of the negotiating text, which some members did not consider suitable as a basis for further work, the Committee established an informal working group in an effort to complete the draft principles. The working group, which held a number of meetings between 24 June and 1 July, focused on the remaining outstanding issues, relating to the preamble and the principles on purposes and objectives, State responsibility, and consultation and agreements between States. Several informal proposals were submitted and Nigeria, the Philippines, Romania and Uruguay became co-sponsors of the negotiating text. However, the group did not reach agreement. At the final meeting of the Committee, Sweden submitted a working paper presenting an alternate version of the principles

that attempted to take into account the discussions of the informal working group. Some delegations expressed reservations on this text, however, and it was not discussed for lack of time. It was annexed to the Committee's 1981 report to the Assembly.<sup>(1)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 18 November, by its resolution on international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space,<sup>(6)</sup> the Assembly decided that the Committee should attempt to complete the draft in 1982 and that the Assembly would consider later that year the adoption of a draft set of principles for the use of direct-broadcast satellites. Accordingly, the item was not listed for the agenda of the Legal Sub-Committee.

During discussion in SPC, a number of delegations, including Hungary, Indonesia, Mongolia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam, stressed the necessity of concluding an agreement that would preclude interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States. The main provision of this approach, that broadcasting to another State should be carried out on the basis of agreement or consultation with that State, was endorsed by Argentina, the Byelorussian SSR, Chile, China, Ecuador, Kenya, Nigeria and Uruguay. Colombia, Iraq, Pakistan, Romania and Venezuela also supported this provision, some of them making the point that the 16-nation negotiating text ensured a balance between the rights and duties of States. Support for this text as a sound basis for arriving at a compromise solution was also voiced by China and Madagascar.

Cuba hoped that the principles would also establish the international responsibility of States which violated the principle of consent. Czechoslovakia proposed that, after formulating a set of principles which respected the sovereignty of States, the Committee on outer space should draft a legally binding convention based on the principles. According to the USSR, an approach that did not respect the sovereignty of States would be a serious attack on the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (Outer Space Treaty), adopted by the Assembly in 1966.<sup>(5)</sup>

Bulgaria stated that principles governing direct television broadcasting should aim at regulating the exchange of information and encouraging mutual co-operation. The German Democratic Republic said new technology must not be allowed to become a vehicle for misinformation in the hands of the media monopolies of certain Western States. The Ukrainian SSR emphasized that direct television broadcasting should be used solely to promote peace and

friendship and raise the educational level and cultural awareness of the largest number of people. No State, said Viet Nam, had the right to broadcast to another State, against its will, television programmes that were contrary to that country's political, economic and cultural interests.

Concern for the legitimate aspirations of developing countries in elaborating the principles was expressed by Chile, Peru and the Philippines. Mali noted that such broadcasting, when conducted with strict regard for State sovereignty, could revolutionize information dissemination.

Italy and Japan believed that the principle of free flow of information should serve as the corner-stone for elaboration of the principles. Along with the Netherlands, they thought the principles should be based on technical regulations drawn up by the International Telecommunication Union. Belgium, in support of this view, urged that the principles be firmly linked to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights<sup>(3)</sup> and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.<sup>(4)</sup> Spain saw two principles as relevant—freedom of information and a State's right to preserve its informational identity. The United States, emphasizing that consensus could never be achieved by departing from the fundamental right of freedom of expression, stated that it was prepared to work towards a set of non-binding principles. France advocated a régime sufficiently flexible to take account of the concerns of receiving countries.

China considered that unilateral emphasis on freedom of communication, without taking account of the sovereignty, interests or specific conditions of States, would lead to disputes. Other delegations maintained that freedom of information should not be allowed to prevent States from protecting their national interests (Brazil); be used as a pretext for political propaganda (Greece, Kenya); endanger another State's values (Madagascar); violate international law (Romania); or infringe the rights of others (Uruguay). Colombia was not convinced by the argument that efforts to protect States from the monopoly, propaganda and advertising of transnational corporations was contrary to freedom of information. If all co-operated, said the Syrian Arab Republic, it would be possible to prevent direct television broadcasting from becoming a means of intervention in a State's affairs.

Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay believed that if consensus could not be reached in the Committee on outer space, the Assembly should act. The value of consensus, particularly with regard to legal matters, was emphasized by

a number of delegations, including Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Spain, the United States and Venezuela, many of which felt that progress on the principles had been achieved.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20; <sup>(2)</sup>Legal Sub-Committee, A/AC.105/288.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>217 A (III), 10 Dec. 1948 (YUN 1948-49, p. 535); <sup>(4)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 423); <sup>(5)</sup>2222 (XXI), annex, 19 Dec. 1966 (*ibid.*, p. 41); <sup>(6)</sup>36/35, paras. 7 & 8, 18 Nov. 1981 (p. 114).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1980, p. 120.

#### Legal implications of remote sensing

WORKING GROUP CONSIDERATION. From 17 March to 3 April 1981, a Working Group established by the Legal Sub-Committee continued considering draft principles governing the remote sensing of earth from space. It reviewed each of the 17 draft principles as they had appeared at the conclusion of the Sub-Committee's 1980 session, with the exception of principles II through X, on which tentative agreement had already been reached.

In the debate on principle XIII, concerning notification by the State conducting remote sensing activities to the States whose territory would be covered (sensed States), delegations supported one or a combination of the following approaches: prior notification of the general nature and geographical coverage of the remote sensing programme, notification after commencement of the programme, or notification that primary data had been received. Since some delegations insisted on some sort of prior notification and others would not accept such an obligation, no consensus was reached.

The remaining seven principles, together with notes and brackets indicating the need for further consideration, were left unchanged, since each of the texts posed problems which the Working Group could not resolve. A new approach to the definitions of "remote sensing of earth", "primary data" and "analysed information" contained in principle I was introduced by Colombia in a working paper that took into account the distinction between macroscopic and microscopic remote sensing and the existence of information collected by sources other than satellites. While some delegations agreed with the basic approach of the Colombian proposal, others felt it complicated matters or went beyond the Sub-Committee's mandate in attempting to regulate activities that were not space-related.

Some delegations felt that principle XI, on international responsibility for remote sensing activities, was unacceptable to the extent that it

went beyond the provisions of the Outer Space Treaty,<sup>(3)</sup> while others stressed the importance of retaining the principle and applying it to the activities of non-governmental organizations.

Although members of the Group agreed that sensed States should have timely and non-discriminatory access to primary data on reasonable terms, as stated in principle XII, no consensus could be reached on the time element and the necessity of the sensing and sensed States agreeing on terms of access.

Some delegations felt that principle XIV, concerning consultation with a sensed State at its request, should be deleted or the language streamlined, since similar ideas were contained in other principles. Others felt it premature to decide on deletion before agreement on other principles.

Opinions were again divided in respect to principle XV, concerning the approval by sensed States of dissemination of information on their natural resources. Some delegations, in support of restricted dissemination, preferred the concept underlying a USSR proposal of 1979, which introduced spatial resolution (degree of detail) as a criterion to determine the types of data whose dissemination should be subject to consent. Others favoured a system of unrestricted dissemination and also argued that spatial resolution would not provide a reliable standard reference because of practical difficulties in establishing the spatial resolution in each instance. New language for the principle was proposed in the working paper by Colombia. Since the paper also provided for the consent of sensed States, some delegations found it unacceptable.

With regard to principle XVI, stating that remote sensing should respect a State's permanent sovereignty over its natural resources, some delegations advocated deletion on the ground that its meaning was unclear and that no consensus had been achieved in other forums where the concept was being discussed. Others supported retention of the principle as a natural complement to other principles.

In discussing principle XVII, relating to dispute settlement, some delegations thought the text gave undue preference to prompt consultations between disputing parties as the only means of settlement; others felt that the application of this principle should not be restricted to legal disputes.

During a preliminary exchange of views in the Group on a working paper submitted by Mexico, which contained a revised version of all 17 principles, a number of delegations supported the paper in principle, reserving the right to comment in detail at the 1982 session of the Legal Sub-Committee. This working paper, as well as that submitted by Colombia, were appended to

the report of the Chairman of the Working Group, which was annexed to the report of the Legal Sub-Committee on its 1981 session.<sup>(2)</sup>

The work of the Legal Sub-Committee and its Working Group on remote sensing was noted by the Committee on outer space at its June/July session.<sup>(1)</sup> Scientific and technical aspects of remote sensing were discussed by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee (p. 116).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 18 November, the General Assembly decided that the Sub-Committee should continue its consideration of the legal implications of remote sensing on a priority basis with the aim of formulating draft principles.<sup>(4)</sup>

During discussion in SPC, a number of delegations, including the Byelorussian SSR, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia and Viet Nam, stressed the necessity of making the dissemination of all data and information subject to the approval of the State whose territory was affected by remote sensing, as a corollary to the principle of State sovereignty. In support of this view, Cuba added that data which did not relate to any particular State should be disseminated promptly among all States, giving priority to those which might be affected, in order to eliminate restrictions impeding access of developing countries to data. The need to facilitate access of developing countries to remote sensing data was also emphasized by Bangladesh, Bolivia, Malawi, Sierra Leone and Sweden.

Romania and other delegations held that States whose territory was the object of remote sensing had the right to receive the results. Of those expressing this view, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Kenya, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Venezuela and Yugoslavia added that those results must not be given to third parties without the sensed State's consent, while France and the Philippines said such prior consent should be a prerequisite to releasing certain kinds of data.

Supporting the prior consent view, Ecuador claimed that only the United Nations should be empowered to compile and disseminate data received from outer space, and Yugoslavia suggested that, in future, the United Nations set up its own system for analysis and dissemination.

Iraq, Kenya, Peru, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uruguay and Viet Nam emphasized that, in addition to the rights of sensed States with regard to priority access and dissemination of information, principles governing remote sensing activities should also stipulate that prior authorization for sensing must be obtained from the sensed States. Although Greece believed prior consent was desirable, it was willing to consider compulsory prior notification. Chile, Indonesia and Madagascar, supporting the principles of prior

notification, transfer of data and consent of the sensed State before dissemination, emphasized that these questions could be resolved only by respecting the sovereignty of States and the needs of developing countries.

Italy cautioned against hasty restrictions on the beneficial applications of remote sensing technology or on the principle of free flow of information. Sweden noted the need for international co-operation so that data could be freely accessible to countries not possessing their own satellite, and suggested that developing countries be assisted in interpreting and using data.

The USSR, remarking that remote sensing should benefit the sensed State rather than a third party, opposed the notion that dissemination of data was not part of space activities and could therefore be incorporated in the so-called free market. Expressing a similar view, Czechoslovakia warned against the increasing endeavours on the part of private capital in some Western countries to commercialize outer space activities, while Romania asserted that countries engaged in space exploration often required payment of a sizeable proportion of the expenditure as a precondition for the use of satellites and access to data, which would lead to a new form of economic and political domination.

Bulgaria expressed the view that remote sensing should be carried out only on the basis of the broadest international co-operation and respect for the rights and interests of all States. The Ukrainian SSR believed speedy completion of draft principles would do much to promote the use of remote sensing to strengthen peace and security and enhance the living standards of all peoples. Egypt and Nigeria hoped that difficulties in the classification and dissemination of data could be overcome without infringing the sovereignty of the sensed States.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20; <sup>(2)</sup>Legal Sub-Committee, A/AC.105/288.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>2222(XXI), annex, 19, Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 41); <sup>(4)</sup>36/35, para. 5 (a), 18 Nov. 1981 (p. 114).

#### Legal aspects of the use of nuclear power sources in outer space

The Working Group established by the Legal Sub-Committee to consider the possibility of supplementing the norms of international law relevant to the use of nuclear power sources in outer space met from 16 March to 9 April 1981. The main issue discussed in the Group was the adequacy of established international law with regard to the safe use of such power sources. Some delegations felt that existing international regulations were relevant but needed to be supplemented; others believed that there was al-

ready an adequate framework of international rules on the use of nuclear power sources in outer space.

The Working Group noted that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee's Working Group on the Use of Nuclear Power Sources in Outer Space, in its 1981 report, had again concluded that such power sources could be used safely provided that all necessary safety requirements were met (p. 117). Emphasizing that the safety of people and the environment should be given the necessary weight, some delegations felt that nuclear power sources should not be used in outer space if an alternative energy source could be utilized; others considered that the choice should be made on technical grounds based on the design and operational features of a specific mission.

The Group discussed a working paper by Canada, based on a paper presented by that delegation in 1980,<sup>(4)</sup> suggesting requirements to be met by launching States and others in regard to information on the use of nuclear power sources, notification prior to re-entry, assistance to States and radiation exposure levels. During the session, a similar working paper was submitted by Venezuela and a working paper containing comments on sections of the Canadian paper was submitted by Italy.

The Sub-Committee annexed the Group Chairman's report, as well as the Canadian working paper, to its report to the Committee on outer space.<sup>(2)</sup> The Committee, after considering these documents, expressed the view that the Sub-Committee's consideration of the subject should provide a constructive basis for continuing work in the Sub-Committee 1982.<sup>(1)</sup> On 18 November, the Assembly decided that the Sub-Committee should continue to consider this item through its Working Group.<sup>(3)</sup>

During discussion in SPC, a number of delegations, including Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, India, the Netherlands and Uruguay, advocated the elaboration of principles to supplement existing norms of international law governing the use of nuclear power sources in outer space. Supporting this view, Italy added that nuclear power sources should be used only when they were irreplaceable, and prior notice of their use should be given. Nigeria emphasized the need for notification prior to re-entry, as well as the responsibility of the launching State for any damage resulting from the disintegration of a nuclear-powered object. Cuba remarked that any regional or international set of rules on this topic should establish as a priority principle the use of nuclear power sources for peaceful purposes. Peru stressed the need to study the possible danger caused by the use of outer space for

the transfer or storage of radioactive wastes produced on earth.

Canada and Japan expressed hope that the Legal Sub-Committee's Working Group would soon be able to submit guidelines that would ensure adequate protection for humans and the environment. Sweden, strongly supporting the idea of pre-launch information and notification prior to re-entry, believed that safety standards should include the general principles devised by the International Commission on Radiological Protection and should be based on the work of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee's Working Group on the Use of Nuclear Power Sources in Outer Space, as proposed in the paper submitted by Canada. Support for the Canadian working paper was also voiced by Indonesia, while the Netherlands and the Philippines regarded it as a useful basis for discussion.

Although Austria believed that the Canadian paper was a valuable starting point, it felt safety aspects should be considered on a more general and comprehensive level. Madagascar thought the paper should be supplemented by a provision obliging launching States to give immediate assistance to developing countries in case of accident. Venezuela emphasized that the principles should also mention the responsibility of States for damage caused when objects equipped with nuclear power sources returned to earth, as noted in its own working paper.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20; <sup>(2)</sup>Legal Sub-Committee, A/AC.105/288.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/35, para. 5 (b) (i), 18 Nov. (p. 114).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 125.

#### Definition of outer space and legal aspects of the geostationary orbit

**LEGAL SUB-COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.** The definition and/or delimitation of outer space and outer space activities, including questions relating to the geostationary orbit, were discussed by the Legal Sub-Committee in April 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> Opinions continued to differ as to whether a definition or delimitation of outer space ought to be established.

Members of the Sub-Committee who considered the definition and/or delimitation of outer space a necessity stated that the legal regime applicable to airspace differed from one applicable to outer space, particularly in matters related to State sovereignty. Some of these members believed that a conventional boundary, established by agreement between States, was the most appropriate method for delimiting outer space. A number of delegations supported the view that the boundary between outer space and airspace be placed at an altitude not higher than 100 to

110 kilometres above sea-level, as proposed by the USSR in 1979.<sup>(5)</sup>

Other Sub-Committee members argued that no practical difficulties had arisen from the absence of a definition or delimitation of outer space and that there was no scientific or technical justification for designating a particular altitude as a boundary. They believed the establishment of such a boundary would be premature and would create difficulties in the transit of a space object over States during launch or descent.

In regard to the geostationary orbit, which was also discussed by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee (p. 117), some members of the Legal Sub-Committee observed that the orbit was a limited natural resource of a unique character and maintained that a satellite should be stationed in such an orbit only with the consent of the underlying State. Others saw no basis for national claims to sovereignty over the orbit, stating that the geostationary orbit was an inseparable part of outer space.

Some delegations thought that a definition of outer space and the geostationary orbit question should be considered in a working group of the Sub-Committee, but others disagreed. The question was referred to the Committee on outer space, where divergent views were again expressed and no consensus was reached.<sup>(1)</sup> On 18 November, the Assembly decided that the Legal Sub-Committee should continue to consider the definition and/or delimitation of outer space and outer space activities, bearing in mind questions related to the geostationary orbit, and should devote adequate time for deeper consideration.<sup>(4)</sup>

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION.** During discussion in SPC, Brazil took the view that delimitation of the boundary between outer space and airspace was necessary to avoid conflict on the application of two distinct régimes. Czechoslovakia said a definition was needed to determine the spatial scope of space treaties already concluded.

The USSR, stressing the importance of a definition as a basis for elaborating the remaining concepts concerning outer space, reiterated its 1979 proposal that the definition be based on altitude. This proposal was supported by a number of others, including Hungary, Madagascar, Mongolia, Poland and Uruguay. Peru, stating that the Committee on outer space should establish the scientific basis for an international instrument on delimitation, believed that consensus should be reached on an altitude accepted by the majority. Venezuela observed that, whatever criterion was to be followed, any definition must be acceptable to all States and take into account their sovereignty and security interests.



India believed the definition and limits of outer space had to be discussed further in the Committee on outer space in order to achieve consensus.

Chile stressed the need to establish by a convention the limits of outer space and promote a more efficient and rational use of the geostationary orbit in the interest of all States. Austria stated that it was prepared to join any consensus on a definition of outer space that was linked to the question of the geostationary orbit. Continued consideration of the two topics as one item was also supported by Ecuador, Japan and the Syrian Arab Republic.

Indonesia emphasized the need for precise regulations governing the use of the orbit that safeguarded the interests of all countries and recognized the special rights of underlying States. Kenya, noting the view of the equatorial States that their sovereignty extended to the segment of the orbit located above their territories, emphasized the urgent need to avoid saturation of the orbit. Concern that the orbit would become saturated if steps were not taken to regulate its use was expressed by several other countries, including Argentina, Colombia, Peru and Venezuela. Brazil stated that appropriate criteria must be found to preserve access to orbital positions on an equitable basis, taking into account the interests of the equatorial countries. In Peru's opinion, equatorial countries should have a preferential right to use it.

Madagascar believed that the United Nations should play a role in regulating use of the geostationary orbit. Nigeria, supporting the rights of African countries to the orbit, suggested that its management be assigned to a specialized body in the United Nations system. The Philippines believed that a special legal regime should be established for the orbit that would ensure its utilization for the benefit of all States, particularly the developing countries. The Syrian Arab Republic warned against monopolization of the orbit by a minority of States.

Colombia, stating that the needs of equatorial and all developing countries were complementary, supported, along with Ecuador, the idea of drafting an additional protocol to the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (Outer Space Treaty)<sup>(3)</sup> to make good its omission with regard to the definition of outer space and the geostationary orbit.

Iraq and Pakistan favoured the elaboration of legal principles to regulate the exploitation of the orbit in a just manner so as to protect the interests of all States equally. Australia, while agreeing that no country should be precluded from utilizing the benefits provided by the orbit,

held the view that claims of sovereignty over the orbit had no scientific or legal basis and would conflict with the Outer Space Treaty.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>COPUOS, A/36/20; <sup>(2)</sup>Legal Sub-Committee, A/AC.105/288.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>2222(XXI), annex, 19 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 41); <sup>(4)</sup>36/35, para. 5 (b) (ii), 18 Nov. 1981 (p. 114).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1979, p. 108.

## Preparations for UNISPACE-82

Work continued in 1981 on plans for the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (UNISPACE-82), scheduled for Vienna from 9 to 21 August 1982.

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 18 November 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> approved recommendations made in July by the Preparatory Committee for the Conference. The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to complete by 31 December the appointment of officers responsible for Conference preparations, invited Member States to promote awareness of the Conference through their national mass media, and requested the Secretary-General of the Conference to mobilize further assistance from the United Nations Department of Public Information, other services of the United Nations system and non-governmental organizations in disseminating information on the Conference.

This resolution was adopted without vote, after having been similarly approved by SPC on 30 October. The draft was sponsored by 44 States and introduced by Austria.

The recommendations approved by the Assembly were made by the Preparatory Committee at its third session, held at United Nations Headquarters from 22 June to 2 July.<sup>(2)</sup> The Committee, made up of the same members as the Committee on outer space and meeting during that body's 1981 session, approved draft provisional rules of procedure and a meetings schedule for the Conference, agreed on the number and geographical distribution of Conference officers, and approved the outline for the draft final report of the Conference. It requested the Conference Secretary-General to prepare a draft of the final report for consideration in 1982. The Committee also noted that a number of countries and organizations had offered to maintain exhibitions during the Conference and that matters related to preparatory work had been or would be considered by regional seminars held in 1981 and scheduled for 1982 under the United Nations Programme on Space Applications (p. 115).

The Preparatory Committee was assisted by an Advisory Committee, made up of the members of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. Meeting at its second session, from 2 to 13 February at United Nations Headquarters,<sup>(1)</sup> the Advisory Committee made a number of recommendations that were endorsed by the Preparatory Committee in July. Noting the contributions to the Conference planned by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Advisory Committee suggested that other specialized agencies and organizations be invited to contribute further to Conference activities. It also recommended that a number of pre-Conference publicity activities be carried out as far as possible within the financial ceiling approved by the Assembly, and that arrangements with Member States and international organizations interested in implementing in-Conference publicity be co-ordinated by the Conference Secretary-General.

Reporting on Conference preparations to SPC in October, the Secretary-General of the Conference, Yash Pal, stated that national papers on space activities had been received from 56 States, with more expected. It had been necessary to delay final preparation of the draft report of the Conference, since it would be based primarily on an analysis of those papers and others provided by specialized agencies. Although preparations were proceeding satisfactorily, the Secretary-General regretted the strict financial constraints and the delay in appointing some senior officials of the Conference secretariat. Since budget allocations for the six regional seminars to be held in connection with the Conference had been inadequate, he had approached a number of Governments to raise more funds. The Conference secretariat was doing its best to implement the numerous public information activities recommended by the Preparatory Committee—including a newsletter, exhibitions, and poster and essay contests—within the \$50,000 allocated for the purpose.

During discussion in SPC, States expressed support for the Conference as a forum for international co-operation in outer space. Some were concerned that all necessary secretariat appointments had not yet been made. Most delegations emphasized the importance of the Conference as a means of increasing scientific and technical exchanges between industrialized and developing countries to lessen the technological dependence of the latter. In this regard, Cuba hoped that the number of scholarships and seminars on space activities would be increased so that developing countries might participate actively in the Conference, and Colombia expressed the view that the Conference should not be confined to consid-

eration of scientific and commercial aspects but should study the urgent legal problems created by technical advances. Venezuela hoped that it would tackle the problems of developing countries and not be converted into a trade fair or a battle of words about outer space feats. Finland regarded the Conference as part of the North-South dialogue.

The United States reiterated that it would be unable to take part in the Conference unless appointments to the Conference secretariat were made in accordance with a formula that preserved the integrity of the United Nations personnel system. Czechoslovakia remarked that delegations which made their participation in the Conference contingent on irrelevant technical or organizational questions seemed to be using those questions to obscure their unfavourable attitude towards the Conference.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CONF.101/PC/4 & Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>Preparatory Committee, A/36/46.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/36, 18 Nov., text following.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.15-20 (27-30 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.63 (18 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 38/36

Adopted without vote Meeting: 63 18 November 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/657 and Corr.1) without vote. 30 October (meeting 20): 44-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.5): agenda items 61 and 62.

Sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Turkey, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 33/16 of 10 November 1978, 34/67 of 5 December 1979 and 35/15 of 3 November 1980 concerning the convening as well as the preparation of the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, to be held at Vienna from 9 to 21 August 1982,

Having considered the report submitted to the General Assembly by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space in its capacity as Preparatory Committee for the Conference,

1. Approves the recommendations contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space concerning, in particular, the publicity arrangements, the outline of the draft report, the provisional rules of procedure, the schedule of meetings and the officers of the Conference;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the United Nations Programme on Space Applications for the holding of regional seminars related to the preparation of the Conference, as well as to all the Governments that have acted as hosts to these seminars;

3. Expresses its concern at the fact that all the officers necessary for the preparation of the Conference have not yet been appointed;

4. Reiterates its request to the Secretary-General to make all the necessary appointments without further delay, and in any case not later than 31 December 1981, in order to

ensure the efficient preparation of the Conference;  
5. Invites Member States actively to promote, to the extent possible, public awareness of the Conference through their national radio and television networks, as well as through the efficient use of other mass media;

6. Requests the Preparatory Committee and its Advisory Committee to continue the preparatory work for the Conference;

7. Commends the Secretary-General of the Conference for the satisfactory arrangements for the Conference;

8. Requests the Secretary-General of the Conference to continue fulfilling his mandate and to mobilize further assistance from the Department of Public Information of the secretariat and other relevant services of the United Nations system as well as from the non-governmental organizations in disseminating effectively information on the Conference to ensure world-wide awareness of the Conference and its objectives;

9. Requests the Conference to submit a report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

## Register of launchings of space objects

In 1981, four States and an intergovernmental organization supplied information to the United Nations on the launching of objects into orbit around earth or farther into space, in accordance with a 1961 General Assembly resolution<sup>(6)</sup> and the Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space.<sup>(7)</sup>

Nineteen notifications of objects launched during 1981 and the latter part of 1980 were re-

ceived and distributed as United Nations documents. Information was submitted by India on 2 launchings,<sup>(1)</sup> by Japan on 2 launchings,<sup>(2)</sup> by the USSR on 71 launchings,<sup>(3)</sup> by the United States on 17 launchings<sup>(4)</sup> and by the European Space Agency on 3 launchings.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Netherlands and the Republic of Korea became parties to the Convention on registration during 1981. There were a total of 30 States parties as at 31 December 1981, as follows:

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Mexico, Netherlands, Niger, Peru, Poland, Republic of Korea, Seychelles, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Letters (l) and notes verbales: <sup>(1)</sup>India: 15 July, A/AC.105/INF.387 (l); 3 Sep., A/AC.105/INF.388 (l).

<sup>(2)</sup>Japan: 9 Apr., A/AC.105/INF.386 (l). <sup>(3)</sup>USSR: 18 Feb., ST/SG/SER.E/45; 3 Apr., ST/SG/SER.E/46; 1 June, ST/SG/SER.E/48; 10 June, ST/SG/SER.E/50; 10 Aug., ST/SG/SER.E/53; 27 Oct., ST/SG/SER.E/57.

<sup>(4)</sup>United States: 2 Feb., ST/SG/SER.E/44; 23 Apr., ST/SG/SER.E/47; 4 June, ST/SG/SER.E/49; 3 Aug., ST/SG/SER.E/52; 13 Aug., ST/SG/SER.E/54; 11 Sep., ST/SG/SER.E/55; 7 Oct., ST/SG/SER.E/56; 17 Dec., ST/SG/SER.E/59. <sup>(5)</sup>European Space Agency: 24 July, ST/SG/SER.E/51 (l).

Resolution: GA: <sup>(6)</sup>1721 B (XVI), 20 Dec. 1961 (YUN 1961, p. 35); <sup>(7)</sup>3235 (XXIX), annex, 12 Nov. 1974 (YUN 1974, p. 63).

## Chapter III

### Law of the sea

The 1981 session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, its tenth, ended in August with the issuance of an official draft Convention on the Law of the Sea. The draft Convention,<sup>(1)</sup> covering most human uses of the oceans, incorporated the results of negotiations at the tenth and previous sessions.

The Conference recorded substantial agreement on most issues, but several problems remained outstanding. They included participation in the Convention by national liberation movements, the establishment of a Preparatory Commission, the protection of pioneer investments in sea-bed mining and drafting issues.

A new timetable approved at the close of the tenth session envisaged a concluding session in 1982 for the purpose of signing the Convention. This schedule was approved by the General Assembly in December 1981.<sup>(4)</sup>

The 1981 session was held in two parts: from 9 March to 16 April at United Nations Headquarters and from 3 to 28 August at Geneva.

The mandate of the Conference, assigned to it by the General Assembly in 1973, was to draw up a convention dealing with all matters relating to the law of the sea.<sup>(5)</sup> The decision to convene the Conference was taken by the Assembly in 1970<sup>(2)</sup> and its first session was held in 1973.<sup>(5)</sup>

Draft Convention: <sup>(1)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.78 & Corr.3.8.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2750 C (XXV), 17 Dec. 1970 (YUN 1970, p. 81); <sup>(3)</sup>3067 (XXVIII), 16 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 43); <sup>(4)</sup>36/79.9 Dec. 1981 (p. 130).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1973, p. 44.

Publication: Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. Official Records, vol. XV: Summary Records of Meetings, Tenth Session, New York, 9 March-16 April 1981; Resumed Tenth Session, Geneva, 3-28 August 1981 (Plenary meetings 142.155; General Committee, meetings 59-66; First Committee, meetings 50-54) and Documents, Sales No. E.83.V.4.

## Conference on the Law of the Sea

### Organizational aspects

#### Tenth session (1981)

A total of 158 States and the United Nations Council for Namibia participated in the tenth session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea: 155 attended the first part and 146 the resumed session. Two Territories, 11 specialized agencies or United Nations-related bodies and 15 intergovernmental organizations participated as observers. (For participating States and officers, see APPENDIX III.)

#### Dates and meeting places

Since the goal of adopting a convention was not reached at the first part of the Conference's tenth session, held in New York from 9 March to 16 April 1981, the Conference reconvened at Geneva from 3 to 28 August, following informal consultations by delegations from 29 to 31 July. The decision to reconvene the session was approved by the General Assembly without vote on 11 May,<sup>(1)</sup> on a revised draft by Singapore, in accordance with a recommendation adopted by the Conference on 16 April, transmitted to the Assembly by a letter of 20 April from the Conference President.<sup>(2)</sup> The Assembly also approved the convening of the Drafting Committee at Geneva from 29 June to 31 July (p. 129).

Sierra Leone, speaking after the Assembly took its decision, expressed concern that once again a session of the Conference might be spent without profit while waiting for one delegation to resume serious negotiations.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 35/452, 11 May, text following.

Letter: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference on Law of Sea President, 20 Apr., A/35/803.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/35/804; S-G statement, A/C.5/35/121 & Add.1.

Meeting records: Law of Sea Conference, A/CONF.62/SR.149 (16 Apr.); GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/35/SR.65 (11 May); plenary, A/35/PV.112, 113 (11 May).

#### General Assembly decision 35/452

Adopted without vote

Draft by Singapore (A/35/L.60/Rev.1) agenda item 20.

Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea

At its 113th plenary meeting, on 11 May 1981, the General Assembly, in the light of the recommendation of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, which met pursuant to Assembly resolution 35/116 of 10 December 1980:

(a) Approved the reconvening of the tenth session of the Conference at Geneva from 3 to 29 August 1981 with a possible one-week extension if the Conference should so decide:

(b) Approved also the convening of the Drafting Committee of the Conference at Geneva from 29 June to 31 July 1981;

(c) Recommended that the Secretary-General should provide the necessary facilities for informal consultations from 29 to 31 July 1981 to delegations participating in the Conference, in particular for the announced consultations of the Group of Seventy-seven.

#### Organization of work

As at previous sessions, the work of the Conference in 1981 was largely carried on at informal meetings and was based on negotiating texts issued by the Conference's collegium, consisting of its President and the chairmen of its three main committees, working as a team with which the Chairman of the Drafting Committee and the Rapporteur-General of the Conference were associated. The results of the informal negotiations were reported to the Conference at formal meetings, at which delegations were given an opportunity to make statements on the work done and the questions which remained.

On 13 March, the Conference elected Tommy T. B. Koh (Singapore) as its new President, to succeed H. Shirley Amerasinghe (Sri Lanka), who had died in December 1980. In addition, Sri Lanka replaced Singapore as one of the Conference's Vice-Presidents.

For the first part of the session, work was based on a draft Convention on the Law of the Sea (informal text) issued in August 1980.<sup>(3)</sup> A work programme for the two weeks ending 27 March was approved by the Conference on 17 March, based on recommendations of the collegium which were transmitted by the President to the General Committee in a note of 16 March.<sup>(4)</sup> The Conference agreed on 30 March to continue with this programme through 13 April. On 10 April, it decided to wind up all substantive work of the New York portion of its session on 16 April while allowing the Drafting Committee to continue through 24 April, the originally scheduled concluding date for the session.

In accordance with this programme, the Conference dealt with three outstanding matters: an article-by-article review of the draft Convention in order to reach harmonization and textual concordance in its six official languages, carried out by the Drafting Committee and reviewed at informal plenary meetings (p. 129); participation in the Convention by entities other than States, considered at informal plenary meetings (p. 134); and the mandate of the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, discussed in formal meetings of the First Committee and informal meetings of the Committee's Working Group of 21 (p. 137). The First Committee also dealt with other matters pertaining to the sea-bed (p. 128), and informal meetings were held by the Second and Third Committees (p. 129).

One further unresolved question- the treatment to be accorded to preparatory sea-bed investments made before the Convention entered into force- was not taken up because the Group of 77 developing countries said it was not prepared to negotiate on the question since the United States had not clarified its position relating to the Convention.

Consultations chaired by the President were held between two interest groups on the question of delimitation of maritime boundaries between States with opposite or adjacent coasts. There were also consultations and First Committee meetings on the production policy for sea-bed mining (p. 132).

On 15 April, the Conference devoted one meeting to hearing reports by Committee chairmen as well as delegation views on the matters considered during the first part of the session. On 16 April, it decided to suspend the session and to resume at Geneva on 3 August (p. 127).

At the opening meeting of the resumed session, the Conference, on the suggestion of its President, approved a programme calling for continued work on outstanding issues for the two weeks through 14 August. This work programme was extended on 17 August for one further week, through 21 August.

At the suggestion of the Chairman of the Group of 77, the United States informed the Conference, at an informal plenary meeting on 5 August, of the results of the review of the draft Convention by the new United States Administration. No agreements were reached during subsequent consultations held to examine the issues raised by the United States with respect to the sea-bed provisions of the Convention.

Indicative votes on the seats of the Authority (p. 133) and the Tribunal (p. 136) were taken at an informal plenary meeting on 21 August.

On the recommendation of the General Committee,<sup>(2)</sup> the Conference decided on 24 August to revise the informal text of the draft Convention in order to accord to it the status of an official draft Convention, subject to three conditions: (1) The door would be kept open for consultations and negotiations on certain outstanding issues; the results, if they received widespread and substantial support improving the prospect of consensus, would be incorporated in the draft Convention without the need for formal amendments. (2) The Drafting Committee would complete its work; its recommendations, as approved by the Conference at informal meetings, would be incorporated into the text. (3) Since consultations and negotiations would continue, delegations would not be permitted to submit formal amendments at that stage; they could do so only after the termination of all negotiations.

On 28 August, the Conference received reports by the President on consultations relating to maritime boundary delimitation (p. 134) and by the chairmen of the First and Drafting Committees. Also submitted were a study on the functions of the Secretary-General under the Convention and on the needs of countries for information, advice and assistance under the new legal régime (p. 139), as well as a revised draft resolution on development of national marine science, technology and ocean service infrastructures (p. 760).

The Conference decided on 28 August to hold its final decision-making session for the adoption of the Convention in New York from 8 March to 30 April 1982 (p. 130), and adopted a work programme for that session (p. 131).

The draft Convention on the Law of the Sea was issued at the close of the session (p. 131).

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on Law of Sea President, A/CONF.62/110.

Recommendations: <sup>(2)</sup>General Committee, A/CONF.62/114. Yearbook reference <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 143.

Meeting records: Conference on Law of Sea: plenary meetings, A/CONF.62/SR.143, 145-147, 149; 151-153 (13 Mar.-16 Apr. & 3-24 Aug.); General Committee, A/CONF.62/BUR/SR.59-66 (16 Mar.-16 Apr. & 3-24 Aug.).

#### First Committee

The First Committee held five formal meetings between 19 March and 27 August 1981 on questions relating to the sea-bed provisions of the Convention and to the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. The first two meetings (19 and 20 March) were devoted to a general debate on the Preparatory Commission (p. 137). At the next two meetings (3 and 7 April), the Committee heard general comments on two reports of the Secretary-General: on potential financial implications for States parties to the future Convention (p. 138), and on the effects of the Convention's production limitation formula for sea-bed mining (p. 132). The fifth meeting (27 August) was devoted to consideration of a report by the Committee Chairman on the results of negotiations on various topics during the resumed session.

The Chairman made three reports during 1981, the first to the Conference on 16 April,<sup>(1)</sup> the second to the Committee on 27 August<sup>(3)</sup> and the third to the Conference on 28 August.<sup>(2)</sup>

The issue of the seat of the Sea-Bed Authority was discussed formally for the first time (p. 133). The opportunity was also given for the examination of any matter that countries felt had not been dealt with formally in the First Committee. In this connection, Australia, on 7 April, made a suggestion about provisions dealing with unfair

economic practices relating to sea-bed minerals which might injure the international trading interests of another State party to the Convention (p. 133).

The Committee's Working Group of 21 met under the co-chairmanship of the Conference President and the First Committee Chairman. It concentrated mainly on negotiations regarding the Preparatory Commission. The Working Group continued to be composed of 10 members nominated by the Group of 77 developing countries, China, and 10 members nominated by the principal industrialized States.

Informal consultations were held among delegations on some of the issues discussed at formal meetings, as well as on the composition of the Council of the Authority (p. 133).

Reports: 1st Committee Chairman, <sup>(1)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.70, <sup>(2)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.81. <sup>(3)</sup>A/CONF.62/C.1/L.29.

Meeting records: Conference on Law of Sea, First Committee, A/CONF.62/C.1/SR.50-54 (19 Mar.-7 Apr. & 27 Aug.).

## Second Committee

The Second Committee held four informal meetings, all during the first part of the 1981 session, and heard 119 statements on matters concerning the territorial sea, the exclusive economic zone and fisheries, and other subjects (p. 135). The delimitation of maritime space between States with opposite or adjacent coasts was dealt with separately by the two groups of countries concerned (p. 134).

In a report of 15 April,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee Chairman stated that, while a number of countries had raised a few questions on which they wanted to see changes in the draft Convention, there was a virtual consensus on the fact that it was not desirable or practical to reopen discussion on the basic issues. He added that the draft Convention was acceptable to the great majority of countries, although it was possible to make minor changes designed to clarify or improve it, at such time as the Conference might decide.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>2nd Committee Chairman, A/CONF.62/L.69.

## Third Committee

The Third Committee held an informal meeting on 25 March 1981, in order to ascertain whether there were still any issues it could discuss. The Chairman, in a report of 17 April,<sup>(1)</sup> reiterated that the substantive negotiations of the Committee had been completed. It had been agreed that the draft Convention with respect to parts XII, XIII and XIV (concerning protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research, and development and transfer of marine technology) constituted a compromise based on a sound balance which should not be upset by reopening issues already exten-

sively negotiated. It had also been agreed that, if and when called upon by the Conference, the Committee should be available to consider any issue within its terms of reference.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>3rd Committee Chairman, A/CONF.62/L.71.

## Drafting Committee

The Drafting Committee, together with its six language groups and their co-ordinators, held five series of meetings in 1981, of which three were held while the Conference was in session and two were inter-sessional: from 12 January to 2 March;<sup>(1)</sup> during the first part of the Conference's 1981 session, 9 March to 16 April;<sup>(3)</sup> from 20 to 24 April, after the adjournment of the Conference's other organs;<sup>(4)</sup> from 29 June to 31 July;<sup>(5)</sup> and during the Conference's resumed session, 3 to 28 August.<sup>(7)</sup> The meetings through April were held in New York and the others at Geneva.

The convening of the inter-sessional meetings at Geneva was a proved by the General Assembly on 11 May.<sup>(9)</sup> The Assembly, in a resolution of 9 December on the work of the Conference, also approved the convening of the Committee in New York from 18 January to 26 February 1982, prior to the 1982 session of the Conference.

The work of the Drafting Committee in 1981 was carried out at 695 meetings of the language groups open to all delegations, 75 meetings of the language group co-ordinators under the direction of the Committee Chairman and at 32 meetings of the Committee as a whole, all informal. The Committee maintained its previously established working methods, but altered the procedure for the meetings of the co-ordinators by opening them to all members of the Committee and of the language groups.

The Committee continued the process of harmonization of words, expressions and terminology as well as improving concordance of the draft Convention in its six official languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, Spanish). It reviewed article by article about 1,000 proposals submitted by the language groups and approved by the co-ordinators on parts II to X, section 5 (6 in the 1980 draft) of part XI, and parts XII to XV of the draft Convention, as well as annexes I to VIII. (For a list of the parts and annexes of the draft Convention, see p. 131.)

The Conference held eight informal plenary meetings—six at the first part of the session<sup>(2)</sup> and two at the resumed session<sup>(6)</sup>—to consider and approve the Committee's recommendations on the following: arts II to X; sections 1 (general provisions), 2 (principles governing the Area) and 5 (settlement of disputes and advisory opinions—section 6 in the 1980 draft) of part XI; parts XII to XV; and annex V.

In an oral report of 17 March, the Chairman informed the Conference that the Committee had found it desirable to avoid records of discussion of drafting changes and suggested that the Conference do likewise in its plenary meetings in order to expedite matters and obviate the need for interpretative statements. He stated that, although the Committee had not always been able to improve linguistic concordance of the texts in the six official languages, it had sought to achieve juridical concordance in all cases.

Reports: Drafting Committee Chairman: <sup>(1)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.67/Rev.1 & A/CONF.62/L.67/Add.1/Rev.1 & Add.1/Rev.1/Corr.1.2, Add.2 & Add.2/Corr.1, Add.3 & Add.3/Corr.1-3, Add.4 & Add.4/Corr.1-5, Add.5 & Add.5/Corr.1-3, Add.6 & Add.6/Corr.1.2, Add.7 & Add.7/Corr.1-3, Add.8 & Add.8/Corr.1-3, Add.9 & Add.9/Corr.1, Add.10 & Add.10/Corr.1.2, Add.11 & Add.11/Corr.1.2, Add.12 & Add.12/Corr.1-3, Add.13-16 & Add.16/Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.72; <sup>(3)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.73; <sup>(4)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.74; <sup>(5)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.75 & Add.1 & Add.1/Corr.1, Add.2 & Add.2/Corr.1, Add.3, Add.4 & Add.4/Corr.1, Add.5 & Add.5/Corr.1, Add.6 & Add.6/Corr.1, Add.7 & Add.7/Corr.1.2, Add.8 & Add.8/Corr.1.2, Add.9 & Add.9/Corr.1, Add.10 & Add.10/Corr.1, Add.11-13; <sup>(6)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.82 & Corr.1; <sup>(7)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.83 & Corr.1.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(8)</sup>GA, 36/79, para. 3, 9 Dec. (p. 130); Dec.: <sup>(9)</sup>GA, 35/452, para. (b), 11 May (p. 127).

Meeting records: Conference on Law of Sea: A/CONF.62/SR.145, 152 (17 Mar., 17 Aug.).

#### Eleventh session (1982)

##### Dates and meeting place

By a resolution of 9 December 1981, <sup>(2)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly approved the convening of the eleventh, final decision-making, session of the Conference in New York from 8 March to 30 April 1982. It authorized the Conference to extend beyond that date exclusively for the purpose of completing its work, should the formal stage of adoption of the Convention and other pertinent decisions have started and more time be needed to finish the decision-making process. It recommended that the Secretary-General provide facilities for informal consultations by delegations, in particular to the members of the Group of 77, and requested him to consult the Government of Venezuela in order to arrange for the signature of the Final Act and the opening of the Convention for signature at Caracas in early September 1982.

The Assembly also approved the convening of the Drafting Committee in January/February 1982 (p. 129) and invited contributions to the Amerasinghe Fellowship on the Law of the Sea (p. 139).

The resolution was based on the Conference's decision of 28 August (p. 1281), as communicated to the Assembly by a letter of 4 November from the Conference President.<sup>(1)</sup>

Introducing the resolution in the Assembly on behalf of 12 nations, Sierra Leone appealed to Governments to forgo the temptation to contemplate a unilateral path and said it was vital for all participants to commit themselves to the successful conclusion of the Conference.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on Law of Sea President, 4 Nov., A/36/659.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/79, 9 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.5/36/60/Add.1; 5th Committee report, A/36/732; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/60.

Meeting records: Conference on Law of Sea: A/CONF.62/SR.155 (28 Aug.). GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.57 (30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.90 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/79

Adopted without vote Meeting 90 9 December 1981 12-nation draft (A/36/L.18 and Add.1); agenda item 28.

Sponsors: Bulgaria, Maldives, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda.

Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea  
The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3067(XXVIII) of 16 November 1973, 3334(XXIX) of 17 December 1974, 3483(XXX) of 12 December 1975, 31/63 of 10 December 1976, 32/194 of 20 December 1977, 33/17 of 10 November 1978, 34/20 of 9 November 1979 and 35/116 of 10 December 1980,

Taking note of the letter dated 4 November 1981 from the President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea to the President of the General Assembly, informing the latter of the decisions adopted by the Conference regarding the holding of its eleventh session from 8 March to 30 April 1982, the possibility of extending the formal work of the Conference beyond that date, should the formal decision-making stage have started, the meeting of the Drafting Committee of the Conference from 18 January to 26 February 1982, the provision of facilities for the Group of Seventy-seven to meet prior to the eleventh session, from 3 to 5 March 1982, and the arrangements for the signature of the Final Act and the opening of the Convention for signature,

Taking note also of the report of the Secretary-General regarding the establishment of a scholarship under the Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe Fellowship on the Law of the Sea, in recognition of the unique contribution made by the late President of the Conference to the work of the Conference,

Taking note further of the decision of the Conference requesting the Secretary-General to continue the study on the future functions of the Secretary-General under the draft Convention and on the needs of countries, especially developing countries, for information, advice and assistance under the new legal régime,

1. Approves the convening of the eleventh, final decision-making, session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, in New York, for the period from 8 March to 30 April 1982;

2. Authorizes the Conference to extend its work beyond 30 April 1982, in consultation with the Secretary-General, exclusively for the purpose of completing its work, should the formal stage of adoption of the Convention, of the text of the draft resolution on the establishment of the Preparatory Commission, of the Final Act and of other pertinent decisions have started and more time be needed to finish the decision-making process;

3. Approves also the convening of the Drafting Committee of the Conference in New York from 18 January to 26 February 1982;

4. Recommends that the Secretary-General should provide the necessary facilities for informal consultations to delegations participating in the Conference, in particular to the members of the Group of Seventy-seven;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to consult the Government of Venezuela in order to arrange for the signature of the Final Act and the opening of the Convention for signature at Caracas in early September 1982;

6. Invites the Governments of States participating in the Conference, as well as universities, philanthropic foundations and other interested national and international institutions and organizations, to contribute to the Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe Fellowship on the Law of the Sea in the form recommended by the Secretary-General in his report.

#### Organization of work

The work programme for the 1982 session, <sup>(1)</sup> approved by the Conference on 28 August 1981, provided for five stages: consultations and negotiations on pending issues, and processing of Drafting Committee recommendations at informal plenary meetings (8-26 March); discussion in plenary of the results of negotiations, followed by the issuance of a memorandum by the collegium listing all changes to be made in the draft Convention (29 March-1 April); decision by the Conference on when to allow formal amendments to the text, and consultations by delegations with their Governments on the decision-making stages of the session (6-12 April); submission of formal amendments if delegations regarded that as necessary, and application of the procedures for seeking general agreement (13-22 April); and adoption of the Convention, the resolution on the establishment of the Preparatory Commission, the Final Act and any other decisions (23-30 April). Should more time be needed to complete the work, the Conference would, in consultation with the Secretary-General, be authorized to extend beyond 30 April exclusively for that purpose.

The work programme was based on proposals submitted by the collegium<sup>(2)</sup> which were modified, in accordance with an oral proposal by Norway as amended by Greece, to allow for the possibility of an extension in the event that the 30 April deadline arrived after the Conference had begun voting. The Conference also agreed on a suggestion by Pakistan to set aside three working days prior to the eleventh session, from 3 to 5 March 1982, for meetings of the Group of 77.

Discussing the work programme, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany argued that four weeks might be needed for the negotiating stage, while Mauritius and the United Republic of Tanzania thought two weeks would be enough. The Conference agreed to retain the three-week consultation and negotiation period proposed by the collegium.

Mauritius and Pakistan thought the time allowed for decision-making in the fifth stage might be too short. Brazil, Cuba, Kenya, Qatar, Romania (speaking on behalf of the Eastern European Group) and the USSR supported the proposed programme of work; Cuba and the USSR stated that it should be strictly implemented so

that the Conference would achieve its goal of adopting the Convention at the next session. The Philippines hoped that no new issues would be raised in 1982.

Programme of work: <sup>(1)</sup>A/CONF.62/116 <sup>(2)</sup>draft by collegium, A/CONF.62/L.80.

Meeting record: Conference on Law of Sea, A/CONF.62/SR.155 (28 Aug.).

#### Issues relating to the draft Convention

As decided by the Conference on the Law of the Sea on 24 August 1981 (p. 128), the official text of the draft Convention on the Law of the Sea was issued at the close of the 1981 session.<sup>(1)</sup> It reproduced the informal text of August 1980 <sup>(2)</sup> with the following changes: (1) The recommendations of the Drafting Committee approved by the Conference in informal plenary meetings during the first and resumed parts of its 1981 session (p. 129) were incorporated. (2) In articles 74 and 83, paragraph 1 was replaced by new texts providing that the delimitation of the exclusive economic zone (article 74) and continental shelf (article 83) between States with opposite or adjacent coasts would be effected by agreement on the basis of international law, in order to achieve an equitable solution (p. 134). (3) A footnote to article 74 concerning the median or equidistance line was deleted. (4) A footnote to article 156, paragraph 3, relating to the Conference's choice of a seat for the projected International Sea-Bed Authority, was deleted and the text changed to read that the seat of the Authority would be in Jamaica (p. 133). (5) A footnote to article 1, paragraph 2, of annex VI, mentioning proposals for the seat of the projected International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, was deleted and the text changed to read that the seat of the Tribunal would be in the Federal Republic of Germany (p. 136).

The draft Convention contained 320 articles, a transitional provision (on non-independent Territories) and eight annexes. The articles were divided into 17 parts, with the following titles: I, Use of terms; II, Territorial sea and contiguous zone; III, Straits used for international navigation; IV, Archipelagic States; V, Exclusive economic zone; VI, Continental shelf; VII, High seas; VIII, Régime of islands; IX, Enclosed or semi-enclosed seas; X, Right of access of land-locked States to and from the sea and freedom of transit; XI, The Area; XII, Protection and preservation of the marine environment; XIII, Marine scientific research; XIV, Development and transfer of marine technology; XV, Settlement of disputes; XVI, General provisions; XVII, Final clauses. The annexes had the following titles: I, Highly migratory species; II, Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf; III, Basic conditions of prospecting, exploration



and exploitation; IV, Statute of the Enterprise; V, Conciliation; VI, Statute of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea; VII, Arbitration; VIII, Special arbitration procedure.

Draft Convention: <sup>(1)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.78 & Corr.3.8.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 143.

#### Sea-bed

Several issues relating to the future legal system for mining the international sea-bed area and the control machinery of the projected International Sea-Bed Authority were considered by the Conference in 1981. However, a number of issues were left pending after the United States informed the Conference, during the March/April part of its session in New York, that that country's new Administration was engaged in an overall review of the draft Convention and particularly of part IX, concerning the sea-bed, and that the review would not be completed until late in the year.

#### Sea-bed mining

Production control. At a First Committee meeting on 19 March 1981, Zambia, supported by Zaïre and Zimbabwe, appealed for further examination by the Conference of the issue of sea-bed mineral production policies under the Convention. The position of these countries, along with Gabon and others, was that the production limitation formula contained in the draft Convention failed to provide adequate protection to the land-based producers and exporters of cobalt, manganese, copper and low-grade nickel from adverse effects on their economies likely to result from sea-bed mining. The four States sponsored an informal amendment which, according to a statement by Gabon to the Conference on 16 April, would guarantee a satisfactory profit to the companies exploiting the sea-bed while mitigating the negative effects of the existing provision.

On 3 April, the Committee discussed a report of the Secretary-General dated 24 February,<sup>(3)</sup> requested by the Conference in August 1980,<sup>(4)</sup> on some potential effects of the draft Convention's formula (in article 151) to limit sea-bed production of nickel. The report contained a technical numerical analysis of how the formula might limit such production under various sets of assumptions, including different start-up dates for deep-ocean exploitation and different hypothetical growth rates for world nickel consumption ranging up to 5 per cent a year.

While Canada, Cuba, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States found the report useful, Gabon, Zaïre, Zambia and Zimbabwe criticized it for not adequately show-

ing what they regarded as the potentially catastrophic effects of sea-bed mining on the economies of land-based producers such as themselves. Zambia informally circulated a proposal to base the limitation formula on cobalt rather than nickel, allowing lower tonnages of metals produced from sea-bed mining. Gabon calculated that, under the existing formula, it would lose 30 to 40 per cent of its income from manganese. On the other hand, Belgium and the Federal Republic of Germany expressed concern that the future sea-bed mining system might be too costly for the restricted number of mine-sites that could be established under the production limitation formula.

Canada proposed the establishment of a small group of experts to evaluate further the production limitation formula. The proposal was supported by Australia, Gabon, the Philippines, Zaïre, Zambia and Zimbabwe, while Chile, Cuba, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Peru, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States felt that it should be taken up at the following session. As there was no consensus on the proposal, the Chairman said he would consult delegations informally on the matter.

In his report of 27 August on various First Committee issues,<sup>(2)</sup> the Chairman said there had been no formal negotiations on production policy during 1981. However, having analysed different approaches brought out in his informal consultations, he had come to the conclusion that no single measure might be adequate and that a combination of steps might be needed. He suggested that the matter be studied by the Preparatory Commission (p. 137), which should then make recommendations to the Authority on ways to reach a mutual accommodation among producers and consumers. Reporting to the Conference on 28 August at the end of the resumed session,<sup>(1)</sup> the Chairman said there was room for enlarging the scope of the existing consensus on production policy without disturbing the fundamental structure of the production limitation formula. A balance should be sought that would both stimulate sea-bed production and avoid measures that would have serious adverse effects on the fragile economies of several developing countries.

At plenary meetings on 16 April and 24 August, Gabon; Zaïre and Zimbabwe, supported by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, urged that the production limitation formula, which in their view conferred advantages on producers of marine minerals, should be considered as an unresolved topic requiring further consideration.

The First Committee, on 27 August, approved a suggestion by Liberia on behalf of the African Group that the Conference secretariat should

undertake a preliminary study of the potential impact of the Convention on the economies of the developing countries which were producers and exporters of the minerals to be extracted from the international sea-bed area, with special reference to the production limitation formula.

Reports: 1st Committee Chairman, <sup>(1)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.81, <sup>(2)</sup>A/CONF.62/C.1/L.29; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/CONF.62/L.66 & Corr.1.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 138.

Meeting records: Conference on Law of Sea: 1st Committee, A/CONF.62/C.1/SR.50, 52, 54 (19 Mar., 3 Apr., 27 Aug.); plenary, A/CONF.62/SR.150, 153, 154 (16 Apr. & 24, 28 Aug.).

**Pioneer investors.** The First Committee Chairman, in his report of 27 August 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> referred to the problem of protection of sea-bed investments made by consortia before the Convention entered into force. He stated that the United States had made some concrete proposals on the subject, but had withdrawn them during the first part of the 1981 session; during the resumed session no discussion of the matter had taken place. He appealed to the industrialized countries to ensure that the matter would be discussed at the following session.

On 17 March, during a discussion of the Conference's work programme, Uganda, speaking for the Group of 77, said the Group was not prepared to discuss the subject of pioneer investors in view of the United States decision to review the entire Convention.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>1st Committee Chairman, A/CONF.62/C.1/L.29.

**Other matters.** Consultations continued during 1981 on a so-called unfair practices clause proposed for inclusion in the sea-bed part of the Convention. According to an oral report by Australia presented to the First Committee on 27 August, an earlier text was revised during the year by Australia, its main proponent, following consultations involving potential sea-bed mining countries and land-based mineral producers. The new clause provided that, in the production, processing, transport and marketing of minerals and commodities derived from the resources of the international sea-bed area, parties to the Convention must avoid economic practices which caused, or threatened to cause, material injury to the interests of another party.

Addressing the Conference on 28 August during a discussion of First Committee matters, the United Kingdom said it did not consider that such a provision should be included in the Convention. In response, Australia stated that the unfair practices clause had commended itself to several African, Asian and Latin American countries, and Australia hoped the United Kingdom would drop its reservations.

Meeting records: Conference on Law of Sea: 1st Committee, A/CONF.62/C.1/SR.54 (27 Aug.); plenary, A/CONF.62/SR.154 (28 Aug.).

### International Sea-Bed Authority

**Membership of the Council.** The First Committee Chairman reported at the end of the Conference's 1981 session in August that a stalemate still existed on the problem raised by some smaller and medium-sized industrialized Western States which sought a better representation for such States in the Council of the projected International Sea-Bed Authority.<sup>(1)</sup>

Speaking in the Committee on 27 August, the USSR expressed strong objection to consultations on this matter and to the Chairman's request that they be intensified, stating that the issue had already been settled. Sweden, on the other hand, said the question still posed serious difficulties for several small and medium-sized industrialized countries, and it expressed confidence that an acceptable text could be found without upsetting the balance of the Council's decision-making procedure.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>1st Committee Chairman, A/CONF.62/C.1/L.29.

Meeting record: Conference on Law of Sea: 1st Committee, A/CONF.62/C.1/SR.54 (27 Aug.).

**Site of Authority headquarters.** On 21 August 1981, at an informal plenary meeting, the Conference voted in favour of Jamaica as the seat of the Sea-Bed Authority. Before the balloting, the President told the meeting that the voting would be indicative rather than formal, that the candidates had agreed to abide by the results and that the outcome would be taken into account in any future revision of the draft Convention. The Conference agreed that, if the country chosen did not become party to the Convention or later withdrew as a party, the Assembly of the Authority would be authorized to select another seat.

In the first of two secret ballots, Jamaica received 69 votes, Malta 56 and Fiji 14; there were 5 abstentions and 1 blank ballot. As no candidate received the required majority of 70 votes, a second ballot was held, limited to the two candidates receiving the most votes in the first ballot. In this deciding ballot, Jamaica obtained 76 votes to 66 for Malta, with 5 abstentions.

Prior to this decision, the site of the Authority was considered by the First Committee on 7 April. Jamaica, recalling that its candidacy had the support of the Group of 77, said that a building (in Kingston) for the Preparatory Commission would be completed by September. Malta said it already had buildings available which the Commission and the Authority could use; however, it objected to the First Committee's discus-

sion of a matter which the Conference had agreed to decide. The latter view was supported by Fiji.

Support for Jamaica's candidacy, which was first put forward in 1974,<sup>(1)</sup> was voiced by Argentina, the Bahamas, Barbados, Botswana, Brazil, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador (on behalf of the Latin American Group), El Salvador, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Madagascar, Morocco and Senegal thought the matter should be discussed later.

At a plenary meeting on 3 August, Malta invited delegation heads to visit Malta as the Government's guests to see the facilities available there for the Authority.

The cost of establishing the Authority's headquarters was discussed in a report of the Secretary-General on the financial aspects of the Convention (p. 138).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(1)</sup>1974, p. 75.

Meeting records: Conference on Law of Sea: 1st Committee, A/CONF.62/C.1/SR.53 (7 Apr.); plenary, A/CONF.62/SR.151 (3 Aug.).

#### Delimitation of maritime boundaries

On 28 August 1981, the President reported to the Conference that there was widespread and substantial support for a new compromise formula on the delimitation between States of adjacent exclusive economic zones and continental shelves. This was confirmed by Ireland and Spain as the chairmen of the two groups involved in negotiations on the issue.

The compromise, later inserted in the draft Convention issued at the close of the 1981 session (p. 130) provided for a revision of two controversial articles (74 and 83) in the 1980 informal draft Convention concerned with delimitation problems arising when States faced one another across a body of water or lay adjacent to one another along a coastline. According to the revised text, delimitation of the exclusive economic zone or continental shelf would be effected by agreement on the basis of international law, as referred to in Article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice (listing the evidence of international law to be applied by the Court in deciding disputes), in order to achieve an equitable solution.

During negotiations lasting several years, the group chaired by Ireland favoured an emphasis on "equitable principles" in resolving maritime boundary disputes, while the group chaired by Spain advocated inclusion in the text of a specific reference to the "equidistance" principle, which

called for drawing the boundary line midway between the coastlines. The two groups met informally during both parts of the 1981 session, both jointly and separately.

Argentina, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Peru, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR expressed support for the new formula or stated that they would not object to its incorporation in the draft Convention, while Bahrain, China, Egypt, Iran, Israel, Kuwait, Oman, Portugal, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, the United States and Venezuela expressed reservations on the proposal or asked for more time to consider it.

Meeting record: Conference on Law of Sea, A/CONF.62/SR.154 (28 Aug.).

#### Participation in the Convention

The President of the Conference prepared two reports in 1981 (not issued as formal Conference documents) on the results of informal consultations he had conducted on provisions for participation in the Convention by three categories of entities other than States: national liberation movements, intergovernmental organizations, and self-governing associated States and dependent Territories. He said an understanding had emerged from the consultations that an entity which did not fall within the category of sovereign States could participate in the Convention provided it had competence over matters falling within the scope of the Convention and the capacity to enter into treaties with regard to such matters.

#### National liberation movements

With regard to national liberation movements recognized by the United Nations and regional intergovernmental organizations, the President reported in August that it had been conceded that such entities could not currently fulfil the two criteria determining participation in the Convention. However, it had been urged that the strict application of those criteria was not appropriate and that, since liberation movements, as evolving States, had the potential to fulfil the criteria, they should be allowed to participate. The opposing view had insisted on strict application of the criteria and contended that failure to allow such participation would not prejudice the position of the future State when it desired to become a party.

The President indicated that further negotiations on this issue would be required.

#### Intergovernmental organizations

Participation in the Convention by intergovernmental organizations was considered infor-

mally at both parts of the Conference's 1981 session. In August, the President suggested a seven-article draft annex to the Convention spelling out the circumstances under which such bodies would be able to adhere, linked to a revised article 305 under which the Convention could be signed by any international organization to which States signatories to the Convention that were members of such organizations had transferred competence over matters governed by the Convention, including the competence to enter into treaties in respect of such matters. A new article 306 his would permit such organizations to adhere to the Convention by acts of formal confirmation, and a revised article 307 would enable them to accede (a process of adherence not involving prior signature).

The proposed new annex contained provisions on signature, acceptance, rights and obligations, declarations and notifications, responsibility of international organizations and settlement of disputes involving an international organization party to the Convention.

#### Self-governing associated States and dependent Territories

The President reported in April 1981 that it had been found during consultations that self-governing associated States satisfied the two criteria established for participation in the Convention. It had been pointed out that, if such States did not participate in their own right, the Convention could not apply to them at all, as no other State was entitled to act on their behalf.

With regard to dependent Territories, the President said three points had emerged: not all such Territories could be allowed to participate as a class; the question of disputed Territories should be set aside for the moment; and some Territories which had achieved full internal self-government in a manner consistent with United Nations resolutions could satisfy the two criteria.

#### Territorial sea

##### Innocent passage

A number of States expressed reservations on article 21 of the draft Convention, governing the innocent passage of foreign warships through the territorial sea.

Reporting to the Conference on 15 April 1981, <sup>(1)</sup> the Second Committee Chairman noted that several States had proposed the establishment of a working group or that consultations be held among the most interested countries with the aim of harmonizing the different points of view. However, he had found from consultations that there was no agreement on the establish-

ment of a working, negotiating or consulting group for that purpose.

During discussion in plenary meetings on 15 April and 24 August, a number of speakers, including Argentina, Cape Verde, China, the Congo, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen, favoured a change in the text that would require prior notification to or authorization by the coastal State for such passage. Ecuador remarked that the Convention must guarantee the rights which many States had long exercised in their territorial sea.

Australia, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Chile, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Poland, Portugal, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and Viet Nam maintained that there was apparent agreement on the substantive provisions of the draft, which should not be renegotiated. Some, such as France, Italy and the United States, specifically urged retention of the existing wording providing for freedom of passage for all ships. The USSR said the existing formula safeguarded both the security interests of coastal states and the interests of international navigation.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>2nd Committee Chairman, A/CONF.62/L.69.

Meeting records: Conference on Law of Sea, A/CONF.62/SR.148, 153 (15 Apr., 24 Aug.).

#### Sanitary regulations

By a letter of 21 August 1980, circulated as a Conference document in March 1981, <sup>(1)</sup> the Director-General of the World Health Organization stated that clauses in articles 21 and 42 of the draft Convention, dealing with the right of coastal States to make laws and regulations relating respectively to innocent passage through the territorial sea and to transit passage through straits used for international navigation, were compatible with the International Health Regulations.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>WHO. 21 Aug. 1980, A/CONF.62/109.

#### Exclusive economic zone

A few matters pertaining to the draft Convention's provisions on the exclusive economic zone—the maritime area extending to 200 nautical miles from the coast between the territorial sea and the high seas—were raised during the Conference's discussion on 15 April 1981 of the report by the Second Committee Chairman, as well as its consideration on 24 August of its 1982 work programme.

Land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States. Several land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States raised the question of their

access to the exclusive economic zone. Zaire said that, without amendments to the existing text, the rights accorded to land-locked States and those with special geographical characteristics might remain theoretical. Romania called for continued consultations, arguing that geographically disadvantaged States situated in a region poor in living marine resources must be assured access to such resources of coastal States in adjacent regions, in accordance with an informal proposal it had presented. Zambia, supported by Zimbabwe, suggested that the area beyond 12 miles should be of a regional nature so as to ensure that the land-locked, coastal and geographically disadvantaged States had access to its natural resources.

The German Democratic Republic stated its opposition to proposals designed to change the provisions on access to the living resources in the economic zones of coastal States by land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States to the disadvantage of any member of that group of States, whether developed or developing. Peru could not agree with the changes proposed by Zaire, and said Zambia's proposal seemed anachronistic in the light of the negotiations and the practice established among States over the previous 10 years.

Fishery conservation. Argentina urged that consultations continue on the conservation of fish stocks occurring in two or more adjacent exclusive economic zones or straddling such zones and the high seas; it supported an informal amendment proposed by Uruguay and others to article 63 of the draft Convention, arguing that the amendment sought better protection for those resources and would benefit all countries. Uruguay hoped the text could be amended by consensus after consultation and negotiation.

The German Democratic Republic opposed the amendment on the ground that it would curtail freedom of fishing in areas adjacent to the exclusive economic zone, and the USSR remarked that approximately 60 land-locked or geographically disadvantaged States, backed by a large number of other countries, were unable to accept the amendment. Hungary, Poland and the Ukrainian SSR also opposed a reopening of discussion on this question.

Offshore structures. The United Kingdom detailed its informal proposal to modify article 60, paragraph 3, on the removal of abandoned or disused installations or structures in the exclusive economic zone. According to the proposal, such structures would be removed as necessary to assure safe navigation of ships in accordance with generally accepted international standards; such removal would have due regard to fishing, protection of the marine environment, and the

rights and duties of other States. Publicity would have to be given to information on the depth and position of any installations or structures which were not entirely removed. Support for the proposal was expressed by Italy, and France said it would consider the proposal with sympathy.

Proposed Common Heritage Fund A number of land-locked States urged support for their proposal to establish a Common Heritage Fund which would redistribute to developing countries a share of the revenues derived from exploitation of the natural resources of the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf. Nepal said the sponsors of that proposal had agreed to place a ceiling on the rate of contributions to the Fund and to ensure that the amount received by a developing country from the Fund would be no less than that Government's contribution.

The proposal was supported by Israel, the Niger, Zambia and Zimbabwe, while Algeria said it deserved serious consideration and Yugoslavia promised to study the revised formula with interest. The Niger said the proposal was aimed at reducing the widening gap between developed and developing countries, and counterbalancing the situation of countries disadvantaged by geographical location or history.

In Peru's opinion, on the other hand, the proposal had the support only of its sponsors and a limited number of others; any proposal on financing could be accepted only if it were based on revenues from the international sea-bed area or the continental shelf—not from the exclusive economic zone, over which coastal States exercised express rights.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>2nd Committee Chairman, A/CONF.62/L.69.

Meeting records: Conference on Law of Sea, A/CONF.62/SR.148, 153 (15 Apr., 24 Aug.).

#### Location of the Tribunal for the Law of the Sea

At an informal plenary meeting on 21 August 1981, the Conference voted in favour of the Federal Republic of Germany as the seat of the projected International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. The other candidates were Portugal and Yugoslavia.

Two secret ballots were needed. In the first, with a required majority of 71, the Federal Republic of Germany received 67 votes, Yugoslavia 59 and Portugal 15; there were 3 abstentions and 1 blank ballot. The results of the second ballot, limited to the two countries receiving the most votes on the first ballot, were 78 for the Federal Republic of Germany and 61 for Yugoslavia; there were 4 abstentions and 2 blank ballots.

As in the case of the decision on the site of the International Sea-Bed Authority headquarters (p. 133), the voting was indicative rather than

formal. The result was incorporated into the draft Convention issued at the close of the Conference's 1981 session (p. 131). The Conference agreed that, if the country chosen did not adhere to the Convention or later withdrew as a party, another location would be selected.

By a letter of 17 March to the Conference President,<sup>(\*)</sup> the Federal Republic of Germany reiterated its offer of Hamburg for the seat of the Tribunal. The offer was first made in August 1980.<sup>(2)</sup> At a plenary meeting on 16 April 1981, Portugal offered as the site of the Tribunal the Cascais fortress, former summer residence of the Portuguese President on the Atlantic coast.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Federal Republic of Germany, 17 Mar., A/CONF.62/111.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 158.

Meeting record: Conference on Law of Sea, A/CONF.62/SR.150 (16 Apr.).

#### Establishment of a Preparatory Commission

A draft resolution on the establishment of a Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, prepared in March 1980 by the former President of the Conference as a result of discussions at informal plenary meetings,<sup>(3)</sup> was considered by the First Committee on 19 and 20 March 1981. It was discussed further in April, and again in August, at informal meetings of the Working Group of 21, co-chaired by the President and the First Committee Chairman, as well as at a First Committee meeting on 27 August. The co-Chairmen prepared an informal draft text on 6 August which they revised on 26 August.

On 16 April, the First Committee Chairman reported to the Conference<sup>(1)</sup> a general agreement in the Working Group that: the Commission should be established by a resolution of the Conference included in its Final Act; the objective of the Commission was to make provisional arrangements for the first sessions of the Authority's Assembly and Council, for the establishment of its secretariat and Enterprise (its mining arm), and for the convening of the Tribunal; the United Nations Secretary-General should be empowered to convene the Commission once 50 States signed or acceded to the Convention; and the Commission's life should not be unduly long, considering the nature of its mandate and the need to have the Authority established expeditiously.

The discussion revealed divergences of view on critical issues relating to the composition, mandate, decision-making system and financing of the Commission.

Referring to the discussion in the Working Group of 21, the First Committee Chairman noted in his report that some industrialized

countries preferred the membership of the Commission to be open to all signatories of the Conference's Final Act. This position was endorsed in the Committee and at a plenary meeting on 16 April by Austria, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, Japan, Nepal, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom. The arguments they advanced were that preparations for the establishment of a world-wide organization should be approved on as broad a basis as possible and that such an arrangement would avoid the problem of a changing membership. The Federal Republic of Germany said it was eager to contribute to the Commission's work from the start, but that might not be possible if it first had to sign the Convention—a potentially lengthy process under its national law.

Others, such as Argentina, 'Colombia, the German Democratic Republic, Haiti, India, Iraq, Pakistan, the Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, Uruguay and Yugoslavia, believed that signature of the Convention must be the minimum criterion for membership. It was stated that membership must be based on the clearly expressed desire of States to assume the rights and obligations provided for in the Convention; that such a rule would offer an incentive for States to sign the Convention as soon as possible; that signatories of the Convention and signatories of the Final Act could hardly be treated on the same footing; and that allowing signatories of the Final Act to become members might enable some States to obtain concessions or advantages without later becoming members of the Authority. Peru, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, expressed willingness to accept a compromise granting observer status to States which signed only the Final Act, empowering them to participate fully in the Commission's deliberations but not to take part in decision-making. The Netherlands thought it might be useful to discuss a formula enabling all States to participate in the Commission but drawing a distinction in regard to decision-making between those which had signed the Convention and those which had signed only the Final Act.

Summarizing the results of the discussion on these issues at the resumed session, the First Committee Chairman, in his report of 27 August,<sup>(2)</sup> said it was recognized that the issue of membership was linked to decision-making on substantive questions and to the financing of the Commission.

With regard to decision-making, the Chairman, in his report of 16 April, stated that the Western industrialized and the Eastern European countries appeared to insist that decisions be taken by consensus, while the Group of 77

favoured a two-stage approach in which failure to achieve consensus would be followed by voting. As reported by the Chairman on 27 August, the Group of 77 further clarified its position by supporting in principle a two-thirds majority rule for decisions on all substantive issues.

Commenting in the Committee on the Chairman's August report, the USSR said it was prepared to negotiate with the Group of 77 and others in order to find a compromise on the basis of the decision-making formula applicable to the Authority's Council.<sup>(4)</sup>

With regard to the financing of the Commission, the Chairman said in his April report that the issue presented some difficulties. At the first part of the session, all sides had agreed to having the United Nations provide for the initial costs, but some had seen legal and practical difficulties. The Group of 77 and the Eastern European States had argued that the Commission should be financed from the United Nations regular budget, but others had pointed out that that procedure would require non-signatories of the Convention to contribute. The industrialized Western States had taken the position that the Commission should be financed by a repayable loan from the United Nations. The revised draft submitted by the two co-Chairmen on 26 August adopted the former approach.

With regard to the Commission's functions, the First Committee Chairman reported that there appeared to be general agreement on its broad mandate of preparing for the establishment of the Authority and the Tribunal. However, at the first part of the session, the industrialized countries had considered it premature to discuss the establishment of the Enterprise, arguing that that had to be taken up along with proposals for protecting pioneer sea-bed investments. The Group of 77 and other members of the Working Group, on the other hand, had thought it imperative for the Commission to have this function, as the Enterprise would be a main organ of the future system for deep-sea mining. At the resumed session, as reported by the Chairman, the industrialized countries accepted this as a function of the Commission, provided that it was also given the task of making arrangements for the other track of the parallel system, namely exploration and exploitation of the sea-bed by State and private operators.

Agreement was reported at the resumed session that the Commission should prepare draft rules, regulations and procedures of the Authority, be empowered to establish subsidiary organs and make use of outside experts, and prepare a final report on its work, though it was disputed

as to whether that report should go to the Authority, its Assembly or Council, the Secretary-General or the General Assembly.

Concerning the location of the Commission, the co-Chairmen proposed in their draft of 26 August that the Commission meet at the seat of the Authority if facilities were available. Colombia, speaking in the First Committee, opposed this proposal, stating that the Commission should meet at United Nations Headquarters for reasons of efficiency and economy. Kenya, however, expressed dismay that anyone should regard it as illogical for the Commission to work at the seat of the Authority.

No agreement was reached in 1981 on the issue of when the Commission should terminate its work. Some members preferred it to remain in existence until both the Assembly and the Council of the Authority had been convened, while the Group of 77 considered that it should conclude its work upon the convening of the Assembly. The co-Chairmen proposed on 26 August that it remain in existence until the conclusion of the Assembly's first session.

The Group of 77 also proposed that the Commission should not continue indefinitely if the Convention had not entered into force after five years. This idea was supported by some participants in the Working Group, while others regarded such a provision as premature.

In his report of 27 August to the First Committee, the Chairman said substantial agreement had been reached in the Working Group of 21 on many basic issues relating to the Commission. He identified membership, decision-making, financing and termination of the Commission's work as issues still unresolved, and suggested they be dealt with as a package.

Reports: 1st Committee Chairman, <sup>(1)</sup>A/CONF.62/L.70,

<sup>(2)</sup>A/CONF.62/C.1/L.29.

Yearbook references: 1980, <sup>(3)</sup>p. 140, <sup>(4)</sup>p. 144.

Meeting records: Conference on Law of Sea: 1st Committee, A/CONF.62/C.1/SR.50, 51, 54 (19, 20 Mar. & 27 Aug.); plenary, A/CONF.62/SR.150 (16 Apr.).

#### Financial aspects

On 7 April 1981, the First Committee discussed a report by the Secretary-General, submitted in February, on the potential financial implications for States parties to the future Convention on the Law of the Sea.<sup>(1)</sup> The report provided preliminary estimates of possible costs of the main organs to be established under the Convention, as well as of the contributions of States parties to the financing of the first mine-site to be operated by the Enterprise.

Three possible levels of cost were provided for each of these organs. The ranges were as follows (rounded to the nearest million dollars): for the Authority, \$51-112 million to construct and

equip a headquarters, \$20-26 million annually to operate; for the Enterprise, \$32-70 million to construct and equip, \$14-17 million annually to operate; for the Tribunal, \$21-47 million to construct and equip, \$5-7 million annually to operate; for the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf, \$2 million annually; for the Preparatory Commission, \$1 million to service meetings, no estimate for other costs; total, \$104-229 million for headquarters, \$41-53 million annually for operation.

Concerning the cost of an initial sea-bed mining venture, the report assumed three alternative amounts (in 1980 dollars): \$700 million, \$1,000 million and \$1,400 million. Under the draft Convention, half of these amounts, along with half of the administrative costs of the Enterprise, would be contributed by all States parties by way of interest-free loans; the remaining half would be borrowed by the Enterprise on the world credit market.

Introducing the report in the Committee on 3 April, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General stated that it was based on a number of assumptions that were subject to revision in the light of future events.

Commenting on the report, several speakers, including the German Democratic Republic, Iran, Romania and the USSR, stressed the need for the most economical arrangements possible.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G A/CONF.62/L.65.

Meeting records: Conference Law of Sea: 1st Committee, A/CONF.62/C.1/SR.52, 53 (3, 7 Apr.).

#### Functions of the Secretary-General

During its resumed session in August 1981, the Conference received a study by the Secretary-General on his future functions under the Convention and on the needs of countries, especially developing countries, for information, advice and assistance under the new legal regime.<sup>(2)</sup>

The report detailed the functions which the Convention would assign to the Secretary-General with respect to the establishment of the limits of coastal State jurisdiction, depositary and related functions, administrative functions associated with the convening of meetings of States parties, dispute-settlement functions and reporting. The Secretariat would also be involved in the co-ordination of marine-related activities and the establishment of policies with regard to problems of ocean space.

The study concluded that the provision of information, advice and assistance in the various sectors covered by the Convention would be the responsibility of specific United Nations organizations or entities. A common understanding must be reached on the future roles of the international organizations concerned in the implementation of the Convention.

The report, requested by the General Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> was briefly considered by the Conference on 28 August 1981. On a suggestion by Peru, supported by Bulgaria, Pakistan and Uruguay, the Conference decided to request the Secretary-General to continue the study.

The Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, at its May/June session in New York (p. 1076), decided to consider in 1983 a cross-organizational programme analysis of marine affairs activities by organizations of the United Nations system.<sup>(1)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>CPC, A/36/38; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/CONF.62/L.76.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/116. para. 6, 10 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 159).

Meeting record: Conference on Law of Sea, A/CONF.62/SR.155 (28 Aug.).

#### Other questions

##### Amerasinghe Fellowship on the Law of the Sea

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 9 December 1981 on the Conference on the Law of the Sea,<sup>(3)</sup> invited States participating in the Conference, as well as universities, philanthropic foundations and other interested national and international institutions and organizations, to contribute to the Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe Fellowship on the Law of the Sea, in the form recommended in a report by the Secretary-General.

In his report of November 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General presented recommendations for an annual award by the United Nations of a fellowship in the field of the law of the sea and related matters, as a memorial to Mr. Amerasinghe, the Sri Lankan diplomat who was President of the Conference until his death in December 1980. The report was requested by the Assembly in 1980.<sup>(2)</sup>

According to the Secretary-General's recommendations, the Fellowship would be funded from voluntary contributions and awarded annually by the Conference secretariat, after consultation with the President of the Conference. It would provide an academic component, followed by specialized training in matters relating to the law of the sea within the Conference secretariat. It would be carried out by that secretariat, during 1982-1983 and in subsequent years, under the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law (p. 1267). Contributions for the Fellowship would be sought from the States and organizations periodically invited by the Secretary-General to contribute to the Programme. These arrangements relating to the Programme were endorsed by the Programme's Advisory Committee.



Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/697.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/116, para. 2, 10 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 159); <sup>(3)</sup>36/79, para. 6, 9 Dec. 1981 (p. 131).

#### Marine science and technology

The Conference decided on 28 August 1981 to postpone a decision on a draft resolution, submitted by Pakistan on behalf of the Group of 77,<sup>(1)</sup>

on assistance to strengthen the marine science, technology and ocean services of developing countries (p. 760).

Draft resolution postponed: <sup>(1)</sup>Pakistan, for Group of 77, A/CONF.62/L.79.

Meeting record: Conference on Law of Sea, A/CONF.62/SR.155 (28 Aug.).

## Chapter IV

# International peace and security

The General Assembly adopted in December 1981 a Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States,<sup>(8)</sup> affirming that no State had the right to intervene or interfere in the internal or external affairs of other States.

This was the main action emerging in 1981 from the Assembly's annual consideration of issues pertaining to international security, with special reference to implementation of its 1970 Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.<sup>(2)</sup> In a related resolution, the Assembly made recommendations to States and the Security Council on ways of improving the world security situation.<sup>(7)</sup> In another action, the Assembly invited States to intensify efforts to implement its 1978 Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace.<sup>(3)</sup>

Concerning peace and security between neighbouring States, the Assembly called on States to develop good-neighbourly relations and sought governments' views on ways to enhance good-neighbourliness so as to prevent conflicts.<sup>(6)</sup>

After receiving an inconclusive report from its Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations,<sup>(1)</sup> the Assembly again urged the Committee to work towards completion of agreed guidelines for United Nations peace-keeping operations and to devote attention to the practical implementation of such operations.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Assembly proclaimed an International Day of Peace, to be celebrated on the third Tuesday of each September, and invited the Economic and Social Council to consider declaring an International Year of Peace.<sup>(5)</sup>

Other questions pertaining to international political relations were examined by the Assembly from their legal aspects (p. 1204).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, A/36/469.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2734(XXV), 16 Dec. 1970 (YUN 1970, p.105); <sup>(3)</sup>33/73, 15 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p.165);

<sup>(4)</sup>36/37, 18 Nov. 15 1981 (p. 154); <sup>(5)</sup>36/67, 30 Nov.

(p. 155). <sup>(6)</sup>36/101 (p. 152), <sup>(7)</sup>36/102 (p. 144), <sup>(8)</sup>36/103 (p. 147); <sup>(9)</sup>36/104 (p. 150). 9 Dec.

## Implementation of the 1970 Declaration on international security

COMMUNICATIONS. In 1981, as in previous years, many communications from United Nations Member States addressed to the Secretary-General were circulated under the General Assembly agenda item "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". A number of these dealt with disarmament or with specific disputes or situations, including the armed attack against Seychelles (p. 226), the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Sudan (p. 225), other questions concerning the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (p. 358), the Afghanistan situation (p. 232), the Kampuchea situation (p. 239), the Kampuchea-Thailand border (p. 249), the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Thailand (p. 249), China and Viet Nam (p. 250), Guyana and Venezuela (p. 254), and the Western Sahara question (p. 1193). Others, concerned with general aspects of international security, are summarized below.

By a letter of 24 June,<sup>(15)</sup> the USSR transmitted the text of an appeal from its Supreme Soviet to the parliaments and peoples of the world, adopted on 23 June, declaring that the achievement of peace was the highest goal of the foreign policy of the Soviet State and urging the legislative organs of all countries to support negotiations for the prevention of a new phase of the nuclear missile race. This appeal was supported in a declaration of 25 June by the People's Chamber of the German Democratic Republic, transmitted on 3 July;<sup>(4)</sup> a declaration of 30 June by

the Federal Assembly of Czechoslovakia, transmitted on 4 August;<sup>(3)</sup> a declaration of 4 July by the National Assembly of Viet Nam, transmitted on 26 August;<sup>(16)</sup> and a declaration of 7 July by the People's Assembly of Bulgaria, transmitted on 20 July.<sup>(1)</sup>

By a note verbale of 25 June,<sup>(7)</sup> Mongolia transmitted a statement by its Government reviewing the international situation and mentioning a proposal made on 26 May by the Chairman of the Presidium of the Great People's Khural of Mongolia for the drafting and signature of a convention on non-aggression and non-use of force in Asia and the Pacific. This proposal, which also called for the convening of a conference of Asian and Pacific States to which the five permanent members of the Security Council could be invited, was referred to again in an appeal by the Khural to the parliaments of all countries of the region, adopted on 29 June and transmitted on 15 July.<sup>(8)</sup> Further particulars of the proposal were provided in a message dated 21 September from the Chairman of the Presidium, transmitted on 9 October.<sup>(9)</sup>

Two appeals by the Grand National Assembly of Romania were transmitted. In the first, adopted at a session held on 30 June and 1 July and communicated on 2 July,<sup>(10)</sup> the parliaments of the States that had signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (Helsinki, Finland, 1975) were asked to join in measures of co-operation and disarmament in Europe. In the second appeal, adopted at a session of 27 and 28 November and communicated on 30 November,<sup>(13)</sup> the parliaments, Governments and peoples of European countries, the United States and Canada were asked to co-operate in ensuring respect for the right of the European peoples to develop freely on the path to progress, co-operation and peace; in stopping the armaments race; in achieving general disarmament, and first and foremost nuclear disarmament; in strengthening security and co-operation in Europe; and in building a better and more just world. Romania also transmitted, on 4 November,<sup>(12)</sup> an appeal for disarmament and peace adopted on 30 October by its Socialist Democracy and Unity Front.

By a letter of 18 September,<sup>(11)</sup> Romania transmitted the text of a message from its President to the participants in the International Symposium "Scientists and Peace", held at Bucharest on 4 and 5 September, and of an appeal by the participants announcing the establishment of an International Action Committee to organize scientific activities, expose the dangers of the arms race, inform the public about them, formulate measures to avoid them and prepare for a world congress of scientists in the service of peace.

By a letter of 5 December,<sup>(14)</sup> Romania transmitted a communiqué adopted at a Bucharest meeting on 1 and 2 December of the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States Parties to the 1955 Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance, setting out their views on the international situation and urging a series of steps towards disarmament.

By a letter of 11 November,<sup>(2)</sup> Bulgaria forwarded excerpts from a speech by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of its Communist Party and President of its State Council, delivered at a ceremonial meeting in Sofia on 20 October dedicated to the 1300th anniversary of the founding of the Bulgarian State, stressing the need for co-operation among Balkan States and proposing a meeting on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the area (p. 44).

By a letter of 25 June,<sup>(6)</sup> Malta transmitted a declaration on the neutrality of Malta approved by its Government on 14 May, declaring Malta to be a neutral State that would refuse to participate in any military alliance and would not permit foreign military bases on its territory. By a letter of 25 June,<sup>(5)</sup> Italy transmitted a declaration of its Government issued on 15 May, welcoming the Maltese declaration, pledging to respect Malta's sovereignty and neutrality, and inviting all other States to do likewise.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 9 December,<sup>(18)</sup> the General Assembly called on States to help implement the Declaration on international security.<sup>(17)</sup> It urged them, particularly the permanent members of the Security Council, to refrain from any threat or use of force against a State or its rights over its natural resources, to reject situations brought about by such use, to take measures to prevent the disruption of detente, to seek the peaceful settlement of disputes, to start meaningful disarmament negotiations, to support national liberation movements and to proceed to global economic negotiations (p. 380). It requested the Council to examine mechanisms for enhancing its authority and enforcement capacity, and to explore the possibility of holding periodic high-level meetings on conflict prevention. It called on participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe to seek substantial results, favoured further efforts to transform the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation, and called for the views of Governments on the latter question.

Other provisions of the resolution concerned the nuclear capability of South Africa (p. 46), the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace (p. 94), and human rights and peace (p. 974).

This resolution, sponsored by 20 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 127 to none, with 20 abstentions, following its approval in the First

Committee on 3 December by a recorded vote of 93 to none, with 21 abstentions. The original draft was revised by its sponsors before adoption.

Introducing the resolution, Yugoslavia said it reflected the particular attention that the non-aligned countries paid to the question of strengthening international security, as well as their concern over the aggravation of the international situation.

In explanation of its abstention in the vote, Israel stated that much of the text was calculated to encourage confrontation and hostility rather than dialogue and mutual understanding. The United States, also abstaining, said it had serious reservations about the utility of the many resolutions on the subject when the Charter of the United Nations provided the best guidelines for measures to strengthen peace and security; it also objected to calls for support to national liberation movements without recognition of the role of peaceful settlement of disputes.

Albania, stating that it would not participate in the vote, said it had a different opinion about detente from that implied in the text; it did not approve of appeals to permanent members of the Security Council, since they included the super-Powers responsible for world tension; for a similar reason, it did not agree with the idea of high-level Council meetings; it had reservations on the idea of nuclear-weapon-free zones; it thought peace and security in the Mediterranean would be better served by countering the manoeuvres and designs of the imperialist super-Powers, particularly with respect to the presence of the USSR and United States navies there; also, it did not accept the resolution's evaluations of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Among those voting for the resolution but with reservations, Austria said the requests to the Security Council did not take full account of the delimitation of functions of different United Nations organs. Finland emphasized that there should be strict compliance with Charter provisions concerning the powers of the Council and the General Assembly. Ireland also had reservations about references touching on the competences of the two organs. France did not consider that the international mechanisms for maintaining peace and security could be questioned as institutions.

Austria stated that it could not support the proposal to transform the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, as long as the concept had not been defined and clarified in discussions with all countries of the region and until their readiness to participate had been ascertained. Finland said the regional arrangements dealt with in the text

could only be arrived at freely among the States of the region concerned and with undiminished security for all. Spain, abstaining in the vote, said it had reservations on viewpoints and terms used in reference to the Mediterranean. Turkey, though it also abstained on the resolution, said the provision on the Mediterranean took account of its own security concerns and came close to its concept.

France and the United States said that the rights of States to dispose of their' natural resources must be exercised with respect for international law.

Reservations were also expressed by France on the paragraph on South Africa's nuclear capability, and by France and the United States on the references to the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

During the general debate on international security, a number of suggestions were made for steps to bring about a more secure world through improved international relations. Bulgaria urged contacts and the beginning of a dialogue to achieve mutually acceptable understandings on key questions, while respecting the principle of equal security and the legitimate interests of the opposing side. The Byelorussian SSR stressed the need to settle conflicts by peaceful means, around the negotiating table. Hungary welcomed efforts to revitalize negotiations and other contacts between the USSR and the United States, and said it intended to continue to establish and broaden contacts with every country, without exception, that was ready for dialogue.

Poland said it was necessary to seek ways of reducing conflicts, to institutionalize various forms of governmental and non-governmental consultations and make them more substantive, to develop forms of co-operation based wherever possible on long-range agreements, and to strive for vital national objectives through negotiation without attempting to impose one's will. Romania considered that there was no conflict that could not be settled by negotiations conducted in a spirit of understanding and mutual respect, and also believed that inter-State relations must be democratized and based on absolute respect for the principles of international law. The Ukrainian SSR favoured an active and thorough dialogue and negotiations in all forms and at all levels, including the highest, aiming at urgent joint action to reduce the threat of war, curb the arms race and ensure world peace.

Cuba stated that security could be strengthened by ending the arms race, eradicating colonialism, radically transforming the structure of international economic relations, ending all acts of aggression, resolving the Middle East conflict

and eliminating the racist apartheid regime. Sri Lanka also had an agenda for strengthening security, which called for completing decolonization, eradicating racism and apartheid, making tangible progress towards general and complete disarmament, dismantling military blocs and alliances, enabling nations to feel secure from foreign domination and aggression and from intervention in their internal affairs, and restructuring international economic relations on a more equitable basis.

In the view of Bangladesh, concerted international economic co-operation, on the basis of an agreed strategy to reduce and eliminate the gap between the developed and developing countries, was a vital pre-condition for the strengthening of international peace and security. Nigeria questioned whether the doctrine of deterrence, or balance of terror, would prove a reliable instrument of control in a crisis.

To foster the preservation of peace and security, said Trinidad and Tobago, all nations should pledge to abide by the principles of the Charter and to accept the authority of United Nations organs. Venezuela stated that respect for, and compliance in good faith with, international agreements concluded by States constituted one of the foundations of peaceful, harmonious coexistence among States.

Cyprus stressed the importance of maintaining order and security through the prevention or suppression of acts of aggression, and suggested that the Assembly hold a special session on international security within the system established by the Charter.

Eastern European States and some others held the United States responsible for a worsening international situation. Czechoslovakia stated that the imperialist forces headed by the United States were striving by military and other means to negate the positive results achieved through détente. Viet Nam said the world situation was characterized by a new recrudescence of aggressiveness by the United States against the security of third world countries and an ever closer collusion between Washington and Beijing. The USSR described its own peace programme, put forward by its Communist Party Congress early in 1981, calling for steps towards disarmament, settlement of disputes in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, and a high-level meeting of the Security Council; it contrasted that programme to that it described as the irresponsible policy of the United States aimed at securing a position of superior force.

In Albania's view, the two imperialist super-Powers-pursuing an aggressive, hegemonic, neo-colonialist policy-were primarily responsible for the dangers jeopardizing peace and

security. China stated that the correct way to strengthen peace and security was for the people of the world to unite and wage a resolute struggle against the hegemonists.

Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic supported the USSR proposal that a special session of the Security Council be held at the highest level to seek a solution to the most pressing international problems. The German Democratic Republic thought such a meeting would provide an opportunity, by means of constructive dialogue, to reach a decision on a reasonable balance.

Cyprus stated that there was an urgent need to comply with Article 43 of the Charter by creating an international force to give effect to the Council's decisions. Malta welcomed and supported efforts to strengthen the Council. Sri Lanka stated that, while it did not intend to pillory the Council or blame it for the state of the world, careful consideration should be given to ways in which its authority and enforcement capacity could be utilized for the settlement of outstanding issues. Yugoslavia thought the Council should be far more active and efficient in defence of peace and in the search for solutions, and regretted that there was no initiative from the Council to that end.

The Sudan supported the idea of establishing zones of peace in the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean, Africa, the Middle East, Asia and Latin America. The concept of zones of peace was also endorsed by Yugoslavia.

Several States, including Czechoslovakia and Hungary, spoke in favour of the creation of a zone of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reiterated its support for maintenance of the Mediterranean's neutrality, as a sea of peace. Malta said the establishment of such a zone would enable component States to tackle their own problems, free from super-Power interference, and could eventually entail the creation of a political forum for periodic discussion. Yugoslavia also supported the idea, adding that security in that area must be considered in the context of the situation in Europe and the world as a whole.

The USSR said it would welcome the conversion of the Mediterranean from a scene of military and political confrontation into a zone of stable peace and co-operation, through the application of confidence-building measures in the military field, an agreed reduction of armed forces, withdrawal of ships carrying nuclear weapons, renunciation of the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territory of non-nuclear-weapon countries, and acceptance by nuclear-weapon Powers of the obligation not to use nuclear weapons against a Mediterranean country

which did not permit such weapons to be placed on its soil.

Concerning peace and security in Europe, a number of speakers commented favourably on proposals made to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, meeting at Madrid, Spain, for a further conference on military security in Europe, also discussed during the First Committee's disarmament debate (p. 89). Albania accused the United States and the USSR of plotting in the Balkans to inflame chauvinistic feelings, set the peoples and countries of the area against one another and prevent the development of good-neighbourly relations. Romania supported efforts to develop economic, technical, scientific and cultural co-operation among all European States, without distinction as to social systems, and eventually to free the continent from nuclear weapons.

With regard to Asia and the Pacific, Mongolia outlined its proposal, described in communications to the Secretary-General (p. 141), for a regional conference to conclude a convention on non-aggression and non-use of force. The Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and Viet Nam supported the proposal.

Many speakers commented on aspects of international security also dealt with under separate agenda items. Thus, a number of States—including Cyprus, Malta, Nigeria, Poland and Romania—referred to the close link between disarmament and international security, a connection discussed during the First Committee's disarmament debate (p. 100). Suggestions were made by Bangladesh, Nigeria and Romania to strengthen the role of the United Nations, a topic discussed in greater detail by the Sixth (Legal) Committee (p. 1236).

States directly involved in particular disputes gave their views on those situations, including disputes between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Malta over the continental shelf (p. 358) and Guyana and Venezuela over borders (p. 254), as well as the situations between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the United States (p. 360) and between Nicaragua and the United States (p. 255).

Letters and notes verbales (nv): Bulgaria: <sup>(1)</sup>20 July, A/36/391 & Corr.1 (nv); <sup>(2)</sup>11 Nov., A/C.1/36/11. <sup>(3)</sup>Czechoslovakia: 4 Aug., A/36/422 (nv). <sup>(4)</sup>German Democratic Republic: 3 July, A/36/359 & Corr.1. <sup>(5)</sup>Italy: 25 June, A/36/348. <sup>(6)</sup>Malta: 25 June, A/36/349. Mongolia: <sup>(7)</sup>25 June, A/36/365 (nv); <sup>(8)</sup>15 July, A/36/388 (nv); <sup>(9)</sup>9 Oct., A/36/586. Romania: <sup>(10)</sup>2 July, A/36/358; <sup>(11)</sup>18 Sep., A/36/528 & Corr.1; <sup>(12)</sup>4 Nov., A/C.1/36/8; <sup>(13)</sup>30 Nov., A/C.1/36/15; <sup>(14)</sup>5 Dec., A/36/807-S/14784. <sup>(15)</sup>USSR: 24 June, A/36/347. <sup>(16)</sup>Viet Nam: 26 Aug., A/36/456 (nv).

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(17)</sup>2734(XXV), 16 Dec. 1970 (YUN 1970, p. 105); <sup>(18)</sup>36/102, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.45-51 (27 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/102

127-0-20 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/761) by recorded vote (93-0-21), 3 December (meeting 51); 20-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1); agenda item 58 (a).

Sponsors: Algeria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burundi, Congo, Egypt, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malta, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

#### Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security

The General Assembly,

Having considered the item entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security",

Noting with concern that the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security have not yet been fully implemented,

Profoundly disturbed by the escalation of tension in the world, the ever more frequent recourse to the threat or use of force, intervention, interference, aggression and foreign occupation, the continued stalemate in the solution of crises in different regions, the continuous escalation of the arms race and military build-up, the pursuance of the policy of rivalry, the confrontation and struggle for the division of the world into spheres of influence and domination, the persistence of colonialism, racism and apartheid, and the lack of solution of the economic problems of developing countries, all of which endanger international peace and security,

Deeply concerned that the process of relaxation of international tension has reached a point of deep crisis owing to the lack of progress in the settlement of international problems and conflicts and to the stalemate in the process of disarmament,

Stressing the need for the main organs of the United Nations responsible for the maintenance of peace and security, particularly the Security Council, to contribute more effectively to the promotion of international peace and security by seeking solutions to the unresolved problems and crises in the world,

Emphasizing that, in its twenty years of existence, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has significantly contributed to the efforts of the United Nations towards the promotion of international peace and security, the democratization of international relations, the development of international co-operation and the establishment of a system of international relations based on justice, sovereign equality and equal security of all States and peoples, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles and policy of non-alignment.

1. Expresses its deep concern over the aggravation of focal points of international tension and crisis in the world, more frequent recourse to force and increasing violations of the Charter of the United Nations;

2. Reaffirms once more the universal and unconditional validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter as the firm basis of relations among all States, irrespective of size, geographical location, level of development or political, economic, social or ideological systems;

3. Urges all States to abide strictly, in their international relations, by their commitment to the Charter and, to that end:

(a) To refrain from any threat or use of force, intervention, interference, aggression, foreign occupation or measures of political and economic coercion which violate the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and security of other States or their right freely to dispose of their natural resources;

(b) To refrain from supporting or encouraging any such act for any reason whatsoever;

(c) To reject and refuse recognition of situations brought about by any such act;

4. Calls upon all States to contribute effectively to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security;

5. Urges all States, in particular the permanent members of the Security Council, to take all necessary measures to prevent the further aggravation of the international situation and the disruption of the process of detente and, to this end:

(a) To seek the peaceful settlement of disputes and the elimination of the focal points of crisis and tension;

(b) To start serious, meaningful and effective negotiations on disarmament and on the halting of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, on the basis of the recommendation of the General Assembly at its tenth special session;

(c) To contribute to an urgent solution of international economic problems and the establishment of the new international economic order;

(d) To accelerate the economic development of developing countries, particularly the least developed ones;

(e) To proceed without any delay to a global consideration of ways and means for a revival of the world economy and for the restructuring of international economic relations within the framework of the global negotiations;

6. Takes note of the fact that the Security Council has failed to report to the General Assembly on steps taken to implement the provisions of paragraphs 13 and 15 of Assembly resolution 35/158 of 12 December 1960;

7. Requests the Security Council to consider ways and means to ensure the implementation of the provisions of paragraph 5 above as well as to examine all existing mechanisms and to propose new ones aimed at enhancing the authority and enforcement capacity of the Council in accordance with the Charter, and to explore also the possibility of holding periodic meetings of the Council, in conformity with Article 28 of the Charter, at the ministerial or higher level in specific cases, so as to enable it to play a more active role in preventing potential conflicts, and to present the Council's conclusions to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

8. Reiterates the need for the Security Council, particularly its permanent members, to ensure the effective implementation of its own decisions in compliance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations;

9. Considers that respect for and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms in their civil, political, economic, social and cultural aspects contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security;

10. Reaffirms again the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes and their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, and urges Member States to increase their support for and solidarity with them and their national liberation movements and to take urgent and effective measures for the speedy completion of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and for the final elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid;

11. Calls upon the Security Council to take appropriate effective measures to promote the fulfilment of the objective of the denuclearization of Africa in order to avert the serious danger which the nuclear capability of South Africa constitutes to the African States, in particular to the front-line States, as well as to international peace and security;

12. Reiterates its support for the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and expresses the hope that the Conference on the Indian Ocean, which is an important stage in the realization of the objectives of that Declaration, will be held not later than in the first half of 1983 and, to this end, calls upon all States to contribute effectively to the success of that Conference;

13. Calls upon all States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, at Madrid, to take all possible measures and exert every effort in order to ensure substantial and balanced results of that meeting in the implementation of the principles and goals established by the Final Act of the Conference, signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975,

as well as the continuity of the multilateral process initiated by the Conference, which has great significance for the strengthening of peace and security in Europe and in the world;

14. Considers that further efforts are necessary for the transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation on the basis of the principles of equal security, sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, non-intervention and non-interference, non-violation of international frontiers, non-use of force, peaceful settlement of disputes and just and viable solutions of the existing problems and crises in the area on the basis of the Charter and relevant resolutions of the United Nations, respect for sovereignty over natural resources and the right of peoples to make their own decisions independently and without any outside pressure or intimidation;

15. Calls upon all Governments to submit to this effect, before the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, their views on the question of the strengthening of security and co-operation in the region of the Mediterranean and requests the Secretary-General to submit the report on this question to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

16. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

## Declaration against intervention

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 9 December 1981, approved a Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, and requested the widest dissemination of the text to States and organizations.<sup>(1)</sup>

By this Declaration, the Assembly declared that no State or group of States had the right to interfere, in any form or for any reason, in the internal and external affairs of other States. The Declaration spelled out the components of the non-intervention principle in three categories: rights of States, duties of States, and matters which were both rights and duties. Matters dealt

with under rights were sovereignty, independence, national security, permanent sovereignty over natural resources, and information (p. 371). In the category of duties, States were enjoined to refrain from intervention through such means as the use of force in international relations (p. 1205), assistance to mercenaries (p. 1216), propaganda, international economic relations, exploitation of human rights issues (p. 974) and terrorism (p. 1219). Aspects of human rights and self-determination were mentioned under the category of rights and duties. Nothing in the Declaration was to prejudice the right to self-determination, freedom and independence of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes.

This resolution and annexed Declaration, sponsored by Guyana on behalf of United Nations Member States belonging to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, were adopted by a recorded vote of 120 to 22, with 6 abstentions, following approval by the First Committee on 3 December by a recorded vote of 90 to 21, with 8 abstentions.

Guyana, which chaired the Ad Hoc Working Group of the First Committee that had worked on the text in 1980<sup>(2)</sup> and during the 1981 Assembly session, introduced the text and said the sponsors saw the Declaration as a shield to be used by all States rather than as a sword. Although many delegations had remarked on the frequent instances of intervention and interference in recent times, some had shown a marked reluctance to negotiate on the text. Nevertheless, said Guyana, the States of the Non-Aligned Movement had decided to press for a decision by the Assembly in 1981.

Australia, which voted against the resolution and Declaration, regretted that the sponsors had decided to persist with a text which, while containing much of merit, also included elements causing Australia serious difficulties that might have been overcome, given time for examination and consultation. Austria, also voting against, and Finland, which abstained, doubted the necessity of a new declaration—particularly one which in Austria's view contained a number of highly controversial elements, some of which seemed incompatible with the United Nations Charter, and which Finland saw as interpreting Charter principles selectively and arbitrarily.

Venezuela, voting against, said the text contained incongruities and contradictions, and lacked any reference to unsolved territorial disputes; it should have contained a statement that nothing in the Declaration affected the rights of States under treaties concerning territorial disputes, and that no State should use it to evade the obligation to try to find peaceful solutions envisaged in such treaties.

Also voting negatively, France and the United States opposed the clause on the duty of States to refrain from measures to strengthen military blocs and alliances conceived in the context of great-Power confrontation, on the ground that this provision was at variance with the right of States to individual and collective self-defence; the United States also objected that the text defined rights and duties in vague and sometimes unbalanced language. Reservations on this clause were also voiced by Greece and Turkey, which abstained in the vote on the text as a whole. Fiji, voting in favour, interpreted the clause as not precluding a State from entering into any arrangement commensurate with its genuine security needs. Haiti also voted affirmatively but with the reservation that inequality of geopolitical conditions could impel some States to have recourse to defensive alliances so as to protect themselves against expansionist designs. Ireland, voting against, said the text contained provisions inconsistent with the right of United Nations organs to take collective action to maintain or restore peace and security.

Fiji and Uruguay, voting in favour, voiced reservations on a clause declaring it to be a State's right and duty to support the right of peoples under colonial, foreign or racist domination to wage both political and armed struggle for self-determination, freedom and independence; Uruguay could not accept an attempt to institutionalize recourse to armed force for the attainment of any objective, however noble. Similarly, Ireland could not associate itself with an explicit endorsement of armed struggle in a United Nations declaration.

Objections were also raised to the provision on a State's duty not to use economic assistance or economic reprisals as instruments of political pressure or coercion and to prevent the use of transnational corporations under its control for that purpose. Finland said it would have voted against this provision if it had been voted on separately. The United States said the text purported to define new and hitherto unrecognized duties of States and did not address the issues realistically or equitably.

Objections to the clauses on information and on exploitation of human rights issues were also voiced by Finland, Greece, Ireland and the United States.

Among those which voted in favour, Mexico, though it had doubts about some aspects of the text which seemed to address circumstantial factors rather than general principles, regretted that the absence of a negotiating attitude on the part of some delegations had not made consensus possible. Malta regarded the text as a major step forward and a comprehensive indication of the

preoccupations of the Non-Aligned Movement, but would welcome an improvement in the text at forthcoming sessions to gain wider support. The USSR said the Declaration was positive and constructive on the whole, though the clause on military blocs could have been strengthened by referring to the need to dissolve military alliances, and the reference to military bases conceived in the context of great-Power confrontation could be used by the imperialists to justify deployment of interventionist forces and bases against developing countries.

The Declaration was welcomed by States from Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe and Latin America. Bhutan stated that the Declaration would provide guidance applicable to all nations, big or small, powerful or weak, in the conduct of their mutual relations. Czechoslovakia regarded the Declaration as an important measure within the framework of efforts to strengthen international security, while Mongolia saw it as an important complement to the Declaration on international security. Guinea viewed the Declaration as a useful legal instrument for the security of States in the current state of international affairs.

Romania said that if there was any reason to reaffirm and develop the substance of the principle of non-interference and non-intervention in a comprehensive declaration, it was precisely because political concepts were still being entertained which overlooked the need for strict respect for that principle. The USSR stated that all those who had no ignoble intentions with regard to the non-aligned and other developing countries must support the Declaration. Yugoslavia observed that the Declaration contained precise definitions of all unlawful acts of intervention and should serve as a standard for assessing such behaviour from whatever quarter it might come.

Commenting on the non-intervention principle, the Congo cited what it viewed as two aberrations whose intended victim was peace and security: the notion of vital national interests outside the national territory of an imperial Power, and the supposed right to intervene in defence of those interests, which was an interpretation of self-defence that was wholly alien to the terms of Article 51 of the Charter on the right of individual and collective self-defence). Also supporting the Declaration, Trinidad and Tobago said that, as a minimum, States should freely recognize each other's rights to national existence and territorial inviolability, so that no State would have the right to invade the territory of another.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/103, 9 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 170.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.38, 45, 46-50, 51 (20 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/103

120-22-6 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/761 and Corr.1) by recorded vote (90-21-8). 3 December (meeting 51); draft by Guyana, for Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (A/C.1/36/L.61); agenda item 58 (b).

#### Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2734(XXV) of 16 December 1970, containing the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965, containing the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty,

Recalling also its resolutions 2625(XXV) of 24 October 1970, containing the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and 3314(XXIX) of 14 December 1974, containing the Definition of Aggression,

Recalling further its resolutions 31/91 of 14 December 1976, 32/153 of 19 December 1977, 33/74 of 15 December 1978, 34/101 of 14 December 1979 and 35/159 of 12 December 1980 on non-interference in the internal affairs of States,

Deeply concerned at the gravity of the international situation and the increasing threat to international peace and security owing to frequent recourse to the threat or use of force, aggression, intimidation, military intervention and occupation, escalation of military presence and all other forms of intervention or interference, direct or indirect, overt or covert, threatening the sovereignty and political independence of States, with the aim of overthrowing their Governments,

Conscious of the fact that such policies endanger the political independence of States, the freedom of peoples and their permanent sovereignty over their natural resources, adversely affecting thereby the maintenance of international peace and security,

Conscious of the imperative need for all foreign forces engaged in military occupation, intervention or interference to be completely withdrawn to their own territories, so that peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist régimes may freely and fully exercise their right to self-determination, in order to enable peoples of all States to administer their own affairs and determine their own political, economic and social systems without external interference or control,

Conscious also of the imperative need to put a complete end to any threat of aggression, any recruitment, any use of armed bands, in particular mercenaries, against sovereign States, so as to enable the peoples of all States to determine their own political, economic and social systems without external interference or control,

Recognizing that full observance of the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of sovereign States and peoples, whether direct or indirect, overt or covert, is essential to the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. Approves the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, the text of which is annexed to the present resolution;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure the widest dissemination of the Declaration to States, the specialized agencies and other organizations in association with the United Nations, and other appropriate bodies.

#### ANNEX

#### Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and interference in the internal Affairs of States

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, that no State has the right to intervene directly or



indirectly for any reason whatsoever in the internal and external affairs of any other State,

Reaffirming further the fundamental principle of the Charter that all States have the duty not to threaten or use force against the sovereignty, political independence or territorial integrity of other States,

Bearing in mind that the establishment, maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security are founded upon freedom, equality, self-determination and independence, respect for the sovereignty of States, as well as permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources, irrespective of their political, economic or social systems or the levels of their development:

Considering that full observance of the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of States is of the greatest importance for the maintenance of international peace and security and for the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the Charter,

Reaffirming, in accordance with the Charter, the right to self-determination and independence of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes.

Stressing that the purposes of the United Nations can be achieved only under conditions where peoples enjoy freedom and States enjoy sovereign equality and comply fully with the requirements of these principles in their international relations,

Considering that any violation of the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of States poses a threat to the freedom of peoples, the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of States and to their political, economic, social and cultural development, and also endangers international peace and security,

Considering that a declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States will contribute towards the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the Charter,

Considering the provisions of the Charter as a whole and taking into account the resolutions adopted by the United Nations relating to that principle, in particular those containing the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, the Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Definition of Aggression,

Solemnly declares that:

1. No State or group of States has the right to intervene or interfere in any form or for any reason whatsoever in the internal and external affairs of other States.

2. The principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of States comprehends the following rights and duties:

#### I

(a) Sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity, national unity and security of all States, as well as national identity and cultural heritage of their peoples;

(b) The sovereign and inalienable right of a State freely to determine its own political, economic, cultural and social systems, to develop its international relations and to exercise permanent sovereignty over its natural resources, in accordance with the will of its people, without outside intervention, interference, subversion, coercion or threat in any form whatsoever;

(c) The right of States and peoples to have free access to information and to develop fully, without interference, their system of information and mass media and to use their information media in order to promote their political, social, economic and cultural interests and aspirations, based, *inter alia*, on the relevant articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of the new international information order:

#### II

(a) The duty of States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any form whatsoever to violate the existing internationally recognized boundaries of another State, to disrupt the political, social or economic order of other States, to overthrow or change the political system of another State or its Government, to cause tension between or among States or to deprive peoples of their national identity and cultural heritage;

(b) The duty of a State to ensure that its territory is not used in any manner which would violate the sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and national unity or disrupt the political, economic and social stability of another State; this obligation applies also to States entrusted with responsibility for territories yet to attain self-determination and national independence;

(c) The duty of a State to refrain from armed intervention, subversion, military occupation or any other form of intervention and interference, overt or covert, directed at another State or group of States, or any act of military, political or economic interference in the internal affairs of another State, including acts of reprisal involving the use of force;

(d) The duty of a State to refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples under colonial domination or foreign occupation of their right to self-determination, freedom and independence;

(e) The duty of a State to refrain from any action or attempt in whatever form or under whatever pretext to destabilize or to undermine the stability of another State or of any of its institutions

(f) The duty of a State to refrain from the promotion, encouragement or support, direct or indirect, of rebellious or secessionist activities within other States, under any pretext whatsoever, or any action which seeks to disrupt the unity or to undermine or subvert the political order of other States;

(g) The duty of a State to prevent on its territory the training, financing and recruitment of mercenaries, or the sending of such mercenaries into the territory of another State and to deny facilities, including financing, for the equipping and transit of mercenaries;

(h) The duty of a State to refrain from concluding agreements with other States designed to intervene or interfere in the internal and external affairs of third States;

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

(j) The duty of a State to abstain from any defamatory campaign, vilification or hostile propaganda for the purpose of intervening or interfering in the internal affairs of other States;

(k) The duty of a State, in the conduct of its international relations in the economic, social, technical and trade fields, to refrain from measures which would constitute interference or intervention in the internal or external affairs of another State, thus preventing it from determining freely its political, economic and social development; this includes, *inter alia*, the duty of a State not to use its external economic assistance programme or adopt any multilateral or unilateral economic reprisal or blockade and to prevent the use of transnational and multinational corporations under its jurisdiction and control as instruments of political pressure or coercion against another State, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations;

(l) The duty of a State to refrain from the exploitation and the distortion of human rights issues as a means of interference in the internal affairs of States, of exerting pressure on other States or creating distrust and disorder within and among States or groups of States;

(m) The duty of a State to refrain from using terrorist practices as state policy against another State or against peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes and to prevent any assistance to or use of or toler-

ance of terrorist groups, saboteurs or subversive agents against third States;

(n) The duty of a State to refrain from organizing, training, financing and arming political and ethnic groups on their territories or the territories of other States for the purpose of creating subversion, disorder or unrest in other countries;

(o) The duty of a State to refrain from any economic, political or military activity in the territory of another State without its consent:

### III

(a) The right and duty of States to participate actively on the basis of equality in solving outstanding international issues, thus actively contributing to the removal of causes of conflict and interference:

(b) The right and duty of States fully to support the right to self-determination, freedom and independence of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes, as well as the right of these peoples to wage both political and armed struggle to that end, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter;

(c) The right and duty of States to observe, promote and defend all human rights and fundamental freedoms within their own national territories and to work for the elimination of massive and flagrant violations of the rights of nations and peoples, and, in particular, for the elimination of apartheid and all forms of racism and racial discrimination:

(d) The right and duty of States to combat, within their constitutional prerogatives, the dissemination of false or distorted news which can be interpreted as interference in the internal affairs of other States or as being harmful to the promotion of peace, co-operation and friendly relations among States and nations;

(e) The right and duty of States not to recognise situations brought about by the threat or use of force or acts undertaken in contravention of the principle of non-intervention and non-interference.

3. The rights and duties set out in this Declaration are interrelated and are in accordance with the Charter.

4. Nothing in this Declaration shall prejudice in any manner the right to self-determination, freedom and independence of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes, and the right to seek and receive support in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

5. Nothing in this Declaration shall prejudice in any manner the provisions of the Charter.

6. Nothing in this Declaration shall prejudice action taken by the United Nations under Chapters VI and VII of the Charter.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamshiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Swaziland, Turkey.

## Implementation of the 1978 Declaration on societies and peace

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In a report to the General Assembly issued in September 1981 (with later addenda),<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General transmitted replies from 14 Governments on progress in implementing its 1978 Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace.<sup>(3)</sup> The report, requested by the Assembly when it adopted the Declaration,<sup>(4)</sup> also included a response by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) describing action taken at meetings of educators, activities under the Associated Schools Project in Education for International Co-operation and Peace, the award of a UNESCO Prize for Peace Education and social sciences research relevant to the promotion of peace.

In a letter of 20 February 1981 to the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> Poland, the initiator of the Declaration in 1978,<sup>(6)</sup> described what it had done to implement the Declaration by teaching a "mentality of peace" in schools; it mentioned the recognition given to the document in various international bodies and suggested internal, regional and multilateral activities by States.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 9 December 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly invited States to intensify efforts to implement the Declaration. It reiterated its appeal for concerted action—by Governments, the United Nations, specialized agencies and other organizations—to give tangible effect to the supreme importance and need of establishing, maintaining and strengthening a just and durable peace for present and future generations. It requested the Secretary-General to report again by 1984 on progress in implementing the Declaration.

This resolution, sponsored by 16 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 143 to none, with 2 abstentions, following its approval by the First Committee on 3 December by a recorded vote of 114 to none, with 2 abstentions.

Introducing the resolution, Poland stated that far more dedicated efforts were needed to put into effect the concepts and ideals of the Declaration. These included increased co-operation among States, good faith in dialogue and negotiations, increased regional efforts on all continents, greater bilateral co-operation, promotion of good-neighbourliness and mutual respect, and encouragement of specific activities by organizations and individuals.

Abstaining in the vote, the United States saw

what it regarded as two fundamental flaws in the Declaration and the resolution: there was inadequate reference to human rights, and the idea that States should prepare their citizens for life in peace and use information media and schools to achieve what the resolution's preamble referred to as the "moulding of human consciousness" to fulfil the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter was antithetical to free societies, whose Governments were prohibited from attempting to dictate or mould the opinions of their citizens.

Reservations on this preambular phrase were also voiced by some States that voted for the resolution. The United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Community (EC) members, rejected the concept of controlling information sources, and also thought the call in paragraph 2 for action by Governments, the United Nations and specialized agencies might be interpreted as placing them on the same level, whereas the United Nations should exercise a co-ordinating role. The Netherlands thought the preambular phrase seemed to imply state activities that could prejudice the exercise of freedoms by individuals and also believed, as did Austria, that the concept of life in peace must be related to human rights. Poland, on behalf of the sponsors, did not accept a Canadian suggestion that the phrase "positive moulding of human consciousness" be replaced by "encouraging in the human consciousness".

In the general debate on international security, support for the resolution was voiced by the Byelorussian SSR and Czechoslovakia.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>poland, 20 Feb., A/36/119.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/386 & Add.1-3.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>33/73, 15 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 165); <sup>(4)</sup>ibid., sect. III (p. 166); <sup>(5)</sup>36/104, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1978, p. 160.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.45, 46-50, 51 (27 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/104

143-0-2 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/761) by recorded vote (114-0-2), 3 December (meeting 51); 16-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.58); agenda item 58 (c).

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Colombia, Congo, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mongolia, Peru, Philippines, Poland, United Republic of Cameroon, Yugoslavia.

#### Implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace

The General Assembly,

Recalling the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, contained in its resolution 33/73 of 15 December 1978,

Taking note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General,

Reaffirming the lasting importance of the preparation of societies for life in peace as part of all constructive efforts at shaping relations among States and strengthening international peace and security,

Aware of the paramount value of positive moulding of human consciousness for the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the charter of the United Nations,

1. Solemnly invites all States to intensify their efforts towards the implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace by strictly observing the principles enshrined in the Declaration and taking all necessary steps towards that end at the national and international levels;

2. Reiterates its appeal for concerted action on the part of Governments, the United Nations and the specialized agencies, in particular the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, as well as other interested international and national organizations, both governmental and non-governmental, to give tangible effect to the supreme importance and need of establishing, maintaining and strengthening a just and durable peace for present and future generations;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to continue following the progress made in the implementation of the Declaration and to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly not later than at its thirty-ninth session.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel, United States.

## Good-neighbourliness between States

By a resolution of 9 December 1981 on the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly called on States to develop good-neighbourly relations and reaffirmed that good-neighbourliness conformed with the purposes of the United Nations and was founded on the rejection of attempts to establish zones of influence or domination. The Assembly reaffirmed the need to examine good-neighbourliness in order to develop its content as well as modalities to enhance it, and believed the results of that examination could be included at an appropriate time in an international document. It requested Governments to communicate their views and suggestions on

the topic, with a view to preventing conflicts and increasing confidence among States; invited United Nations organizations to continue to inform the Secretary-General of their activities relevant to good-neighbourliness; and requested him to submit a report in 1982 containing such views and suggestions.

This resolution, sponsored by 31 nations, was adopted without vote following its approval in similar fashion by the First Committee on 3 December. The sponsors orally revised paragraph 8 to have the Assembly request that the report contain "an orderly presentation of the views and suggestions received concerning the content of good-neighbourliness, as well as ways and modalities to enhance its effectiveness" rather than simply "a systematic presentation of the views and suggestions received".

Romania, introducing the resolution, said it was not enough to proclaim principles and norms; ways to ensure their application in relations between States must be established and utilized. Romania suggested a number of possible methods to strengthen good-neighbourliness, including the conclusion of friendship treaties and other instruments on the non-use of force, the creation of bodies for consultation and negotiation, and the establishment of zones of peace and co-operation and of demilitarized zones. Such an institutional and juridical framework could prevent disputes or ensure that they did not degenerate into conflicts.

A report of the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> requested by the Assembly in 1979,<sup>(2)</sup> contained replies from 27 States with their views and suggestions on good-neighbourliness and ways to enhance it, and from 14 organizations and bodies in the United Nations system on their activities relevant to the development of good-neighbourliness.

In the First Committee debate, Albania stressed the duty of States to cast aside everything that could endanger good-neighbourly relations and said it was especially important to take a firm attitude against attempted interference or intrigue by the super-Powers and other imperialists practising a "divide-and-rule" policy. Yugoslavia viewed national minorities as bridges of friendship, mutual understanding and co-operation among countries and peoples, particularly between neighbours.

Bangladesh endorsed the idea that the principle of good-neighbourliness should be studied further with a view to finding specific modalities for achieving it. China reiterated its view that relations among States and among neighbours should be based on the five principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in inter-

nal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. The Congo stated that, for weak countries that were slow to develop, good-neighbourliness was a symbol of union and thus of strength.

Ecuador believed that a specific reference to the principles of non-use of force and the obligation to settle international disputes by peaceful means should have been included in paragraph 2 of the resolution, calling on States to develop good-neighbourly relations.

Greece classified the elements regulating good-neighbourliness into three phases or categories: the cessation of every act that had a negative effect on good-neighbourliness, the positive steps which a State could take in order to develop good relations with its neighbours and close co-operation for the benefit of all peoples concerned. Guinea listed three principles which West African States had followed in negotiating disputes: giving up the threat or use of force and hostile propaganda, promoting confidence by practical actions, such as avoiding the stationing of troops along frontiers, and maintaining agreements and dialogue at the highest possible level. Turkey stated that good-neighbourliness required a certain stability or a minimum of harmony among the partners, in the absence of which it would be absurd to speak of such a concept.

Mali believed that a legal instrument governing good-neighbourliness should be drafted. Singapore acknowledged the concern that good-neighbourliness did not correspond to any concept in international law or that a legal code on the subject would be broken to suit selfish interests, but felt nevertheless that there were two reasons to start giving the concept some legal content: a well-defined concept of good-neighbourliness would assist in judging rights and wrongs in a world where acts of aggression against neighbouring States had always been justified by some lofty principle, and it was the hallmark of civilized men to regulate their mutual relations according to a set of laws or recognized code of ethics. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, stated that they were not convinced that the notion of good-neighbourliness necessarily corresponded to any existing principles of international law and thought any further work to strengthen and develop the concept should take place in the Assembly's Sixth (Legal) Committee.

The USSR stated that the motto which best characterized United States policy towards its neighbours was the slogan "Speak softly but carry a big stick", as demonstrated by the overthrow it organized in 1954 of the progressive régime in Guatemala, the 1961 invasion by mer-

cenaries against Cuba and the landing of United States troops in the Dominican Republic in 1965. The United States said it had improved its excellent relations with the two neighbours sharing its open and unguarded borders; a truly good neighbour encouraged the free exchange of people and ideas, and did not require a rigid political orthodoxy of smaller States on its borders or resort to massive armed intervention to enforce that orthodoxy.

Report <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/376. & Add.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>34/99, paras. 4-6, 14 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 143); <sup>(3)</sup>36/101, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV. 45, 46, 47, 48-50; 51 (27 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/101

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/760) without vote, 3 December (meeting 51); 31-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.59), orally revised: agenda item 57.

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

#### Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States

The General Assembly,

Bearing in mind the determination of the peoples of the United Nations as expressed in the Charter to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours,

Recalling its resolutions 1236(XII) of 14 December 1957, 1301(XIII) of 10 December 1958, 2129(XX) of 21 December 1965 and, in particular, 34/99 of 14 December 1979,

Bearing in mind that, owing to geographic proximity, there are particularly favourable opportunities for co-operation and mutual advantage between neighbouring countries in many fields and that the development of such co-operation may have a positive influence on international relations as a whole,

Considering that the great changes of a political, economic and social nature as well as the scientific and technological progress which have taken place in the world and led to unprecedented interdependence of nations have given new dimensions to good-neighbourliness in the conduct of States and increased the need to develop and strengthen it,

1. Reaffirms that good-neighbourliness conforms with the purposes of the United Nations and is founded upon the strict observance of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, as well as upon the rejection of any acts seeking to establish zones of influence or domination;

2. Calls upon all States, in the interest of the maintenance of international peace and security, to develop good-neighbourly relations, acting on the basis of these principles;

3. Considers that the generalization of the long practice and of principles and rules pertaining to good-neighbourliness is likely to strengthen friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter;

4. Reaffirms the need to examine the question of good-neighbourliness in order to strengthen and further develop its content, as well as ways and modalities to enhance its effectiveness;

5. Believes that the results of the examination of good-neighbourliness and of the clarification of its elements could be included, at an appropriate time, in a suitable international document;

6. Requests the Governments that have not communicated their views and suggestions on good-neighbourliness, as well as on ways and modalities to enhance it, with a view to preventing conflicts and to increasing confidence among States, to do so as soon as possible, and invites the Governments that have already communicated such views and suggestions to supplement them if they deem it necessary;

7. Invites the United Nations organs, bodies and programmes, as well as the specialized agencies, within their fields of competence, to continue to inform the Secretary-General of the aspects of their activities relevant to the development of relations of good-neighbourliness between States;

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

9. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States".

## Review of UN peace-keeping operations

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS. The Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, established by the General Assembly in 1965,<sup>(3)</sup> held three meetings in 1981, on 17 July and 6 and 26 August. It discussed its mandate, reiterated by the Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(5)</sup> which was to work towards the completion of agreed guidelines to govern the conduct of United Nations peace-keeping operations and devote attention to specific questions related to the practical implementation of such operations.

In its report to the Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee observed that long-standing basic differences remained and that its task would continue to be difficult, owing to the fundamental nature of the issues involved. It concluded, however, that the importance of the issues was such that its mandate should be renewed.

The Secretary-General submitted to the Committee a report<sup>(1)</sup> containing the responses of seven Governments to the Assembly's 1980 invitation<sup>(4)</sup> that States provide information on experience gained in peace-keeping operations.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 18 November 1981,<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly took note of the Special Committee's report, repeated its invitations to Member States to provide information on experience gained in peace-keeping operations, and again urged the Committee to work towards completion of agreed guidelines for the conduct of peace-keeping operations and to devote further attention to questions related to the practical implementa-

tion of such operations. The Committee was requested to report in 1983.

This resolution was adopted without vote on the basis of a text submitted by the Chairman of the Special Political Committee (SPC) following informal consultations, and approved by that Committee without vote on 13 November.

Commenting on the text, Jamaica thought it should have been improved by urging the Special Committee to hold substantive meetings and requesting it to submit a comprehensive report explaining the nature of the difficulties and the options it had considered with a view to overcoming the deadlock.

In the SPC debate on this subject, it was generally felt that the peace-keeping role of the United Nations was fundamental to the effective implementation of its Charter. Most delegations expressed regret that, although a certain amount of common ground had been reached, deep-rooted differences had prevented the Special Committee from fulfilling its mandate. It was felt however that, despite the lack of progress, the Committee should not give up its search for agreed guidelines for future United Nations peace-keeping operations.

As in previous years, the debate centred on a small number of issues, including the role of the Security Council and other main organs of the United Nations in peace-keeping operations, and the financing of those operations.

Regarding the role of peace-keeping operations, Lebanon thought they should have diplomatic and political dimensions, since warring parties could not be made to co-operate with an international force without constant political action; moreover, the Security Council's authority must be enhanced, so that peace-keeping resolutions could be implemented and States that defied them could be forced to abide by them.

Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Pakistan maintained that the Council alone had the power of decision with regard to the launching, supervision, financing and command of United Nations peace-keeping operations throughout their duration. Czechoslovakia thought it would be useful for the Council to establish a subsidiary body to assist it in implementing such operations.

India, Ireland and Kenya, on the other hand, while stressing the Council's responsibility in backing or conducting United Nations peace-keeping operations, felt that the Secretary-General should be given the authority and flexibility needed to ensure the effective conduct of the operations. Nepal, too, felt the Secretary-General must have clear authority to direct the day-to-day operations of any such force so that

the United Nations could respond adequately and promptly to emergencies.

Egypt, Greece and India stressed the need for prior consent by the host country before the establishment of United Nations peace-keeping operations. Cyprus, Greece and India added that there must be full respect for the sovereignty of the State on whose territory the operations were being carried out. In this regard, Ireland upheld the principle that a peace-keeping force must have the full co-operation of all parties involved in a dispute, while Israel suggested that, in order for the force to have the confidence of the parties, it should be composed exclusively of troops from countries maintaining normal relations with all the Governments in the area. The Syrian Arab Republic reaffirmed the need for all parties to commit themselves to unconditional co-operation with United Nations peace-keeping forces, and Cyprus stressed that those forces should be allowed to function without hindrance.

Several speakers, including Chile, Cyprus, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, made the point that peace-keeping operations should not be an end in themselves or a substitute for efforts to find a peaceful solution to the underlying causes of conflicts.

Regarding the work programme of the Special Committee, some States continued to favour parallel consideration of issues of principle and practical implementation, while others insisted on seeking prior agreement on guidelines for peace-keeping operations. In the former camp, Japan thought the consideration of practical measures would have an important bearing on current and future operations and would contribute to the completion of agreed guidelines.

On the other hand, Hungary said that, while it was not averse to discussing practical matters relating to peace-keeping, it believed the preparation of guidelines should have priority. The German Democratic Republic said the over-emphasis on so-called practical aspects complicated the solution of the main issue. A similar view was expressed by the USSR, which felt that attempts to divert the Committee's attention from resolving the main issues could play into the hands of those who did not want it to complete its main task; the so-called practical aspects could be worked out in special arrangements concluded under Article 43 of the Charter between the Security Council and potential troop-contributing countries.

Israel thought the usefulness of general guidelines was likely to be limited; they could be effective only if they were adaptable to particular requirements. Jamaica said the guidelines should not be too tightly drawn and should take account

of different circumstances in different areas as well as the need for operational flexibility; it also voiced doubts about continuing the Special Committee and mentioned a special session of the Assembly or an expert group as alternative ways to continue the work on guidelines and other matters.

A number of suggestions were made with a view to improving the efficiency of United Nations peace-keeping efforts. Kenya, Nepal and the United States stressed the need for maintaining stand-by forces or earmarking contingents that could be made available to the United Nations in urgent situations, and Finland, speaking for the Nordic States, pointed out that they had maintained such forces since 1964. Austria and Cyprus suggested that national or regional seminars be conducted under United Nations auspices so that States could share their experiences; Austria also suggested that standards be elaborated relating to the safety and security of peace-keeping units. Morocco observed that peace-keeping operations had to be conducted with extraordinary speed in order to keep pace with events.

Regarding the financing of peace-keeping operations, Chile, Fiji, Finland, Jamaica, Kenya, Nepal and the United States expressed the view that Member States had a collective responsibility for such financing and that, consequently, the costs must be borne by all Members as part of United Nations expenses. Sharing this view, Ireland, Japan and the United Kingdom (for the EC members) regretted that certain countries, in particular some permanent members of the Security Council, had refused to honour their financial obligations with regard to peace-keeping operations; the United Kingdom remarked that this placed an additional financial burden on troop-contributing States. Zaïre stated that the financial implications of peace-keeping operations should not serve as a pretext to shirk collective responsibility.

Fiji emphasized that troop-contributing States should be fully, regularly and equitably compensated for their services in order to encourage the participation of small States in peace-keeping operations and to achieve a balanced geographical distribution in the composition of the force. Canada cautioned that delays in the payment of contributions might reduce the capacity of the countries concerned to maintain their contingents and discourage participation by other States. The United States called for the punctual payment of financial contributions so that the troop-contributing countries would not have to bear the financial burden.

Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic

Republic and Hungary reaffirmed the primary role of the Security Council in choosing the method of financing peace-keeping operations. The German Democratic Republic maintained that the aggressor must bear full responsibility with regard to the expenses incurred by such operations, and the Syrian Arab Republic said the victim of aggression could not be required to contribute. Making a similar point, the Lao People's Democratic Republic said that to apportion the costs of the aggression among the members of the international community would be tantamount to legitimizing a criminal act.

Albania expressed the opinion that the negative impact of United Nations peace-keeping operations was due in part to the ineffectiveness of the Security Council and declared that it would never participate in financing such operations.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/AC.121/34 & Add.1; <sup>(2)</sup>Special Committee, A/36/469.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>2006(XIX), 18 Feb. 1965 (YUN 1964, p. 59); <sup>(4)</sup>35/121 para. 2, 11 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 182); <sup>(5)</sup>ibid., para. 4; <sup>(6)</sup>36/37, 18 Nov. 1981, text following.

Meeting records; GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.29-32 (11-13 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.63 (18 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/37

Adopted without vote Meeting 63 18 November 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/690) without vote, 13 November (meeting 32); draft by Chairman following informal consultations (A/SPC/36/L.16); agenda item 63.

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2006(XIX) of 18 February 1965, 2053 A (XX) of 15 December 1965, 2249(S-V) of 23 May 1967, 2308(XXII) of 13 December 1967, 2451 (XXIII) of 19 December 1968, 2670(XXV) of 8 December 1970, 2835(XXVI) of 17 December 1971, 2965(XXVII) of 13 December 1972, 3091 (XXVIII) of 7 December 1973, 3239(XXIX) of 29 November 1974, 3457(XXX) of 10 December 1975, 31/105 of 15 December 1976, 32/106 of 15 December 1977, 33/114 of 18 December 1978, 34/53 of 23 November 1979 and 35/121 of 11 December 1980,

Reaffirming once again the fundamental importance of the maintenance of international peace and security by the United Nations as set out in the Charter of the United Nations,

Reaffirming the determination of the United Nations to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest of Member States,

Having considered the report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations,

Noting with regret the difficulties being experienced by the Special Committee in carrying out its mandate,

Emphasizing again that only by a greater demonstration of political will and conciliation can progress be achieved,

1. Takes note of the report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations;

2. Repeats its invitations to Member States to report and to provide information on experience gained in peace-keeping operations;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare a further compilation of the replies submitted in accordance with paragraph 2 above;

4. Urges again the Special Committee, in accordance with its mandate, to renew its efforts to work towards the completion of agreed guidelines which will govern the conduct of peace-keeping operations of the United Nations in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and to devote further attention to specific questions related to the practical implementation of peace-keeping operations;

5. Requests the Special Committee to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects".

## International Day and Year of Peace

On 30 November 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly proclaimed the third Tuesday of September, the opening day of its regular session, as International Day of Peace, devoted to commemorating and strengthening the ideals of peace. It invited Member States, organizations and individuals to commemorate the Day, especially through all means of education. The Assembly also invited the Economic and Social Council to consider declaring an International Year of Peace at the first practicable opportunity and to submit its recommendations to the Assembly in 1982.

This resolution, sponsored by 20 nations, was adopted without vote.

The item entitled "Declaration of a Peace Year, a Peace Month and a Peace Day" was placed on the Assembly's agenda at the initiative of Costa Rica, contained in a letter of 14 August to the Secretary-General.<sup>(1)</sup> An accompanying explanatory memorandum stated that the International Association of University Presidents, at its Sixth Triennial Conference (San José, Costa Rica, 28 June-3 July), had endorsed the conclusion that the most effective means of achieving lasting peace was education. Consequently, it had decided to invite the Assembly to declare a Peace Year, a Peace Month and a Peace Day to serve as a constant reminder of the ardent longing for universal peace.

Introducing the resolution, Costa Rica said the Peace Year should not be a celebration empty of substance; apart from its educational aspect, it should be a year in which tensions were reduced, lives were saved and the arms race did not attain the level of universal madness. Costa Rica had originally proposed the year 1984, but was leaving the choice open in order to abide by guidelines to be decided by the Assembly.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Costa Rica, 14 Aug., A/36/197.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/67, 30 Nov., text following.

Meeting records: GA, A/36/PV.75, 77 (27, 30 Nov.).

### General Assembly resolution 36/67

Adopted without vote Meeting 77 30 November 1981

20-nation draft (A/36/L.29/Rev.1); agenda item 133.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Panama, Philippines, Senegal, Somalia, Venezuela, Zaire.

International Year of Peace and International Day of Peace  
The General Assembly,

Recalling that the promotion of peace, both at an international and a national level, is among the main purposes of the United Nations, in conformity with its Charter,

Reaffirming that, as set forth in the preamble of the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed, that a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of Governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind,

Further recalling that, on the basis of similar considerations, the General Assembly established the United Nations University in 1972 and, more specifically, the University for Peace in 1980, and entrusted other organs and organizations of the United Nations system with the promotion of peace, mainly through education in all its aspects,

Noting with appreciation the initiative taken by the International Association of University Presidents at its Sixth Triennial Conference, held at San José from 28 June to 3 July 1981, to propose the Declaration of a Peace Year, a Peace Month and a Peace Day,

Acknowledging the conclusions of the Conference that it would be appropriate to devote a specific time to concentrate the efforts of the United Nations and its Member States, as well as of the whole of mankind, to promoting the ideals of peace and to giving positive evidence of their commitment to peace in all viable ways,

Considering that, through the declaration and proper celebration of an International Year of Peace and an International Day of Peace, it would be possible to contribute to strengthening such ideals of peace and alleviating the tensions and causes of conflict, both within and among nations and peoples,

1. Invites the Economic and Social Council to consider, at its first regular session of 1982, the possibility of declaring an International Year of Peace at the first practicable opportunity, taking into account the urgency and special nature of such an observance as well as the guidelines for international years and anniversaries adopted by the General Assembly in its decision 35/424 of 5 December 1980, and to submit its recommendations to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the basis of appropriate arrangements for the timing, organization and financing of the Year;

2. Declares that the third Tuesday of September, the opening day of the regular sessions of the General Assembly, shall be officially proclaimed and observed as International Day of Peace and shall be devoted to commemorating and strengthening the ideals of peace both within and among all nations and peoples;

3. Invites all Member States, organs and organizations of the United Nations system, regional organizations, non-governmental organizations, peoples and individuals to commemorate in an appropriate manner the International Day of Peace, especially through all means of education, and to co-operate with the United Nations in the observance of that Day.



## Chapter V

### Africa

The apartheid policies of South Africa and ways to bring them to an end remained under active consideration during 1981 in several United Nations bodies (see below). The General Assembly continued to urge the imposition of mandatory sanctions and the Security Council denounced South Africa's bantustanization policy. An International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris in May, adopted a Declaration on Sanctions.

No progress was reported in efforts to bring about independence for Namibia through implementation of a plan approved by the Security Council in 1978 (p. 1126).

The Assembly condemned South Africa's aggression against neighbouring States, in particular against Angola and Seychelles (p. 214). While Angola's complaint to the Security Council against South Africa did not result in the adoption of a resolution (p. 217), the Council condemned the armed attack against Seychelles carried out in November by mercenaries and established a commission of inquiry to investigate the incident (p. 226).

Charges of South African attacks against Lesotho and Mozambique (p. 221), the situation in Chad (p. 222) and relations between Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Sudan (p. 225) were the subject of letters from those States to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council.

The Assembly reaffirmed the sovereignty of the Comoros over the island of Mayotte and invited the Comoros and France to continue talks for a just solution (p. 223). Assembly consideration of a dispute between France and Madagascar over the status of several Malagasy islands in the Indian Ocean was postponed until 1982 (p. 225).

The United Nations and the Organization of African Unity continued their co-operation on a number of matters aimed at the elimination of colonialism and apartheid in Africa and the accelerated development of African countries (p. 228).

### South Africa and apartheid

The General Assembly continued in 1981 to call insistently for an end to the racial separation policies enforced by the Government of South Africa under the name of apartheid

Throughout the year, the Assembly's Special Committee against Apartheid mobilized international campaigns to apply pressure on South Africa and to block various forms of collaboration with that country's régime.

Following a debate in plenary meetings, the Assembly adopted 16 resolutions on apartheid on 17 December. By the first of these,<sup>(4)</sup> it urged the Security Council to determine that the situation in South Africa constituted a grave threat to international peace and security, and to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime.

This call for sanctions was repeated in another text by which the Assembly also called on Governments to sever all relations with South Africa.<sup>(7)</sup> By a resolution condemning South Africa's acts of aggression against Angola, Seychelles and other African States, the Assembly urged the Council to adopt effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations (on action with respect to threats to the peace breaches of the peace and acts of aggression).<sup>(6)</sup> It repeated an earlier request that the Council consider imposing a mandatory oil embargo,<sup>(10)</sup> and urged it to consider effective measures to strengthen the existing arms embargo<sup>(9)</sup> and secure the immediate cessation of military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa.<sup>(8)</sup> It also demanded that Israel terminate all such collaboration.<sup>(16)</sup> In the economic sphere, it again urged the Council to consider steps to achieve the cessation of foreign investments and loans.<sup>(18)</sup> The termination of all collaboration by transnational corporations with South Africa was called for by the Economic and Social Council on 2 November.<sup>(2)</sup>

To mobilize support for such efforts, the Assembly proclaimed 1982 the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa<sup>(5)</sup> and authorized the Committee against Apartheid to organize in 1982 an International Conference of Trade Unions on Sanctions against South Africa.<sup>(11)</sup>

The Assembly took a series of steps to mobilize public action against apartheid. It endorsed a proposal for national and international conferences and exhibits to promote such action by academic, cultural and sports personalities, as part of a boycott of South Africa in these fields.<sup>(12)</sup> It moved to encourage action by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the mass media in

the international campaign against apartheid including mobilization of support for sanctions.<sup>(15)</sup> In approving the work programme of the Committee against Apartheid, the Assembly made a special allocation for projects to promote the international campaign.<sup>(17)</sup>

The Security Council and the Assembly denounced South Africa's 4 December proclamation of the Ciskei, a bantustan, as a so-called independent State (p. 193).

The members of the Council, in a statement by its President on 5 February 1981, expressed grave concern over death sentences handed down by a South African court in November 1980 against three men charged with attacks on a bank and a police station (p. 195).

In the latest of a series of resolutions on political prisoners in South Africa, the Assembly demanded again that the Pretoria régime refrain from executing persons sentenced for acts arising from opposition to apartheid and release all political prisoners.<sup>(13)</sup> It invited co-operation in promoting solidarity with and assistance to the women and children of South Africa.<sup>(14)</sup> The Assembly appealed for contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, which aided refugees from that country as well as persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation there.<sup>(19)</sup>

The Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities dealt with human rights violations in South Africa, including death sentences, political prisoners, and women and children under apartheid (p. 943).

Concerned about the burden placed on host countries by student refugees from South Africa and Namibia, the Assembly, on 16 December, urged generous contributions to the assistance programmes for those refugees in southern Africa.<sup>(3)</sup> The United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa was giving scholarship aid to 533 persons from South Africa (p. 212).

Twice during the year, in March and September, the Assembly approved recommendations by its Credentials Committee to reject credentials submitted by South Africa (p. 163).

The Committee against Apartheid continued to review the apartheid policies of South Africa and their international repercussions. Meeting throughout the year, it carried out its mandate from the Assembly to promote the dissemination of information on the evils of apartheid and the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa, to encourage full implementation of United Nations resolutions on the subject by all Governments and organizations, to promote public

action and campaigns supporting the national liberation movement of South Africa, and to promote concerted action by Governments and organizations in the international mobilization against apartheid.

In its annual report,<sup>(1)</sup> transmitted to the Assembly on 9 October, the Committee summarized its activities and presented a series of conclusions and recommendations, many of which were incorporated into Assembly resolutions. It also submitted two special reports: on relations between Israel and South Africa (p. 192), and on the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa (p. 177).

A review of developments in South Africa since October 1980, annexed to the Committee's report, stated that mass resistance to apartheid had attained new heights and greater effectiveness. Organized and sustained struggles had taken place on several fronts, including a nationwide uprising against the Republic Day festivities in May, a widespread revolt by black students against racial discrimination in education, an unprecedented wave of strikes by black workers demanding a living wage and trade union rights, bus boycotts and rent strikes, and struggles against forced removals and relocation of communities in urban and rural areas. A significant feature of 1981 had been the growing unity in action among the various struggling sectors of the population.

The régime, however, was pursuing its policy of repression, terror and propaganda, the review continued. Political arrests, detentions, torture, bannings, banishments, police attacks, intimidation and other forms of repression had intensified. Six freedom fighters had been sentenced to death. The Government had accelerated the implementation of its policy of bantustanization. Its aggression against neighbouring States had intensified. There were increased military contacts and co-operation between South Africa and some military establishments in Western Europe, North America, Latin America, Israel and Taiwan.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22 & Corr.1. Resolutions:

Economic and Social Council: <sup>(2)</sup>1981/86, 2 Nov. (p. 190). General Assembly: <sup>(3)</sup>36/170, 16 Dec. (p. 211); <sup>(4)</sup>36/172 A (p. 161), <sup>(5)</sup>36/172 B (p. 1781), <sup>(6)</sup>36/172 C (p. 216), <sup>(7)</sup>36/172 D (p. 171), <sup>(8)</sup>36/172 E (p. 185), <sup>(9)</sup>36/172 F (p. 174), <sup>(10)</sup>36/172 G (p. 177), <sup>(11)</sup>36/172 H (p. 180), <sup>(12)</sup>36/172 I (p. 203), <sup>(13)</sup>36/172 J (p. 198), <sup>(14)</sup>36/172 K (p. 199), <sup>(15)</sup>36/172 L (p. 206), <sup>(16)</sup>36/172 M (p. 193), <sup>(17)</sup>36/172 N (p. 213), <sup>(18)</sup>36/172 O (p. 187), <sup>(19)</sup>36/172 P (p. 212), 17 Dec.

Meeting records: GA, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.).

### General aspects

COMMUNICATIONS. By a letter of 2 January 1981 to the Secretary-General,<sup>(4)</sup> South Africa

transmitted a letter of 1 January from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information dismissing as superficial and contemptible the resolutions on South Africa and apartheid adopted by the General Assembly in 1980. The Minister stated that the resolutions did not reflect the situation in South Africa, a dynamic society working at its major problem of accommodating the national aspirations of all its peoples in a way that would ensure advancement for all while avoiding conflict. Proposed sanctions would hurt South African blacks and Western investors.

Cuba, by a note verbale of 5 June to the Secretary-General,<sup>(3)</sup> transmitted a communiqué adopted by the extraordinary plenary meeting of the non-aligned countries, held in New York on 4 June, condemning the intensification of repression in South Africa, noting with grave concern the support of South African policies and practices by the United States, and reiterating its solidarity with the struggle of the oppressed South African people.

By a letter of 26 August to the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> the Acting Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid transmitted a Committee statement of the same day drawing urgent attention to the recent detention and trial of numerous persons and the death sentences passed against six freedom fighters (p. 196); it called for urgent and effective international action for the total isolation of the apartheid régime and for full support to the South African national liberation movement.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. The first of the resolutions on South Africa and apartheid which the General Assembly adopted on 17 December<sup>(7)</sup> dealt with the situation in South Africa and its international implications. Several of its provisions were elaborated upon in other resolutions of the same date.

The Assembly urged the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa and called for urgent measures to terminate all political, diplomatic, economic, trade, military, nuclear and other collaboration with that régime (p. 168). It condemned the actions of States which had increased their relations with South Africa, as well as transnational corporations and other organizations which collaborated with the régime and apartheid institutions. It appealed for assistance to the national liberation movement (p. 209) and reaffirmed the legitimacy of the anti-apartheid struggle by the South African people, including armed struggle. It vehemently condemned South Africa for repeated acts of aggression, subversion and terrorism against African States (p. 215) and denounced the "independence" proclamation of the Ciskei, a bantustan (p. 194).

On human rights aspects, it condemned South Africa for its brutal repression and the imposition of death sentences, demanded prisoner-of-war treatment for captured freedom fighters (p. 197), appealed to States to accede to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid<sup>(6)</sup> (p. 946), and reaffirmed the United Nations commitment to the total eradication of apartheid and the establishment of a democratic society in South Africa.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 115 to 12, with 16 abstentions.

Introducing the 39-nation resolution, Nigeria recalled that the United Nations had repeatedly endorsed the aspirations of the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement, and remained committed to the establishment of a democratic society in which all the people would enjoy equal and full human rights and participate freely in determining their destiny. The South African régime, however, had increased its repression; six freedom fighters were under sentence of death; the Government had proceeded with its bantustanization policy in a vain attempt to deprive the African majority of its citizenship, and had engaged in numerous acts of aggression, terrorism and destabilization against several other countries. The United Nations Charter provided sufficient authority for decisive action.

While all States participating in the Assembly debate voiced strong opposition to South Africa's apartheid policies, a number of them, such as Australia (abstaining), the Bahamas, Brazil and Costa Rica (in favour) and the United States (against), objected to some of the language in this resolution and others on apartheid, on the ground that it prevented the Assembly from reaching the desired consensus. Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Botswana, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway (for the Nordic States), Portugal, Samoa, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States found unsuitable the references to certain countries in this and other resolutions; the United States characterized as a despicable perversion of the truth the provision that its Government's pronouncements, policies and actions had encouraged South Africa to undertake its criminal acts. Solomon Islands abstained because of references to individual countries and Fiji voted in favour but with reservations on this point. Also voting positively, Thailand voiced reservations on the paragraph singling out the United States, and Ecuador said it would have abstained on that paragraph if there had been a separate vote.

Explaining their negative vote, several speakers, including Canada, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal and the United King-

dom, the last speaking for the member States of the European Community (EC), objected to the endorsement of armed struggle. Australia, Austria, Ireland, Norway (for the Nordic States) and Spain abstained because they could not support such an endorsement. Argentina and Papua New Guinea, though supporting the text, also reserved their position on this point. Fiji said it had no difficulty in supporting the provision to the extent that it advocated abandonment of apartheid through a process that would allow peaceful change.

Objections or reservations about the provision on sanctions were voiced by Botswana, Ireland, Lesotho, Spain and Swaziland (p. 168). Canada and the Netherlands objected to provisions on assistance to national liberation movements (p. 209). Argentina and the Netherlands had reservations on the provision concerning captured freedom fighters (p. 197).

During the debate, speakers generally condemned apartheid in South Africa as a criminal violation of human rights and demanded prompt international action for its eradication.

In Hungary's opinion, South Africa's apartheid policy had been the greatest political and moral challenge to the United Nations for many years. India said the question of apartheid was still the central issue facing the General Assembly, even after decades of discussions in various forums aimed at eliminating that pernicious evil. What distinguished apartheid from any other human rights violation and justified the world's insistent concern, said Ireland, was the fact that a racist theory had been adopted as a fundamental political principle for a whole society. Kenya observed that the United Nations had been founded to prevent such a situation from arising. Liberia charged that each time the issue of apartheid came up for debate by the international community, South Africa engaged in acts of defiance of United Nations policies. The more appeals the United Nations made, said Senegal, the more South Africa redoubled its efforts to consolidate the apartheid system.

As a result of apartheid, Bulgaria said, more than 3 million people had been uprooted from their homes and suffered untold misery, and the vast majority of the South African population was denied its right to equal education, health services and other benefits. In the view of Cyprus, apartheid was an affront to the United Nations and humanity as a whole. Finland regarded it as the most systematic and massive violation of human rights, while Saudi Arabia called it the basest form of degradation in society. Iran viewed it as a manifestation of materialism. Mexico remarked that no alleged legality, no so-called respect for freedom of expression or

for political organization could be invoked as being above the principles of equality, justice and human dignity which had to be restored in South Africa.

Sierra Leone expressed deep concern over the apparent disparity between the international community's overwhelming support for resolutions calling for action against apartheid and their implementation once adopted; the end result of that dichotomy was not only the perpetuation of apartheid but also the loss of the Assembly's credibility. Bahrain, Brazil, and Trinidad and Tobago expressed a similar view.

In Angola's view, the situation would not change unless the international community forced all States to observe and implement the countless resolutions on the subject. In view of South Africa's inflexible position, said Austria, the international community would doubtless consider further measures under the United Nations Charter to bring about the long-overdue change in that country's policy. Bhutan believed that only through joint and individual action by the international community, particularly by key Western countries, could South Africa be coerced into abandoning apartheid. Ghana felt the time had come for States to pronounce themselves against apartheid or risk most of their relations with the rest of Africa. Vanuatu thought United Nations decisions and international public opinion had been ignored far too long by those profiting from South Africa's system of exploitation. Viet Nam said a solution to the South Africa situation could not be postponed; the struggle of the people concerned and the international efforts to eliminate apartheid were entering a particularly urgent and complex phase, which could be decisive.

Many States were of the view that South Africa was enabled to persist in its apartheid policy because of the support it received from outside. Thus, the United Republic of Cameroon regretted that certain Powers, whose dedication to the ideals of freedom, human rights and justice was well known, had let themselves be caught in a web of economic and geostrategic interests, enabling South Africa to defy the entire international community.

Australia urged delegations to seek language in Assembly resolutions that would attract universal support as well as leave South Africa in no doubt that its policies were condemned by all United Nations Members; references commending armed struggle, or mentioning the purported errors of others in support of Pretoria, did nothing to enhance the deliberations.

Somalia felt there had been noticeable progress in recent years, and particularly over the previous 12 months, in establishing and shaping

international mechanisms to combat South Africa's racial policies, especially at the grass-roots level of NGOs and concerned individuals; however, in the face of increasing repression, the need for concerted action to eradicate apartheid had never been more apparent.

According to Cuba, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and others, repression in South Africa had intensified, in disregard of repeated United Nations resolutions. Madagascar thought that, despite protestations to the contrary, no progress had been made that reflected the desire of the international community for the establishment of racial equality, justice, freedom and peace in South Africa.

Bangladesh believed that the problem created by apartheid had two components, humanitarian and political, which could not be treated in isolation from each other. Other States mentioned the economic aspect, exemplified by the dependence of the apartheid system on cheap labour.

In Finland's opinion, South Africa's isolation would only deepen as long as apartheid persisted, with internal and external violence as an inevitable consequence. Djibouti, Sweden and others held a similar position. New Zealand thought South Africa could not keep the majority of its people under subjugation for long; if there was to be an evolutionary and relatively peaceful solution, the Government had to begin to bring about genuine change.

Many States expressed concern at South Africa's rapidly expanding military budget. Noting that the country's current defence spending had risen by 30 per cent over the previous year, Nepal said the aim was to keep the rulers safe from their own people and to carry out aggression against neighbouring States.

Apartheid was regarded by many, including Algeria, Bulgaria, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, the Niger, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia, as a threat to international peace and security. Haiti feared that, unless all States redoubled their efforts to deal the final blows to apartheid, the parties might resort to extreme measures and the conflict might spill over South Africa's borders and extend throughout Africa and even beyond.

Czechoslovakia said recent reforms which had softened some external aspects of apartheid could only be called cosmetic, since they had not touched such areas as education, the economy, health and sports; the racist leaders were merely changing tactics to gain time, compensate for political losses, halt the spread of the national

liberation struggle and resolve the problem of southern Africa on a neo-colonialist basis. Albania, Australia, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Egypt, Finland, the Gambia, Ghana, Ireland, the Netherlands, Singapore, the Sudan, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR and Zimbabwe also expressed the view that the changes were not substantive; Zimbabwe saw them as aimed at maintaining white control by the limited appeasement of blacks.

Botswana said that constitutional reform, in the context of Afrikaaner political thought, meant the consolidation of apartheid and the desegregation of a few restaurants and other places, designed to hoodwink black South Africans and the world into believing that meaningful change had begun. Morocco asked how promises of reform could be believed when Pretoria sought ways to refine and perpetuate apartheid. Mauritania said there could be no compromise with apartheid, no liberalization by little steps. Mozambique and the Sudan stated that apartheid could not be dealt with by petty reforms; it must be destroyed. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, said the reforms introduced by South Africa in 1980 had failed to create the hoped-for momentum for the liberalization and dismantling of apartheid; the system of apartheid must be eliminated, not simply modified, and must give way to a Government based on truly representative democracy.

Zambia cited the boycott of elections to the South African Indian Council as testimony of the oppressed people's mood in the face of divide-and-rule tactics intended to weaken the ranks of apartheid's victims.

The need for a peaceful solution was stressed by many speakers, including Austria, Brazil, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Norway; the United Nations, Brazil thought, had an important role to play in that connection. Botswana believed that dialogue between the leaders of white South Africa and the African leaders currently in prison or exile could initiate meaningful change towards a common society. Sweden also called for dialogue, warning that important sections of the majority increasingly saw little alternative to armed action to achieve fundamental change.

The view that mass resistance by the South African people was growing was shared by many countries, including Albania, Brazil, Czechoslovakia, the Gambia, the German Democratic Republic, Haiti, Jamaica, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mongolia, the Niger, Romania, Uganda, the USSR, Viet Nam and Zambia.

China stated that the historical trend of national liberation was irresistible, while the

Comoros expressed the conviction that South Africa was moving irresistibly towards majority rule, even if it might still demand a long struggle. Pakistan was confident that the South African people would succeed in their just struggle. Cuba thought the oppressed people of South Africa, despite massive and brutal repression, had won major victories in their struggle to eradicate apartheid and to create a new society based on freedom, equality and respect for human dignity.

Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the Syrian Arab Republic, the USSR, the United Republic of Cameroon, Viet Nam, Zaire and many others declared their support for the liberation struggle of the South African people. Nicaragua said the determination of the South African people to struggle for its freedom must be given the broadest international support.

The Netherlands considered that the collective weight of the EC members provided an important means to influence events in South Africa and also that increased international pressure was necessary, supported by autonomous initiatives. Sri Lanka said those having diplomatic and other means of pressure on South Africa must convey to that régime the international community's rejection of apartheid so that bloodshed could be avoided and a free society established. Sweden also called for pressure by Western countries.

The United States said the United Nations should consider concrete ways to expand democracy, education and economic opportunity in South Africa, to help advance peaceful, non-destructive change; it also urged that South Africa be allowed to take its rightful place in the Assembly, arguing that its continued illegal expulsion violated the United Nations Charter and diminished the Organization's capacity to influence the country constructively.

Algeria, on the other hand, considered armed struggle the only means to free South Africa from racist oppression, while Gabon stated that the racist régime would not abandon apartheid until it was forced into its last trenches.

By a letter of 17 December to the President of the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> the Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid transmitted a statement he had intended to make at the end of the Assembly debate. He appealed to the countries collaborating with South Africa to reassess their position and made a special appeal to the United States, whose attitudes and actions, he said, would greatly influence the pace of South Africa's inevitable transition to freedom and the scale of sacrifices in human lives needed to reach that goal.

The Special Political Committee, on 24 and 25 November, heard statements on the item by representatives of nine NGOs, in accordance with an Assembly decision that organizations having a special interest in the question should be heard. The speakers were: Beatrice von Roemer, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; Wilfred Grenville-Grey, International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa; Annie Street, Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility; Luis Guastavino, Chile Democrático; William Booth, American Committee on Africa; Jim Morrell, Center for International Policy; Vicki Erenstein, International Committee of the National Lawyers Guild; Colin Moore, National Bar Association; and the Reverend Herbert Daughtry, National Black United Front. The Assembly, by a decision of 27 November,<sup>(8)</sup> adopted without vote on an oral proposal of its President, took note of the Committee's report on these hearings.<sup>(5)</sup>

Letters and note verbale (nv): Committee against Apartheid Chairman and Acting Chairman (AC): <sup>(1)</sup>26 Aug., A/36/459-S/14656 (AC); <sup>(2)</sup>17 Dec., A/36/849. <sup>(3)</sup>Cuba, for non-aligned countries: 5 June, A/36/311-S/14508 (nv). <sup>(4)</sup>South Africa: 2 Jan., A/36/64.

Report: <sup>(5)</sup>SPC, A/36/719.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(6)</sup>3068(XXVIII), annex, 30 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 103); <sup>(7)</sup>36/172 A, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(8)</sup>GA: 36/419, 27 Nov., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/PV.41, 42 (24, 25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/172 A

115-12-16 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981 39-nation draft (A/36/L.34 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Situation in South Africa

The General Assembly,

Having considered the reports of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Reaffirming that apartheid is a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security,

Recognizing the contribution of the struggle for freedom and equality in South Africa to the purposes of the United Nations,

Conscious of the responsibility of the United Nations and the international community towards the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement, as proclaimed, in particular, in General Assembly resolution 3411 C (XXX) of 28 November 1975,

Convinced that it is incumbent on the international community to provide all necessary assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement

in their legitimate struggle for the establishment of a democratic society in accordance with their inalienable rights, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

Welcoming with great satisfaction the growing mobilization of world public opinion and of all segments of the oppressed people of South Africa against apartheid,

Commending, in particular, the courageous struggle of the black workers of South Africa for their legitimate rights,

Commending the liberation movements, particularly the African National Congress, and the oppressed people of South Africa for intensifying the armed struggle against the racist régime.

Paying tribute to all those who have sacrificed their lives in the struggle for freedom and human dignity in South Africa,

Reaffirming that the apartheid régime is totally responsible for precipitating violent conflict through its policy of apartheid and inhuman repression,

Gravely concerned at the intensification of repression in South Africa and the imposition of death sentences on six freedom fighters of the African National Congress, namely, Mr. Johannes Shabangu, Mr. Anthony Tsotsobe, Mr. David Moise, Mr. Ncimbithi Johnson Lubisi, Mr. Naphtali Manana and Mr. Petrus Tsepo Mashigo,

Reaffirming that freedom fighters of South Africa are entitled to prisoner-of-war status under Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949,

Denouncing as an international crime the policy of "bantustanization" designed to deprive the African majority of citizenship and to further dispossess it of its inalienable rights, as well as the continuing forced removals of millions of black people,

Recognizing that apartheid cannot be reformed but must be totally eliminated,

Noting with indignation the recent vetoing by the Western permanent members of the Security Council of proposals to impose mandatory sanctions against the apartheid régime of South Africa,

Concerned that some Western countries and Israel continue to provide military supplies to South Africa, directly and indirectly, in gross violation of the provisions of Security Council resolution 41 418(1977) of 4 November 1977 forbidding the supply of arms and all related matériel to the apartheid régime.

Reaffirming that the policies and actions of the apartheid régime, the strengthening of its military forces and its escalating acts of aggression, subversion and terrorism against independent African States have resulted in frequent breaches of the peace and constitute a grave threat to international peace and security,

Recognizing the urgent need for increased humanitarian and educational assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa, as well as for direct assistance to the national liberation movement in its legitimate struggle,

Taking note of Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/54 of 22 July 1981 on implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations,

Recalling and reaffirming the Declaration on South Africa contained in its resolution 34/93 O of 12 December 1979,

Endorsing the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981, as well as the declarations of international seminars organized by the Special Committee against Apartheid in 1981,

Emphasizing the conclusion of the Paris Declaration that the continuing political, economic and military collaboration of certain Western States and their transnational corporations with the racist régime of South Africa encourages its persistent intransigence and defiance of the international communi-

ty and constitutes a major obstacle to the elimination of the inhuman and criminal system of apartheid in South Africa and the attainment of self-determination, freedom and national independence by the people of Namibia,

Considering that the acquisition of nuclear capability by the apartheid régime constitutes a grave menace to Africa and the world,

Condemning all military, nuclear and other collaboration of certain Western States and Israel with South Africa,

Condemning also the collaboration of transnational corporations and financial institutions with South Africa,

1. Strongly condemns the apartheid régime of South Africa for its brutal repression and indiscriminate torture and killings of workers, schoolchildren and other opponents of apartheid, and the imposition of death sentences on freedom fighters;

2. Vehemently condemns the apartheid régime for its repeated acts of aggression, subversion and terrorism against independent African States, designed to destabilize the whole of southern Africa;

3. Reiterates its firm conviction that the apartheid régime has been encouraged to undertake these criminal acts by the protection afforded by major Western Powers against international sanctions, especially by the pronouncements, policies and actions of the Government of the United States of America;

4. Condemns, in particular, the actions of those States, especially the major trading partners of South Africa, that have increased their political, economic and military relations with the racist régime of South Africa despite repeated appeals by the General Assembly;

5. Further condemns those transnational corporations, financial institutions and other organizations that collaborate with the racist régime and apartheid institutions in South Africa;

6. Reaffirms its conviction that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, universally applied, are the most appropriate and effective means by which the international community can assist the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa and discharge its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security;

7. Urges the Security Council to determine that the situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole, resulting from the policies and actions of the apartheid régime of South Africa, constitutes a grave and growing threat to international peace and security, and to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against that régime under Chapter VII of the Charter;

8. Deplores the action of the Western permanent members of the Security Council in vetoing proposals for mandatory and comprehensive sanctions against South Africa and calls upon them to co-operate in effective action for the elimination of apartheid;

9. Denounces the proclamation of the so-called "independence" of the Ciskei on 4 December 1981;

10. Again calls upon all States and organizations to refrain from any recognition of or co-operation with the so-called "independent" bantustans;

11. Calls upon all States, in particular the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Israel to take urgent, effective measures to terminate all collaboration with South Africa in the political, diplomatic, economic, trade, military, nuclear and other fields in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations;

12. Appeals to all States that have not yet done so to accede to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid;

13. Reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement by all available means, including armed struggle, for the seizure of power by the people, the elimination of the apartheid régime and the exercise of the right of self-determination by the people of South Africa as a whole;

14. Demands that the apartheid régime treat captured freedom fighters as prisoners of war under the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 and Additional Protocol I thereto;

15. Again proclaims its full support of the national liberation movement of South Africa as the authentic representative of the people of South Africa in their just struggle for liberation;

16. Appeals to all States to provide all necessary humanitarian, educational, financial and other necessary assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement in their legitimate struggle;

17. Urges the United Nations Development Programme and other agencies of the United Nations system to expand their assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and to the South African liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity, namely, the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, in consultation with the Special Committee against Apartheid;

18. Decides to continue the authorization of adequate financial provision in the budget of the United Nations to enable those liberation movements to maintain offices in New York in order to participate effectively in the deliberations of the Special Committee and other appropriate bodies;

19. Extends its greetings to the African National Congress on its seventieth anniversary;

20. Requests Governments and organizations to co-operate with the Special Committee in publicizing the national liberation struggle in South Africa, its legitimate objectives and its wider significance;

21. Reaffirms the commitment of the United Nations to the total eradication of apartheid and the establishment of a democratic society in which all the people of South Africa as a whole, irrespective of race, colour, sex or creed, will enjoy equal and full human rights and fundamental freedoms and participate freely in the determination of their destiny.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Liberia, Norway, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Upper Volta.

General Assembly decision 38/419

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 32.

Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa

At its 75th plenary meeting, on 27 November 1981, the General Assembly took note of the report of the Special Political Committee.

Credentials of South

Africa in the General Assembly

In 1981, the General Assembly twice approved recommendations of the Credentials Committee

to reject the credentials of South Africa, for the resumed thirty-fifth session and for the eighth emergency special session on the Namibia question. South Africa did not submit credentials for the regular Assembly session later in 1981.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (MARCH). On 2 March,<sup>(9)</sup> the Assembly, by 112 votes to 22, with 6 abstentions, approved a report by its Credentials Committee<sup>(7)</sup> rejecting the credentials submitted by South Africa for the resumed thirty-fifth session. The credentials were rejected earlier that day by a Committee vote of 6 to 1 (United States), with 2 abstentions (Costa Rica, Spain).

The Committee acted after South Africa's credentials were challenged by the United Republic of Cameroon, on behalf of the African Group, at the start of the Assembly's deliberations on Namibia on 2 March (p. 1129). At the request of the United Republic of Cameroon, the Assembly President referred the matter immediately to the Credentials Committee.

The Committee's Acting Chairman announced that a letter had been received from South Africa requesting that it be permitted to present its position on its credentials to the Chairman or the Committee.<sup>(1)</sup> He stated that it was not the practice of the Committee to give the floor to non-members of the Committee and that therefore the request could not be acted upon.

In the Committee's discussion, as summarized in its report, the majority—Angola, China, Haiti, Kenya, Singapore and the USSR—of the nine members declared that they would vote to reject South Africa's credentials. They mentioned their stand on South Africa's apartheid policies, and China added that it could not accept the right of a minority racist régime, imposed on the South African people, to represent that people. In the view of the United States, however, the credentials conformed to the Assembly's rules of procedure and were therefore in order. Spain said it would abstain as it could not ignore the position adopted by the Assembly, although it appeared that the credentials were technically in order.

South Africa, by a letter of 2 March to the Assembly President,<sup>(2)</sup> expressed the wish to address the Assembly before it acted on the Committee's report; it invoked rule 29 of the rules of procedure, under which a representative to whose admission a Member had objected must be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives until the Credentials Committee had reported and the Assembly had decided. However, the Assembly adopted, by 113 votes to 23, with 1 abstention, a motion by the United Republic of Cameroon not to hear South



Africa before the report had been disposed of. Austria and the United Kingdom opposed the motion, arguing that South Africa should have had the opportunity to speak in accordance with rule 29.

Speaking in explanation of vote on the credentials resolution, several States objected to the denial of South Africa's right to participate in the Assembly deliberations, saying the Committee had rejected the credentials for reasons not provided for in the rules of procedure or in the Charter of the United Nations. Some, such as Australia, Austria, Chile, France, Iceland (speaking for the Nordic States) and Samoa, stated that they had voted against the decision on legal grounds, although they continued to oppose apartheid. Australia, Austria, Canada, Chile, Iceland (for the Nordic States), New Zealand and the United Kingdom also thought it was at variance with the principle of universality of the United Nations. Canada, Iceland (for the Nordic States) and the United States regarded the rejection of South Africa's credentials as contrary to Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter, according to which a Member State might be suspended or expelled only on the recommendation of the Security Council as confirmed by the Assembly.

The Netherlands, speaking for the EC members, said they had voted against because the Committee had rejected the credentials for reasons not provided for in the Assembly rules. The Federal Republic of Germany added that the Committee's competence did not go beyond the right to examine the due form of credentials and that it was inconsistent with the Charter to evaluate the legitimacy and policies of the Governments issuing credentials. A similar view was held by France and New Zealand. Portugal said it had voted against the Committee's decision because the credentials met the procedural requirements and also because it believed that South Africa should be considered as one of the parties in the Namibia question, as had been stressed in many Assembly resolutions. The United Kingdom did not think South Africa's exclusion helped solve the problems before the Assembly.

Costa Rica abstained, citing what it saw as the contradiction between legal arguments and the fact that the official policy of the Pretoria Government was based on minority control. Turkey said its positive vote should be interpreted strictly in the light of its protest against South Africa's racist policies.

By two further letters dated 2 March, South Africa protested the Assembly President's refusal to grant it the opportunity to speak on the original point of order raised by the United Republic of Cameroon,<sup>(3)</sup> and strongly objected to the decision to deny it the right to speak as violating

the Charter and the rules of procedure.<sup>(4)</sup> On 6 March, South Africa transmitted to the Secretary-General a letter of the same date from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information<sup>(5)</sup> rejecting as null and void the resolution to deny South Africa the right to participate in Assembly deliberations.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (SEPTEMBER). On 4 September, the Assembly acted on South Africa's credentials for the eighth emergency special session, on the Namibia question, by adopting a resolution<sup>(10)</sup> approving a report of the Credentials Committee rejecting the credentials.<sup>(6)</sup> The Assembly acted by a recorded vote of 117 to 22, with 6 abstentions, after the Committee vote on the previous day of 6 to 1 (United States), with 2 abstentions (Costa Rica, Spain).

Explaining its negative vote on the Assembly decision, the United States repeated the arguments it had used in March, adding that it was vitally important that the United Nations be fair and even-handed if it was to be an effective participant in the process leading to Namibia's independence. Australia, Austria, Canada, Chile, New Zealand, Norway (for the Nordic States) and the United Kingdom (for the EC members) said that, although they opposed South Africa's apartheid policy and its illegal occupation of Namibia, they supported the acceptance of South Africa's credentials as they firmly believed in the basic principle of United Nations universality. Canada added that the Assembly decision contradicted the distribution of powers between the Security Council and the Assembly.

Costa Rica, explaining its abstention, stated that rejecting the credentials of a delegation because the Government that issued them was illegitimate would be equivalent to affirming the legitimacy of all those whose credentials had been accepted. Repeating the stand it had taken in March, Turkey said its positive vote should be interpreted strictly in the light of its protest against South Africa's racist policy.

Before considering the resolution, the Assembly, by a recorded vote of 113 to 24, with 6 abstentions, endorsed Algeria's appeal on behalf of the African Group against a ruling by the Assembly President to give South Africa the opportunity to speak. Canada, the United Kingdom (for the EC members) and the United States opposed that appeal as not being in accordance with the Assembly's rules of procedure. Jordan, on the other hand, believed that the rule stating that representatives whose credentials were in dispute should be provisionally seated did not mean that they should be entitled to participate in the debate.

On 11 September,<sup>(6)</sup> South Africa transmitted

to the Secretary-General a letter of the same date from its Foreign Minister rejecting the Assembly decision not to accept South Africa's credentials. He stated that the Assembly had revealed itself as the intransigent party, had reinforced the belief that it was incapable of being objective and was afraid of hearing an opposing view.

Letters: South Africa: <sup>(1)</sup>2 Mar., A/35/795; <sup>(2)</sup>2 Mar., A/35/796; <sup>(3)</sup>2 Mar., A/35/797; <sup>(4)</sup>2 Mar., A/35/798; <sup>(5)</sup>6 Mar., A/35/802-S/14395; <sup>(6)</sup>11 Sep., A/ES-8/12. Reports: Credentials Committee, <sup>(7)</sup>A/35/484/Add.2 & Add.2/Corr.1, <sup>(8)</sup>A/ES-8/6. Resolutions: GA: <sup>(9)</sup>35/4 C, 2 Mar. (p. 352); <sup>(10)</sup>ES-8/1 A, 4 Sep. (p. 352).

### Sanctions against South Africa

In 1981, the General Assembly and its Special Committee against Apartheid again called insistently for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa, and condemned States which maintained political and economic relations with that country. However, because of negative votes by three permanent members, the Security Council did not adopt proposals by African States to impose such sanctions in connection with South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia (p. 1133).

To help mobilize world opinion in favour of sanctions, the Committee, in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity (OAU), organized in Paris in May an International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa. The Assembly proclaimed 1982 the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa (p. 177). Recognizing the important role of trade unions in the international campaign for sanctions, the Assembly authorized the Committee to organize in 1982 an International Conference of Trade Unions on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 179). The Security Council was urged to strengthen the arms embargo (p. 172) and to consider a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa (p. 175).

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.** On 23 February, in a resolution on violations of human rights in South Africa and Namibia (p. 944), the Commission on Human Rights requested the Security Council to consider imposing mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa.<sup>(11)</sup> On 6 March, in a resolution on the self-determination of peoples (p. 8911, the Commission condemned the policy of States which continued to maintain political, economic, military and other relations with the racist régime in southern Africa, thus supporting, protecting and encouraging it to persist in suppressing the aspirations of peoples for self-determination and independence.<sup>(12)</sup>

**CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA.** The International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, organized by the United Nations in co-operation with OAU, was held in Paris from 20 to 27 May. The Conference, authorized by the General Assembly in 1980,<sup>(13)</sup> was attended by representatives of 121 Governments as well as of United Nations bodies and specialized agencies, OAU, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, national liberation movements, intergovernmental, international and national organizations, and invited individuals. The liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia—the African National Congress of South Africa, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and the South West Africa People's Organization—were represented by high-level delegations led by their respective presidents. (For list of participating States and officers, see APPENDIX III.)

The Conference reviewed the situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole. On 27 May, it adopted by acclamation the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, by which it called on Governments and organizations to counteract all moves to assist and encourage the apartheid régime, and appealed to them to concert their efforts in an international campaign for comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. It urged the United Nations, in co-operation with OAU and the national liberation movements, to promote, secure and monitor the sanctions programme.

The purpose of the sanctions, according to the Declaration, was to force abandonment of apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia; to demonstrate abhorrence of apartheid and solidarity with the struggle against it; to deny benefits of international co-operation to South Africa; to undermine South Africa's ability to repress its people, commit aggression and threaten peace and security; and to remove economic support from apartheid so as to promote as peaceful a transition as possible.

The Conference drew the attention of States which opposed sanctions to the fact that their policies were aiding the escalation of violence. It considered that the oppressed people of South Africa and Namibia and their national liberation movements deserved international support in their legitimate struggle.

The Conference also adopted a Special Declaration on Namibia by which it called on all Member States to impose sanctions on South Africa to ensure its immediate compliance with United Nations decisions (p. 1137).

The Political and Technical Commissions of the Conference proposed a number of detailed political and economic measures to implement

sanctions and isolate South Africa, including an international campaign to stop the use of the veto against sanctions by one or more of the permanent members of the Security Council, unilateral sanctions pending the international imposition of a comprehensive programme and support to the national liberation movements. They also recommended strengthening of the existing arms embargo (p. 173) and oil embargo (p. 176), as well as other action to terminate military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa (p. 181), cut off foreign investments (p. 186) and monitor the activities of transnational corporations (TNCs) (p. 188).

The Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid, by a letter of 27 May,<sup>(1)</sup> drew the Conference report<sup>(10)</sup> to the attention of the Assembly and the Security Council. On 11 June, he transmitted the two declarations to the Secretary-General for the attention of the Assembly and the Council.<sup>(2)</sup>

Plans for publicizing the results of the Conference were made part of the programme for the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa (1982) (p. 177).

COMMUNICATIONS. In a message to the President of the Conference on sanctions, circulated by a note of 25 May,<sup>(7)</sup> the President of the Security Council stated that the Council recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the South African people to eliminate apartheid and maintained the hope that the inevitable changes in South Africa's racial policy could be attained peacefully. Without prejudice to the individual position of its members, the Council was unanimous in its condemnation of apartheid and had called on South Africa to act immediately to eliminate apartheid and grant all citizens equal rights.

Brazil, by a letter of 27 May to the Secretary-General,<sup>(3)</sup> transmitted a message from its President to the Conference expressing solidarity with the peoples of Africa. Nicaragua, on 2 June,<sup>(4)</sup> transmitted a government message of 21 May saying the Conference must do everything possible to give practical expression to the international repudiation of apartheid.

South Africa, on 27 May,<sup>(5)</sup> transmitted a letter of the same date in which its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information asserted that sanctions would hurt the countries of southern Africa whose economies were tied to that of South Africa, and said the Secretary-General's statement at the Conference simply echoed the same emotional statements expressed in General Assembly resolutions and ignored the fact that blacks in South Africa enjoyed better living conditions than black Africans in the rest of Africa. Replying on 29 May,<sup>(6)</sup> the Secretary-General

observed that the position of the main United Nations organs on apartheid did not coincide with that of South Africa, and that in his own statement he had observed strict moderation in order to facilitate peaceful change.

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES. A resolution on United Nations organizations and decolonization, containing provisions deploring relations between South Africa and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), was adopted on 17 August by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. These provisions were later incorporated into General Assembly resolution of 24 November (p. 167).

The Committee's Sub-Committee on Petitions, Information and Assistance presented a report in August in which it deplored the continued collaboration between IMF and South Africa. It stated that that country's continued membership, and its consequent ability to borrow money from the Fund when necessary, enabled it to borrow more and on better terms in private international financial markets, thereby buttressing the régime. The Sub-Committee recommended that the presiding officers of the Committee on colonial countries, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Committee against Apartheid constitute a mission to the Fund in 1982, and that the United Nations Secretariat's Unit on Studies and Information on Decolonization prepare a study on the relationship between IMF and South Africa. The Committee on colonial countries decided that further consultations should be held on implementing these recommendations, and it annexed them to its report to the Assembly.<sup>(9)</sup>

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. In its report to the General Assembly,<sup>(8)</sup> the Committee against Apartheid recommended that the Assembly endorse the declarations of the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa as well as the measures proposed by its commissions, and take urgent steps towards implementing them. The Committee regretted the non-participation in the Conference of a number of States, particularly the major trading partners of South Africa, namely, the United Kingdom, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Italy, Belgium, Greece and Portugal, and of a number of inter-governmental organizations, particularly the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, IMF and the World Bank.

The Committee emphasized again the desirability of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions

against South Africa. It recalled that many States had instituted unilateral sanctions in response to appeals by the national liberation movements, OAU and the United Nations. It noted with utmost regret that the Western permanent members of the Security Council had continued, in the face of repeated breaches of peace and acts of aggression by South Africa, to prevent a determination by the Council that the situation constituted a threat to international peace and security requiring action under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter (on action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression). It considered that the attitudes and actions of those permanent members were a violation of their responsibilities under the Charter and an abuse of the veto, encouraging South Africa to persist in its escalating crimes.

The Committee said that a number of States, including several Western States, had become convinced of the need for sanctions, and it noted with satisfaction the statements by the new Government of France. It expressed appreciation at action by African, non-aligned, socialist and other States to break off, or refrain from, any relations with the apartheid régime.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(23)</sup> the General Assembly endorsed the declarations of the Conference on sanctions and the reports of its Political and Technical Commissions, and requested the Security Council to consider them urgently with a view to imposing comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. It called on all Governments to sever relations, implement the arms embargo (p. 173), prohibit nuclear collaboration (p. 180), cease trade and commercial transactions as well as loans and investments (p. 185), prohibit collaboration by corporations and individuals, prevent services by national airlines and shipping companies, and prevent cultural and sports contacts. It condemned the continuing collaboration of certain States with South Africa, in particular the United States, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel. It expressed serious concern that IMF and the World Bank had not acted to terminate loans and credits to South Africa and suspend its membership, and requested the Secretary-General to try to persuade them to respect United Nations resolutions. The Committee against Apartheid was requested to intensify its sanctions campaign, and Governments, parliaments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were invited to co-operate.

The Assembly also endorsed the recommendations of the Seminar on Effective Measures to

Prevent Transnational Corporations and Other Established Interests from Collaborating with the Racist Régime of South Africa (Geneva, 29 June-3 July) (p. 188).

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 109 to 18, with 13 abstentions.

In a resolution of 17 December proclaiming 1982 as the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa, the Assembly endorsed the Paris Declaration of the Conference on sanctions and commended it to the attention of all Governments and organizations.<sup>(21)</sup> In another resolution of the same date, on the work programme of the Committee against Apartheid, the Assembly requested the Committee to give the highest priority in 1982 to mobilizing support for sanctions, reviewing implementation of United Nations resolutions on apartheid, especially those on embargoes, and publicizing developments concerning collaboration with South Africa.<sup>(25)</sup>

In a resolution on foreign interests impeding decolonization,<sup>(15)</sup> adopted on 24 November, the Assembly strongly condemned Western and other States and TNCs which continued to invest in and supply armaments, oil and nuclear technology to South Africa. It called on all States, particularly the United Kingdom, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Japan, Belgium, Israel and Italy, to terminate all political, diplomatic, economic, trade, military and nuclear collaboration with that régime.

Paragraph 10 of this resolution, citing States by name, was adopted by a recorded vote of 63 to 30, with 49 abstentions, after a motion to have a separate vote on this paragraph, to which Angola objected, was adopted by a recorded vote of 57 to 48, with 28 abstentions.

In a resolution of the same date on United Nations organizations and decolonization<sup>(16)</sup>—similar to the one adopted in August by the Committee on colonial countries—the Assembly expressed regret that the World Bank and IMF continued to maintain links with South Africa, as exemplified by that country's membership in both agencies; deeply deplored and called for an end to the persistent collaboration between IMF and South Africa; and proposed that the IMF Board of Governors include in its agenda an item on the Fund's relationship with South Africa.

The Assembly voted separately on two paragraphs of this resolution concerning IMF and World Bank relations with South Africa. Paragraph 6, expressing regret that the two agencies continued to maintain links with South Africa and that neither had fully implemented Assembly resolutions, was adopted by a recorded vote of 82 to 25, with 30 abstentions. Paragraph 7,

deploring and calling for an end to the persistent collaboration between IMF and South Africa, was adopted by a recorded vote of 84 to 22, with 29 abstentions.

The Assembly called for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa in resolutions adopted on 28 October, on the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination;<sup>(14)</sup> 10 December, on the Namibia situation,<sup>(17)</sup> and 17 December, on the South Africa situation.<sup>(20)</sup> By the last resolution, it reaffirmed its conviction that such sanctions, universally applied, were the most appropriate and effective means by which the international community could assist the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa and discharge its responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and security; urged the Security Council to determine that the situation in South Africa and southern Africa as a whole, resulting from South Africa's policies and actions, constituted a grave and growing threat to international peace and security, and to impose comprehensive sanctions; and deplored the action of the Western permanent members of the Council in vetoing proposals for sanctions and called on them to co-operate in effective action for the elimination of apartheid.

By a resolution of 10 December calling for action by Member States in support of Namibia,<sup>(18)</sup> the Assembly requested States to take measures to isolate South Africa and sever all relations with it, and requested the Council for Namibia to continue to monitor the boycott of South Africa and to submit to the Assembly in 1982 a comprehensive report on all contacts between Member States and South Africa, with an analysis of information from States and other sources on the continuing political, economic and other relations of States and their economic and other interests with South Africa, and of measures taken by them to terminate all dealings with South Africa.

The 17 December resolution on sanctions was introduced by Ghana on behalf of 33 nations. Ghana said that violence and repression in South Africa were increasing and, save for a few cosmetic amendments to the laws, the apartheid system remained structurally unaltered. Therefore, despite the failure of the Security Council to impose sanctions, the case for them remained valid. The resolution represented another attempt to focus international attention on the serious situation in South Africa, to demonstrate the universal abhorrence of apartheid, and to deny the benefits of international co-operation to South Africa so as to oblige it and its supporters to heed world opinion.

Explaining the opposition of the Nordic

States to the resolution, Norway said they could not endorse the recommendations of the Conference commissions; they deplored the inappropriate and arbitrary singling out of individual countries and reserved their position on provisions which failed to take into account that only the Security Council could adopt decisions binding on Member States. Canada and New Zealand also voted against, Canada stating that the question of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter was strictly a Council prerogative and New Zealand declaring that it could not support proposals seeking to pre-empt the Council's functions or singling out countries for criticism.

Ireland, though supporting the application by the Council of certain selective measures, voted against the resolution because it doubted the wisdom of calling for comprehensive sanctions and because it disapproved of the arbitrary condemnation of a number of countries. Spain also objected to the call for sanctions and the naming of countries, both in this resolution and in the one on the South Africa situation. The naming of States was cited by Greece and Portugal in explaining their negative votes on the sanctions resolution.

Explaining the negative votes of the EC members, the United Kingdom said they did not support demands to break off all relations with South Africa and believed that existing lines of communication must be used to allow for the free expression of views on all political, social and economic questions of concern to the South African people. The Netherlands favoured limited sanctions but believed that the imposition of global sanctions against South Africa and its total isolation would only lead to increased oppression and hardship for the population and cause damage to neighbouring States; it also had reservations on entrusting the Committee against Apartheid with tasks belonging to the Security Council's arms embargo Committee. The United States, also voting against, said sanctions and boycotts were ineffective ways by which to attempt the eradication of apartheid.

Lesotho abstained as it feared that, because of its geopolitical situation, economic sanctions would present it with considerable problems; it had the same reservations on the sanctions provisions of the resolution on the South Africa situation and in the call for Security Council action in the Assembly's 17 December resolution on South African aggression against neighbouring States.<sup>(22)</sup> Swaziland abstained on similar grounds in the vote on the sanctions resolution. Botswana reserved its position on the provisions concerning comprehensive sanctions in the resolutions on the work programme of the Committee against Apartheid and the South Africa situa-

tion, as well as on clauses in the latter resolution mentioning specific States and the reference to the Conference on sanctions in the resolution on an arms embargo.<sup>(24)</sup>

Austria, which abstained, said it could not support prejudgement of the prerogatives and decisions of the Council, and felt that the arbitrary singling out of States for condemnation or criticism was unjustified and did not advance the cause of the oppressed people in South Africa.

The Bahamas, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Senegal, Suriname and Togo supported the text but voiced reservations on the specific mention of certain States—as did Samoa, which abstained. Bangladesh and Suriname said they would have abstained had there been a separate vote on the paragraph concerned.

Argentina, which cast a positive vote, said Member States could not be asked to comply with some of the measures until the Security Council had acted.

Brazil voted in favour but voiced doubts about the excessive language and scope of the text, which seemed to go beyond what would be expected of an Assembly resolution. Costa Rica, though supporting the text, said it could not go along with some of its paragraphs and concepts; it also expressed reservations on the mention of the Paris Conference and Declaration in the preambles of the resolutions on the South Africa situation and the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa, noting that the Declaration had been adopted without Costa Rica's agreement.

Explaining its abstention on the resolution on an International Year for sanctions against South Africa, Australia noted that it had not participated in the Conference on sanctions and did not subscribe to the Declaration. New Zealand, which also abstained, said it could not support the endorsement of the Paris Declaration.

Ireland said its support for this resolution should be understood in the light of the statement it had made at the Conference (describing its understanding that the reports of the Political and Technical Commissions did not form part of the consensus). The Netherlands, though casting a positive vote, also voiced reservations on the Declaration. Speaking for the Nordic States, which also voted in favour, Norway recalled that they had participated in the Conference's consensus with reservations.

Voting against paragraph 10 of the resolution on foreign interests impeding decolonization, Belgium said the selection of States mentioned therein was inspired by political considerations. The Central African Republic, Ireland, New Zealand and Uruguay deplored the selective

condemnation of particular countries—especially, Ireland added, when some of them had denied the allegations. Chile thought the provision did nothing to encourage the understanding and co-operation needed to solve the problems of southern Africa. Denmark and Norway believed the accusations to be unjustified, and Finland said they were based on insufficient evidence. France asked how it and other members of the Western contact group on Namibia could be asked to break diplomatic relations with South Africa even as they were being urged to induce that régime to implement the Security Council's settlement plan for the Territory; as to economic and nuclear matters, France was bound to honour contracts and commitments already assumed. Israel believed that the condemnation of its Government had been generated by extraneous considerations. Japan said it had no diplomatic, military or nuclear relations with South Africa, had prohibited Japanese investments there, had called on its banks to refrain from extending loans and had limited trade relations with South Africa. Liberia remarked that the strategy of putting States in the full blaze of publicity had not proved successful.

Somalia thought the provision went against the aims of the resolution and contained a list that was far from exhaustive. Sweden said some countries were arbitrarily named, while Turkey would have preferred a text that avoided discriminatory condemnation. The United Kingdom, on behalf of the EC members, found the unjustified and arbitrary attacks against certain States particularly offensive. The United States said many Governments traded directly or indirectly with South Africa, often through their own state trading organizations.

Among those which abstained on this paragraph, Argentina and Fiji thought the provision impaired the effectiveness of the resolution. The Bahamas said no effort had been made to verify the allegations or distinguish between the positive and negative activities of certain States. Gabon, Indonesia, Morocco, Senegal, Sri Lanka and Togo expressed regret or reservations about the selective condemnation of several countries, as did the United Republic of Cameroon, which observed that the text was silent about other States that had collaborated with South Africa. Saint Lucia considered it impossible to encourage members of the Western contact group to apply pressure on South Africa while expecting them to sever all political relations with that régime. Reservations were also voiced by Bangladesh, Botswana, Burundi, Mali, Peru, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand; Botswana also reserved its position on the mention of oil supplies to South Africa.

In explanation of vote on the resolution concerning United Nations organizations and decolonization, the United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, cited the references to IMF and the World Bank among the reasons why they could not support the resolution. They voted against two paragraphs referring to the two agencies, as did Canada and Uruguay, which regarded the provisions as unacceptable politicization of technical agencies, and New Zealand, which considered the criticisms to be inappropriate.

Among States which abstained on these paragraphs, Lesotho said its stand should not be interpreted as endorsing negative references to IMF and the World Bank; Sri Lanka would have preferred it if the text had not referred to technical institutions whose statutes prevented them from implementing some Assembly resolutions; and Swaziland objected to politicizing the two agencies. Bolivia, Fiji, Mexico, Portugal and Spain also said they had difficulties with these paragraphs, and Saint Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago thought they were not in accord with facts.

Voting for the resolution, the USSR said the \$2.2 billion in assistance received from IMF would help South Africa solve its balance-of-payments problems and increase its military power.

The IMF representative told the Fourth Committee, where the resolution originated, that the Fund's decisions on financial transactions had been taken in conformity with its Articles of Agreement and implied no approval or disapproval of policies or actions by a member State that were not within the Fund's authority. For IMF to base decisions on considerations unrelated to its Articles of Agreement would mean cutting itself adrift from agreed principles, to the detriment of all members.

The representative of the World Bank said South Africa had not been represented among the Bank's Executive Directors since 1972 and received no assistance from the Bank; the sole link was South Africa's membership in the agency.

Referring to a paragraph in an Assembly resolution of 10 December on dissemination of information on Namibia, calling for an international campaign to denounce the collusion of certain Western countries with the South African racists,<sup>(19)</sup> Costa Rica stated that it was against singling out any States for condemnation, because many others also traded with South Africa, including some in Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe. In response, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, the Central African Republic, the Congo, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, the Lao Peo-

ple's Democratic Republic, Poland, Romania, the USSR, Viet Nam and Zaire denied that they traded with South Africa.

During the debate on apartheid and South Africa, many speakers supported the call for sanctions or measures under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Those taking this position included Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, China, the Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, the Gambia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, the Sudan, Sweden, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia. Several countries, such as Bangladesh, Cyprus, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago, called for a total isolation of South Africa.

The Netherlands thought selective economic measures against South Africa should preferably be decided upon by the Security Council or be implemented by enough countries in a position to exert meaningful pressure. New Zealand was willing to go along with economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations. Senegal called for a ban on commercial transactions and on the provision of essential supplies, particularly electronic and telecommunications hardware.

Many countries declared that they had restricted their relations with South Africa. China, Cyprus, Turkey, the United Republic of Cameroon and Venezuela said they had no political or economic relations with that country; Venezuela added that it discouraged its citizens from establishing contact with South African corporations. Czechoslovakia said it had stopped all contacts with South Africa in 1963 and was systematically boycotting that country. Ecuador had no official relations and refrained from promoting trade with South Africa. Malaysia had totally banned all trade and economic relations with South Africa and prohibited travel between the two countries. Nigeria had maintained a total trade embargo since its independence in 1960. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had closed its air and sea space to the aircraft and ships of countries that collaborated with South Africa.

Norway said that, together with other Nordic countries, it had taken steps to prevent Norwegian investments in and exports to South Africa, adopted a policy of not selling Norwegian oil to South Africa and instituted visa requirements for South African citizens; it was willing to

co-operate with other countries to see how existing voluntary measures could be better coordinated and made more effective. Sweden said it had taken a series of measures unilaterally and on the basis of the Joint Nordic Programme of Action against South Africa adopted in 1978.

Japan and New Zealand declared that they had no diplomatic relations with South Africa; Japan added that it confined its economic relations with that country within the framework of normal trade and was making every effort to reduce its dependence on imports, particularly of natural resources, from there.

The United States, on the other hand, thought the United Nations could contribute to the ultimate erosion of apartheid if it became more realistic and less repetitive in calling for more embargoes, sanctions and other punitive steps which had never brought about constructive political reforms at any time in modern history.

According to many participants in the debate, collaboration by certain Western States and others was responsible for the continued existence of the apartheid régime. The Gambia said continued trade and investment were the life-blood of apartheid, enabling the régime to survive the economic disruption resulting from mass industrial action within the country. Saudi Arabia remarked that the profits derived from such a policy of opportunism were short term and would prove useless in the long run. The USSR said the Assembly should condemn States which had not ceased co-operating with South Africa, gave it political and diplomatic protection, and even proclaimed it their strategic ally. In the view of Viet Nam, the major Western countries must either continue their collusion with South Africa and share with it the ignominy of condemnation for complicity in the crime of apartheid, or join with the international community in imposing comprehensive sanctions.

Others protesting Western support for South Africa included Albania, Angola, Bahrain, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ghana, Guinea, Nepal, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania. Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia and the Ukrainian SSR held the United States especially responsible in this regard. China said South Africa had stepped up its collaboration with the Taiwan authorities, in violation of Chinese sovereignty.

Letters: Committee against Apartheid Chairman: <sup>(1)</sup>27 May, A/36/501-S/14688; <sup>(2)</sup>11 June, transmitting Conference declarations, A/36/319-S/14531. <sup>(3)</sup>Brazil: 27 May, A/36/289. <sup>(4)</sup>Nicaragua: 2 June, A/36/304. <sup>(5)</sup>South Africa: 27 May, A/36/290. <sup>(6)</sup>S-G: 29 May, A/36/291.

Note: <sup>(7)</sup>SC President, S/14486.

Reports: <sup>(8)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(9)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1; <sup>(10)</sup>Conference A/CONF.107/8.

Resolutions: Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): <sup>(11)</sup>4(XXXVII), para. 12, 23 Feb.; <sup>(12)</sup>14(XXXVII), para. 9, 6 Mar. GA: <sup>(13)</sup>35/206 I, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980 p. 215); <sup>(14)</sup>36/8, para. 8, 28 Oct. 1981 (p. 868); <sup>(15)</sup>36/51, paras. 8 & 10, 24 Nov. (p. 1109); <sup>(16)</sup>36/52, 24 Nov. (p. 1102); <sup>(17)</sup>36/121 A, para. 34, 10 Dec. (p. 1157); <sup>(18)</sup>36/121 B, 10 Dec. (p. 1157); <sup>(19)</sup>36/121 E, para. 4, 10 Dec. (p. 1168); <sup>(20)</sup>36/172 A, paras. 6-8, 17 Dec. (p. 162); <sup>(21)</sup>36/172 B, para. 1, 17 Dec. (p. 178); <sup>(22)</sup>36/172 C, para. 1, 17 Dec. (p. 216); <sup>(23)</sup>36/172 D, 17 Dec., text following; <sup>(24)</sup>36/172 F, para. 1, 17 Dec. (p. 175); <sup>(25)</sup>36/172 N, para. 2 (a)-(c), 17 Dec. (p. 213).

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

Publication: Objective: Justice, vol. XIII, No. 1 (DPI/687), No. 2 (DPI/696).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 D

109-18-13 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981 33-nation draft (A/36/L.37 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe,

#### Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling and reaffirming its resolution 35/206 C of 16 December 1980.

Having considered the reports of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Recognizing that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations are essential to avert the grave threat to international peace and security resulting from the policies and actions of the apartheid régime of South Africa,

Considering that political, economic, military and any other collaboration with the apartheid régime of South Africa encourages its persistent intransigence and defiance of the international community and its escalating acts of repression and aggression,

Deploping the attitude of those Western permanent members of the Security Council that have so far prevented the Council from adopting comprehensive sanctions against that régime under Chapter VII of the Charter,

Deploping also the attitude of those States, in particular the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, which have continued and increased their political, military, economic and other collaboration with South Africa,

Strongly condemning the activities of those transnational corporations that continue to collaborate with the apartheid régime, especially in the military, nuclear, petroleum and other fields, and of those financial institutions which have continued to provide loans and credits to South Africa,

Deploping the policies of those States that refuse to take firm action against transnational corporations and financial institutions within their jurisdiction to prevent them from collaborating with the apartheid régime,

Commending the efforts of trade unions, religious institutions, student organizations and anti-apartheid movements in their campaigns against transnational corporations and



financial institutions collaborating with the racist régime of South Africa,

Taking into account the relevant decisions adopted by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981, and by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981.

Having considered the declarations and reports of commissions of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, as well as the declarations of the international seminars organized in 1981 by the Special Committee against Apartheid.

1. Endorses the declarations of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa as well as the reports of Its Political and Technical Commissions, and the declarations of the International seminars organized by the Special Committee against Apartheid;

2. Also endorses the recommendations of the Seminar on Effective Measures to Prevent Transnational Corporations and Other Established Interests from Collaborating with the Racist Régime of South Africa, held at Geneva from 29 June to 3 July 1981;

3. Requests the Security Council urgently to consider the above declarations and reports with a view to the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the apartheid régime of South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations;

4. Condemns the continuing economic and other collaboration of certain Western and other States, in particular the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, with the racist régime of South Africa;

5. Commends all Governments that have taken action to break off, or to refrain from, any relations with the apartheid régime of South Africa;

6. Urges all States that have not yet done so to adopt separate and collective measures for comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, pending action by the Security Council;

7. Calls upon all Governments that have not yet done so:

(a) To sever diplomatic, military, nuclear, economic, cultural, academic, sports and other relations with the apartheid régime of South Africa;

(b) To implement scrupulously the arms embargo against South Africa and prohibit all forms of nuclear collaboration with South Africa;

(c) To cease all direct and indirect trade and commercial transactions with, as well as loans to and investments in, South Africa;

(d) To eliminate all government promotion of, or assistance or facilities to, trade with and investment in South Africa;

(e) To prohibit the sale of krugerrands;

(f) To prohibit, within their jurisdiction, collaboration of corporations and individuals with the racist régime of South Africa;

(g) To cease any facilities to airlines and shipping lines of South Africa and to prevent their national airlines and shipping companies from providing services to and from South Africa;

(h) To deny visas and other facilities to South African athletes, artists, entertainers and academic personalities and effectively to prevent their nationals from having cultural, academic and sporting contacts with South Africa;

8. Again requests States members of the European Economic Community, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, as well as States parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to take the necessary steps to deny all assistance and commercial or other facilities to the racist régime of South Africa;

9. Expresses serious concern that the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have not taken steps to terminate loans and credits to South Africa and to suspend South Africa from membership;

10. Requests the Secretary-General to undertake urgent consultations with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in order to persuade them to respect the repeated resolutions of the United Nations on collaboration with the apartheid régime of South Africa, and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

11. Requests the Secretary-General, as well as all agencies and organizations of the United Nations system:

(a) To withhold any facilities from, or investment of any funds in, banks, financial institutions and corporations that continue to give loans to or invest in South Africa;

(b) To refrain from any purchase of South African products, directly or indirectly;

(c) To deny any contracts or facilities to transnational corporations and financial institutions collaborating with South Africa;

(d) To prohibit any official travel by South African Airways or South African shipping lines;

12. Requests and authorizes the Special Committee:

(a) To continue and intensify its campaign to achieve world-wide support for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa;

(b) To strengthen its co-operation with trade unions and other organizations in order to promote effective sanctions against South Africa;

(c) To publicize the activities of transnational corporations, financial institutions and other interests collaborating with the apartheid régime of South Africa;

(d) To organize conferences and seminars, and to arrange for studies and publications on all aspects of sanctions against South Africa and on the continuing collaboration with South Africa of Governments, corporations and other interests;

13. Invites all Governments, parliaments, non-governmental organizations, anti-apartheid and solidarity movements, trade unions, religious bodies and other groups to promote comprehensive sanctions against South Africa in co-operation with the Special Committee.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.  
Against: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Botswana, Central African Republic, Dominican Republic, Finland, Guatemala, Lesotho, Liberia, Samoa, Swaziland, Sweden, Upper Volta.

#### Arms embargo

There were calls in United Nations bodies during 1981 for a strengthening of the arms embargo against South Africa mandated by the Security Council in 1977.<sup>(10)</sup>

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.** On 23 February 1981, in a resolution on violations of human rights in South Africa and Namibia (p. 944), the Commission on

Human Rights requested the Security Council to reinforce the arms embargo against South Africa by adopting comprehensive mandatory measures to end all military and nuclear collaboration with the apartheid régime.<sup>(4)</sup>

ACTIVITIES OF THE SEMINAR ON THE ARMS EMBARGO. An International Seminar on the Implementation and Reinforcement of the Arms Embargo against South Africa was held in London from 1 to 3 April 1981, organized by the Committee against Apartheid in co-operation with the World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa and with the assistance of the British Anti-Apartheid Movement. The Seminar was attended by representatives of United Nations bodies, Governments, national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, anti-apartheid movements and other NGOs, members of parliament and experts.

In a Declaration, transmitted to the Secretary-General by a letter of 10 April from the Committee Chairman,<sup>(1)</sup> the Seminar expressed serious concern that the Security Council's arms embargo had not been effectively implemented because of the resistance of certain Western and other States. It pointed to the failure of many States to enact adequate legislation, to their narrow interpretations which made the embargo largely ineffective and to the weakness of monitoring and enforcement measures.

The Seminar considered it essential and urgent to promote a world-wide campaign aimed at pressing the major Western Powers to implement and reinforce the arms embargo against South Africa. It suggested in particular: that all States enact legislation or policy directives covering all military collaboration, including transfers through third parties and involvement in production in South Africa; that petroleum, computers, other electronic equipment, military technology, "dual purpose" equipment for civilian and military use, components, auxiliary equipment and spare parts for arms be included in the embargo; that the Security Council adopt the 1980 recommendations<sup>(12)</sup> of its Committee on the question of South Africa established in 1977<sup>(11)</sup> (on measures to make the arms embargo more effective); and that all States furnish the Council with information about violations.

In its report to the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee against Apartheid recommended urgent action on the Seminar's recommendations for the enforcement and better monitoring of the arms embargo. To promote effective monitoring, the Committee suggested joint meetings of itself and the Council Committee to consider means to investigate and publicize information on implementation of the embargo and the strength-

ening of monitoring services in the United Nations Secretariat.

ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS. In its Paris Declaration of 27 May (p. 165), the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa<sup>(3)</sup> also endorsed the recommendations of the Security Council Committee. Like the London Seminar, the Conference called on States to adopt legislation or issue policy directives covering all forms of military collaboration, direct or indirect, including end-user clauses designed to monitor and enforce the arms embargo scrupulously. Such legislation should also cover existing loopholes with regard to "dual purpose" items, computers, electronic equipment and related technology.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. The Declaration of the Seminar on the arms embargo against South Africa was approved by the General Assembly in a resolution of 28 October on racial discrimination.<sup>(5)</sup>

By a resolution of 17 December on the arms embargo against South Africa,<sup>(9)</sup> the Assembly urged the Security Council to consider effective measures to reinforce and strengthen the embargo, taking into account the 1980 recommendations of the Council Committee and the declarations of the Conference on sanctions and the Seminar. It called, on all States to take effective measures to ensure that governmental and non-governmental organizations within their jurisdiction ceased relations with the military and police forces, military industry and nuclear institutions of South Africa; requested States to take firm steps to prevent co-operation or contacts with South Africa by military alliances to which they were parties, and asked them to co-operate with the Committee against Apartheid and the Council Committee; and requested more effective Secretariat services for monitoring the arms embargo. The Assembly also requested the Committee against Apartheid to strengthen its co-operation with the Council Committee and to continue efforts for a comprehensive and effective embargo on all military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa.

The resolution, introduced by Nigeria on behalf of 52 sponsors, was adopted by a recorded vote of 138 to none, with 7 abstentions.

By a resolution of the same date concerning military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa,<sup>(8)</sup> the Assembly urged the Security Council to take immediate steps to ensure the scrupulous and full implementation of the arms embargo and its effective monitoring in the light of the Council Committee's report on ways of making the embargo more effective.

In a resolution of 28 October on the right of peoples to self-determination,<sup>(6)</sup> the Assembly

again demanded the immediate application of the arms embargo by all countries, particularly those that maintained military and nuclear co-operation with the Pretoria régime and continued to supply it with related matériel.

By a resolution of 10 December on action by Member States in support of Namibia,<sup>(7)</sup> the Assembly requested all States: to cease providing to South Africa arms and related matériel, as well as equipment, supplies and licences for their manufacture or maintenance; to ensure that arms export agreements provided for guarantees preventing embargoed items or any components thereof from reaching South Africa through third countries; to prohibit the export of spare parts for embargoed aircraft and other military equipment belonging to South Africa, and the maintenance and servicing of such equipment; to prohibit government agencies and corporations under their jurisdiction from transferring technology for the manufacture of arms and related matériel to South Africa and from investing in such manufacture in South Africa; and to prohibit all imports of arms and related matériel from there.

France said its abstention in the vote on the arms embargo resolution was justified by the fact that certain provisions were perceptibly removed from the 1977 Security Council resolution imposing an arms embargo, which it was strictly applying. Also abstaining, the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the declarations of the Conference on sanctions and the Seminar on the arms embargo contained dubious propositions to which it could not subscribe; it had applied a voluntary arms embargo against South Africa since 1963 and had given full support to the 1977 Council resolution.

Among those voting for the resolution, Australia and Spain mentioned that the imposition of sanctions was the responsibility of the Security Council. Belgium, Botswana, Japan and the Netherlands, though supporting the text, expressed reservations on the Conference and Seminar declarations; Belgium added that it could not accept the indirect references to supposed co-operation between certain Western States and South Africa, and Japan said it had strictly implemented the arms embargo. Ireland said its support for the resolution should not be seen as endorsement of the Seminar Declaration; it also expressed reservations concerning the paragraph calling on States to take specific measures unilaterally. The Netherlands attached importance to strengthening the arms embargo as a means to compel South Africa to desist from its repressive internal policy and military actions against neighbouring States; however, it believed that peaceful nuclear collaboration could not be categorized as a form of military collaboration.

During the debate, many States-among them Gabon, Indonesia, Ireland and Singapore-deemed it essential to strengthen the arms embargo and improve its monitoring. Malaysia and others were disturbed at reports of breaches of the embargo by certain countries. Ghana and Tunisia expressed concern that there were still loopholes which permitted violations, while Venezuela was concerned at the failure to enforce the embargo. The German Democratic Republic charged imperialist monopolies with violating the embargo, and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said that 'Western States, and the United States in particular, had paid no attention to its implementation.

The Netherlands said it had long prohibited the sale of arms on a voluntary basis. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, stated that they strictly observed the embargo. The United States said it had been the first country to impose a complete arms embargo against South Africa, in 1963, 15 years before the United Nations embargo.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman, transmitting Declaration of Seminar on arms embargo, 10 Apr., A/36/190-S/14442.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(3)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 4(XXXVII), para. 12 (b), 23 Feb. GA: (5)36/8, para. 9, 28 Oct. (p. 868); <sup>(6)</sup>36/9, para. 12, 28 Oct. (p. 895); <sup>(7)</sup>36/121 B, paras. 15-20, 10 Dec. (p. 1158); <sup>(8)</sup>36/172 E, para. 5, 17 Dec. (p. 185); <sup>(9)</sup>36/172 F, 17 Dec., text following. SC: <sup>(10)</sup>418(1977), 4 Nov. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 161); (11)421(1977), 9 Dec. 1977 (ibid., p. 162).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(12)</sup>1980, p. 201.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 F

138-0-7 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
52-nation draft (A/36/L.39 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Arms embargo against South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/206 B of 16 December 1980,

Further recalling Security Council resolutions 418(1977) of 4 November 1977, 421(1977) of 9 December 1977 and 473(1980) of 13 June 1980.

Recognizing the importance of the effective and universal implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa, the cessation of all military co-operation with South Africa and the denial of any assistance or co-operation, either direct or indirect, to South Africa in its military build-up or nuclear plans,

Considering that military or nuclear co-operation with South Africa increases the threat to international peace and security.

Having considered the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Taking note of the report of the International Seminar on the Implementation and Reinforcement of the Arms Embargo against South Africa, held in London from 1 to 3 April 1981, and the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981,

Expressing its grave concern about the large increase in the military budget of South Africa since the imposition of the arms embargo by the Security Council, the development by South Africa of its nuclear-weapon capability and the increasing acts of aggression by South Africa against independent African States,

Noting with regret that the Security Council has so far failed to take action on the report of 19 September 1980 of the Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa on ways and means of making the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa more effective,

Commending the World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa and other groups for their co-operation in providing information to organs of the United Nations on infringements of the arms embargo,

1. Urges the Security Council to consider effective measures to reinforce and strengthen the arms embargo against South Africa, taking into account the recommendations of the Council Committee established by resolution 421(1977) concerning the question of South Africa, the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa and the Declaration of the International Seminar on the Implementation and Reinforcement of the Arms Embargo against South Africa;

2. Calls upon all States to take effective measures to ensure that governmental and non-governmental organizations within their jurisdiction cease any relations with the military and police forces, military industry and nuclear institutions of South Africa;

3. Requests all States concerned to take firm steps to prevent any co-operation or contacts with the régime of South Africa by military alliances to which they are parties;

4. Requests all States to extend their co-operation to the Special Committee against Apartheid and the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa in the discharge of their respective mandates;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure more effective Secretariat services for the monitoring of the arms embargo against South Africa and maximum co-ordination towards that end;

8. Requests and authorizes the Special Committee:

(a) To strengthen its co-operation with the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421(1977) concerning the question of South Africa;

(b) To continue in its efforts to promote a comprehensive and effective embargo on all forms of military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway,

Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Italy, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

## Oil embargo

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. During 1981, the Committee against Apartheid continued to promote an embargo on international trade in petroleum and petroleum products with South Africa. In co-operation with a committee of nine Western European parliamentarians, it organized a Conference of West European Parliamentarians on an Oil Embargo against South Africa, at Brussels, Belgium, on 30 and 31 January. The Conference, attended by 35 members of parliament from eight Western European countries and the European Parliament, representatives of United Nations bodies, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, adopted a declaration favouring a mandatory Security Council oil embargo and urging legislative action by European Governments to enforce and strengthen such an embargo.

The Committee Chairman, by a letter of 21 January, expressed appreciation to Norway for its action in preventing a Norwegian tanker from delivering oil from the Norwegian continental shelf to South Africa. By a letter dated 22 January to the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, he requested that Committee to consider the continued supply to South Africa of oil from Brunei under a contract between Shell and SASOL, the South African parastatal oil corporation. By a letter of 20 March, he commended the work of the Holland Committee and its Shipping Research Bureau, established to study how South Africa had been able to evade the oil embargo imposed by oil-exporting countries.

The Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in a joint statement commending five churchmen in France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States for a letter they had addressed on 23 March to five oil companies, called on all oil companies to cease forthwith the supply of oil and oil products to South Africa, especially in violation of embargoes enacted by oil-exporting countries.

In its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> which gave an account of these activities, the Committee recommended that the Security Council institute a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa and call on States to impose exemplary punishment on any transnational corporation or tanker company involved in the supply of oil to South Africa. It also called for the termination of all participation by corporations and financial institutions in South Africa's oil-from-coal industry.

The Committee commended for the urgent attention of the Council and the Assembly the proposals of the Conference of West European Parliamentarians on an oil embargo and of the Technical Commission of the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa (see below), as well as a resolution on South Africa adopted in June at Nairobi, Kenya, by the OAU Council of Ministers, which reaffirmed the organization's commitment to an oil embargo and reiterated its appeal to prohibit oil exports to South Africa or Namibia.<sup>(1)</sup>

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.** In a resolution of 23 February on violations of human rights in South Africa and Namibia (p. 944), the Commission on Human Rights requested the Security Council to consider imposing mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa, including in particular an embargo on the supply of petroleum and petroleum products.<sup>(5)</sup>

**ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS.** In its Paris Declaration of 27 May, the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa<sup>(4)</sup> (p. 165) noted with satisfaction that the major oil-exporting States had imposed an embargo on the supply of their oil to South Africa. It called on other suppliers of oil or oil products to join in implementing the embargo through legislation or policy directives. It urged the Security Council to institute a mandatory embargo on the supply of oil and oil products to South Africa and on the provision of any assistance to the South African oil industry.

The Conference's Technical Commission, recognizing that oil was South Africa's most vulnerable point of dependence on the outside world, agreed that an oil embargo was a key element in any sanctions programme against South Africa. It recommended a set of legislative, monitoring and enforcement measures, including the establishment of an intergovernmental monitoring agency and action by Governments to penalize companies that violated the embargo.

**COMMUNICATION.** Kuwait, by a letter of 9 November,<sup>(2)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a resolution adopted at Kuwait on 6

May by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC), containing recommendations for the strengthening and better control of the embargo on the delivery of Arab oil to South Africa, to be adopted by its member countries. The resolution was signed by Algeria, Bahrain, Iraq, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Emirates.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(8)</sup> the General Assembly again requested the Security Council to consider urgently a mandatory embargo on the supply of petroleum and petroleum products to South Africa. It urged States to take effective legislative and other measures to ensure the implementation of an oil embargo, and asked them to act against corporations and tanker companies involved in the illicit supply of oil to South Africa. It requested the Committee against Apartheid to continue its efforts to promote an effective oil embargo and authorized it to organize if necessary, under United Nations auspices, a conference of oil-exporting countries that had imposed an oil embargo, to consider national and international arrangements to ensure implementation. It invited Governments and organizations to lend their full support to the embargo.

This resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 126 to 7, with 12 abstentions.

By a resolution of 24 November on foreign interests in colonial countries,<sup>(7)</sup> the Assembly called on oil-producing and oil-exporting countries to take effective measures against the oil companies that supplied crude oil and petroleum products to South Africa.

Introducing the 52-nation resolution on an oil embargo against South Africa, Algeria said the text essentially reproduced the provisions of the 1980 Assembly resolution on the subject.<sup>(6)</sup> The sponsors were convinced that its strict application would do a great deal to strengthen common action to eradicate apartheid.

New Zealand, which abstained in the vote, as well as Ireland, the Netherlands and Spain, which supported the Assembly's request to the Council to impose an oil embargo, reserved their position on provisions which they regarded as appearing to pre-empt Council consideration. Australia abstained on similar grounds. Norway, which voted in favour, said the Nordic States were prepared to join in a mandatory oil embargo imposed by the Council; it was Norway's policy not to sell oil to South Africa.

During the debate, Ghana urged the Council to adopt an oil embargo as a matter of urgency. The call for an embargo was supported by a number of other countries, among them Algeria,

Ireland, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Poland and Senegal; the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said that, as a member of OAU, it worked closely with other oil-exporting countries in implementing the embargo. Saudi Arabia declared its readiness to carry out boycotts by every available means, particularly an oil embargo. The Netherlands said it was considering participation in the existing voluntary embargo.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, annexing OAU resolutions, 18 Sep., A/36/534; <sup>(2)</sup>Kuwait, 9 Nov., A/36/665-S/14750.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(4)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8.

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 4(XXXVII), para. 12 (a), 23 Feb. GA: <sup>(6)</sup>35/206 D, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 214); <sup>(7)</sup>36/51, para. 13, 24 Nov. 1981 (p. 1109); <sup>(8)</sup>36/172 G, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 G

126-7-12 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
52-nation draft (A/36/L.40 and Add.1): agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Oil embargo against South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling and reaffirming its resolution 36/206 D of 16 December 1980.

Having considered the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Taking note of the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981, and the Declaration of the Conference of West European Parliamentarians on an Oil Embargo against South Africa, held at Brussels on 30 and 31 January 1981.

Convinced that an embargo on the supply of petroleum, petroleum products and other strategic materials is an essential complement to the arms embargo against South Africa.

Commending all Governments that have imposed an oil embargo against South Africa,

Taking note of the resolution adopted on 6 May 1981 by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries to tighten crude oil sales contracts in order to prevent oil from reaching South Africa,

Reiterating the urgent need for the imposition of a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and for more effective monitoring of the embargoes imposed by most oil-exporting States,

Condemning the activities of corporations and other interests engaged in the clandestine supply to South Africa of oil from countries which imposed an oil embargo,

1. Again requests the Security Council to consider urgently a mandatory embargo on the supply of petroleum and petroleum products to South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations;

2. Urges all States that have not yet done so to take effective legislative and other measures to ensure the implementation of an oil embargo against South Africa;

3. Requests all States concerned to take effective action against corporations and tanker companies involved in the illicit supply of oil to South Africa;

4. Requests and authorizes the Special Committee against Apartheid to continue its efforts, including the undertaking of missions, the holding of seminars and the publication of studies, to promote an effective oil embargo against South Africa;

5. Further authorizes the Special Committee, in consultation with the Secretary-General and oil-exporting countries, to organize if necessary, under the auspices of the United Nations, a conference of oil-exporting countries that have imposed an oil embargo against South Africa to consider national and international arrangements to ensure the effective implementation of their oil embargo;

6. Invites Governments, International and non-governmental organizations, trade unions and other appropriate bodies to lend their full support to the oil embargo against South Africa.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Luxembourg, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Botswana, Chile, Greece, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, New Zealand, Portugal, Swaziland.

#### International Year for sanctions against South Africa (1982)

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. In its annual report for 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee against Apartheid recommended that 1982 be proclaimed the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa.

In a special report to the General Assembly on this observance, transmitted on 29 October 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee suggested that the purpose of the Year should be to make world public opinion aware of the grave situation in southern Africa and mobilize maximum support for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. While awaiting the imposition of sanctions by the Security Council, the Year's activities would seek to promote selective and partial sanctions and unilateral measures by States, organizations, groups and individuals in order to isolate the apartheid régime.

The programme for the Year would entail the

promotion of concrete action by the United Nations, Governments, and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to end collaboration and encourage wider public action such as consumer, sports, cultural and academic boycotts, divestment from corporations doing business in South Africa, and the establishment of anti-apartheid and solidarity movements.

The Committee's recommendations for the Year included: the holding of a special General Assembly meeting to present awards to persons recommended by the Committee for their outstanding contribution to the international movement for sanctions; United Nations publicity for the Paris Declaration and other documents of the Conference on sanctions (p. 165), and for other measures for the isolation of South Africa; and government action to establish national committees, hold special parliamentary sessions and review actions concerning the cessation of collaboration with South Africa. Specialized agencies and other intergovernmental organizations should be requested to review their relations with South Africa with a view to terminating any collaboration.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 17 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly proclaimed 1982 the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa. It endorsed the programme for the Year recommended by the Committee against Apartheid, as well as the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, and requested the Committee to promote observance of the Year. It invited Governments, intergovernmental organizations, NGOs and institutions to participate, and requested the Secretary-General to encourage the widest possible observance.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 130 to 8, with 8 abstentions.

By another resolution of the same date,<sup>(5)</sup> dealing with the Committee's work programme, the Assembly requested the Committee to give the highest priority in 1982 to mobilizing support for sanctions against South Africa.

India introduced the resolution on the International Year on behalf of its 52 sponsors, stating that the time had come for greater concerted efforts to mobilize the world community for comprehensive sanctions.

Explaining its negative vote on the resolution, Portugal said the initiatives of those in South Africa struggling for fundamental changes should not be hampered and contact should be kept with the people of South Africa.

New Zealand, which abstained, said it thought that designating an international year was the wrong way to go about imposing selective sanctions. Speaking for the Nordic States,

which voted in favour, Norway observed that the resolution did not take into account the guidelines for international years established in 1980 by the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(3)</sup>

Reservations regarding the Paris Declaration were voiced by Australia and New Zealand, which abstained, and by Ireland, the Netherlands and Norway, the last speaking for the Nordic States, which voted in favour (p. 169).

During the Assembly's debate, Jamaica suggested that the programme of the Year concentrate on promoting concrete actions by Governments to end collaboration with South Africa and encourage wider public action, such as consumer, sports and cultural boycotts.

Reports: Committee Apartheid, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/22, <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/22/Add.2-S/14689/Add.2.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC: 1980/67, annex, 25 July 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1030). GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/172 B, 17 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/172 N, para. 2 (a), 17 Dec. (p. 213).

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 B

130-8-8 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
52-nation draft (A/36/L.35 and Add.1): agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia; Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian, SSR., United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Zimbabwe.

#### International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981.

Recognizing that the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, adopted by the Conference, provides the framework for effective international action for the elimination of apartheid and for averting the growing threat to international peace and security,

Recognizing the need to promote maximum support for the implementation of the Paris Declaration,

Having considered the special report of the Special Committee against Apartheid on the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa,

Having also considered resolution CM/Res.865(XXXVII) adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-seventh ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 15 to 26 June 1981.

1. Endorses the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa and commends it to the attention of all Governments and organizations;

2. Proclaims the year 1982 International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa;

3. Endorses the programme for the Year recommended by the Special Committee against Apartheid in its special report;

4. Requests the Special Committee to take all appropriate action to promote the widest and most effective observance of the Year:

5. Invites all Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and institutions to participate effectively in the observance of the Year in co-operation with the United Nations;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to encourage the widest possible observance of the Year and to provide all necessary assistance to the Special Committee in the discharge of its responsibilities.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaïre, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Luxembourg, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Botswana, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, New Zealand, Swaziland.

#### Trade unions and sanctions

**ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS.** The Political Commission of the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 165), in its report to the Conference adopted on 26 May,<sup>(3)</sup> called on all trade unions to help boycott transport and communication with South Africa and to support the struggle of black workers there and in Namibia, both through direct solidarity and by giving material assistance to the South African Congress of Trade Unions and the National Union of Namibian Workers.

**ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID.** In its 1981 report,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee against Apartheid commended the actions of trade unions in denouncing repression against workers and journalists, supporting sanctions and exposing violations of the arms and oil embargoes, discouraging loans and emigration of workers to South Africa, opposing the activities of transnational corporations (TNCs) in aid of the apartheid régime, and assisting persecuted workers and their trade unions. It also commended the Declaration and resolutions on apartheid adopted at Geneva in June by the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) as an important guide to further action.

In its Declaration, which updated a 1964 ILO Declaration on the subject,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Conference reaffirmed the organization's determination to promote and take part in securing the

freedom and dignity of the people of South Africa, and to fight the policy of apartheid; confirmed the ILO Director-General's mandate to monitor and follow the situation in South Africa in respect of labour and social matters and to submit a special report every year; decided to establish a permanent Conference Committee on Apartheid to examine information on South Africa and on action taken against apartheid; and asked ILO to increase its technical assistance to the liberation movements, black workers and their independent trade unions and to create a training institute for South Africa to promote manpower training and development.

The Committee against Apartheid welcomed a resolution adopted at Nairobi, Kenya, in June by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), requesting the OAU Sanctions Committee, in collaboration with the Organization of African Trade Union Unity, the Committee against Apartheid and the United Nations Council for Namibia, to convene an international trade union conference to work out an action programme towards the enforcement of sanctions.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Committee recommended that the General Assembly should: denounce the trade union rights violations in South Africa and the repression against black workers; commend the courageous struggle of black workers of South Africa for their rights; commend actions by the world trade union movement in support of the struggle for trade union rights and liberation in South Africa, and encourage further measures in the light of the conclusions of the Conference on sanctions and the decisions of the ILO General Conference; and provide funds to enable the Committee to contribute to the organization of an international sanctions conference of trade unions and to undertake other activities to promote trade union action against apartheid.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly requested and authorized the Committee against Apartheid to take steps, in co-operation with the Council for Namibia, ILO, OAU and the Organization of African Trade Union Unity, to organize in 1982 an International Conference of Trade Unions on Sanctions against South Africa. The purpose of the Conference would be to work out an action programme towards the enforcement of sanctions against apartheid. The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 129 to 2, with 12 abstentions.

By its resolution of the same date on sanctions against South Africa,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly requested the Committee to strengthen its co-operation with trade unions and other organizations in order to promote effective sanctions against South Africa. In another resolution of 17 Decem-



ber, on public information, the mass media and apartheid the Assembly authorized the Committee to promote the organization of the Conference.

Guinea, introducing the 47-nation resolution on the Conference, said the denial of trade union rights formed part of a series of measures to restrict, limit, persecute and do police violence to the victims of which made of South Africa a vast camp of displaced persons, subjected to strict conditions of forced labour. The Assembly, in endorsing the holding of a conference of trade unions, would contribute to the success of the International Year for sanctions (p. 177) and express its devotion to humanitarian ideals.

Abstaining in the vote on this resolution, New Zealand voiced reservations about the call for such a conference. Costa Rica, though voting in favour, expressed reservations on the mention of the report of the Conference on sanctions in a preambular paragraph of the resolution. Botswana had reservations on the reference to the Conference of trade unions in the public information resolution.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, 18 Sep., annexing OAU resolutions, A/36/534.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22;

<sup>(3)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/172 D, para. 12 (b), 17 Dec. (p. 172); <sup>(5)</sup>36/172 H, 17 Dec., text following; <sup>(6)</sup>36/172 L, para. 6, 17 Dec. (p. 207).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1964, p. 492.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/172 H

129-2-12 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
47-nation draft (A/36/L.41 and Add. 1): agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burundi, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

International Conference of Trade Unions on  
Sanctions against South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/206 C of 16 December 1980.

Deploping that some Member States have maintained and even increased their political, military, economic and other relations with South Africa despite the resolutions of the United Nations on apartheid:

Having considered the report of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981, as well as the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid.

Recognizing the important role of trade union organizations in the international campaign for sanctions against South Africa,

1. Requests and authorises the Special Committee against Apartheid to take all necessary steps, in co-operation

with the United Nations Council for Namibia, the International Labour Organisation, the Organization of African Unity and the Organization of African Trade Union Unity, to organize in 1982 an International Conference of Trade Unions on Sanctions against South Africa for the purpose of working out a programme of action towards the enforcement of sanctions against apartheid;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to provide all necessary assistance to the Special Committee in the organization of the Conference.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenade, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Portugal, Swaziland.

### Relations with South Africa

Political, economic and military collaboration with South Africa by States, business enterprises and financial institutions was condemned in 1981 by the General Assembly, the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa and the Committee against Apartheid as an encouragement of South Africa's apartheid policies. To isolate South Africa, they urged the Security Council to take measures to end such collaboration, especially in the military and nuclear fields (see below). The Assembly condemned in particular Israel's increasing collaboration with South Africa in these areas (p. 192). Termination of collaboration by TNCs was called for by the Economic and Social Council (p. 188), while the Assembly requested effective steps by the Security Council to achieve the cessation of foreign investments in South Africa (p. 185).

### Military and nuclear relations

ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS. By a resolution of 23 February, on foreign support of South Africa (p. 945), the Commission on Human Rights requested States to end all forms of collaboration and assistance, including military and nuclear supplies and equipment, to the racist régime which used such assistance to repress the people of South Africa

and Namibia and their national liberation movements<sup>(7)</sup>

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (MARCH).** In a resolution on the Namibia question adopted on 6 March,<sup>(11)</sup> the General Assembly condemned Western and other States which had assisted South Africa in developing a nuclear capacity and urged all Member States to frustrate South Africa's attempts to develop nuclear weapons.

In a resolution of the same date on Namibian uranium,<sup>(12)</sup> the Assembly requested the Security Council to ensure that South Africa did not continue to acquire foreign nuclear technology. It condemned the collusion of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel and the United States with South Africa in the nuclear field; and called on all States to refrain from supplying the régime with installations that might enable it to produce nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment.

**ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS.** In its Paris Declaration, adopted on 27 May (p. 165), the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa<sup>(6)</sup> expressed concern at reports of efforts by South Africa to form military alliances and arrangements involving some Western Powers and régimes in other regions. It considered that any military alliances or arrangements with South Africa would be an act of hostility against the struggle of its people that would greatly aggravate the situation in southern Africa, and called for vigilance by the international community to prevent such arrangements.

The Political Commission of the Conference stated in its report that the apartheid economy and its war machine had been created primarily through the active participation of a number of Western Powers and TNCs, which had developed into an alliance between those enterprises and the régime. South Africa continued to manufacture under licence military aircraft and equipment originating in France, Italy, the United Kingdom and other countries; it had obtained military communications equipment from France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom; Danish ships had been involved in arms transport to South Africa, Spain had acted as a conduit of arms, a United States-Canadian company had provided an artillery system and Israel had supplied arms and munitions. Several Western States had permitted the training and recruitment of nuclear scientists and the supply of nuclear technology.

In addition to calling for a strengthened arms embargo, the Commission said there was an urgent need to apply Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations (on action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and

acts of aggression) to prevent all forms of nuclear collaboration with South Africa. It also called for action to stop all imports of uranium from South Africa and Namibia.

The Conference's Technical Commission expressed grave concern over the serious and immediate threat which South Africa's nuclear capability presented to world peace and particularly to African States. It was of the view that South Africa had developed and tested a design weapon and that producing a small arsenal from its available weapons-grade material was only a matter of weeks. That capability had been acquired with the assistance of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States, as well as Belgium, Israel, Japan, the Netherlands and Switzerland, through uranium extraction and processing, supply of nuclear equipment, technology transfer, and training and exchange of scientists.

The Commission recommended a halt to the uranium trade with South Africa and Namibia and a strengthened Security Council ban on nuclear collaboration with South Africa. It also proposed the termination of nuclear contracts, training of personnel, technology transfer, supply of nuclear materials, and all economic and other support for South Africa's nuclear industry or any related industry.

**ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES.** In a consensus on military bases in colonial countries (p. 1110), adopted on 14 August,<sup>(5)</sup> the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples condemned any co-operation with South Africa by certain Western countries and other States in supplying arms, military equipment and technology, including nuclear technology and equipment that could be used for military purposes. It called on States to cease such collaboration and support, particularly the sale of weapons and other matériel which increased South Africa's capacity to wage war against neighbouring States, as well as the supply of equipment, technology, materials and training which increased its nuclear capacity.

In a consensus on the Namibia question (p. 1138), also adopted on 14 August, the Committee condemned the continued military collaboration between South Africa and certain Western and other States, and called for the termination of their collaboration in the nuclear field, which it regarded as a serious violation of the military embargo imposed by the Security Council in 1977.<sup>(20)</sup>

**ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID.** During 1981 the Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid addressed com-

munications — summarized in its annual report<sup>(4)</sup> — to the Secretary-General, the President of the Security Council and others calling attention to instances in which equipment with military uses had reportedly been supplied to South Africa.

By a letter of 12 March to the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, he conveyed the Committee's concern at press reports that the United States intended to grant Israel the right to sell to South Africa its KFIR jets and other military equipment with American components, and called for action to prevent such sale. In a reply of 6 April, the United States assured the Committee that it had received no such request from Israel and that it would not grant permission to sell any military equipment containing American components, including KFIR jets, to South Africa.

After receiving a report that the United Kingdom was exporting electronic equipment from the Plessey Company to South African military forces, the Chairman sent a letter on 29 April to the Chairman of the Security Council Committee on the question of South Africa, expressing hope that the Committee would take urgent action to prevent the export of the equipment to South Africa. On 8 May, following a further report that the equipment included United States computers manufactured under licence in Ireland, the Chairman wrote to the United States requesting that it look into the matter urgently and act in the light of the Council and Assembly arms embargo resolutions.

By a letter of 11 May, the Chairman transmitted to the Secretary-General, for the attention of the Assembly and the Council, a statement of the same date denouncing reported plans for a non-governmental conference at Buenos Aires, Argentina, on 26 May, to be attended by representatives from South Africa, the United States, Argentina, Brazil and other Latin American countries, for the purpose of discussing a South Atlantic alliance, including South Africa.<sup>(1)</sup>

In a reply of 22 May,<sup>(3)</sup> transmitted on the same day to the Secretary-General, Brazil stated that it had never been associated with the event, would not send any representative and had not altered its opposition to undertaking military alliances with the South African Government. Argentina, by a letter of 22 June,<sup>(2)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a letter of 15 May to the Chairman together with a press release of 14 May, stating that it had no connection with the meeting and it resolutely opposed the conclusion of any military pact with South Africa relating to the South Atlantic.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (DECEMBER). By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(19)</sup> the General As-

sembly strongly condemned the collusion with South Africa in the nuclear field by certain Western countries and other States, particularly the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, and called on France and all other Governments not to supply installations that might enable South Africa to produce nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment. It condemned all States that continued military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, in particular certain Western States and Israel. The Assembly again requested the Security Council to strengthen the arms embargo (p. 173) and secure the immediate cessation of military and nuclear collaboration. It authorized the Committee against Apartheid to continue to promote an embargo on such collaboration and to expose developments. It invited Governments and organizations to assist persons compelled to leave South Africa because of conscientious objection to military or police service. Condemning manoeuvres to create a South Atlantic Treaty Organization with South Africa, it appealed to the Council to ensure that such an organization was not established.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 119 to 19, with 4 abstentions. Paragraph 1, condemning nuclear collusion by certain named States and calling on France and others not to supply certain installations, was adopted by a recorded vote, requested by the United States, of 56 to 24, with 51 abstentions.

By a resolution of 9 December on implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa,<sup>(16)</sup> adopted in 1964 by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Assembly reaffirmed that South Africa's nuclear programme endangered peace and security and increased the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons; condemned and called for an end to nuclear collaboration with South Africa by any State, corporation, institution or individual; and requested the Security Council to prohibit all such collaboration. In a resolution of the same date on South Africa's nuclear capability, the Assembly requested the Council to intensify its efforts to prohibit nuclear co-operation and collaboration with South Africa and to institute effective enforcement action to prevent that regime from endangering peace and security by acquiring nuclear weapons. It called on States, corporations, institutions and individuals to terminate all military and nuclear collaboration, including the provision of such related materials as computers, electronic equipment and corresponding technology.

In resolutions on foreign interests impeding decolonization, adopted on 24 November,<sup>(13)</sup> and on the Namibia situation, adopted on

10 December,<sup>(18)</sup> the Assembly strongly condemned the continuing collaboration of certain Western and other States with South Africa and called on all Governments to refrain from such collaboration. It particularly condemned such collusion by the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, and called on France and all others to refrain from supplying South Africa with installations that might enable it to produce nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment.

The Assembly, in a resolution of 1 December<sup>(14)</sup> on implementation of its 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,<sup>(8)</sup> strongly condemned all collaboration with South Africa, particularly nuclear and military, and called on all States concerned to cease all such collaboration forthwith.

In a resolution of 9 December<sup>(17)</sup> on implementation of its 1970 Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security,<sup>(10)</sup> the Assembly called on the Security Council to take effective measures to promote the denuclearization of Africa in order to avert the serious danger which South Africa's nuclear capability constituted to the African States, in particular the front-line States, as well as to peace and security.

Introducing in the Assembly the 34-nation resolution on military and nuclear collaboration, Cuba said South Africa's actions were sufficient cause for denying that country collaboration of any kind, all the more so if such collaboration enabled it to strengthen its already considerable military potential and gave it access to nuclear military technology. It was highly surprising that well-known Western Powers should maintain links with South Africa and expressly violate the arms embargo. Particularly disturbing was the information concerning recent talks between the United States and South Africa on nuclear collaboration. It was necessary to put an end to that reprehensible collaboration, which directly resulted in aggression by South Africa against African States and the consolidation of apartheid.

Voting against paragraph 1 as well as the resolution as a whole, Australia, Greece, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway (for the Nordic States), Portugal and Spain declared that they could not support the singling out of certain States. Spain reserved its position also on the naming of countries and groups of countries in the preamble (which referred to certain members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Israel) and in paragraph 4 (mentioning the United States). Norway, speaking on behalf of the three Nordic NATO members-Denmark, Iceland and Norway-rejected the reference to NATO as wholly unjustified, saying it introduced

an East-West element totally irrelevant to the struggle against apartheid.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community (EC) members, which also voted against in both votes, said they rejected all arbitrary and unjustified attacks on Member States, whether by name or implicitly. The Federal Republic of Germany strongly rejected the accusations of nuclear and military collusion as unjustified, unacceptable and harmful to friendly co-operation. The United States said it denounced, in the strongest possible terms, the malicious fabrications on military and nuclear collaboration; it did not export nuclear fuel or provide nuclear facilities to South Africa, and charges about its alleged intention to create a "South Atlantic Treaty Organization" were specious and demonstrably false.

Several other speakers objected or expressed reservations to the singling out of certain countries. These included Austria, which voted against paragraph 1 and abstained on the whole text, as well as Argentina, Bangladesh, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Jamaica, Morocco, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Togo, which voted in favour of the resolution but abstained on that paragraph; Togo wondered whether the States mentioned were the only ones deserving of condemnation.

Brazil, voting for the text but abstaining on paragraph 1, said some provisions should have been more balanced; it reiterated its opposition to any military alliance involving South Africa. Chile said the allusion to such an alliance was baseless and Costa Rica said it could not accept the paragraph. Turkey, which supported the resolution but voted against paragraph 1, voiced reservations also about the reference to NATO in the preambular paragraph by which the Assembly expressed serious concern at the failure of certain NATO members, Israel and other States to cease their military and nuclear co-operation with South Africa.

Sierra Leone, on the other hand, said there was substantial evidence, which had yet to be contradicted or disproved, to support paragraph 1, and there was also evidence of a fiendish attempt by South Africa to draw others into a so-called South Atlantic Treaty Organization; it could not see why those who would have nothing to do with such an organization should be exercised by the reference to it.

Paragraph 4 of the resolution on the denuclearization of Africa, containing the call for termination of military and nuclear collaboration, was approved in the Assembly's First Committee by a recorded vote, requested by the United States, of 101 to 6, with 16 abstentions. Several States objected to this provision and to a

preambular paragraph by which the Assembly expressed indignation that certain Western countries and Israel had continued to collaborate with South Africa despite the risk of proliferation of nuclear weapons. Voting against the paragraph, Israel and the United Kingdom denied any nuclear collaboration with South Africa, while the United States rejected efforts to include all high-technology items under the arms embargo. Among those abstaining, Australia objected to the tendentious naming of States, while Portugal considered that only military co-operation should be condemned. Austria, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Turkey objected to the preambular provision referring to certain Western countries and Israel.

Paragraph 9 of the resolution on foreign interests impeding decolonization, citing States by name in reference to military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, was adopted by a recorded vote of 59 to 36, with 47 abstentions, after a motion to have a separate vote on this paragraph, to which Angola objected, was adopted by a recorded vote of 57 to 50, with 26 abstentions.

Voting against the paragraph, the Federal Republic of Germany rejected the accusation of military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, adding that it had applied since 1963 a voluntary embargo on arms to that country. The United States said it had permitted no export of nuclear fuel or facilities to South Africa in the previous five years. Belgium, the Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Israel, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Senegal, Somalia, Sweden, Turkey and Uruguay, as well as the United Kingdom on behalf of the EC member States, objected to the mention of specific States.

Reservations, mainly concerning the selectivity of the list, were also voiced by the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burma, Burundi, Fiji, Indonesia, Liberia, Mali, Peru, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Suriname, Thailand and Togo, which abstained on the paragraph. Liberia added that it would have been better if the States accused of nuclear collusion had been requested to advise the Secretary-General on the action they had taken or intended to take.

Canada, speaking for the five-nation contact group engaged in negotiations on the Namibia question, stated that the condemnation of two members of that group for collusion with South Africa in the nuclear field was included in the resolution on the Namibia question in apparent ignorance of the true state of affairs.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid, a number of speakers viewed as ominous the possible acquisition of nuclear weapons by South

Africa. Several countries proposed a total ban on nuclear collaboration with South Africa, and Ghana urged the Security Council urgently to prohibit all such collaboration. Singapore urged countries supplying South Africa with nuclear technology and equipment to reconsider their policy. Sri Lanka called for a halt to all military and other collaboration with South Africa which enabled it to maintain apartheid and commit aggression against neighbouring States. The Netherlands held it imperative that South Africa adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons<sup>(9)</sup> or, at least, that it accept full-scope safeguards which would permit inspection of its installations.

Austria endorsed a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, while Turkey stated that every effort should be made to achieve the denuclearization of Africa and the ending of nuclear co-operation with South Africa.

According to the USSR, South Africa's military self-sufficiency had advanced from 70 to 90 per cent as a result of financial and technical assistance and licences granted by Western Powers. The Syrian Arab Republic said the open collaboration between South Africa and the United States had reached a higher stage, as evidenced by visits to that country by South African military officials. Those who supplied military hardware to South Africa, said the Gambia, must assume direct responsibility for the savage repression of the Africans there.

Japan said there was no military co-operation between Japan and South Africa, nor co-operation in nuclear development.

Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, the Ukrainian SSR and Viet Nam expressed concern at reports that the United States was trying to create a South Atlantic Treaty Organization including South Africa, Argentina and other countries. Argentina restated its opposition to such a pact.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman, 11 May, A/36/253-S/14479; <sup>(2)</sup>Argentina, 22 June, A/36/340-S/14565; <sup>(3)</sup>Brazil, 22 May, A/36/285-S/14487.

Reports: <sup>(4)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22., <sup>(5)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1; <sup>(6)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8.

Resolutions: <sup>(7)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 8(XXXVII), para. 4, 23 Feb. GA: <sup>(8)</sup>1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49); <sup>(9)</sup>2373(XXII) annex. 12 June 1968 (YUN 1968, D. 17); <sup>(10)</sup>2734(XXV), 16 Dec. 1970 (YUN 1970, p. 105); <sup>(11)</sup>35/227 A, para. 24, 6 Mar. 1981 (p. 1149); <sup>(12)</sup>35/227 I, paras. 7 & 12, 6 Mar. (p. 1169); <sup>(13)</sup>36/51, paras. 6 & 9, 24 Nov. (p. 1109); <sup>(14)</sup>36/68, para. 8, 1 Dec. (p. 1098); <sup>(15)</sup>36/86 A, paras. 3 & 4, 9 Dec. (p. 48); <sup>(16)</sup>36/86 B, paras. 2-5, 9 Dec. (D. 45); <sup>(17)</sup>36/102, para. 11, 9 Dec. (p. 145); <sup>(18)</sup>36/121 A, para. 17 10 Dec. (p. 1156); <sup>(19)</sup>36/172 E, 17 Dec., text following. <sup>(20)</sup>SC: 418(1977), 4 Nov. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 161).

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/172 E

119-19-4 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
34-nation draft (A/36/L.38 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming its resolutions on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, in particular its resolution 35/206 B of 16 December 1980.

Recalling Security Council resolutions 418(1977) of 4 November 1977, 421(1977) of 9 December 1977 and 473 (1980) of 13 June 1980.

Recalling also its resolutions concerning the denuclearization of the continent of Africa,

Having considered the reports of the Special Committee against Apartheid and of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981.

Gravely concerned that the racist régime of South Africa has continued to obtain military equipment and ammunition, as well as technology and know-how, to develop its armament industry and to acquire nuclear-weapon capability,

Recognizing that any nuclear-weapon capability of the racist régime of South Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security,

Expressing its serious concern at the failure of certain members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Israel and other States to cease their co-operation with the racist regime of South Africa in the military and nuclear fields and to prevent corporations within their jurisdiction from carrying out such co-operation,

Condemning the attitude of those transnational corporations that continue, through their collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa, to enhance its military and nuclear capabilities,

Considering the urgent need for comprehensive mandatory sanctions by the Security Council, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to prohibit any military and nuclear collaboration with the racist regime of South Africa,

1. Strongly condemns the collusion by the Governments of certain Western countries and other States, particularly those of the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, with the racist regime of South Africa in the nuclear field and calls upon France and all other Governments to refrain from supplying the racist minority régime of South Africa, directly or indirectly, with installations that might enable it to produce uranium, plutonium and other nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment;

2. Further condemns the manoeuvres to create a South Atlantic Treaty Organization with the racist régime of South Africa and appeals to the Security Council to undertake measures to ensure that this sinister organization is not established;

3. Condemns all States that violate the arms embargo and continue to collaborate with South Africa in the military and nuclear fields, in particular certain Western States and Israel;

4. Expresses its deep concern about reports on the recent talks between the United States of America and South Africa concerning closer collaboration in the nuclear field;

5. Urges the Security Council to take immediate steps to ensure the scrupulous and full implementation of the arms

embargo imposed by the Council in its resolution 418(1977) and the effective monitoring of the embargo in the light of the report of the Council Committee established by resolution 421(1977) concerning the question of South Africa on ways and means of making the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa more effective;

6. Again requests the Security Council to take mandatory measures to strengthen the arms embargo and secure the immediate cessation of any form of collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa in the military and nuclear fields;

7. Requests all States to co-operate with the Special Committee against Apartheid in its efforts to ensure the total cessation of military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa;

8. Invites all Governments and organizations to assist, in consultation with the national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, persons compelled to leave South Africa because of their objection, on the ground of conscience, to serving in the military or police force of the apartheid régime;

9. Authorizes the Special Committee:

(a) To follow closely the question of the nuclear plan and capability of South Africa;

(b) To continue its efforts to promote a comprehensive and effective embargo on all forms of military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa;

(c) To continue its efforts to expose all developments concerning military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa, particularly:

(i) Supply of arms, technology and other vital resources in contravention of resolutions of the United Nations;

(ii) Attempts to forge any military alliance with the racist régime of South Africa;

(iii) Development of further links with the apartheid regime as an ally, in the context of aggravating international tension and conflict.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Austria, Finland, Guatemala, Sweden.

#### Investments in South Africa

**ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS.**  
In its Paris Declaration,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted on 27 May 1981, the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 165) called for a freeze on all new investments in, and financial loans to, South Africa. Foreign capital, loans and other financial facilities, it said, sustained the apartheid economy and provided it with resources to expand its aggressive apparatus and increase its

military and nuclear capability, to the detriment of peace and security in southern Africa.

More specific action was proposed in the report of the Conference's Technical Commission. This included intensified campaigns against financial institutions which provided loans to South Africa, aimed at severing all such links; investigation of banks involved in financing trade with South Africa; and campaigns against the sale of kruggerands (South African gold coins).

**ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID.** On 24 March, the Committee against Apartheid held a hearing on bank loans to South Africa, with the participation of several leaders of non-governmental organizations who informed the Committee of their campaigns against such loans.

The Committee, in co-operation with the World Council of Churches, the Non-Governmental Organizations Sub-Committee on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Apartheid and Decolonization, the Swiss Anti-Apartheid Movement and the Berne Declaration Group, held an International Seminar on Loans to South Africa at Zurich, Switzerland, from 5 to 7 April. Participants included representatives of Governments, United Nations bodies and agencies, other organizations and national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, as well as individual experts.

The Seminar adopted a Declaration containing a number of proposals for halting all loans, credits and other financial assistance to South Africa, including a special appeal to Switzerland and the Federal Republic of Germany. Any such assistance, it declared, represented collusion with apartheid and was a hostile act against the oppressed people of South Africa, OAU and the United Nations. It called on all financial institutions to cease all lending to the South African Government and its agencies and to South African corporations, and called on the United Nations and Governments to assist the front-line and other neighbouring States in their efforts to extricate themselves from economic relations with South Africa. The Declaration was transmitted to the Secretary-General by a letter dated 10 April from the Committee Chairman.<sup>(1)</sup>

On 5 January, the Committee Chairman issued a press statement expressing satisfaction at the decision of the Borough of Lambeth, London, to remove its account from Barclays Bank because of the Bank's involvement in South Africa, and commending the United Kingdom Labour Party for drawing the attention of all Labour-controlled municipal councils to the involvement of the Bank in financing the apartheid régime. On 9 January, in another press state-

ment, he commended six United States organizations for initiating a campaign to press for further action by state legislatures and city councils to divest from banks and corporations in South Africa.

By a letter dated 20 March to the President of the United Nations Correspondents Association, the Chairman expressed consternation that the membership directory of the Association carried an advertisement for South African Airways.

By letters of 13 May to the Director-General of the World Health Organization and the Secretary-General of the World Medical Association, the Chairman conveyed the Committee's appeal to reject attempts to readmit the Medical Association of South Africa to the World Medical Association. After the Association took this step at its annual Assembly (Lisbon, Portugal, 28 September-2 October), the Committee denounced the decision and called for appropriate action by Governments and organizations.

In a statement and cable of 13 September, the Chairman expressed satisfaction at an announcement by the World Council of Churches that it was breaking links with the Union Bank of Switzerland, the Swiss Bank Corporation and the Dresdner Bank of the Federal Republic of Germany because of their extensive involvement in financial support to South Africa.

In its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee noted with regret that the Security Council had failed to take steps to achieve cessation of further foreign investments in and loans to South Africa. It noted with serious concern that South Africa had been able to raise substantial loans in the past year, regarding them as an expression of confidence in the apartheid system, and noted with regret the continuing flow of large-scale investments to South Africa from a number of Western countries.

The Committee recommended that the Assembly endorse the recommendations contained in the Declaration of the Seminar on Loans to South Africa and the report of the Technical Commission of the Conference on sanctions. It also recommended that the Assembly appeal to States and organizations to support non-governmental campaigns against loans to and investments in South Africa.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly again urged the Security Council to consider at an early date the matter of foreign investments in and loans to South Africa, with a view to taking effective steps to achieve their cessation. In the preamble, the Assembly expressed its conviction that a cessation of all new foreign investments and loans would constitute an important step in international action for the elimination of apart-

heid, as such investments and loans abetted and encouraged South Africa's apartheid policies. It welcomed the action of those Governments that had taken legislative and other measures and noted with regret that the Council had not yet acted.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 138 to 1, with 7 abstentions.

By a resolution of 24 November on activities of foreign interests impeding decolonization,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly requested all States to refrain from making any investments to the benefit of, or extending loans to, South Africa and from agreements or measures to promote trade or other economic relations with it.

Introducing the 49-nation resolution on foreign investments, Sweden said a diminishing flow to South Africa of capital for investment and other purposes would be an effective means of pressing the régime to change its racial and aggressive policies, and would make it more difficult for that country to carry out the increasingly costly build-up of its military and nuclear capacity and energy reserves for the purpose of withstanding internal and international pressure. Though some States might find the scope of the resolution too limited, the sponsors had formulated the operative element in such a way as to enable the widest range of countries to vote for it. The broadest possible support for such action would be a clear signal to South Africa that the world as a whole was reacting strongly against its apartheid policies.

Speaking in explanation of vote, Canada said it had abstained because of the inclusion of emotive or substantial generalizations on such matters as the alleged effect and intent of international business dealings with South Africa and allegations of collaboration with South Africa by private and public institutions.

New Zealand explained that it was a sponsor of the text because it offered a practical way of bringing pressure to bear on South Africa peacefully and effectively. Greece voted for the resolution on similar grounds. The Netherlands also voted in favour but said selective enforcement measures should preferably be decided upon by the Security Council.

Speaking during the Assembly debate on apartheid, a number of States cited foreign investment as a vital source of support for the South African Government. Directly or indirectly, said the Byelorussian SSR, such loans enabled South Africa to finance its repressive apparatus, including its militarization and nuclear programmes, as well as its aggression against African States. Trinidad and Tobago remarked that capital flows to South Africa from major financial institutions in Western countries continued unabated, while develop-

ing countries had been experiencing enormous difficulties in obtaining financial aid for development. According to Hungary, the United States had \$2 billion of direct investment in South Africa. The USSR cited figures published in the South African press putting foreign investment in South Africa at 30 billion rands and stating that, at the end of 1980, there had been 1,200 British, 375 American and 350 West German companies operating in South Africa.

Japan declared that it did not permit direct economic investment in South Africa and had called on Japanese foreign exchange banks to refrain from extending loans to that country. The Netherlands said it withheld medium- and long-term credit guarantees to South Africa and was considering regulations concerning investments in that country. Norway stated that, together with other Nordic countries, it had adopted a number of measures aimed at voluntary and unilateral disengagement from previous contacts with South Africa, including steps to prevent Norwegian investments. Sweden said it was reviewing its 1979 law on prohibition of investments in South Africa and Namibia in the light of possible supplementary measures in such areas as technology transfer. The United States maintained that South Africa was only of modest economic interest to it, having received only some 1 per cent of United States overseas investment.

Algeria, Ireland and Senegal called for a ban on investments, while Ghana strongly urged the Security Council to prohibit all forms of loans and technology transfers to South Africa. In Finland's view, the Council should, as a first step, take decisions aimed at preventing new foreign investments in South Africa; this position was supported by Singapore.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman, transmitting Declaration of Seminar on Loans to South Africa, 10 Apr., A/36/201-S/14443.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(5)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/51, para. 12, 24 Nov. (p. 1109); <sup>(5)</sup>36/172 O, 17 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 102, 103 (2 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/1720

138-1-7 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
49-nation draft (A/36/L.48and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh, Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.



### Investments in South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/206 Q of 16 December 1980.

Taking note of the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Convinced that a cessation of all new foreign investments in, and financial loans to, South Africa would constitute an important step in international action for the elimination of apartheid, as such investments and loans abet and encourage the apartheid policies of that country,

Welcoming the actions of those Governments that have taken legislative and other measures towards that end,

Noting with regret that the Security Council has not yet taken steps towards that end, as requested by the General Assembly in its resolutions 31/6 K of 9 November 1976, 32/105 O of 16 December 1977, 33/183 O of 24 January 1979, 34/93 Q of 12 December 1979 and 35/206 Q of 16 December 1980.

Again urges the Security Council to consider the matter at an early date with a view to taking effective steps to achieve the cessation of further foreign investments in, and financial loans to, South Africa.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States.

Abstaining: Botswana, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Guatemala, Italy, United Kingdom.

### Activities of transnational corporations

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL.** In a resolution of 23 February 1981 on foreign support of South Africa (p. 945), the Commission on Human Rights called on Governments to put an end to the trading, manufacturing and investing activities in South Africa by banks, transnational corporations (TNCs) and other organizations identified in a report by a Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities as assisting the racist régime.<sup>(6)</sup>

On 8 May,<sup>(12)</sup> the Economic and Social Council approved a 1980 decision of the Sub-Commission<sup>(13)</sup> to authorize the Special Rapporteur to continue updating the list of organizations in his report.

**ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS.** The Technical Commission of the Conference

on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 165), in its report of May 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> recommended that the Committee against Apartheid in consultation with the United Nations Council for Namibia and the national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, should ensure that effective monitoring procedures were established with a view to investigating financial and commercial dealings, including the transfer of technology, between TNCs and other companies and the South African economy. It proposed that regular reports of such dealings be provided to Governments and the Council, to be taken into account in the award of public contracts and in all other appropriate ways. The Commission further recommended the extension of campaigns against emigration to South Africa, to include especially the transfer of personnel by TNCs, as a contribution towards halting the exchange of technology, and the co-ordination of campaigns to expose the role of TNCs in South Africa, in order to secure their withdrawal and a halt to trade promotion.

**SEMINAR ON TNCs AND SOUTH AFRICA.** In connection with the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (1973-1983) (p. 864), the United Nations Division of Human Rights organized at Geneva from 29 June to 3 July a Seminar on Effective Measures to Prevent Transnational Corporations and Other Established Interests from Collaborating with the Racist Régime of South Africa. Arrangements for the Seminar were made following consultations between the Chairmen of the Commission on Human Rights and the Committee against Apartheid. Participants came from 16 countries, several United Nations organs and bodies, specialized agencies, the League of Arab States and OAU.

The Seminar, in its report,<sup>(5)</sup> recommended the following measures, among others: concerted campaigns against TNCs whose collaboration was crucial to South Africa's economy, with direct action against specific corporations; a stepped-up boycott of South African products; elaboration of a global convention or regional conventions binding States to enforce sanctions against South Africa and to prevent their nationals from collaborating with it; consideration of the international responsibility, including criminal responsibility, of TNCs, their officers and their countries of nationality; and measures to awaken world public opinion to the adverse consequences for human rights in South Africa of the collaboration with that country by certain Governments-in particular those of Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United

States-and of TNCs and other interests, and to expose the false picture of that collaboration being presented by the collaborators and their defenders.

Among the Seminar's other recommendations were: that oil-exporting countries review their relations with TNCs supplying petroleum and petroleum products to South Africa, in particular Shell, British Petroleum, Total, Caltex and Mobil; that States committed to action against apartheid review their relations with TNCs operating in Namibia and South Africa; that trade unionists employed by TNCs be urged to act to secure the withdrawal of those corporations from South Africa and to take action in solidarity with the struggle of South African workers; and that measures be adopted to stop TNC activities which assisted the apartheid régime by undermining United Nations initiatives, promoting trade and immigration, carrying out propaganda for the apartheid régime and otherwise assisting South Africa.

Recommendations for action by the United Nations and its specialized agencies included: preparation of a report on TNC involvement in the infringement of human rights in South Africa; publication by the Commission on Human Rights of a list of all TNCs directly contributing to South Africa's military and nuclear capability; convening of an international conference of scientists to consider the implications of South Africa's nuclear capability for the peace and security of Africa; and discontinuation of business dealings between United Nations organizations and banks or other commercial enterprises collaborating with South Africa.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. In its annual report,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee against Apartheid again emphasized the importance of action against TNCs collaborating with South Africa and called for action by the United Nations and Member States to prevent such collaboration.

The Committee recommended that the General Assembly endorse and act on the recommendations made by the Technical Commission of the Conference on Sanctions against South Africa and by the Seminar on TNCs and South Africa. It also asked that it be authorized to organize seminars and symposia to promote the campaign against TNC operations in South Africa.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMISSION ON TNCs. In a report of 9 July,<sup>(4)</sup> the United Nations Secretariat supplied to the Commission on Transnational Corporations information on recent financial activities and employment practices of TNCs in South Africa and Namibia. According to this report, following three years of relatively low levels of foreign borrowing, South Africa had

resumed in 1980 its borrowing activities abroad. The value of identified foreign loans had increased from \$296 million in 1979 to nearly \$800 million in 1980, arranged mainly by individual transnational banks or by consortia.

Most of the new investment projects had fallen into three groups: energy, mining and import substitution, especially for strategic products such as chemicals and transport equipment. The role of TNCs in the energy sector had been particularly important in view of South Africa's dependence on external sources of petroleum and of the Government's goal of self-sufficiency. The activities of some TNCs in the coal and oil sectors, and in oil-from-coal projects, as well as the flow of foreign capital through international loans, undermined international efforts against apartheid. Yet, except for efforts by some countries to discourage the flow of capital and technology to South Africa, most home Governments of TNCs operating there had not responded to the concerns of the international community.

Regarding employment practices, the report said that some TNCs had recognized black trade unions in 1980, but on the whole it did not seem that the TNC practices had made significant contributions in the area of wages or industrial relations; with few exceptions, they did not differ substantially from those of South African enterprises.

In September,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission recommended to the Economic and Social Council a draft resolution on TNC activities in southern Africa (see below).

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION (NOVEMBER). Adopting on 2 November the resolution proposed by the Commission on Transnational Corporations,<sup>(7)</sup> the Economic and Social Council condemned those TNCs which collaborated with South Africa and urged all TNCs to comply fully with United Nations resolutions by terminating all further investments in South Africa and Namibia and by ending their collaboration. It called on all home countries of TNCs to take steps to terminate such collaboration by their corporations, to prevent new investments and reinvestments, and to bring about an immediate withdrawal of all existing investments in Namibia; and it called on institutions which owned shares of TNCs operating in South Africa and Namibia to withdraw their holdings. The Council reaffirmed that the code of conduct on TNCs (p. 600) should include measures against their collaboration with South Africa, and requested the Secretary-General to intensify the collection and dissemination of information on TNC activities in southern Africa, to arrange for public hearings by the Commis-

sion and to present further reports to the Commission.

The resolution was adopted by a roll-call vote of 35 to 5, with 8 abstentions.

Speaking for the European Community members represented on the Council, the United Kingdom said they could not support the resolution because it contained some unacceptable elements, though they abhorred and rejected apartheid and were committed to peaceful change in southern Africa. The United States said it was unable to support the text, as the competence to adopt measures constituting sanctions lay exclusively with the Security Council.

During the Council debate, Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries, said the resumed financial and banking support to South Africa's public sector had a clear political significance; also, although some developed countries had induced TNCs to apply codes of conduct in employment matters, the corporations had not always observed the codes and had followed South African labour legislation, which sanctioned apartheid. Nigeria said many corporations had not observed the United Nations stipulations that the purpose of their activities in southern Africa should be to improve living and working conditions; some corporations seemed to have increased their investments in South Africa, thus strengthening the position of the racist minority regime and contributing to a deterioration in the situation instead of helping to improve political conditions.

The German Democratic Republic and the USSR spoke in support of the resolution; in the USSR's opinion, the Secretariat's Centre on Transnational Corporations should establish closer co-operation with the Centre against Apartheid in its research on TNC activities in South Africa.

**ACTION BY THE SUB-COMMISSION ON DISCRIMINATION AND MINORITIES.** In a resolution on adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of assistance given to racist regimes in southern Africa, adopted on 9 September,<sup>(11)</sup> the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities recommended to its parent body, the Commission on Human Rights, that the Group of Three set up under the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid<sup>(8)</sup> should be asked whether the actions of TNCs operating in South Africa came under the definition of the crime of apartheid, and whether or not legal action could be taken under the Convention (p. 946).

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** The activities of TNCs in South Africa were dealt with in two of the resolutions on apartheid which the General

Assembly adopted on 17 December. In its main resolution on the South Africa situation,<sup>(9)</sup> the Assembly condemned TNCs that collaborated with the racist regime and with apartheid institutions in South Africa. In its resolution on sanctions,<sup>(10)</sup> the Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the Seminar on TNCs and South Africa, requested the Secretary-General and United Nations organizations to deny contracts or facilities to TNCs that collaborated with South Africa, and requested the Committee against Apartheid to publicize the activities of such corporations.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid, many speakers, among them the Byelorussian SSR, Nicaragua and the Ukrainian SSR, stated that the co-operation of certain Western Powers and their TNCs with South Africa supported the apartheid policy. Bulgaria remarked that more than 2,000 Western companies, over 540 of them American, had economic interests in South Africa. Bahrain urged that the countries concerned forbid TNCs from trading or otherwise co-operating with South Africa.

The TNCs operating in South Africa were also criticized for bolstering apartheid through their labour policy. Angola stated that they had created the migrant labour system and the poverty and deprivation resulting from it. Egypt thought it illogical to expect that TNCs in South Africa would work to eliminate racial discrimination, since apartheid enabled them to reap tremendous profits through cheap labour.

The Nordic States described steps they had taken to curb investments in South Africa (p. 187).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49; <sup>(2)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(3)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8; <sup>(4)</sup>Secretariat, E/C.10/83 & Corr.1,2; <sup>(5)</sup>Seminar on TNCs and South Africa, ST/HR/SER.A/9.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(6)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 8(XXXVII), 23 Feb. <sup>(7)</sup>ESC: 1981/86, 2 Nov., text following. GA: <sup>(8)</sup>3068(XXVIII), annex, 30 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 103); <sup>(9)</sup>36/172 A, para. 5, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 162); <sup>(10)</sup>36/172 D, 17 Dec. (p. 171). <sup>(11)</sup>SCPDP (report, E/CN.4/1512): 6(XXXIV), para. 4, 9 Sep.

Decision: <sup>(12)</sup>ESC: 1981/141, 8 May (p. 946).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(13)</sup>1980, p. 809.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.42, 43 (21 Oct., 2 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/86

35-5-8 (roll-call vote) Meeting 43 2 November 1981

Draft by Commission on TNCs (E/1981/49); agenda item 12.

Activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa and their collaboration with the racist minority régime in that area

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New Inter-

national Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling also General Assembly resolutions 35/206 F of 16 December 1980, entitled "Role of transnational corporations in South Africa", 35/227 A of 6 March 1981, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa", and 35/227 B of 6 March 1981, entitled "Intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in support of Namibia", and the Special Declaration on Namibia adopted at the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981,

Reaffirming the resolutions adopted by the Commission on Transnational Corporations at its previous sessions on the activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa and their collaboration with the racist minority regime in that area,

Having considered the report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations entitled "Transnational corporations in southern Africa: update on financial activities and employment practices",

Considering the internationally documented fact that the employment practices of transnational corporations in southern Africa have brought no positive contribution to the improvement of the situation of the majority populations in that area,

Considering also that the operations of transnational corporations in the industrial and technological development of South Africa contribute to the survival of the racist minority regime and the continued illegal occupation of Namibia,

Considering further that the role of transnational corporations in critical sectors of South Africa's economy undermines the sustained efforts of the international community directed against the policy of apartheid and the continued illegal occupation of Namibia,

Concerned that some Governments of home countries of transnational corporations operating in southern Africa have not taken effective measures at the national level which respond directly to the concerns of the international community to prevent collaboration by transnational corporations with the racist minority régime in southern Africa,

Affirming the need for action at the international level by intergovernmental as well as non-governmental organizations in order to complement national measures,

1. Notes with satisfaction the report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations entitled "Transnational corporations in southern Africa: update on financial activities and employment practices";

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretariat for the efforts made by it to publicize in home countries of transnational corporations information on the activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa;

3. Reaffirms the legitimate struggle of the people of South Africa and Namibia towards self-determination and independence, including their right to armed struggle;

4. Commends those non-governmental organizations which have made efforts to combat apartheid and, in particular, to stop bank loans and capital transfers to South Africa and calls upon such organizations to intensify their useful efforts in these areas;

5. Welcomes as a positive step the policies of some Governments to bring about an end to the activities of their transnational corporations in southern Africa;

6. Condemns the racist minority regime in South Africa for its perpetuation of the inhuman system of apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia;

7. Condemns those transnational corporations which collaborate with the racist minority régime in southern Africa, and calls upon all transnational corporations to respect the various United Nations resolutions concerning southern Africa;

8. Condemns the actions of those home countries of transnational corporations designed to promote and perpetuate investments by their transnational corporations in South

Africa and Namibia in contravention of United Nations resolutions;

9. Calls upon all home countries of transnational corporations to take effective measures to terminate the collaboration of their transnational corporations with the racist minority régime in southern Africa, to prevent further new investments and reinvestments and to bring about an immediate withdrawal of all existing investments in Namibia;

10. Calls upon all those countries concerned to re-examine their relations with the transnational corporations operating in their territories which collaborate with the racist minority régime in southern Africa;

11. Calls upon all anti-apartheid movements, religious institutions and bodies, trade unions, universities and other institutions which are shareholders of transnational corporations operating in South Africa and Namibia to contribute to the efforts of the international community to eradicate apartheid by withdrawing their shareholdings in such transnational corporations;

12. Urges all transnational corporations to comply fully with the relevant United Nations resolutions by terminating all further investments in South Africa and Namibia and by ending their collaboration with the racist minority régime;

13. Reaffirms Security Council resolution 301(1971) of 20 October 1971 calling upon all States to abstain from entering into economic relations with South Africa in respect of Namibia and declaring that rights, titles or contracts granted to individuals or corporations by South Africa after the termination of the mandate are not subject to protection or espousal by their home States against the claims of a future lawful government of Namibia;

14. Reaffirms that the code of conduct on transnational corporations should include effective measures against the collaboration of transnational corporations with the racist minority régime in southern Africa;

15. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To intensify the useful work of the Secretariat in the collection and dissemination of information on the activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa;

(b) To make arrangements for the organization of public hearings, at an appropriate time, to be conducted by the Commission on Transnational Corporations or an ad hoc body, with the assistance of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations, on the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia;

(c) To disseminate the text of the present resolution as widely as possible, particularly to anti-apartheid movements, religious institutions and bodies, trade unions, universities and other institutions and transnational corporations operating in South Africa and Namibia, and to seek their reaction and follow-up action thereon;

(d) To report to the Commission on Transnational Corporations at its eighth session on the measures taken in pursuance of the present resolution;

(e) To prepare a report on the policies and practices of transnational corporations regarding their activities in South Africa and Namibia for the Commission on Transnational Corporations at its ninth session, and to include as an annex to that report a list of transnational corporations which continue to operate in strategic sectors, including military and nuclear sectors, of the southern African economy in violation of United Nations resolutions, as well as those transnational corporations which have taken measures to terminate their activities in such sectors.

Roll-call vote in Council as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, China, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Thailand, Turkey, USSR, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Denmark, Ireland, Italy, Malawi, Norway, Spain.

### Israel and South Africa

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. The Acting Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid transmitted to the Secretary-General on 9 September 1981 a special report by the Committee on recent developments concerning relations between Israel and South Africa,<sup>(1)</sup> prepared in pursuance of a 1980 General Assembly request.<sup>(3)</sup> The report stated that, during the 12 months under review, the collaboration had become systematic and covered a wide range of political, military, nuclear, economic and cultural relations.

The report said that Lucas Mangope and Chief Patrick Mphahlele, the Presidents of the bantustans Bophuthatswana and Venda, respectively, had visited Israel in 1980. Israeli officials had also visited South Africa.

There had been persistent reports of increasing nuclear collaboration between Israel, Taiwan and South Africa. According to those reports, South Africa was the main supplier of uranium to Israel and Taiwan, and shared its uranium extraction process with them. The United States Department of State and intelligence sources had reported that the three were collaborating on a nuclear-weapons programme and developing a strategic cruise missile with a nuclear warhead delivery capacity of 1,500 miles. At Salisbury Island, South Africa, Resheff class single-missile gunboats were being constructed under contract with Israel.

Trade between Israel and South Africa had been increasing rapidly; during the first nine months of 1980, Israeli exports to South Africa reportedly totalled \$33 million while its imports totalled \$63 million. Bank Leumi and its subsidiary, the Union Bank, had begun selling krugers in Israel. In December 1980, South Africa and Israel had concluded a trade agreement, providing Israel with 125 million rands of easy South African credit over the following three years, allowing South Africa to invest approximately R 45 million in Israel and permitting the Israel bonds campaign to operate in South Africa. Agreements in principle had also been reached to increase Israel's fishing rights off the South African coast and to increase South Africa's coal quota to Israel from the current 1 million tons per annum to 3 million tons.

Relations existed also in the areas of culture, sports and science. An Israeli soccer team had toured Bophuthatswana in June 1981, while South Africa had participated in Israel's Maccabi Games in July. Joint medical and scientific research programmes had been carried out, and a conference on operation research had been held in February as a joint venture between the Operation Research Societies of Israel and South Africa.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly strongly condemned Israel's continuing and increasing collaboration with South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields, and demanded that Israel desist from and terminate all such collaboration. It requested the Committee against Apartheid to keep the matter under constant review and report to the Assembly and the Security Council as appropriate.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 104 to 19, with 17 abstentions.

The Sudan, which introduced the 48-nation resolution, pointed to what it saw as the danger arising from relations between the two countries and cited, as a recent example of military collaboration, the visit of the Israeli Defence Minister to South Africa in December.

Israel did not participate in the vote, saying that it wished to express its abhorrence at the cynical debasement of the discussion. It was the only country singled out for specific condemnation in a special resolution based on patent falsehoods. The sponsors of the resolution had ignored official Israeli communications refuting the false allegations and had instead relied on the unsupported distortions, innuendoes and speculative press reports cited in the Committee's report. During the Assembly debate on apartheid, Israel reaffirmed its strong and absolute opposition to apartheid, stating that there was no evidence of anything special or different in its relations with South Africa; the unending diatribes against Israel only served to subvert and discredit the United Nations role in the genuine battle against racism.

Voting against the resolution, Ireland believed the text inappropriately singled out one State for selective condemnation. Australia, Austria, New Zealand and Norway, the last speaking for the Nordic States, cited similar reasons for their negative votes, as did Argentina, the Bahamas, Chile, Costa Rica and Greece for their abstentions. Reservations about the condemnation of Israel for its collaboration with South Africa were also voiced by Jamaica and Thailand, which voted in favour.

During the Assembly debate, most Arab States condemned co-operation between Israel and South Africa, and many added that the two régimes applied similar racist policies in areas subject to their domination.

ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON NEW AND RENEWABLE SOURCES OF ENERGY. In a resolution of 21 August on the right of nations to develop and control non-fossil energy resources,<sup>(2)</sup> the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 689) warned against the danger of joint military nuclear

activities between Israel and South Africa. This provision was in a resolution by which the Conference condemned Israeli aggression against Iraq's nuclear research centre (p. 279).

Explaining its negative vote, Israel denied allegations of nuclear co-operation, stating that no evidence had been adduced. It added that it accounted for a mere two fifths of 1 per cent of South Africa's international trade and that virtually every nation was represented in the other 99.6 per cent.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22/Add.1-S/14689/Add.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (report, A/CONF.100/11, Sales No. E.81.I.24):2, para. 2, 21 Aug. GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/206 H, para. 3, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 223); <sup>(4)</sup>36/172 M, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 102, 103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (1.5 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/172 M

104-19-17 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981

48-nation draft (A/36/L.46 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Relations between Israel and South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling and reaffirming its resolution 35/206 H of 16 December 1980,

Having considered the special report of the Special Committee against Apartheid on recent developments concerning relations between Israel and South Africa,

Gravely concerned about the reports of continued collaboration between Israel and South Africa, in particular in the military and nuclear fields,

Considering that such collaboration is a serious hindrance to international action for the eradication of apartheid, an encouragement to the racist régime of South Africa to persist in its criminal policy of apartheid and a hostile act against the oppressed people of South Africa and the entire African continent, and constitutes a threat to international peace and security,

1. Strongly condemns the continuing and increasing collaboration of Israel with the racist régime of South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields;

2. Demands that Israel desist from and terminate all forms of collaboration with South Africa forthwith, particularly in the military and nuclear fields, and abide scrupulously by the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council;

3. Requests the Special Committee against Apartheid to keep the matter under constant review and to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council as appropriate.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon,

Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Burma, Chile, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Greece, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

### Non-recognition of the independence of the Ciskei

Both the Security Council and the General Assembly denounced the proclamation by South Africa of the Ciskei, a bantustan, as a so-called independent State on 4 December 1981.

LETTER FROM THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. The Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid by a letter of 19 November,<sup>(1)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a statement approved by the Committee on 17 November, calling on the international community to denounce the so-called "independence" of the Ciskei, to refrain from direct or indirect recognition of its authorities or any dealings with them and to proclaim that the 2.1 million people of Ciskeian origin retained their inalienable rights as citizens of South Africa as a whole.

The proclamation of so-called independence, the statement said, was part of the plan to ensure total white domination of South Africa and to dispossess the African people of their inalienable rights in their own country. The Ciskei had a population of 636,000, while the South African régime regarded 2.1 million people of Ciskeian origin all over South Africa as "citizens" of the Ciskei. An area of 8,300 square kilometres, or 2.4 per cent of South Africa, with low farm income and hardly any industry, it suffered from high population density and extreme poverty and unemployment. Chief Lennon Sebe, the Chief Minister of the Ciskei, and his brother Brigadier Charles Sebe, Ciskei's intelligence chief, had established a régime of terror with brutal repression against trade union leaders, students and others, in order to suppress the widespread resistance to their collusion with the Pretoria régime.

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION. At a meeting on 15 December, the Security Council condemned and declared invalid the proclamation of the Ciskei's "independence". The Council's position was set out in a statement made on its behalf by

its President, after consultation with the members. The statement,<sup>(4)</sup> read out at the meeting, was as follows:

"The Security Council notes that on 4 December 1981, the South African régime proclaimed the Ciskei, an integral part of South African territory, a so-called 'independent' State, in pursuance of its apartheid and bantustanization policy.

The Security Council recalls its resolution 417(1977), in which it demanded that the racist régime of South Africa should abolish the policy of bantustanization. It also recalls its resolutions 402(1976) and 407(1977), in which it endorsed General Assembly resolution 31/6 A of 26 October 1976 on the matter. The Council further takes note of General Assembly resolution 32/105 N of 14 December 1977 on the question of bantustans.

The Council does not recognize the so-called 'independent homelands' in South Africa: it condemns the purported proclamation of the 'independence' of the Ciskei and declares it totally invalid. This action by the South African régime, following similar proclamations in the case of the Transkei, Bophuthatswana and Venda, denounced by the international community, is designed to divide and dispossess the African people and establish client States under its domination in order to perpetuate apartheid. It seeks to create a class of foreign people in their own country. It further aggravates the situation in the region and hinders international efforts for just and lasting solutions.

The Security Council calls upon all Governments to deny any form of recognition to the so-called 'independent' bantustans, to refrain from any dealings with them, to reject travel documents issued by them, and urges Governments of Member States to take effective measures within their constitutional framework to discourage all individuals, corporations and other institutions under their jurisdiction from having any dealings with the so-called 'independent' bantustans."

The meeting was convened following receipt of a letter of 7 December<sup>(2)</sup> from Botswana, on behalf of the African Group, inviting the Council President to consult with members on appropriate action. The Group said the action was designed to divide and dispossess the Africans and establish client States under South Africa's domination in order to perpetuate apartheid.

On 28 December, South Africa transmitted to the Council President a letter of the same date from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information<sup>(3)</sup> saying that the President's statement was reprehensible and that the Council had no authority or jurisdiction to involve itself in the matter. Accordingly, South Africa rejected the statement as an attempt to deny the people of the Ciskei their right to self-determination. The decision to grant independence to the Ciskei had been taken in exercise of South Africa's sovereign right in response to a request by the Ciskei, following a referendum in which a sub-

stantial majority of the people of the Ciskei opted for independence. The letter concluded that no decision by the Council or any other United Nations body could eliminate the fact that the Republic of the Ciskei was now an independent State.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In its resolution of 17 December on the South Africa situation,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly denounced the proclamation of the so-called "independence" of the Ciskei and again called on all States and organizations to refrain from any recognition of or co-operation with the so-called "independent" bantustans.

During the debate on apartheid, many speakers, including Bhutan, the Byelorussian SSR, Djibouti, the Gambia, Hungary, Japan, Madagascar, Mongolia, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Trinidad and Tobago, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Kingdom (for the European Community members), the United States, Yugoslavia and Zambia, rejected South Africa's bantustan programme and pledged to withhold recognition of the so-called independent bantustans, including the Ciskei. More Africans were to be deprived of their citizenship, said Cyprus, and transferred forcibly to densely populated areas with the aim of dismembering the country. Greece, Ireland and Venezuela condemned bantustanization as a policy designed to deprive thousands of Africans of their human rights.

The Niger and others supported the view of the Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid that the policy of bantustanization was aimed at strengthening white South African domination while confining the black population in so-called States which were nothing but satellites, providing South Africa with its own reserves of cheap labour and a dumping-ground for the infirm and elderly. Albania saw the policy as turning South Africa into a veritable concentration camp for more than 20 million blacks. Gabon said the Government was increasingly thinking in terms of a white State from which blacks would be banned. Africans were being deprived of their citizenship and ethnic differences were being exacerbated, Hungary and the Lao People's Democratic Republic commented. The USSR remarked that the policy sought to relegate the indigenous population to 10 bantustans comprising only 13 per cent of South Africa's territory, on land least suitable for supporting human life. The United States described the policy as cruel in bestowing "homelands citizenship" on 6 million urban blacks who might never have seen those poor lands.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman, 19 Nov., A/36/708; <sup>(2)</sup>Botswana, for African Group, 7 Dec., S/14787; <sup>(3)</sup>South Africa, 28 Dec., S/14817.

Note: <sup>(4)</sup>SC President, S/14794.  
 Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>GA, 36/172 A, paras. 9 & 10, 17 Dec.  
 (p. 162).  
 Meeting record: SC, S/PV.2315 (15 Dec.).

### Situation in South Africa

Violations of human rights in South Africa continued to be considered by United Nations bodies in 1981. Members of the Security Council, in a statement by its President, expressed grave concern over death sentences imposed on three members of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) (see below), and the General Assembly again demanded the release of all political prisoners (p. 196). The Assembly also appealed for solidarity with and assistance to South African women and children in their liberation struggle (p. 198).

Economic and social conditions in South Africa were the subject of a report of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (p. 200). The Trade and Development Board requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to assist national liberation movements of southern Africa on trade and development issues (p. 209).

Reviewing the year's developments in South Africa, the Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid told the General Assembly in November that there had been a further mobilization of the oppressed people against racist tyranny. Blacks and many whites had joined in a massive boycott of celebrations organized by the régime in May to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the Republic. The nearly total boycott of elections to the South African Indian Council (4 November) had shown the futility of manoeuvres to divide the blacks. Armed resistance had increased, with attacks by freedom fighters on police stations, apartheid institutions and military installations. Action by the international community would determine whether freedom would come through martyrdom or through the creation of a non-racial society by means of consultation.

### Sentencing of ANC members

Three members of ANC were sentenced to death in 1981 by the Pretoria Supreme Court, and three others were awaiting an appeal from death sentences imposed in 1980. Those sentenced in November 1980—Ncimbithi Johnson Lubisi, Naphtali Manana and Petrus Tsepo Mashigo—had been tried on charges of treason and attempted murder in connection with January 1980 attacks on a bank at Silverton (a suburb of Pretoria) and a police station in northern Transvaal. The three others—David Moise, Johannes Shabangu and Anthony Tsotsobe—were sentenced on 19 August 1981 for a June 1980 attack on instal-

lations of SASOL (the South African parastatal oil corporation) and assaults on a police station and a constable's house. The Security Council met twice during 1981 on these cases.

COMMUNICATION. Egypt, by a letter of 23 January 1981 to the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> denounced the 1980 death sentences as a crime against humanity, appealed to world public opinion to mobilize efforts to secure the immediate release of all African nationals in South African prisons and called on national and international organizations to ensure the implementation of sanctions against South Africa.

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION (FEBRUARY). On 5 February 1981, the Council met following consultations on a November 1980 letter concerning the sentences, sent by Senegal as Chairman of the African Group.<sup>(7)</sup> The President read out the following statement on behalf of the Council members:<sup>(4)</sup>

"The members of the Security Council have entrusted me to express, on their behalf, their grave concern over the death sentences recently passed by the Transvaal Division of the Supreme Court at Pretoria on Ncimbithi Johnson Lubisi (28), Petrus Tsepo Mashigo (20) and Naphtali Manana (24), and which may be considered shortly by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court at Bloemfontein.

Having this in mind, I strongly urge that the Government of South Africa, in order to avert further aggravating the situation in South Africa, should take into account the concerns expressed for the lives of these three young men."

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION (AUGUST). On 27 August, the Niger, on behalf of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries members of the Council, transmitted a letter of 24 August<sup>(2)</sup> to the Council President from the ANC representative to the United Nations, Johnstone F. Makatini, conveying a request of the ANC National Executive Committee for action by the Council to save the lives of the three ANC members sentenced to death on 19 August. That verdict and sentence, the letter added, was designed to pave the way for indiscriminate prosecution and execution of all opponents of the apartheid régime. The Niger requested a Council meeting at the earliest possible opportunity to consider this matter.

The Council met on this request the same day and decided to invite Mr. Makatini under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.<sup>a</sup> The proposal to invite the ANC representative was made by the Niger, Tunisia and Uganda in a letter of 27 August.

<sup>a</sup> Rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure reads: "The Security Council may invite members of the Secretariat or other persons, whom it considers competent for the purpose, to supply it with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence."



During the Council debate, all speakers expressed concern at the death sentences. China condemned them as outrageous criminal acts, while Mexico saw them as proof that Pretoria despised international public opinion and systematically denied United Nations principles. Although the ANC members had been condemned for alleged acts of sabotage, said the Niger, the sentences were obviously linked to their everyday struggle against the apartheid régime. In Uganda's view, the Council must make clear that it was dealing not with a normal judicial process but with a political situation which had given rise to oppression leading to resistance and to the death sentences; it should do nothing which would comfort the forces of apartheid or which might be interpreted as equivocation.

The German Democratic Republic, Panama, the Philippines, Spain and Tunisia were among those calling for urgent Council action to save the lives of young patriots; the Philippines expressed disappointment and astonishment that there had been opposition to such an appeal. In France's opinion, the Council, through its President, should unanimously express concern and appeal to South Africa to take that concern into account in order not to aggravate the situation. Ireland supported an appeal by the President on behalf of Council members, and Japan wanted the members' concern conveyed immediately to South Africa. The USSR said it supported the convening of the Council in order to prevent a fresh crime against those combating apartheid; it also supported the proposal of the non-aligned countries that the President make a statement on behalf of the Council.

The United Kingdom said it understood that the judicial process in the case might not be complete; however, on humanitarian grounds alone, the death sentences, if confirmed, should call for clemency. The United States strongly urged the South African Government to take into serious account the concern expressed not only regarding the lives of the three men but also regarding the need not to enhance the tensions within the country.

Mr. Makatini appealed to the Council to make its voice heard in order to save the lives of the three patriots who, in the eyes of the entire black community in South Africa, were freedom fighters; the Council could not afford by omission to encourage further deterioration of the South Africa situation, whose explosion might poison race relations not only in Africa but throughout the world for decades to come.

The Council adjourned without setting a date for a further meeting on the subject.

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID.** In its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(5)</sup> the Committee against Apartheid strongly condemned the imposition of death sentences on six freedom fighters. It considered the sentences imposed on 19 August to be particularly alarming, as they set the precedent of death sentences in cases in which no loss of life had resulted from the alleged actions of the accused. The court's conclusion that membership in ANC showed a common purpose and conspiracy to commit "terrorism" opened the way to mass executions of members of the national liberation movement. The Committee warned that the execution of patriots was bound to lead to grave repercussions and might well lead to reprisals by the liberation movement against the régime and its supporters.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** In the preamble to its 17 December resolution on political prisoners in South Africa,<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly expressed alarm at the imposition of death sentences on six freedom fighters and the recent assassination of attorney Griffith Mxenge (p. 197).

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Egypt, 23 Jan., A/36/79; <sup>(2)</sup>Niger, for non-aligned countries, 27 Aug., S/14648; <sup>(3)</sup>Niger, Tunisia, Uganda, 27 Aug., S/14653.

Note: <sup>(4)</sup>SC President, S/14361.

Report: <sup>(5)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolution: <sup>(6)</sup>GA, 36/172 J, 17 Dec. (p. 198).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1980, p. 228.

Meeting records: SC, S/PV.2264, 2295 (5 Feb., 27 Aug.).

#### Political prisoners

**ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID.** The Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid, in a press statement of 10 March 1981, denounced the capture of ANC members reportedly abducted by South African forces—three from Mozambique on 30 January and one from Swaziland on 19 February—and urged Governments to exert their influence to persuade South Africa to release and return them.

In its 1981 report,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee noted again with utmost concern that, despite repeated calls by the United Nations and the international community, the apartheid régime had failed to release political prisoners and detainees and grant prisoner-of-war status to captured freedom fighters, and instead had intensified repression and instituted numerous trials. There had been increasing evidence of torture of political detainees, and the régime had even resorted to kidnapping and assassination of members of national liberation movements from neighbouring countries.

The Committee noted with satisfaction that the national liberation movement of South Africa had adhered to the Geneva Conventions

of 12 August 1949 and Additional Protocol I of 1977 on respect for human rights in armed conflicts. It recommended that, in the light of the escalating repression by the apartheid régime and its grave repercussions, the General Assembly should warn the régime of the grave consequences of continued repression and execution of patriots, call on all parties to the Geneva Conventions to take effective measures to grant prisoner-of-war status to captured freedom fighters, and request all Governments to help promote the campaign for the release of all political prisoners in South Africa.

On 12 October, the Committee held two meetings in observance of the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners (11 October). After hearing statements by United Nations and national liberation movement officials, it adopted a Declaration by which it appealed to Governments, organizations and individuals: to denounce the brutal repression in South Africa; to demand the immediate and unconditional release of all those imprisoned, restricted, banished or exiled for their opposition to apartheid; to publicize and mobilize support for their noble ideals; to honour the martyrs and leaders in the South African liberation struggle; and to support that struggle by implementing United Nations resolutions for the isolation of the apartheid régime and for assistance to the liberation movements. This Declaration was transmitted to the Secretary-General for the attention of the General Assembly and the Security Council by a letter of 13 October from the Committee Chairman.<sup>(1)</sup>

On 27 November, the Chairman expressed indignation at the assassination in Durban, South Africa, of Griffith Mxenge, an attorney who had defended a number of political prisoners in South Africa. In a statement of the same date, he expressed shock at the death in police custody of Tshifhiwa Muofhe, a leader of the banned Black People's Convention.

On 1 December, the Chairman issued a statement denouncing the arrest of over 30 trade unionists, as well as student and other leaders. He expressed concern on 8 December at reports of a hunger strike among a number of political prisoners on Robben Island.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly demanded again that South Africa end repression against the black people and other opponents of apartheid, cease all trials under arbitrary repressive laws, refrain from executing persons sentenced under those laws for acts arising from opposition to apartheid, release all political prisoners and abrogate bans on organizations and the media for their opposition to

apartheid. It urged Governments and organizations to act for an end to repression and for the release of all political prisoners in South Africa, and requested the Committee against Apartheid with the assistance of the United Nations Centre against Apartheid, to continue to promote the world campaign for the release of all political prisoners in South Africa. By a preambular paragraph, the Assembly expressed alarm at the death sentences imposed on six freedom fighters (p. 196) and at the assassination of Mr. Mxenge.

The Assembly, in its resolution on the South Africa situation, adopted on the same date,<sup>(3)</sup> demanded that the apartheid régime treat captured freedom fighters as prisoners of war under the 1949 Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocol I. Also on 17 December, in a resolution on the work programme of the Committee against Apartheid,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly requested the Committee to give the highest priority in 1982 to promoting the world campaign for the unconditional release of all persons imprisoned or restricted for their opposition to apartheid.

Introducing the 68-nation resolution on political prisoners, Finland said that, in view of the death sentences pending against six ANC members and the recent arrests of numerous black trade union leaders, students and others, the resolution had particular urgency. Wide support for the text should help persuade South Africa to change its policies and convey a message of solidarity to the victims and opponents of apartheid.

Argentina and the Netherlands expressed reservations about the provision in the resolution on the South Africa situation concerning prisoner-of-war status under the Geneva Conventions and Protocol; the Netherlands questioned the applicability of those instruments, while Argentina said it was still studying the Protocol.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid, many countries, including the United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community members, called for the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners. The Lao People's Democratic Republic called for a campaign to free those imprisoned for resistance to apartheid or at least give them the status of political prisoners. The Sudan also urged assistance to the prisoners and their families and a halt to arbitrary arrests. Sweden appealed for the release of Nelson Mandela and other imprisoned leaders of the majority, stating that they could make an important contribution to South Africa's transition to a democratic society.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman, 13 Oct., A/36/592-S/14724.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee against Apartheid. A/36/22.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>36/172 A, para. 14, 17 Dec. (p. 163); <sup>(4)</sup>36/172 J, 17 Dec., text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/172 N, para. 2 (e), 17 Dec. (p. 214).  
 Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.  
 Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81. 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 J

Adopted without vote Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
 68-nation draft (A/36/L.43 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Political prisoners in South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions concerning political prisoners in South Africa, in particular resolution 35/206 K of 16 December 1980,

Noting with grave concern the continued escalation of repression against all opponents of apartheid in South Africa, including the persecution of black trade unionists, students and journalists, as well as the threats against churches,

Alarmed at the imposition of death sentences on six freedom fighters, namely, Mr. Johannes Shabangu, Mr. Anthony Tsotsobe, Mr. David Moise, Mr. Ncimbithi Johnson Lubisi, Mr. Naphtali Manana and Mr. Petrus Tsepo Mashigo,

Further alarmed at the recent assassination of attorney Griffith Mxenge and other opponents of the apartheid régime,

Considering that the continued repression against and executions of opponents of apartheid are bound to have grave repercussions,

Taking note of the Declaration adopted by the Special Committee against Apartheid on 12 October 1981 to commemorate the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners,

Reaffirming the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa for the elimination of apartheid and the establishment of a democratic society,

1. Demands again that the racist régime of South Africa:

(a) End repression against the black people and other opponents of apartheid;

(b) Cease all trials under arbitrary repressive laws;

(c) Refrain from the execution of persons sentenced under such repressive laws for acts arising from opposition to apartheid;

(d) Release all political prisoners in South Africa;

(e) Abrogate bans imposed on organizations and the media for their opposition to apartheid;

2. Expresses its appreciation to those Governments, cities, organizations and institutions that have honoured the leaders of the struggle against apartheid imprisoned or restricted by the South African régime, as part of the campaign for the release of political prisoners in South Africa;

3. Urges all Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to take all appropriate action for an end to repression and for the release of all political prisoners in South Africa, and to lend their co-operation to the Special Committee against Apartheid;

4. Requests the Special Committee, with the assistance of the Centre against Apartheid of the Secretariat, to continue to promote the world campaign for the release of all political prisoners in South Africa.

#### Women and children under apartheid

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. During the year, the Committee against Apartheid and its Task Force on Women and Children under Apartheid continued to devote attention to the plight of women and children under apartheid their role in the national liberation struggle and ways of promoting assistance to them. The Task Force consulted with the liberation movements and the Non-Governmental Organizations Sub-Committee on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Apartheid and Decolonization.

In its 1981 report,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee urged that international action in solidarity with the struggle of women in South Africa and Namibia should be intensified, particularly with respect to mobilization of world opinion and increased assistance. It declared its intention to expand its activities to that end and invited Governments and organizations to co-operate. It planned to send a mission to the relevant projects of national liberation movements and front-line States in order to consult on means to promote greater assistance to them; to expand contacts with women's organizations all over the world; and to organize in 1982 an international conference in co-operation with the newly established International Committee of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia (p. 199).

The Committee recommended that the General Assembly proclaim 9 August as International Day of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia (p. 199), appeal to Governments and organizations for assistance to projects of the national liberation movement and front-line States and invite United Nations Secretariat units to co-operate on publicity for the plight of women and children under apartheid and their struggle for national liberation.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly encouraged the Committee against Apartheid to intensify activities in support of women and children oppressed by apartheid, through conferences, seminars and missions. It appealed to Governments and organizations to contribute to the projects of national liberation movements and front-line States for assistance to refugee women and children from South Africa. It requested the Secretary-General to ensure the closest co-operation by the Secretariat's Centre against Apartheid Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs and Department of Public Information on maximum publicity for the plight of women and children under apartheid and their struggle for national liberation. It invited Governments and organizations to observe 9 August annually as the International Day of Soli-

darity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia (see below).

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 145 to none, with 2 abstentions. The 63-nation text was introduced by Indonesia.

In a resolution of 28 October on the self-determination of peoples,<sup>(2)</sup> the Assembly demanded the immediate release of children detained in Namibian and South African prisons.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/9, para. 22, 28 Oct. (p. 896); <sup>(3)</sup>36/172 K, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 K

145-0-2 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981

63-nation draft (A/36/L.44 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Women and children under apartheid

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/206 N of 16 December 1980,

Gravely concerned about the inhuman oppression of millions of women and children under apartheid, resulting in the killing, detention and torture of schoolchildren protesting against discrimination, the enforced separation of women from their husbands and mass starvation in the reserves,

Commending the Special Committee against Apartheid and its Task Force on Women and Children for giving special attention to the plight of women and children under apartheid,

Noting the wide observance of 9 August 1981 as the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia,

Noting with appreciation the establishment of the International Committee of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia,

1. Invites all Governments and organizations to observe 9 August annually as the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia;

2. Encourages the Special Committee against Apartheid to intensify activities in support of women and children oppressed by apartheid, and authorizes it to organize conferences, seminars and missions for this purpose;

3. Appeals to all Governments and organizations to provide generous contributions to the projects of the national liberation movements and front-line States for assistance to refugee women and children from South Africa;

4. Invites the co-operation of all Governments and organizations with the Special Committee in promoting solidarity with and assistance to the women and children of South Africa in their struggle for liberation;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure the closest co-operation by the Centre against Apartheid and the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs as well as the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, with a view to maximum publicity for the plight of women and children under apartheid and their struggle for national liberation.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United Kingdom, United States.

#### Day of Solidarity (9 August)

On the recommendation of its Task Force on Women and Children under Apartheid, the Committee against Apartheid decided to observe 9 August 1981, the twenty-fifth anniversary of a demonstration by women against the South African pass laws in Pretoria, as the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia. At a meeting on 11 August, the Committee heard statements by United Nations and non-governmental organization officials and national liberation movement representatives. It received signatures from hundreds of organizations and individuals to a message of greetings to women of South Africa and Namibia, declaring solidarity with them and all those struggling to destroy the apartheid system. Special guests invited to the meeting decided to establish an International Committee of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia, with Jeanne Martin Cissé of Guinea as Convenor.

As recommended by the Committee in its annual report,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on women and children under apartheid,<sup>(2)</sup> invited Governments and organizations to observe this Day annually on 9 August. Introducing the resolution, Indonesia said that by this observance the international community would express its solidarity with the women suffering under apartheid and its support for their righteous struggle to eliminate that repressive system.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/172 K, para. 1, 17 Dec. (above).

#### Economic and social survey

The Trade and Development Board of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), on 9 October 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to continue studies of the economic and social conditions of South Africa.

The UNCTAD secretariat submitted to the Board in August a report<sup>(1)</sup> prepared by a consultant, J. H. Mensah (Ghana), on economic conditions in Namibia (p. 1170) and South Africa. The report noted that the South African economy was the most industrially advanced in Africa, with the characteristics of a middle-rank industrialized country. Trade with neighbouring African countries provided a substantial outlet for manufactures, including machinery and equipment.

The report stated that black workers constituted some 68 per cent of the 9.3 million working population and were concentrated in agriculture and mining, where they made up some 90 per cent of the labour force. Under the migratory labour system, the African worker had no opportunity to acquire such rights as seniority, pensions and social security, to acquire skills or achieve a stable place in industrial production. Due to a growing shortage of skilled workers, however, industry had started to advocate the opening up of skilled jobs to Africans. On the other hand, the number of unemployed blacks continued to increase. The earnings gap between Africans and whites had tended to narrow in the tertiary sectors, to about one third of the average white wage, but in the most important production sectors it had tended to widen.

The report cited such aspects of South African economic and social life as resistance to full trade union rights for workers of all races; dissatisfaction over the inadequacy of housing, education, transport and recreational facilities for the black urban population; and an absence of development opportunities in the bantustans. It added that, while the business community had finally come to the conclusion that government policy must change, legislation and implementation of reforms proposed in 1979 by two South African commissions had met resistance. The changes required might well be left to a post-liberation government, and United Nations technical assistance should prepare the national liberation movements for that task.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCTAD consultant, TD/B/869/Add.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15), 238(XXIII), para. 2, 9 Oct.

#### Other aspects

Action against violations of human rights in South Africa (p. 943) was recommended in 1981 by the Commission on Human Rights.

The Economic and Social Council demanded on 8 May<sup>(1)</sup> the cessation of police and state interference in industrial disputes and the recognition of the right of the black trade union movements in South Africa to full freedom of association and to unimpeded collective bargaining. Also on that date,<sup>(2)</sup> the Council decided to transmit to the Commission's Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on southern Africa allegations regarding infringement of trade union rights in South Africa received by the Secretary-General from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and requested the Group to report to the Commission and the Council in 1982.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/41, 8 May (p. 950). Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/155, 8 May (p. 950).

#### Encouragement of public action against apartheid

Throughout 1981, the Special Committee against Apartheid continued, with General Assembly approval, to encourage public action against apartheid by promoting a boycott of apartheid sports as well as a cultural and academic boycott and other activities (see below). Work continued on the drafting of an international convention against apartheid in sports, begun in 1978 (p. 203). An International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid made recommendations, which were endorsed by the Assembly, for greater involvement and co-operation of the mass media in the international anti-apartheid campaign (p. 204). The Committee organized and/or co-sponsored several conferences, seminars, meetings and other events, and observed a number of international days in solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa (p. 207).

#### Cultural, academic and sports boycotts

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. The Committee against Apartheid continued in 1981 to promote an international campaign to achieve a total boycott of apartheid sports teams as well as a cultural and academic boycott. It issued statements commending countries and organizations that had refused to participate in matches with South African teams or to tour South Africa, and sent communications to other sports organizations urging them to end sports exchanges with that country. It repeatedly appealed to the Irish Rugby Football Union to cancel a proposed tour to South Africa, but the team went ahead with the tour in May.

In connection with a tour to New Zealand by the South African Springbok rugby team, the Committee repeatedly appealed for action to stop the tour and commended two players who

had decided not to play against the South African team. After the tour took place in July, the Chairman, in a statement of 14 September, expressed disappointment that the New Zealand Government, while expressing opposition, had not only failed to take action within its power to stop the tour, but had constantly attacked the anti-apartheid movement and provided police protection to the apartheid team.

In its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> and in a statement of 14 September, the Committee expressed serious disappointment at the fact that the United States Government had taken no action to prevent the United States tour of the South African team upon completion of its New Zealand tour. The Committee noted with satisfaction, however, that widespread public opposition to the United States tour and repeated appeals by the Committee Chairman to the authorities of the cities where the games were scheduled had resulted in cancellation of games in New York City and Rochester, New York.

In a message of 8 April to the Conference of European Ministers of Sport as well as in a press statement, the Chairman expressed concern that some sports bodies, administrators and promoters had been enticed by South African propaganda and by offers of enormous financial rewards to organize sports exchanges with South Africa. On 14 April, in a message to the Fourth Biennial Meeting of the South African Council on Sport (Durban, South Africa, 8 and 9 May) and in a press statement, the Chairman said the Committee admired the Council's continued efforts to uphold the principle of non-racialism in sports and denounced the seizure of its Secretary's passport in June 1980 on the eve of his departure for consultations at the United Nations.

The Chairman sent a letter on 23 October to the Permanent Representative of the Netherlands to the United Nations, requesting action with regard to a pamphlet issued by Royal Dutch Airlines (KLM) offering South Africa's white sports clubs assistance to compete internationally. The representative replied on 12 November that the head office of KLM had ordered its South African office to stop distributing the folder and to recall copies already sent.

On 8 December, the Chairman issued a statement commending the Welsh Rugby Union for cancelling its proposed tour of South Africa.

The first register of sports contacts with South Africa by organizations, individuals, promoters and administrators in Western and other States was published by the Committee on 15 May. The stated purpose was to enable Governments and organizations to take action with respect to sportsmen and sports administrators and promo-

ters collaborating with South Africa. The register, which was transmitted to the Organization of African Unity, was to be kept up to date and published from time to time.

In its annual report, the Committee noted with concern and regret that several sports organizations outside South Africa had promoted renewed sports contacts with that country and that some sportsmen had been enticed by exorbitant financial rewards to play in South Africa. It noted with particular regret the failure of several Governments, especially New Zealand and the United States, to take firm action to terminate sporting contacts with South Africa, and suggested that the General Assembly should deplore the attitudes of those Governments and appeal to them to co-operate in the campaign against apartheid in sports.

With regard to cultural contacts, the Committee noted with great satisfaction the movement inside South Africa to boycott tours by entertainers from abroad. It commended action by the Netherlands Parliament to terminate the cultural agreement between the Netherlands and South Africa, expressing hope that other countries would take similar action.

The Committee proposed to organize in 1982 an international conference of cultural personalities for action against apartheid and to sponsor international and national art exhibits and other events against apartheid. It also intended to initiate a register of cultural contacts with South Africa in order to promote an effective boycott.

In a press statement of 9 March, the Committee Chairman commended the organizations and individuals, including dancers, who had expressed opposition to a projected two-week tour of South Africa by the Boston Ballet of the United States, which the company's executive board had decided on 6 March to abandon in response to representations by a number of organizations.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted by a recorded vote of 124 to 5, with 14 abstentions, the General Assembly commended the Committee against Apartheid for its efforts to promote academic, cultural and sports boycotts of South Africa and to mobilize academic, cultural and sports personalities in the campaign against apartheid. It endorsed the Committee's proposal to organize national and international conferences and exhibits to promote action by academic, cultural and sports personalities against apartheid and condemned sports organizations, sportsmen and promoters of sports events that had collaborated with South Africa. It also requested continued work by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports (p. 203).

In a resolution of the same date on the work programme of the Committee against Apartheid,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly requested the Committee to give the highest priority in 1982 to promoting the participation of writers, artists and other cultural personalities in the international campaign against apartheid.

Introducing the 39-nation resolution on academic, cultural and sports boycotts, Barbados stated that there could be no normal sports or cultural environment in a country where racial discrimination was an integral part of the law.

Among those voting against the resolution, the Federal Republic of Germany said certain academic and cultural contacts with South Africa were necessary in order to maintain a dialogue, though it would continue, within its legal possibilities, to discourage sports organizations and athletes from having contacts with South Africa if they promoted and practised racial discrimination; moreover, the Federal Republic had reservations about singling out countries and about the register of sportsmen visiting South Africa. New Zealand, though declaring its support for the basic purpose of the text, objected to the criticism in the preamble directed at it and the United States for permitting tours of the Springbok rugby teams; with regard to the register, New Zealand was unconvinced that it was appropriate or defensible for a United Nations body to judge the actions of individuals. New Zealand voiced similar objections in explaining its abstention on the resolution endorsing the report and work programme of the Committee against Apartheid.

Also voting against, Portugal said contact must be kept with the people of South Africa. The United States reiterated its position that sports were not a matter for government control and added that it would be more practical and constructive to encourage integration in South African sports, as a spearhead of the movement towards greater integration in the country as a whole.

The United Kingdom, which also cast a negative vote, said the member States of the European Community strictly adhered to the Olympic principle of non-discrimination and would continue firmly to discourage sporting contacts involving racial discrimination, but they respected the independence of private sports organizations and the fundamental right to travel abroad freely.

Abstaining, Canada said that to end academic and cultural interchanges with South Africa would deny to the academic and cultural communities the opportunity of demonstrating in meetings and discussions the total unacceptability of apartheid and the need for change. The

Netherlands could not accept any infringement of certain traditional freedoms, such as the autonomy of sports organizations and the right of nationals to leave the country. Canada and the Netherlands also had reservations about the proposed convention (p. 204). Samoa believed the singling out of two States was neither necessary nor exhaustive. Australia, Austria and Solomon Islands abstained on similar grounds.

Though voting in favour, Fiji, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Spain and Thailand voiced reservations to the paragraph singling out New Zealand and the United States for criticism; Thailand remarked that New Zealand had opposed the Springbok tour and had a long record of opposition to apartheid Costa Rica, stating that it could not accept the legitimacy of requesting States to impose certain sanctions and limits on individuals, expressed reservations on the paragraph condemning sports organizations, sportsmen and promoters that had collaborated with South Africa. Japan also expressed reservations on the endorsement of the Committee's proposal to organize conferences and exhibits to promote action by academic, cultural and sports personalities.

Ireland said its support for the resolution should not give rise to expectations that it would restrict the constitutional right of its citizens to travel abroad. Speaking for the Nordic States, which also supported the text, Norway said that, in accordance with the Joint Nordic Programme of Action against South Africa, restrictive measures had been taken with regard to academic, cultural and sports exchanges; however, the Nordic States reserved their position on elements in the resolution which infringed their citizens' constitutional rights.

During the apartheid debate, the Gambia expressed the view that sports contacts with South Africa undermined efforts to isolate the regime diplomatically and conferred a de facto respectability on apartheid. Ghana stated that sports and cultural events with South African participation were on the increase because of the naivety and greed of some individuals, sporting organizations, impresarios and international agents; it hoped that, wherever possible, visas and other facilities would be withheld from those who had chosen to collaborate with the racist régime. Indonesia believed that sports, cultural and academic boycotts had a strong impact on the morale of the South African Government and should be intensified. Japan said it had decided not to issue visas to South Africans for cultural and educational exchanges or sports. Trinidad and Tobago thought that the sports boycott was the most effective weapon in the fight against apartheid.

New Zealand said it had fulfilled its commitment under the 1977 Gleneagles Agreement, in which the Commonwealth Governments had agreed that they would seek to discourage sporting contacts with South Africa by means consistent with their domestic laws and practices; however, New Zealand followed the principle that there should be no political interference in sports.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/172 I, 17 Dec., text following; <sup>(3)</sup>36/172 N, para. 2 (d), 17 Dec. (p. 214).

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 I

124-5-14 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
39-nation draft (A/36/L.42 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Academic, cultural and sports boycotts of South Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 35/206 E and M of 16 December 1980,

Having considered the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid and the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports,

Recognizing the importance of the participation of writers, musicians, artists, sportsmen, academic personalities and others in the international campaign against apartheid,

Commending all Governments, organizations and individuals that have taken action for the academic, cultural, sports and other boycotts of South Africa in solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement,

Commending, in particular, the organizations and individuals in Ireland, New Zealand and the United States of America that have effectively demonstrated their opposition to exchanges with South African rugby teams,

Deploring the actions of those sports bodies and sportsmen that have continued to collaborate with South Africa, and the failure of several Governments to take firm action to terminate sporting contacts with South Africa, in particular the Governments of New Zealand and the United States of America, which have permitted tours by Springbok rugby teams despite widespread public protests in their countries and appeals by the Special Committee,

Emphasizing the urgent need for an international convention against apartheid in sports,

1. Commends the Special Committee against Apartheid for its efforts to promote effective academic, cultural and sports boycotts of South Africa and to mobilize academic, cultural and sports personalities in the campaign against apartheid;

2. Notes with appreciation the action of the Special Committee in publishing lists of sportsmen, entertainers and others visiting South Africa, in order to enable the Governments and organizations to take any action they may deem appropriate;

3. Condemns those sports organizations, sportsmen and promoters of sports events who have collaborated with South

Africa in violation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the International Declaration against Apartheid in Sports;

4. Endorses the proposal of the Special Committee to organize national and international conferences and exhibits to promote action by academic, cultural and sports personalities against apartheid;

5. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports to continue its work with a view to submitting a draft convention as soon as possible;

6. Authorizes the Ad Hoc Committee to continue consultations with representatives of Governments and organizations concerned and experts on apartheid in sports.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Guatemala, Iceland, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Samoa, Solomon Islands.

#### Draft convention against apartheid in sports

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports was again unable in 1981 to complete work on a draft convention because of disagreement over the sole remaining issue—a proposal that would require measures to be taken against non-parties to the convention if they acted contrary to its principles. The Committee reported to the General Assembly that a working group had considered several proposals in this regard. One of these, mentioned in its report,<sup>(1)</sup> was to expand the mandate of the International Commission against Apartheid in Sports, to be established under the convention, so that it could decide on action to be taken against teams and individuals from States not parties to the convention that violated the boycott of apartheid sports. The Committee felt that further consultations might enable it to reach a consensus.

The Committee, which began work on the draft convention in 1978,<sup>(3)</sup> recommended that its mandate be extended.

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on cultural, academic and sports boycotts against South Africa,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the Committee to continue its work with a view to submitting a draft convention as soon as possible,



and authorized it to continue consultations with representatives of Governments and organizations and with experts on apartheid in sports.

Canada, which abstained in the vote on this resolution, expressed reservations about the appropriateness and utility of the proposed convention, saying its generalizations and the constitutional framework of Canada's federal system would probably make it impossible for Canada to subscribe. The Netherlands also voiced reservations about the convention, while Ireland hoped the convention would not create legal or constitutional problems for its Government.

In the debate on apartheid and South Africa, Ghana expressed hope that the convention would soon become a reality.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on convention against apartheid in sports, A/36/36 & Corr.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/172 I, paras. 5 & 6, 17 Dec. (p. 203).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1978, p. 201.

Public information, public action and the mass media

SEMINAR ON PUBLICITY, THE MASS MEDIA AND APARTHEID. An International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid, organized by the Committee against Apartheid in co-operation with the Government and the Solidarity Committee of the German Democratic Republic, was held at Berlin from 31 August to 2 September 1981. Participants included representatives of Governments, United Nations bodies and agencies, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, as well as individual experts.

On 2 September, the Seminar unanimously adopted the "Berlin Declaration", containing recommendations on the role and responsibility of the mass media in the struggle against apartheid. This stated that the media must publicize the legitimacy of that struggle, and make the world aware of the inhumanity of apartheid and the need for international action; they must expose the propaganda of the apartheid régime and its allies, including efforts to defame the national liberation movements; and they must expose the links of the apartheid régime with racist and fascist régimes and groups all over the world. The media must investigate, publicize and expose the sustenance of the apartheid régime by certain Western Powers and transnational corporations (TNCs).

The Seminar recommended that the United Nations, Governments, organizations and institutions should assist the national liberation movements in their information activities by

providing broadcasting facilities, printing and distributing publications, offering technical and professional training, providing equipment and supplies, and assisting in gathering information. Also, public campaigns against apartheid should be developed and co-ordinated. Specific suggestions were made for activities by the Committee against Apartheid, including monitoring distorted reports about events in South Africa and Namibia presented by major Western news agencies and other media, and encouraging journalists' organizations to establish awards for journalists with outstanding records of exposing the apartheid system.

With regard to government action, the Seminar recommended: that Governments inform the public through all media about the national liberation struggle in South Africa and Namibia and United Nations efforts to eliminate apartheid; that they prevent and counteract propaganda by the apartheid régime; and that they instruct their external information services and offices to help disseminate anti-apartheid information.

The Seminar called for support action, especially by media and media workers, for journalists subjected to repression by the apartheid régime. It called on trade unions with members in the media to consider discussing with management its editorial policy on news and information on southern Africa; Journalists' organizations and trade unions in developing countries, it suggested, should set up anti-apartheid committees to ensure that false and distorted information about South Africa and Namibia would not be automatically disseminated. It recommended steps to collect and disseminate news about the liberation struggle in South Africa and Namibia, with United Nations assistance.

On 1 September, the Seminar adopted an appeal to journalists, film-makers, organizations of writers and mass communicators, and all United Nations organizations to mobilize world public opinion against apartheid and expose and condemn the racist régime in South Africa and its external allies and accomplices. It called on them: to be vigilant against the clandestine apartheid propaganda paid for by South Africa; to express concern at the suppression of press freedom in, and manipulation of news by, South Africa; to expose in words and pictures those collaborating with the apartheid régime; to publicize the activities of the national liberation movements in southern Africa and extend solidarity to journalists, publicists and writers of those movements; to expose the crimes of the apartheid régime and the operations of TNCs in assisting apartheid; and to inform world public opinion of the decisions and activities of the United Nations and other international organizations against racism and apartheid.

The Berlin Declaration and the appeal, together with a Declaration on aggression by South Africa against Angola (p. 220), were transmitted to the Secretary-General by a letter of 10 September from the Acting Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid.

COMMUNICATION. On 16 June,<sup>(2)</sup> Guyana transmitted to the Secretary-General the Georgetown Declaration, adopted by the International Forum on the Liberation of Southern Africa, held at Georgetown, Guyana, from 30 April to 3 May, with the participation of representatives of 12 States, national liberation movement spokesmen and others. The participants reaffirmed the legitimacy of armed struggle and all other forms of struggle against the South African régime, condemned in the strongest terms the collaboration between South Africa and Western countries, and called for assistance to the liberation movements and the front-line States.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID. The Committee against Apartheid continued to encourage and promote dissemination of information against apartheid by the Secretariat's Centre against Apartheid and the Department of Public Information as well as by NGOs, through publications in several languages, radio programmes for broadcast to South Africa, television spots, films and other material. It promoted voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid (p. 207) and co-sponsored conferences, seminars and other events with anti-apartheid movements and other NGOs (p. 207).

In its 1981 report,<sup>(3)</sup> the Committee made several recommendations concerning public action, in particular: the United Nations and States should consider political, financial and other assistance to anti-apartheid and solidarity movements to enable them to continue and expand their activities; the United Nations and other organizations should provide assistance and co-operation to promote youth and student activities against apartheid; the General Assembly should appeal to NGOs to desist from collaboration with the apartheid régime, and should request the Economic and Social Council and the Secretary-General to co-operate with the Committee in investigating and publicizing such collaboration so that action might be taken with respect to organizations which continued it; and the United Nations should make a special effort to inform parliamentarians on international action against apartheid, and should publicize and encourage anti-apartheid actions by local authorities.

With regard to public information, the Committee recommended that the General Assembly increase the United Nations budget appropri-

tion for publications on apartheid in various languages and appropriate \$5,000 for grants to writers in connection with the initiation of a feature service on apartheid.

ACTION BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly commended the Berlin Declaration to Governments, organizations and the media, and requested the Committee against Apartheid to take appropriate action towards implementing the recommendations in that document, including the publication of expert studies and the organization of journalists' seminars. It requested the Secretary-General and the Committee to encourage action by NGOs and the mass media in the anti-apartheid campaign, called on NGOs to desist from collaboration with the apartheid régime and institutions, and requested the Secretary-General to co-operate with the Committee in investigating and publicizing such collaboration and persuading those concerned to desist. It approved the Committee's recommendations to increase the budgetary provision for publications on apartheid and to initiate a feature service, and it requested the Committee to intensify co-operation with NGOs in the mobilization for sanctions against South Africa and aid to the national liberation movement.

The Assembly authorized the Committee to promote the International Conference of Trade Unions on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 179) and appealed for contributions to the Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid (p. 207).

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 126 to 2, with 19 abstentions.

By its resolution of the same day on the South Africa situation,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly requested Governments and organizations to co-operate with the Committee in publicizing the national liberation struggle in South Africa, its legitimate objectives and its wider significance.

Egypt introduced the 49-nation resolution on public information and public action against apartheid, stating that additional efforts should be made to keep the public informed of the South Africa situation with a view to isolating the apartheid régime and supporting the national liberation movement.

Explaining its negative vote on the resolution, the United States said that mobilizing world public opinion was an activity singularly unsuited to the United Nations; it feared that the gross distortions of truth found in the resolutions on apartheid could find their way into United Nations information activities. The United Kingdom, which also voted against, said the European Community (EC) member States (most of which abstained) could not support texts imply-

ing a limitation of freedom of information and expression; in particular, they could not support formulae implying that the press, broadcasting services or journalists were subject to government dictate.

Ireland abstained on the resolution because of reservations it shared with other EC members. New Zealand and Spain abstained on similar grounds; New Zealand added that it had a number of reservations concerning the Berlin Declaration. Australia, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and the Nordic States abstained because of objections to the endorsement of the Declaration; the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and Norway, the last speaking for the Nordic States, also held that the media could not be subjected to governmental interference. Austria abstained mostly for constitutional reasons which would prohibit implementation of the resolution at the national level. Also abstaining, Japan could not support the \$5,000 grant for feature writers.

Costa Rica and Greece, though voting in favour, reserved their position in respect of the endorsement of certain ideas and recommendations in the Berlin Declaration; Greece also had reservations on the paragraph endorsing the Committee's recommendations for activities to be financed from the United Nations budget. Ecuador supported the text on the understanding that it did not affect freedom of information. Botswana had reservations on the paragraphs on the Conference of trade unions and on mobilization for sanctions.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid and South Africa, Egypt favoured an international mobilization of opposition to apartheid concentrating on the countries that collaborated with the régime. As international public opinion became better acquainted with the evils of apartheid, said Iraq, Governments became more convinced of the necessity of adopting effective measures against South Africa. Poland remarked that, for joint anti-apartheid actions to be effective, there was need for the full co-operation of civic and political organizations, trade unions and student bodies. Trinidad and Tobago thought the mass media had a responsibility to bring their influence to bear on the side of patriots who sought to eliminate apartheid. Viet Nam thought that mobilization of international opinion to unmask and outlaw the actions of the South African régime, the complicity of Governments and corporations and the complacency of certain international organizations was one of the most important tasks of the United Nations.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Acting Chairman, transmitting documents of Seminar on publicity, mass

media and apartheid, 10 Sep., A/36/496-S/14686; <sup>(2)</sup>Guyana, 16 June, A/36/330-S/14548.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/172 A, para. 20, 17 Dec. (p. 163); <sup>(5)</sup>36/172 L, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 L

126-2-19 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
49-nation draft (A/36/L.45 and Add.1); agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia; Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Public information and public action against apartheid and role of the mass media in the struggle against apartheid  
The General Assembly,

Recognizing the important role of non-governmental organizations and of public action in the international campaign against apartheid,

Recognizing further the importance of public information and the role of the mass media in combating apartheid and promoting international action for the eradication of apartheid,

Recognizing, in particular, the need to encourage trade union action for sanctions against South Africa,

Noting with appreciation the co-operation of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Labour Organisation and other agencies in this respect,

Noting with great regret the actions of some non-governmental organizations which are actively collaborating with the apartheid régime of South Africa,

Recognizing, in particular, the need to encourage trade union action for sanctions against apartheid,

Having considered the Declaration of the International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid, held at Berlin, German Democratic Republic, from 31 August to 2 September 1981.

Recalling and reaffirming its resolutions 34/93 L and M of 12 December 1979,

1. Commends all anti-apartheid and solidarity movements, trade unions, religious bodies, student and youth organizations and other non-governmental organizations that have made a vital contribution to the international campaign against apartheid;

2. Commends the Declaration of the International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid to the attention of all Governments and organizations and the media;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to take steps for the widest dissemination of the Berlin Declaration;

4. Requests the Special Committee against Apartheid to take all appropriate action towards the implementation of the recommendations of the International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid, including the publication of studies by experts and the organization of national and regional seminars for journalists;

5. Requests the Secretary-General and the Special Committee to give special attention to encouraging action by non-governmental organizations and the mass media in the international campaign against apartheid;

6. Authorizes the Special Committee to promote the organization of the International Conference of Trade Unions on Sanctions against South Africa;

7. Calls upon all non-governmental organizations that have not yet done so to desist from any form of collaboration with the apartheid régime and institutions based on racial discrimination in South Africa;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to lend his co-operation to the Special Committee in investigating and publicizing the collaboration of certain non-governmental organizations with the apartheid régime and institutions of South Africa, and in persuading them to desist from such collaboration;

9. Appeals to all Governments to contribute generously to the Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid;

10. Approves the recommendations of the Special Committee contained in paragraph 401 of its report and authorizes it to initiate a feature service on apartheid;

11. Requests the Special Committee to continue and intensify co-operation with non-governmental organizations and with the Non-Governmental Organizations Sub-Committee on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Apartheid and Decolonization in promoting the widest public mobilization for sanctions against South Africa and assistance to the national liberation movement of South Africa.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

#### Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid

In its resolution of 17 December 1981 on public information, the mass media and apartheid, <sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly appealed to all Governments to contribute generously to the Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid. Such an appeal was suggested by the Committee against Apartheid in its 1981 report.<sup>(1)</sup>

During 1981, 17 Governments contributed a total of \$94,255 to the Fund, which was established in 1974 for the production of publications in languages other than the official languages of the United Nations and for grants to NGOs for reprinting and disseminating United Nations information material on apartheid. Details of the contributions received appear in the following table.

1981 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TRUST FUND  
FOR PUBLICITY AGAINST APARTHEID  
(As at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment
Austria	4,500
Bahamas	500
Barbados	500
Brazil	40,000
Finland	12,008
Greece	2,000
India	500
Ireland	7,747
Japan	10,000
Malaysia	500
Mexico	1,000
Nigeria	10,000
Suriname	1,000
Syrian Arab Republic	1,000
Trinidad and Tobago	1,000
Turkey	1,000
Venezuela	1,000
Total	94,255

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/172 L, para. 9, 17 Dec. (above)

#### Meetings, missions and observances

During 1981, the Committee against Apartheid organized and/or co-sponsored several conferences, seminars and other events with anti-apartheid movements and other NGOs, including: the Conference of West European Parliamentarians on an Oil Embargo against South Africa (Brussels, Belgium, 30 and 31 January) (p. 175); the International Seminar on the Implementation and Reinforcement of the Arms Embargo against South Africa (London, 1-3 April) (p. 173); the International Seminar on Loans to South Africa (Zurich, Switzerland, 5-7 April) (p. 186); the Seminar on Effective Measures to Prevent Transnational Corporations and Other Established Interests from Collaborating with the Racist Régime of South Africa (Geneva, 29 June-3 July) (p. 188); and the International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid (Berlin, 31 August-2 September) (p. 204).

The Committee assisted and participated in the International Conference of Youth and Students in Solidarity with the Peoples, Youth and Students of Southern Africa (Luanda, Angola, 13-15 November).

On 27 March, the Committee held a hearing on legal aspects of the struggle against apartheid, to which representatives of several organizations and individuals were invited. The participants reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement by all available means, including armed struggle, for the seizure of power by the people, the elimination of the apartheid régime and the exercise of self-determination by the people of South Africa.

They also were of the view that responsibility for the crime of apartheid was not confined to the South African régime, but extended to its accomplices which artificially kept it alive.

On 24 March, the Committee held consultations with Bishop Desmond M. Tutu, General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches. On 27 March, the South African Prime Minister announced that Bishop Tutu's passport would be seized on his return to South Africa. By a statement of 10 April, the Committee Chairman appealed for wide support for the Bishop. In a statement of 17 April, he called on the international community not only to denounce the seizure of the passport, but also to institute total sanctions and to increase assistance to the oppressed people and their national liberation movements.

Observances in which the Committee participated included the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (21 March) (p. 877); Africa Liberation Day (25 May); the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggling People of South Africa (Soweto Day) (16 June); the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia (9 August) (p. 199); and the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners (11 October) (p. 197).

In its 1981 report,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee recommended the organization of regional conferences or seminars in order to promote wider dissemination of information on the South Africa situation, greater public action against apartheid and the implementation of sanctions or other measures against South Africa. It proposed that in 1982 such meetings be organized in Latin America, to study action by Latin American countries against apartheid, as well as collaboration by certain Governments and corporations; and in Asia, to study the virtual alliance that had developed between South Africa and Taiwan, as well as reports concerning open and clandestine trade and other links between the apartheid régime and some Asian countries.

The General Assembly, by its resolution of 17 December on the Committee's work programme,<sup>(2)</sup> decided to make available for 1982, from the United Nations budget, funds for international and national conferences and seminars against apartheid.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid, Viet Nam welcomed the Committee's proposal for a regional conference or seminar in Asia in 1982 to study the relations of certain Asian countries with South Africa.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolution: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/172 N, para. 3 (a), 17 Dec. (p. 214).

Observance of the seventieth anniversary of ANC

By a letter of 19 November 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid transmitted to the Secretary-General a statement on the seventieth anniversary (8 January 1982) of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) appealing for international action in solidarity with the struggle of the South African people and for isolation of South Africa.

The Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on the South Africa situation,<sup>(2)</sup> extended greetings to ANC on its seventieth anniversary.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman, 19 Nov., A/36/708.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>36/172 A, para. 19, 17 Dec. (p. 163).

### International assistance

Financial, educational and other United Nations assistance continued to be provided in 1981 to the two national liberation movements in South Africa recognized by the Organization of African Unit (OAU) – the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) (see below). The United Nations programme of assistance to southern African student refugees (p. 210) entered its fifth year, having begun in February 1977. The United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa made nine grants totalling \$2,510,000 for legal aid, relief, education and other assistance to persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa and Namibia, as well as for assistance to South African refugees (p. 211). Studying on scholarships granted by the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, established in 1967, were 533 persons from South Africa (p. 212).

### Assistance to national liberation movements

In its 1981 report,<sup>(2)</sup> the Special Committee against Apartheid emphasized the urgent need to assist the national liberation movement in the light of the grave situation in South Africa.

The Economic and Social Council, in a resolution of 22 July on assistance by organizations of the United Nations system to colonial countries and South Africans,<sup>(6)</sup> requested those organizations to intensify their support for the oppressed people of South Africa.

The Council President, on 2 July, reported on consultations held with the Chairmen of the Committee against Apartheid and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples on assistance by United Nations organizations to South Africans and their national liberation movement. According to his report,<sup>(3)</sup>

they agreed on the following conclusions: that the Council and the two committees should continue to maintain close co-operation in maximizing world support for the peoples under colonial and racist domination; that the United Nations commitment to assist peoples under colonial and racist domination should receive urgent priority; that United Nations organizations should provide moral and material assistance; that assistance to the national liberation movements recognized by OAU should be given utmost attention; and that United Nations organizations should contribute to the campaign for South Africa's total isolation.

**UNDP ACTIVITIES.** The Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), by a decision of 24 June,<sup>(10)</sup> requested the UNDP Administrator: to continue to assist efficiently and with maximum flexibility the national liberation movements recognized by OAU; to study the possibility of financing the participation of several liberation movement representatives in meetings convened by UNDP, including Council sessions; and to continue to report to the Council on assistance to the movements.

The Council took note of a report by the Administrator dated 18 March,<sup>(4)</sup> describing activities in 1980 and resources available for assistance to the national liberation movements. It stated that more than \$4 million was available for this purpose in 1981 from the United Nations Trust Fund for Assistance to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

According to a later report covering 1981 activities,<sup>(5)</sup> there were three UNDP projects each for ANC and PAC, involving educational assistance, promotion of self-reliance in housing and infrastructure construction, settlements planning and implementation, and food production for South Africans in the United Republic of Tanzania. In addition, UNDP supported four projects of health, vocational and educational assistance jointly benefiting both liberation movements. A fifth project enabled representatives of those movements to participate in sessions of the UNDP Council.

In September/October, an evaluation mission reviewed all ongoing UNDP-financed assistance to those liberation movements. The mission concluded that: UNDP assistance to African national liberation movements was achieving the intended development and humanitarian objectives; such assistance benefited only the targeted beneficiaries; and, while UNDP assistance to the liberation movements had improved conceptually and procedurally over the years, there was still room for improvement, particularly in such areas as data gathering, compilation and analysis as well as in project formulation, implementation, monitoring and co-ordination.

The mission's report served as a basis for consultations between UNDP, the national liberation movements, OAU and United Nations agencies at an inter-agency meeting held at Dar es Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania, from 8 to 11 December. Priority needs were identified for development assistance in the UNDP programming cycle for 1982-1986.

**UNCTAD ACTIVITIES.** By a resolution of 9 October 1981,<sup>(9)</sup> the Trade and Development Board of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to assist OAU-recognized national liberation movements of southern Africa on the most immediate issues facing their territories in the fields of trade and development, and give their leaders an opportunity to be more fully acquainted with UNCTAD activities in the area of international economic relations and negotiations. He was also asked to continue studies on economic and social conditions in South Africa (p. 200). The Board invited UNDP to make additional resources available to UNCTAD with a view to achieving those objectives, and invited the UNCTAD Secretary-General to submit progress reports on implementation of the resolution.

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 16 December on the work of UNCTAD,<sup>(7)</sup> took note of the Board's resolution. This provision was adopted in place of one in the original draft, proposed by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries,<sup>(1)</sup> that would have had the Assembly endorse the resolution. The adopted text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on the basis of informal consultations.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By its resolution, of 17 December on the South Africa situation,<sup>(8)</sup> the General Assembly appealed to States to provide humanitarian, educational, financial and other assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement. It urged UNDP and other United Nations bodies to expand their assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and to the South African liberation movements recognized by OAU, and decided to continue the authorization of adequate financial provision in the United Nations budget to enable those movements to maintain offices in New York in order to participate in the deliberations of the Committee against Apartheid and other bodies.

In explanation of vote, Canada objected to the allocation of United Nations funds to individual liberation movements. The Netherlands said that, while it supported the efforts of ANC and PAC as anti-apartheid movements, it did not recognize them as a liberation movement

because it did not regard the South African situation as colonial.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid, many States pledged to provide humanitarian assistance to the victims of apartheid and the South African liberation movement. For some countries, such as Japan, which argued that change could still be effected peacefully, such assistance excluded support of armed struggle. Others, including Malaysia and the Sudan, said they supported the struggle against apartheid by all means, including armed struggle. Nigeria said it would continue, regardless of the price and sacrifice, to give material resources to African freedom fighters for their just war against their racist oppressors.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.65.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22; <sup>(3)</sup>ESC President, E/1981/90; UNDP Administrator, <sup>(4)</sup>DP/513, <sup>(5)</sup>DP/1982/17.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(6)</sup>ESC, 1981/54, para. 6, 22 July. (p. 1102). GA: <sup>(7)</sup>36/145, para. 2, 16 Dec. (p. 533); <sup>(8)</sup>36/172 A, paras. 16-18, 17 Dec. (p. 163). <sup>(9)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15); 238(XXIII), 9 Oct.

Decision: <sup>(10)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1); 81/12, 24 June.

#### Assistance to southern African student refugees

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), designated as co-ordinator for the assistance programme for southern African student refugees, reported orally on 14 July 1981 to the Economic and Social Council that Namibian and South African refugee students in the four asylum countries-Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia-continued to benefit from UNHCR assistance. Primary and secondary level scholarships had been provided, as well as medical care and accommodation. Some 250 refugees were enrolled at universities in those countries. UNHCR had met the travel costs of some 200 students who had left Botswana, Lesotho and Zambia for further education elsewhere. The Council took note of the High Commissioner's report on 20 July.<sup>(3)</sup>

At the Secretary-General's request, UNHCR reviewed the assistance programmes and identified needs that had arisen as a result of the student refugees' presence in the asylum countries. In a report of 18 September by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the High Commissioner concluded that the international community had provided valuable assistance to help host Governments provide accommodation, maintenance, care and education for the student refugees. Most of the original assistance projects had been successfully completed. The constant flow of student refugees would require interna-

tional assistance for some time, particularly for the expansion of higher educational institutions.

According to tables appended to the report, government contributions earmarked for refugee aid in the asylum countries, in response to a 1977 appeal by the High Commissioner, amounted to \$15,950,329 as at 15 July 1981, reflecting no increase since 24 May 1980.<sup>(4)</sup> Bilateral assistance reported to UNHCR amounted to an additional \$7,653,182. Also as at 15 July 1981, the cost of projects financed by UNHCR or in co-operation with it totalled more than \$13 million. The financial requirements for continuing projects or for new, related needs were estimated at more than \$5 million.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly endorsed the assessments and recommendations in the Secretary-General's report. It requested him, in co-operation with UNHCR, to continue to organize and implement a programme of educational and other appropriate assistance for the student refugees, and urged Member States and organizations to contribute. It appealed to United Nations programmes and international and non-governmental bodies to provide humanitarian and development assistance for the resettlement and integration of refugee families from South Africa in Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia, and called on all United Nations agencies and programmes to co-operate with the Secretary-General and UNHCR in humanitarian assistance programmes for the student refugees. Finally, it requested the Secretary-General to apprise the Economic and Social Council in 1982 of the status of the programmes and to report to the Assembly later in 1982.

The text, sponsored by 31 nations and introduced by Botswana, was adopted by the Assembly, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, which approved it in like manner on 3 December.

In the Third Committee debate, Yugoslavia said the international community must continue to provide financial support for the creation of decent living conditions and the establishment of educational opportunities for the student refugees. Also appealing for assistance, Zambia said most refugees from South Africa and Namibia were school-age people who had been discriminated against in their own country; in view of their increasing numbers, countries of asylum were bearing an increasing burden.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/423.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/170, 16 Dec., text following. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/169, 20 July (p. 1043).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 238.

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR.35, 38 (14,20 July). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-65, 70,72 (19 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

**General Assembly resolution 36/170**

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, 3 December (meeting 72); 31-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.93); agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Botswana, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

**Assistance to student refugees in southern Africa**

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/184 of 15 December 1980, in which it, inter alia, requested the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to organize and implement an effective programme of educational and other appropriate assistance for student refugees from Namibia and South Africa who had taken asylum in Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General containing the review by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees of the assistance programmes for student refugees from Namibia and South Africa,

Satisfied that some of the projects recommended in the report on assistance to student refugees in southern Africa have been successfully completed,

Noting with concern the continued influx into Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia of student refugees from South Africa as well as from Namibia,

Convinced that the discriminatory policies and repressive measures being applied in Namibia and South Africa will lead to a further exodus of student refugees from these countries,

Conscious of the burden placed on the limited financial, material and administrative resources of the host countries by the presence of those student refugees,

Appreciating the efforts of host countries to deal adequately with their present student refugee populations and also to be prepared to meet any new emergency by sharing the responsibilities and obligations with the international community,

Noting with satisfaction that provisions were made to allow former student refugees from Zimbabwe to complete their education in the country of asylum or to continue with their studies until alternative arrangements can be made for the completion of their education in their own country,

1. Endorses the assessments and recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General and commends him and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for their efforts to mobilize resources and organize the programme of assistance to student refugees in the host countries of southern Africa;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Governments of Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia for continuing to grant asylum and make educational and other facilities available to the student refugees in spite of the pressure which the continuing influx of those refugees exerts on facilities in their countries;

3. Expresses its appreciation to the Governments of Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia for the co-operation which they have extended to the Secretary-General and to the High Commissioner on matters concerning the welfare of those refugees;

4. Notes with appreciation the financial and material support provided for the student refugees by Member States, the High Commissioner, other bodies of the United Nations system and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations;

5. Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the High Commissioner, to continue to organize and implement an effective programme of educational and other appropriate assistance for student refugees from Namibia and South Africa who have taken asylum in Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia;

6. Urges all Member States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to contribute generously to

the assistance programmes for the student refugees, through financial support of the regular programmes of the High Commissioner, the projects identified in the report of the Secretary-General and the projects and programmes submitted to the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa;

7. Appeals to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Food Programme, the World Bank and the United Nations Children's fund, as well as other international and non-governmental bodies, to provide humanitarian and development assistance to expedite the resettlement and integration of refugee families from South Africa who have been given asylum in Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia;

8. Calls upon all agencies and programmes of the United Nations system to co-operate with the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner in the implementation of humanitarian programmes of assistance for the student refugees in southern Africa;

9. Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the High Commissioner, to continue to keep the matter under review, to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the current status of the programmes and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

**UN Trust Fund for South Africa**

The United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa made nine grants totalling \$2,510,000 in 1981, under a 1965 mandate from the General Assembly<sup>(2)</sup> authorizing it to make financial contributions to help persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa and Namibia, as well as refugees from those countries. The funds were to be used for legal aid, relief, education and other assistance to such persons and, in some cases, to their families. Recipients of grants were voluntary organizations, Governments of host countries of South African refugees and other bodies.

In its annual report on the Fund, annexed to a report by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly dated 30 October 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Fund's Committee of Trustees noted that a large number of individuals faced persecution as a result of the nation-wide protests in South Africa in May during the observance of the twentieth anniversary of the Republic, school boycotts, strikes of workers, and community protests against increases in rents and bus fares. There had also been a series of new trials under the Terrorism Act and on treason charges. A number of journalists had been placed under restriction or had lost employment in the aftermath of a strike by the Media Workers' Association, and a large number of trade unionists had been persecuted in connection with strikes and other activities. Particularly alarming had been the imposition of death sentences in political trials (p. 195).

The Committee expressed grave concern at the precedents that might be set by the trials, the



repercussions likely to result from executions, and government moves to intimidate Bishop Desmond M. Tutu (p. 208), the South African Council of Churches and others engaged in humanitarian assistance to victims of apartheid. In the light of those developments, it called for additional efforts to promote greater contributions to the Trust Fund and to voluntary organizations assisting victims of repression and discriminatory legislation in South Africa and Namibia.

Government contributions to the Trust Fund for South Africa totalled \$2,002,032 during the year ended 31 December 1981. They came from 35 States, as follows:

1981 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS  
TRUST FUND FOR SOUTH AFRICA  
(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payments
Australia	27,317
Austria	34,500
Barbados	500
Brazil	20,000
Canada	16,667
China	20,000
Denmark	261,011
Finland	96,061
France	45,045
Germany, Federal Republic of	60,398
Greece	4,500
Hungary	2,500
Iceland	4,400
India	2,000
Iran	4,000
Ireland	42,326
Italy	15,000
Jamaica	392
Japan	20,000
Malaysia	1,000
Mexico	1,000
Netherlands	85,349
New Zealand	6,848
Nigeria	40,000
Norway	281,963
Pakistan	3,000
Philippines	5,000
Singapore	500
Suriname	1,000
Sweden	492,505
Syrian Arab Republic	1,000
Trinidad and Tobago	1,250
United States	400,000
Venezuela	1,000
Yugoslavia	4,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,002,032</b>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly commended the Secretary-General and the Committee of Trustees for their efforts, and expressed appreciation to the Fund's contributors and the voluntary agencies aiding victims of apartheid and racial discrimination. It appealed for generous and increased contributions to the Fund and for direct contributions to the voluntary agencies concerned.

The resolution was sponsored by 50 States. Introducing the text, Norway stated that, until apartheid was totally eradicated, the international

community had to do whatever it could to alleviate the suffering caused by that policy and to assist its victims.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, annexing Committee of Trustees report, A/36/619 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2054 B (XX), 15 Dec. 1965 (YUN 1965, p. 119); <sup>(3)</sup>36/172 P, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA, plenary, A/36/PV.75-79,81,102,103 (27 Nov.- 17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/172 P

Adopted without vote Meeting 102 17 December 1981

50-nation draft (A/36/L.49 and Add.1): agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, Austria, Benin, Canada, Congo, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Mali, Malta, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

#### United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General, to which is annexed the report of the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa,

Gravely concerned at the continued and increased repression against opponents of apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa, and the institution of numerous trials under arbitrary security legislation, as well as continued repression in Namibia,

Reaffirming that increased humanitarian assistance by the international community to those persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa and Namibia is appropriate and essential,

Recognizing that increased contributions to the Trust Fund and to the voluntary agencies concerned are necessary to enable them to meet the increased needs for humanitarian and legal assistance,

1. Commends the Secretary-General and the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa for their efforts to promote humanitarian and legal assistance to persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa and Namibia, as well as assistance to their families and to refugees from South Africa;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Governments, organizations and individuals that have contributed to the Trust Fund and to the voluntary agencies engaged in rendering humanitarian and legal assistance to the victims of apartheid and racial discrimination;

3. Appeals for generous and increased contributions to the Trust Fund;

4. Also appeals for direct contributions to the voluntary agencies engaged in assistance to the victims of apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa and Namibia.

#### UN Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa

During 1981, 533 persons from South Africa were studying in 24 countries on scholarships granted by the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa (p. 1117). According to the Secretary-General's annual report on the Programme, dated 6 October 1981, <sup>(1)</sup>786 applications were received from South Africans and 52 new scholarship awards were granted between 1 October 1980 and 30 September 1981. Of the 533 recipients, 246 were

studying in Africa, 167 in North America, 72 in Asia and 48 in Europe.

On 24 November,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly appealed for greater financial and other support to ensure the Programme's continuation, effectiveness and expansion.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/147.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/53, 24 Nov. (p. 1118).

### Work programme of the Committee against Apartheid

In its annual report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the Special Committee against Apartheid recommended that the annual budget allocation for special projects to promote the international mobilization against apartheid, which had been \$150,000 in 1981, should be increased to \$300,000 in 1982, and that the Committee should be authorized to seek voluntary contributions for such projects. In making this recommendation, it cited the need for a great expansion of activity in view of the grave situation in South Africa and the proposed International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa (p. 177), as well as for more Secretariat services.

The Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(2)</sup> decided to make a special \$300,000 allocation to the Committee for 1982 from the regular United Nations budget, for special projects to promote the international campaign against apartheid through conferences, other promotional efforts and studies, and requested Governments and organizations to assist and contribute towards such projects. Endorsing the Committee's recommendations on its work programme, the Assembly requested the Committee to give the highest priority in 1982 to mobilizing support for sanctions against South Africa (p. 167), reviewing the implementation of United Nations resolutions on apartheid and especially on embargoes, publicizing developments on collaboration with South Africa, promoting the participation of cultural personalities in the anti-apartheid campaign (p. 202) and promoting the campaign for the release of persons imprisoned or restricted for their opposition to apartheid (p. 197).

The resolution, sponsored by 50 States and introduced by Nigeria, was adopted by a recorded vote of 139 to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Japan abstained in the vote, saying that it could not accept the proposal to increase the special allocation to the Committee by 100 per cent or the provision that would enable the Committee to solicit and receive contributions for its own projects. New Zealand also abstained, taking exception to the Committee's comments and recommendations about New Zealand's actions in regard to apartheid and sports (p. 200).

Though voting in favour, Botswana reserved its position on the request for priority to mobilizing support for sanctions, while Greece had difficulties with certain points in the list of the Committee's priorities. The Netherlands voiced reservations on provisions entrusting the Committee with tasks within the competence of the Security Council's Committee on an arms embargo. Portugal expressed reservations on the request for voluntary contributions or other assistance for special projects, particularly in regard to the International Year for Mobilization of Sanctions against South Africa.

During the Assembly debate on apartheid, Jamaica favoured an expansion of the Committee's membership.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/172 N, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832;

S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.- 17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

### General Assembly resolution 36/172 N

139-1-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981

50 -nation draft (A/36/L.47 and Add.1): agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burundi, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

### Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid

The General Assembly,

Having considered the reports of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Recalling and reaffirming its resolution 35/206 P of 16 December 1980,

Commending the Special Committee for its activities in the discharge of the mandate given to it by the General Assembly,

Noting with appreciation the work of the Centre against Apartheid of the Secretariat in assisting the Special Committee,

Recognizing the urgent need for the expansion of activity by the Special Committee and the Centre against Apartheid during 1982,

1. Reaffirms the mandate of the Special Committee against Apartheid for the promotion of the international campaign against apartheid in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and endorses the report of the Special Committee to the Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, in particular the recommendations of the Committee on its programme of work contained in paragraphs 409 to 415 of its report:

2. Requests the Special Committee to give the highest priority in 1982 to:

(a) Mobilizing support for sanctions against South Africa;

(b) Reviewing the implementation of United Nations resolutions on apartheid, especially those for the promotion and effective monitoring of military, nuclear and oil embargoes against South Africa;

(c) Publicizing all developments concerning military, nuclear, economic, political and other collaboration with the racist regime of South Africa;

(d) Promoting the participation of writers, artists and other cultural personalities in the international campaign against apartheid;

(e) Promoting the world campaign for the unconditional release of all persons imprisoned or restricted for their opposition to apartheid;

3. Decides to make a special allocation of \$300,000 to the Special Committee for 1982 from the regular budget of the United Nations for the cost of special projects to be decided on by the Committee in order to promote the international campaign against apartheid, in particular:

(a) Organization and co-sponsorship, and financial assistance, to international and national conferences and seminars against apartheid;

(b) Assistance to enable national liberation movements to participate in such conferences;

(c) Promotion of the widest observance of international days against apartheid and of international campaigns against apartheid;

(d) Studies by experts on apartheid;

4. Requests Governments and organizations to make voluntary contributions or provide other assistance for the special projects of the Special Committee, particularly in order to promote the effective observance of the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa;

5. Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Special Committee, to make urgent and necessary administrative arrangements for effective services to the Committee, as indicated in paragraphs 413 to 415 of its report;

6. Requests all Governments, specialized agencies and other institutions in the United Nations system and other organizations to co-operate with the Special Committee in the discharge of its responsibilities.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In Favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa, Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe,

Against: United States.

Abstaining: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Japan, New Zealand, United Kingdom

## Other questions involving South Africa

Relations between South Africa and neighbouring States were again on the United Nations agenda in 1981. South Africa was charged with aggression against its neighbours (see below), including attacks against Angola (p. 217) and armed incursions into Mozambique (p. 221). A border incident with Lesotho was

the subject of letters to the Secretary-General (p. 221). The Security Council established a commission of inquiry to investigate an armed attack against Seychelles (p. 226). No progress was reported in attempts to secure the independence of Namibia, which remained under illegal South African occupation (p. 1126).

Lesotho continued to benefit from a special economic assistance programme authorized by the General Assembly (p. 513).

### Relations with neighbouring States

The Special Committee against Apartheid, in its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> stated that South Africa had committed numerous acts of aggression against the neighbouring front-line States during the previous few years. Such aggression had become inseparable from apartheid. The Committee therefore considered that the United Nations must recognize the breaches of peace and acts of aggression in southern Africa, declare the apartheid regime as the aggressor and decide on comprehensive and mandatory sanctions. It noted that the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 165), in its Paris Declaration of 27 May,<sup>(3)</sup> had viewed the situation as threatening a wider conflict with grave repercussions in Africa and the world.

The Commission on Human Rights, in resolutions adopted on 23 February in connection with the report of its Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on Southern Africa (p. 944), called on South Africa to desist from its aggression and violations of the territory of African States,<sup>(4)</sup> and condemned those attacks as a breach of international law.<sup>(5)</sup> It repeated this condemnation in a resolution of 6 March on the self-determination of peoples (p. 891) and requested that help be given to the front-line States to buttress their determination to support the liberation struggle in southern Africa.<sup>(6)</sup>

The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in a consensus on the Namibia question (p. 1138) adopted on 14 August,<sup>(2)</sup> condemned the repeated acts of aggression perpetrated by South African forces against neighbouring States and the use of Namibian territory to launch those attacks. It called on States to extend moral and material assistance to Angola and other front-line States to help them defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity against such aggression.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 14 September, in a resolution on the Namibia question,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Assembly condemned South Africa for its armed attacks against neighbouring States, particularly Angola, and called on the

international community to extend support and assistance, including military assistance, to the front-line States to enable them to defend their sovereignty and territory against South African aggression.

By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(13)</sup> adopted in connection with its consideration of apartheid and South Africa, the Assembly condemned the unprovoked acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola, Seychelles (p. 227) and other independent African States. It urged the Security Council to adopt effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations to prevent breaches of the peace and acts of aggression by the apartheid régime, and thereby avert the grave threat to international peace and security. The Assembly called on States and organizations to provide moral and material support to Angola and other African States subjected to aggression, subversion and terrorism by the apartheid régime, and requested the Committee against Apartheid to publicize those acts and promote support to the front-line States. It also demanded the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola and the payment of compensation (p. 221). The resolution, sponsored by 48 States, was adopted by a recorded vote of 136 to 1, with 8 abstentions.

The Assembly, in another resolution of 17 December on the South Africa situation,<sup>(12)</sup> vehemently condemned the apartheid régime for its repeated acts of aggression, subversion and terrorism against African States, designed to destabilize southern Africa.

In a resolution of 28 October on racial discrimination,<sup>(8)</sup> the Assembly vigorously condemned the repeated acts of aggression by South Africa against neighbouring States, particularly Angola, Botswana, Mozambique and Zambia, and expressed solidarity with the front-line States that were victims of South Africa's aggression and destabilization attempts.

In a resolution of 24 November on United Nations organizations and decolonization,<sup>(9)</sup> the Assembly urged the specialized agencies and other United Nations organizations and institutions to extend, as a matter of priority, substantial material assistance to the front-line States in order to enable them more effectively to support the Namibian struggle for freedom and independence and to resist the violation of their territory by South African armed forces, directly or, as in Angola, through puppet traitor groups in the service of Pretoria.

Provisions relating to the front-line States were included in two resolutions on the Namibia situation adopted on 10 December. In one of these,<sup>(10)</sup> the Assembly called on the international community to extend full support and assis-

tance, including military assistance, to the front-line States to enable them to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity against the repeated aggression of South Africa. In the second resolution,<sup>(11)</sup> the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultation with the United Nations Development Programme, a comprehensive programme of assistance to States neighbouring South Africa and Namibia, to help them overcome short-term difficulties and move towards complete self-reliance.

Nigeria, introducing the 17 December resolution on aggression against States neighbouring South Africa, said the text urged the Security Council to carry out its duty concerning the maintenance of international peace and security by imposing mandatory sanctions.

Speaking in explanation of vote, the United States said it deplored the recent South African action in Angola and any escalation of violence in southern Africa from any quarter; however, it had to oppose the resolution for its obvious flaws.

France, abstaining, said the resolution introduced elements not contained in the draft resolution on Angola submitted in the Security Council (p. 218), which France had supported.

Among those voting in favour, Botswana voiced reservations on the clause concerning Council action; some proposed courses of action, it said, presented it with considerable problems because of its geopolitical situation. The Netherlands stated that the call for support to African States subjected to South African aggression was consonant with its own support for their efforts towards increased mutual co-operation and self-reliance. Spain declared that, although it disagreed with some of the ideas contained in the resolution, it would cast a positive vote because it considered that the continuing acts of aggression by South Africa against independent countries deserved serious condemnation.

Canada supported the resolution because of the overwhelming political importance of opposition to aggression, but it expressed reservations on the reference to Seychelles, as well as on the preambular paragraph referring to the United States vote in the Security Council on the armed attack against Angola; also, the paragraph urging the Council to take enforcement action trespassed on the Council's prerogatives. Also voicing reservations with regard to the mention of the armed attack against Seychelles were Australia, Ireland, the Netherlands and New Zealand (p. 227).

Reservations were expressed by Portugal in regard to the provision in the resolution on the Namibia question calling for military assistance to the front-line States.

During the debate on apartheid, many speak-

ers, including Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Gabon, the German Democratic Republic, Kenya, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Romania, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the United Republic of Cameroon, and Zambia, denounced South Africa's aggression against neighbouring States or described it as threatening a wider conflict.

Ghana stated that South Africa's military incursions had been stepped up because of the open political support given it by certain Western Governments, coupled with the knowledge that international action against it would be frustrated by certain permanent members of the Security Council. As long as the racist regime persisted, said Madagascar, South Africa would remain a threat to African countries and a favourable ground for hatching plots to destabilize Governments that opposed apartheid colonialism and imperialism. Mozambique, Uganda and the USSR viewed such action as designed to intimidate and destabilize States and force them to give up their assistance to the national liberation movements in southern Africa. Trinidad and Tobago held it essential that the international community protect the territorial integrity of South Africa's neighbouring States by invoking appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Zimbabwe stated that, based on the instability of the region, South Africa hoped to erect a constellation of States, as an indication of its determination to see that democracy and freedom were destroyed in order to make the region safe for apartheid.

Ireland, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Sudan and Uganda called for assistance to the front-line States to reduce their dependence on South Africa, defend their territory and compensate them for economic losses. The Netherlands said that, together with its partners in the European Community, it attached priority to providing financial aid to the front-line States. Sweden said it was assisting those States in their efforts to reduce their economic dependence on South Africa and their vulnerability to sanctions.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22;<sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1;<sup>(3)</sup>Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, A/CONF.107/8. Resolutions: Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): <sup>(4)</sup>4(XXXVII), para. 9, 23 Feb.; <sup>(5)</sup>5(XXXVII), para. 3, 23 Feb.; <sup>(6)</sup>14(XXXVII), para. 5, 6 Mar. GA: <sup>(7)</sup>ES-8/2, paras. 5 & 7, 14 Sep. (p. 1128); <sup>(8)</sup>36/8, paras. 5 & 6, 28 Oct. (p. 864); <sup>(9)</sup>36/52, para. 17, 24 Nov. (p. 1098). <sup>(10)</sup>36/121 A, para. 28, 10 Dec. (p. 1156); <sup>(11)</sup>36/121 B, paras. 26 & 27, 10 Dec. (p. 1128); <sup>(12)</sup>36/172 A, para. 2, 17 Dec. (p. 157); <sup>(13)</sup>36/172 C, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/832; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/104.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.75-79, 81, 101-103 (27 Nov.-17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/172 C

136-1-8 (recorded vote) Meeting 102 17 December 1981  
48-nation draft (A/36/L.36 and Add. 1): agenda item 32.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Acts of aggression by the apartheid regime against  
Angola and other independent African States

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid,

Gravely concerned at the explosive situation in southern Africa resulting from the policies and actions of the apartheid regime of South Africa,

Condemning the continuing acts of aggression committed by the apartheid regime against independent African States, in particular its raid on Matola, Mozambique, in January 1981, its large-scale invasion of Angola since July 1981 and its recent invasion of Seychelles on 25 November 1981,

Noting with grave concern that the Security Council was unable on 31 August 1981, owing to the veto by the United States of America, to adopt a resolution condemning the unprovoked and massive armed aggression of South Africa against Angola.

Commending the Government and people of Angola, as well as the Governments and peoples of other front-line States, for their sacrifices in the cause of the liberation of South Africa and Namibia,

Recognizing that the apartheid regime of South Africa is guilty of repeated breaches of the peace and acts of aggression which constitute an ever-growing threat to international peace and security,

Condemning any encouragement to the apartheid regime in its acts of aggression, direct or indirect, as hostile to the interest of peace and freedom,

Commending all States that have provided assistance to Angola and other front-line States in accordance with relevant resolutions of the United Nations,

1. Condemns the unprovoked acts of aggression committed by the racist regime of South Africa against Angola, Seychelles and other independent African States;

2. Urges the Security Council to adopt effective measures, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to prevent breaches of the peace and acts of aggression by the apartheid regime, and thereby avert the grave threat to international peace and security;

3. Demands the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all troops of the apartheid regime of South Africa from Angola and demands that South Africa respect fully the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and other States;

4. Further demands that the Government of South Africa pay full compensation to Angola for the damage to life and property caused by its acts of aggression;

5. Calls upon all States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to provide moral and material support to the Government and people of Angola and other independent African States subjected to acts of aggression, subversion and terrorism by the apartheid regime;

6. Requests the Special Committee against Apartheid to publicize the criminal acts of aggression, subversion and terrorism by the apartheid regime and to promote moral and material support to Angola and other front-line States.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian

SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahirlya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vendruela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States.

Abstaining: Belgium, Chile, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Guatemala, Japan, Luxembourg, United Kingdom.

### Angola and South Africa

Following a series of letters from Angola complaining of armed attacks by South African forces across the Angolan border with Namibia, the Security Council met in August 1981 to consider an Angolan complaint of a large-scale invasion and occupation of the southern part of its territory. Because of a negative vote by a permanent member (the United States) the Council did not adopt a draft resolution<sup>(1)</sup> condemning South Africa and demanding the withdrawal of its troops. Following further charges by Angola, the General Assembly, on 17 December, demanded the immediate withdrawal of all South African troops.<sup>(34)</sup>

COMMUNICATIONS (JANUARY-AUGUST). By a letter of 19 January,<sup>(6)</sup> Angola drew the Secretary-General's attention to a series of armed attacks into Cunene and Huila provinces by South African army units and helicopters beginning on 12 January, which had left a number of people dead or wounded. In further letters of 22 January<sup>(7)</sup> and 24 February,<sup>(8)</sup> the latter annexing a communique by the Ministry of Defence, Angola indicated that the attacks were continuing.

In a letter of 23 June,<sup>(9)</sup> Angola charged that more than 95,000 South African troops and mercenaries were in Namibia, ready to invade Angola. On 30 July,<sup>(11)</sup> Angola stated that an infantry brigade and three battalions of South African troops and mercenaries, supported by aircraft, had carried out a massive invasion. Annexed to an Angolan letter of 25 August<sup>(12)</sup> was a letter of the same date from the President of Angola, stating that more than 45,000 South African troops were concentrated in the border area and warning that Angola might be forced to resort to Article 51 of the United Nations Charter (on individual and collective self-defence).

To a letter of 26 August<sup>(13)</sup> was annexed a communique from the Acting Foreign Minister of Angola describing aerial attacks against the towns of Cahama and Tchibemba—more than 200 and 300 kilometres, respectively, inside Angola's borders—as well as continuing ground attacks near Xangongo and Catequero, 100 and 150 kilometres from the border.

On 13 July,<sup>(10)</sup> Angola transmitted the Declaration on the People's Republic of Angola adopted at Nairobi, Kenya, in June by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), expressing concern about steps by the United States Administration to have the Congress revise existing legislation with a view to giving direct military assistance to groups of Angolan traitors in the pay of the Pretoria regime, and voicing Africa's commitment to stand by Angola for the defence of its sovereignty and territory.

On 26 August,<sup>(14)</sup> Angola transmitted a letter from its President requesting an urgent meeting of the Security Council to deal with a rapidly deteriorating situation as a result of an attack by three to four brigades of South African troops, supported by aircraft and about 135 tanks, operating more than 100 kilometres inside the border. Angola reiterated its request for a meeting in a letter of 27 August to the Council President.<sup>(15)</sup>

Letters or notes verbales on this situation were sent to the Secretary-General or the Council President by Spain, on 27 August;<sup>(28)</sup> China,<sup>(21)</sup> Egypt<sup>(23)</sup> and the USSR,<sup>(31)</sup> on 28 August; Mongolia, on 29 August;<sup>(25)</sup> and Algeria Botswana<sup>(20)</sup> and Suriname,<sup>(29)</sup> on 31 August. They transmitted official statements or communiqués condemning South Africa's aggression against Angola, expressing solidarity with the Angolan Government and people, and calling for the immediate withdrawal of South African troops. Algeria called for the immediate imposition of sanctions against South Africa.

In addition, calls for Security Council action were made by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at a 28 August meeting in New York, in a communique annexed to a Cuban letter of 29 August,<sup>(22)</sup> and by the President of Kenya as current OAU Chairman, in a telegram annexed to a letter from Kenya dated 29 August.<sup>(24)</sup> The non-aligned countries called on the Council to apply Chapter VII of the Charter.

By a letter of 26 August to the Secretary-General,<sup>(2)</sup> the Acting Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid transmitted a Committee statement of the same date dealing with various aspects of the South Africa situation (p. 158); with regard to the armed attack against Angola,

the Committee called for urgent action on Angola's request to put an end to the successive acts of aggression against it and neutralize the imminent and large-scale invasion prepared by South Africa. The Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, by a letter of 28 August,<sup>(18)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a statement of the same date condemning the invasion of Angola and calling for the strongest measures against South Africa by the international community and by the Security Council in particular.

By a letter of 27 August,<sup>(27)</sup> South Africa transmitted a letter of the same date from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information, stating that premeditated attacks conducted from across the border by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) had escalated to new levels of intensity during the previous weeks. SWAPO sought to build a terrorist force in neighbouring countries, dependent on the USSR and Cuba for its philosophy, training, armament and supplies. In countering the incursions, South Africa had limited its response to SWAPO targets. It invited Security Council representatives to visit Namibia to observe the situation.

**OTHER ACTION.** The United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 689), by a resolution of 21 August,<sup>(32)</sup> deplored all South African military activities in Namibia and Angola, which were having serious ecological consequences, thereby limiting the future capacity to develop new and renewable energy sources. The Conference demanded the complete and unconditional withdrawal of all South African troops from the occupied Angolan provinces of Cunene and Kuando Kubango.

**SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION.** The Security Council met between 28 and 31 August to discuss Angola's complaint of an armed attack by South Africa. On 31 August, a draft resolution<sup>(1)</sup> sponsored and twice revised by Mexico, the Niger, Panama, the Philippines, Tunisia and Uganda received 13 votes in favour but was not adopted because of the negative vote of a permanent member; there was one abstention.

This draft would have had the Council strongly condemn South Africa for its premeditated, unprovoked and persistent armed invasion perpetrated against Angola and its utilization of the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia as a springboard for armed invasions and destabilization of Angola. The Council would have declared the armed invasion a flagrant violation of Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and a danger to international peace and security. It would have demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African troops from Angola; strongly condemned South

Africa's use of mercenaries against Angola; and condemned the aggressive campaign and other hostile activities aimed at destabilizing Angola.

The Council would have urged all Member States urgently to extend material assistance to Angola in order to enable it to defend its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, and called on all States to implement fully the arms embargo imposed against South Africa in 1977.<sup>(35)</sup> It would have called for full and adequate compensation to Angola by South Africa for the damage to life and property resulting from the armed invasion. The Council would have decided to send immediately to Angola an investigation commission of five Council members for an on-the-spot evaluation of the critical situation resulting from the invasion, with a mandate to report to the Council by 30 September. Finally, the Council would have decided to remain seized of the question and to meet again to consider the implementation of the resolution.

The vote on this draft was as follows:

In favour: China, France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR.

Against: United States.

Abstaining: United Kingdom.

The text was revised twice before the vote. By the first revision, a paragraph by which the Council would have decided to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter was deleted. By the second, the six references to "acts of aggression" were replaced by "armed invasion", and the invasion was described as a danger to rather than a breach of international peace and security.

Explaining its negative vote, the United States said the draft blamed South Africa alone for the escalation of violence, whereas the presence of foreign-particularly Cuban-combat forces and USSR military advisers in Angola, along with the provision to SWAPO of arms of USSR origin, fuelled the explosive atmosphere of confrontation and violence. The United Kingdom, abstaining, said that although it could support much of the draft, particularly the demand for troop withdrawal, it did not believe that offensive characterizations and highly coloured rhetoric contributed to peaceful solutions; moreover, it did not regard the text as constituting a determination under Article 39 of the Charter (on the existence of a threat to peace, breach of peace or act of aggression).

The USSR said it had voted for the draft because it reflected the demands of the victim of the aggression as well as the position and interests of Africa; the negative vote of the United States had been cast in the context of its new

southern Africa strategy, aimed at destabilizing Angola and reversing decolonization by forcing its South African partner on the continent.

Angola said the veto would be seen by Africa and the third world as support for South Africa's racism, its flouting of United Nations resolutions and its disregard for human dignity and life; as stated in its letter of 25 August (see above), Angola might have no option but to invoke Article 51 of the Charter. Uganda, a sponsor of the draft resolution, expressed disappointment that the draft, though not containing any references to Chapter VII and to the fact of aggression, had been blocked by a single veto—an action which would make the victim of aggression more vulnerable, give comfort and encouragement to South Africa and deal a blow to the Namibians in their search for self-determination.

For the discussion preceding the voting, the Council invited Angola, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mozambique, South Africa, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe, at their request, to participate without vote. At Tunisia's request, contained in a letter of 29 August,<sup>(30)</sup> the Council also extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure<sup>a</sup> to the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations.

At the start of the debate, Angola gave an account of the invasion by South Africa, stating that the invasion force, which included gangs of mercenaries, had been accompanied by 135 tanks, 140 armoured vehicles, 38 helicopters and three artillery units, as well as aircraft used for reconnaissance, bombing and strafing. The invaders had occupied or destroyed a number of towns and inflicted brutalities on civilians. Warning that the situation could provoke a widespread conflagration, Angola demanded redress, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops and assistance to strengthen its defences against South Africa's military and nuclear might.

South Africa rejected the charges of aggression against Angola, saying that any action by South African security forces was aimed solely at SWAPO, not at Angola and its people. Between July 1978 and September 1980, there had been almost 1,000 SWAPO attacks across the Angola-Namibia border, involving the murder of almost 300 Namibians, the abduction of 390 schoolchildren and serious injuries to 250 inhabitants of the Territory. The perpetrators had fled back to their sanctuaries in Angola. Rather than a liberation struggle, SWAPO had been conducting a systematic campaign to terrorize and intimidate Namibians with a view to taking over the Territory's government by armed force. The African

States had nothing to fear from South Africa, provided they chose the road of peaceful coexistence. The Chief of the South African Defence Force had announced on 28 August that the forces involved in follow-up operations against SWAPO elements in southern Angola were returning to their bases and advance groups were already back in Namibia.

Most speakers, among them Brazil, China, Cuba, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Ireland, Japan, Kenya (speaking for the OAU members), the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Niger, Panama, the Philippines, Spain, the USSR, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia, considered that the Council must condemn South Africa's invasion, which most regarded as a clear violation of Angolan sovereignty and territory and a threat to peace and security. These States, together with Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States and Zimbabwe, the last speaking as Chairman of the African Group, called for urgent Council action to ensure the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the South African troops.

A number of countries, such as Brazil, China, the German Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Niger, Panama, the Philippines and Viet Nam, supported Angola's demand for full compensation for the human and material losses caused by the invasion. Others, including France, Ireland and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, said the Council must demand that South Africa respect Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The United Kingdom called on the Council to agree urgently on a simple and direct appeal to South Africa to terminate its military action in Angola. The United States believed the Council should call urgently and immediately for the cessation of violence from every quarter and by all parties. Spain expressed the view that a Council condemnation of South Africa's aggression and a request that it unconditionally withdraw all its forces would not prevent the Council from continuing to work on a resolution of wider scope.

China stated that South Africa was so reckless in attacking neighbouring States because of the connivance and support of a super-Power that had sided with it.

In the view of the USSR and Viet Nam, the purpose of Pretoria's action was to destabilize the progressive regime in Angola, with support and encouragement from imperialist and racist

<sup>a</sup> Rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure reads: "The Security Council may invite members of the Secretariat or other persons, whom it consist competent for the purpose, to supply it with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence."



forces in the West. Cuba voiced a similar opinion, saying the refusal by the United States to allow the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa meant a manifest decision to protect the aggressor. The German Democratic Republic and the USSR said it was time for the Council to act in accordance with its June 1980 resolution on Angola and South Africa, when it decided to meet again in the event of further South African violation of Angola's territory in order to consider more effective measures under the Charter, including Chapter VII.<sup>(36)</sup> The German Democratic Republic favoured an appeal to States to provide Angola with all necessary assistance in order to bring South African aggression to an immediate end.

Tunisia said international peace and security, as well as the Council's authority and credibility, would be reinforced by the adoption of mandatory sanctions. The call for sanctions was supported by several others, such as the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Uganda. Yugoslavia said the demand of the non-aligned countries for sanctions had become more acute and more universal. In Brazil's view, the Council would have no other resort but the use of Chapter VII if South Africa did not meet the request to withdraw its troops and pay full compensation for the human and material losses caused by its invasion.

Ireland charged that South Africa had utilized its illegal occupation of Namibia to attack Angola on the pretext of a pre-emptive strike; Ireland wondered whether those attacks might not ultimately be aimed at promoting instability throughout southern Africa. In Japan's opinion, South Africa's military actions in Angola went against all United Nations efforts to find a settlement of the Namibian problem.

Kenya, as Chairman of OAU, said Angola was the target of the invasion, not SWAPO and its bases. Mozambique believed that South Africa's invasion of Angola and its January attack on Matola, Mozambique (p. 211, were meant to destabilize the situation in both countries and make it more difficult for them to express political and material solidarity with national liberation movements. The Niger remarked that the conduct of the operations, their timing and objective ruled out the possibility of improvisation or chance; they were outright acts of aggression, backed with sufficient means. The Philippines saw the invasion as part of South Africa's scheme to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia. India expressed a similar opinion and urged the Council to take appropriate and resolute action, including the application of Chapter VII.

Uganda saw four South African objectives in

committing aggression against Angola: to make the world safe for apartheid; to eliminate all patriotic elements within and outside Namibia so as to consolidate its illegal hold on the Territory and frustrate self-determination; to intimidate the front-line States and inhibit them from expressing solidarity with the liberation movements and refugees; and to weaken the economies of the neighbouring States so as to make them dependent on South Africa.

In Canada's view, the situation re-emphasized the acute need for a solution to the Namibia question. France said South Africa's argument that it was acting in self-defence against incursions by SWAPO fighters was not at all valid, as South African territory was not in danger; the direct cause of the dangerous situation in southern Africa was the unjustified maintenance in Namibia of a South African presence and Pretoria's refusal to accept the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia. The Federal Republic of Germany expressed the conviction that efforts for a peaceful solution to that question could succeed only if all parties exercised the utmost restraint and desisted from any action likely to endanger peace and security in the area.

Mexico stated that South Africa's impunity was largely the result of the Council's ambiguous conduct; it had not reacted with sufficient decisiveness when faced with an obvious fact. Panama said the gravity of South Africa's aggression required the adoption of forceful coercive measures; States could not remain neutral when faced with the constant institutional erosion produced in the United Nations by that country's stubborn and delinquent attitude.

FURTHER COMMUNICATIONS (SEPTEMBER-NOVEMBER). On 3 September<sup>(19)</sup> and 8 September,<sup>(26)</sup> respectively, Bangladesh and Pakistan transmitted government statements denouncing the acts of aggression against Angola, expressing solidarity with it and calling for international action to terminate the attack and ensure withdrawal of the South African troops.

The Acting Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid, by a letter dated 10 September,<sup>(3)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a Declaration on the Aggression by the South African Racist Regime against the People's Republic of Angola, adopted on 31 August by the International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid, held at Berlin (p. 204). The Seminar, condemning the invasion, requested that the Security Council declare South Africa as the aggressor, demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of its forces, declare its liability for full reparations, adopt comprehensive and mandatory sanctions and call on all

## Africa

States, individually and collectively, to assist Angola to defend its sovereignty and territory.

On 17 September,<sup>(5)</sup> Algeria, on behalf of the African Group, transmitted to the Secretary-General a communique issued at the end of an emergent summit of the front-line States and Nigeria Lagos, Nigeria, 11 September), in which the participating heads of State and Government appealed for international assistance for Angola's defence and reconstruction, expressed dismay at the United States veto in the Security Council, condemned that country's support of South Africa and expressed their views on the Namibia question (p. 1128).

Angola, by letters of 28 October<sup>(16)</sup> and 11 November,<sup>(17)</sup> charged that South Africa's aggression against it continued unabated and that South African forces continued to occupy the southern part of the country.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In a resolution of 28 October on self-determination of peoples,<sup>(33)</sup> the General Assembly strongly condemned the invasion and occupation of part of Angolan territory by South African troops.

By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(34)</sup> adopted under the agenda item on apartheid and South Africa, the Assembly condemned the unprovoked acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola and other African States, and urged the Security Council to adopt effective measures to prevent breaches of peace and acts of aggression by the apartheid regime. It demanded that South Africa withdraw all its troops from Angola immediately and unconditionally, respect fully the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and other States, and pay full compensation to Angola for the damage to life and property caused by its acts of aggression. It called on States and organizations to provide moral and material support to Angola and other African States subjected to aggression, subversion and terrorism by the apartheid regime, and requested the Committee against Apartheid to publicize those acts of aggression and to promote moral and material support to Angola and other front-line States.

During the debate on apartheid, a number of States criticized South Africa for committing aggression against Angola. The German Democratic Republic and Uganda said such action was intended to weaken and destabilize Angola; another aim, said Uganda, was to insulate South Africa from the liberation movements fighting against apartheid. Mozambique said South Africa must get out of Angolan territory and pay indemnities to that country.

Ghana and the Syrian Arab Republic said the United States veto in the Security Council of the draft resolution on the invasion of Angola fur-

thered the protection and encouragement of the South African regime. In Sierra Leone's view, the veto indicated double standards and double-talk; it was inconsistent to condemn one proven case of aggression and refuse to condemn another in similar circumstances.

Draft resolution not adopted: <sup>(1)</sup>Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Tunisia, Uganda, S/14664/Rev.2.

Letters and notes verbales (nv):

Committee against Apartheid Acting Chairman: <sup>(2)</sup>26 Aug., A/36/459-S/14656; <sup>(3)</sup>10 Sep., A/36/496-S/14686.

Algeria: <sup>(4)</sup>31 Aug., S/14672 (nv); <sup>(5)</sup>17 Sep., for African Group, A/36/525.

Angola: <sup>(6)</sup>19 Jan., S/14335; <sup>(7)</sup>22 Jan., S/14340; <sup>(8)</sup>24 Feb., S/14385; <sup>(9)</sup>23 June, S/14571; <sup>(10)</sup>13 July, S/14587; <sup>(11)</sup>30 July, S/14623; <sup>(12)</sup>25 Aug., S/14643; <sup>(13)</sup>26 Aug., S/14646; <sup>(14)</sup>26 Aug., S/14647; <sup>(15)</sup>27 Aug., S/14654; <sup>(16)</sup>28 Oct., S/14740; <sup>(17)</sup>11 Nov., S/14749.

Others: <sup>(18)</sup>Council for Namibia Acting President, 28 Aug., A/36/467-S/14671. <sup>(19)</sup>Bangladesh, 3 Sep., S/14682. <sup>(20)</sup>Botswana, 31 Aug., S/14669. <sup>(21)</sup>China, 28 Aug., S/14665. <sup>(22)</sup>Cuba, for non-aligned countries, 29 Aug., S/14661. <sup>(23)</sup>Egypt, 28 Aug., S/14655. <sup>(24)</sup>Kenya, 29 Aug., S/14663. <sup>(25)</sup>Mongolia, 29 Aug., S/14662. <sup>(26)</sup>Pakistan, 8 Sep., S/14680. South Africa, 27 Aug., S/14652. <sup>(28)</sup>Spain, 27 Aug., S/14650. <sup>(29)</sup>Suriname, 31 Aug., S/14674 (nv). <sup>(30)</sup>Tunisia, 29 Aug., S/14666. <sup>(31)</sup>USSR, 28 Aug., S/14658.

Resolutions: <sup>(32)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (report, A/CONF.100/11, Sales No. E.81.L24): 4 paras. 2 & 4, 21 Aug. GA: (33)36/g, para. 8, 28 Oct. (p. 895); <sup>(34)</sup>36/172 C, 17 Dec. (p. 214). SC: <sup>(35)</sup>418(1977), 4 Nov. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 161); <sup>(36)</sup>475(1980), para. 7, 27 June 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 257).

Meeting records: SC, S/PV.2296-2300 (28-31 Aug.).

## Lesotho and South Africa

By a letter of 9 October 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> Lesotho informed the Secretary-General that, on 8 October, mortars and machine-guns had been fired from South African territory at the barracks of a Lesotho paramilitary unit stationed near the border. Annexed to the letter was a protest note addressed to the South African Government.

South Africa transmitted to the Secretary-General on the same day a letter from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information<sup>(2)</sup> rejecting the inference that South Africa had been involved in the attack and pointing out that opposition elements in Lesotho had openly claimed responsibility for past acts of violence against the Lesotho Government. The letter further stated that South Africa had acted against armed persons or groups endeavouring to traverse South African territory en route to Lesotho. It requested the Secretary-General to dispatch a fact-finding mission.

Letters: ("Lesotho, 9 Oct., S/14721; <sup>(2)</sup>South Africa, 9 Oct., S/14720.

## Mozambique and South Africa

By a letter of 2 February 1981 to the Secretary-General,<sup>(2)</sup> Mozambique stated that, on 30 January, a group of South African commandos had

invaded its territory at Matola (near the capital of Maputo) and killed 11 South African refugees who were members of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), as well as a Portuguese technician; it described the attack as part of a concerted plan to weaken, terrorize and destabilize southern African countries. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mozambique, by a letter of 5 February,<sup>(3)</sup> informed the Secretary-General that South Africa had recalled its personnel in Maputo for consultations and continued to concentrate a large number of troops and war equipment along the border and to violate Mozambique airspace; Mozambique believed that South Africa was preparing another aggression and requested the Secretary-General to take immediate action to dissuade it.

Replying on 6 February,<sup>(5)</sup> South Africa transmitted to the Secretary-General a letter of the same day from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information, stating that the action by the South African Defence Force had been directed solely at ANC terrorists; it had followed several warnings to Mozambique that, unless steps were taken to put an end to terrorist activities against South Africa from its territory, South Africa would be forced to act.

The Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid condemned the attack in a press statement of 3 February and urged the Security Council to impose sanctions against South Africa to force it to end its criminal acts of aggression.<sup>(7)</sup>

On 9 February,<sup>(1)</sup> India conveyed to the Council President a message from the Secretary-General of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries (New Delhi, 9-13 February) in which the Conference strongly condemned the South African military action against Mozambique and appealed for increased assistance to strengthen the defence of the African front-line States and for United Nations action to prevent such acts of aggression.

By a telegram of 18 March to the Secretary-General,<sup>(4)</sup> the Foreign Minister of Mozambique stated that, on 17 March, about 50 South African soldiers had crossed the border into Mozambique and opened fire against a unit of border guards near the town of Ponta do Ouro, seriously injuring one guard while losing two of their own soldiers; large numbers of South African troops were still positioned along the border.

South Africa, on 20 March,<sup>(6)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a message of 17 March addressed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mozambique, in which the South African Department of Foreign Affairs and Information stated that the South African border unit involved in the incident had accidentally strayed

across the unmarked border due to a navigational and map-reading error; South Africa protested the killing of one of its soldiers.

Letters and telegram (i): <sup>(1)</sup>India, for non-aligned countries: 9 Feb., S/14370. Mozambique: <sup>(2)</sup>2 Feb., A/36/90-S/14358; <sup>(3)</sup>5 Feb., A/36/96-S/14363; (4)18 Mar., S/14412 (i). South Africa: <sup>(5)</sup>6 Feb., S/14367; <sup>(6)</sup>20 Mar., S/14415.

Report: <sup>(7)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

## Chad situation

During 1981, the situation in Chad was the subject of several communications to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council.

By a letter of 18 February,<sup>(6)</sup> Sierra Leone transmitted to the Council President three documents relating to Chad, including the final communique issued at Lomé, Togo, on 14 January 1981 by the Bureau of the seventeenth summit (1980) of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the OAU Standing Committee on Chad. By that communiqué, the participants called on Chad and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to set aside the reported merger agreement between them, affirmed that only a democratically elected government could commit Chad in such a fundamental agreement, called on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and other Powers immediately to withdraw their troops and military personnel from Chad, called on OAU members to refuse the use of their territory by extra-African Powers or dissident Chadian groups as sanctuaries or bases for mounting armed attacks against Chad, mandated the OAU Secretary-General to organize elections in Chad by the end of April 1981, and decided to send to Chad a Monitoring Commission and an African peace-keeping force composed of troops from Benin, the Congo, Guinea and Togo.

By a letter of 20 February,<sup>(\*)</sup> Chad declared that the January communique had not been approved by the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government and did not commit Chad, as it had been adopted in Chad's absence; peace had returned to Chad since the defeat of the rebel group and Chad firmly opposed any consideration of the situation by the Security Council.

By a letter dated 22 April,<sup>(2)</sup> Chad charged that Egypt and the Sudan were threatening it with armed aggression. Both countries denied these charges by letters of 24 April<sup>(4)</sup> and 27 April,<sup>(7)</sup> respectively; the Egyptian letter annexed a 24 April letter from its Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Council President.

The Sudan, on 16 September,<sup>(8)</sup> stated that the occupying Libyan forces in Chad had committed three acts of aggression against the

Sudan, bombing villages on 10 and 15 September and overflying the city of El Geneina on 15 September. Chad, on 21 September,<sup>(3)</sup> termed these charges baseless and said they were aimed at covering up the repeated military incursions launched against it from the Sudan by perpetrators assisted and protected by the Government. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya also responded to the Sudanese letter on 13 October in the context of its relations with the Sudan (p. 225).

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, by a letter of 24 November,<sup>(5)</sup> maintained that the presence of its forces in Chad, requested in 1980 by the Transitional National Union Government of President Goukouni Oueddi, had helped put an end to the civil war that had lasted since 1965; at the Government's request, all Libyan forces had been withdrawn by the third week of November 1981.

Letters: Chad: <sup>(1)</sup>20 Feb., S/14380; <sup>(2)</sup>22 Apr., S/14455; <sup>(3)</sup>21 Sep., S/14702. <sup>(4)</sup>Egypt: 24 Apr., S/14465. <sup>(5)</sup>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya: 24 Nov., S/14767. <sup>(6)</sup>Sierra Leone, transmitting OAU documents: 18 Feb., S/14378. Sudan: 127 Apr., S/14466; <sup>(8)</sup>16 Sep., S/14693.

## Status of the Comorian Island of Mayotte

The sovereignty of the Comoros over the Island of Mayotte was reaffirmed by the General Assembly in 1981, and France, which retained the island under its jurisdiction, was invited to resume its negotiations with the Comoros on the question.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In response to a 1980 Assembly request,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted a report dated 3 December 1981<sup>(1)</sup> on the question of the Comorian island of Mayotte. The report contained information from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Comoros, the Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations and OAU.

The Comoros, by a note verbale of 9 July, told the Secretary-General that new elements in French policy and the election of a President whose party had opposed the separation of Mayotte from the Comoros raised hopes for a solution; the Comoros wished to raise the issue shortly with the new French Government. France, by a note verbale of 14 September, informed the Secretary-General that its new Government had re-examined the question, and consultations with the Comoros had begun and would continue in the coming weeks.

The OAU activities on the question were indicated in three documents which that organiza-

tion transmitted to the Secretary-General on 2 December. By a resolution adopted in June, the OAU Council of Ministers called on the organization's Ad Hoc Committee of Seven on the Comorian Island of Mayotte, which had not been able to meet as requested by the Council in 1980,<sup>(5)</sup> to convene at Moroni, Comoros, before the Council's next session, to study the situation and recommend a settlement. This Committee, meeting at Moroni from 9 to 11 November, decided to send a mission to consult with French authorities on measures to return the island to the Comoros as soon as possible, and instructed the African Group to set in motion any United Nations action to hasten that return. The Committee also adopted a declaration reiterating its rejection of any recourse to a referendum or to any form of consultation in Mayotte, which would be considered null and void.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 10 December,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly reaffirmed the sovereignty of the Comoros over Mayotte and invited France to honour the commitments entered into prior to the 1974 referendum on self-determination of the Comoro Archipelago, concerning respect for the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros. France was also invited to resume and actively pursue negotiations with the Comoros, with a view to ensuring the island's return to the Comoros as soon as possible. The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to follow developments, in conjunction with the OAU Secretary-General, and to report again in 1982.

This resolution, sponsored by 15 States and introduced by the Comoros, was adopted by a recorded vote of 117 to 1, with 20 abstentions.

The question was also referred to in a resolution of 28 October on the self-determination of peoples, in which the Assembly took note of the contacts between the Comoros and France in the search for a just 'solution to the integration of Mayotte into the Comoros'.<sup>(3)</sup>

Explaining its vote against the resolution on Mayotte, France regretted that the question was again on the Assembly's agenda, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and despite the fact that the debate was not likely to bring a solution closer. The French President had stated that France was committed actively to seek a solution in the context of its national and of international law. It hoped that solution would take account of geographical, ethnic and historical links between the islands of the Archipelago. But France could not be expected to go counter to the sacred principle of self-determination; the inhabitants of Mayotte must freely choose their destiny. Mayotte's status was provisional and did not close the door to any evolution. France

encouraged the development of economic, commercial, human, cultural and other relations between Mayotte and the other Comorian islands, and relied on the Comoros' willingness to make it easier to strengthen such ties. France hoped to continue a constructive dialogue aimed at a solution consistent with the wishes of the inhabitants of all the islands.

The Comoros affirmed that Mayotte was a Comorian island and that the four Comorian islands, including Mayotte, constituted a single entity with a homogeneous population sharing the same language and culture and practising the same religion. During an official visit to France from 4 to 15 October, the President of the Comoros had been assured by the French President that France wished to end the dispute quickly. That position had been reiterated at a Conference of Heads of State of France and Africa (Paris, 4-6 November), when the French President had recalled that as a Deputy he had stood in 1974 and 1975 for the independence of the Comoros in unity. If France did not act speedily to find a solution, the Comoros' future would be jeopardized and tension in the Indian Ocean aggravated.

Australia said its abstention in the vote should not be interpreted as compromising its long-standing view that colonial Territories should be brought to independence on the basis of unity and territorial integrity.

The Ivory Coast said its positive vote could be interpreted only as encouraging negotiations to eliminate any cloud hovering over Franco-Comorian relations.

During the debate, most speakers welcomed the negotiations between France and the Comoros concerning Mayotte. The necessity of respecting the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoro Archipelago and of respecting prior commitments was reaffirmed by Botswana, Cuba, Gabon, Morocco, Senegal, Singapore and Zambia.

Gabon, Chairman of the OAU Committee on Mayotte, said that, since its creation, the Committee had undertaken unceasing efforts and innumerable mediation activities between the parties; its members had no doubt that a just and satisfactory solution could soon be achieved. Senegal, also a Committee member, said the strengthening of co-operation in all fields between France and the Comoros was proof of their desire to overcome the technical difficulties they faced; the United Nations should do more to contribute to the process they had started with a view to finding a solution.

Botswana asked why France, which had been able to decolonize its vast colonies in Africa without losing much face, should seem to want

to hang on to one island and run the risk of damaging its image in Africa. In Morocco's opinion, France could only increase its standing in the eyes of Africa and of the Comorian people if it responded positively to the Comoros' legitimate claims. Zambia said the dismemberment of the Comoros, if tolerated by the Assembly, would constitute a dangerous precedent, with grave implications for many small and weak countries. Singapore, speaking on behalf of the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, expressed a similar view.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/671.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/43, para. 4, 28 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 259); <sup>(3)</sup>36/9, para. 5, 28 Oct. 1981 (p. 895); <sup>(4)</sup>36/105, 10 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 258.

Meeting record: GA, A/136/PV.92 (10 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/105

1 17-1-20 (recorded vote) Meeting 92 10 December 1981

15-nation draft (A/36/L.54 and Add.1); agenda item 27.

Sponsors: Benin, Botswana, Cape Verde, Comoros, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Lesotho, Sierra Leone, Somalia, United Arab Emirates Zambia.

Question of the Comorian island of Mayotte

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, containing the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration.

Recalling also its previous resolutions, in particular resolutions 3161 (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973, 3291 (XXIX) of 13 December 1974, 31/4 of 21 October 1976, 32/7 of 1 November 1977, 34/69 of 6 December 1979 and 35/4:3 of 28 November 1980, in which It, inter alia, affirmed the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros,

Recalling, in particular, its resolution 3385(XXX) of 12 November 1975 on the admission of the Comoros to membership in the United Nations, in which it reaffirmed the necessity of respecting the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoro Archipelago, composed of the islands of Anjouan, Grande-Comore, Mayotte and Mohéli.

Recalling further that, in accordance with the agreements signed on 15 June 1973 between the Comoros and France concerning the accession of the Comoros to independence, the results of the referendum of 22 December 1974 were to be considered on a global basis and not island by island,

Convinced that a just and lasting solution to the question of Mayotte is to be found in respect for the sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of the Comoro Archipelago,

Taking note of the talks opened between the Government of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros and the Government of the French Republic,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General,

Bearing in mind the decisions of the Organization of African Unity, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of the Islamic Conference concerning this question,

1. Reaffirms the sovereignty of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros over the island of Mayotte;

2. Invites the Government of France to honour the commitments entered into prior to the referendum on the self-determination of the Comoro Archipelago of 22 December 1974 concerning respect for the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros;

3. Also invites the Government of France to resume and actively pursue the negotiations with the Government of the

Comoros with a view to ensuring the effective return of the island of Mayotte to the Comoros as soon as possible;

4. Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to follow developments concerning this question, in conjunction with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Question of the Comorian island of Mayotte".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamshiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: France.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, United States.

Denying these charges in a letter of 11 August,<sup>(5)</sup> the Sudan described them as an attempt to cover up Libyan designs of aggression and intervention in the internal affairs of other States; it reiterated a suggestion that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya accept impartial inspection to ascertain the presence of foreign troops in the two countries, and declared that co-operation between Egypt and the Sudan should not be construed as a threat against any State.

On 13 October,<sup>(3)</sup> the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya transmitted to the Council President a letter from the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison, charging that the Sudan had escalated the mobilization of Sudanese and Egyptian troops on their borders with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and had established an airlift between Egypt and the Sudan to transport troops and equipment to the border area, with the aim of covering up foreign intervention in support of the insurgency against Chad (p. 223).

Letters: Libyan Arab Jamahiriya: <sup>(1)</sup>14 Apr., A/36/206; <sup>(2)</sup>31 July, S/14624; <sup>(3)</sup>13 Oct., S/14722. Sudan: <sup>(4)</sup>23 Apr., A/36/223; <sup>(5)</sup>11 Aug., S/14628.

## Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Sudan

In several communications during 1981, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya charged Egypt and the Sudan with harbouring hostile plans against it, which the two countries denied.

By a letter of 14 April,<sup>(1)</sup> the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya transmitted to the Secretary-General a letter to the Arab kings and heads of State from its own head of State and Leader of the First of September Revolution, charging that the President of the Sudan, in a statement published by the International Herald Tribune of Paris, had offered to assist anyone willing to kill the Libyan leader. The Sudan denied the charges by a letter of 23 April.<sup>(4)</sup>

On 31 July,<sup>(2)</sup> the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya transmitted to the President of the Security Council a telegram of 30 July from the Secretary of the People's Committee of the Libyan People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison, stating that repeated hostile statements by the Presidents of Egypt and the Sudan, and the stationing of 90,000 Egyptian troops in the Sudan near the Libyan border, made it evident that a plan for military aggression by the two countries against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was being hatched in co-ordination with Israel and the United States.

## Status of Malagasy islands in the Indian Ocean

In response to a 1980 General Assembly request for follow-up and report,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General addressed communications to the Governments of France and Madagascar on 2 April 1981, inviting them to inform him of any developments since December 1980 on the question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India.

Reporting on 25 November 1981 <sup>(1)</sup> on the information supplied in response to his request, the Secretary-General said Madagascar had informed him that the question had been discussed in June by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, which decided to keep the matter under consideration. France had informed him that it had no information to provide. The Secretary-General reported that the Presidents of the two countries had met in Paris on 30 September, and if either party transmitted additional information he would reproduce it for the Assembly.

By a decision of 16 December,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted without vote on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, the Assembly decided to include the question in the provisional agenda of its 1982 session. The decision was approved

by the Committee in similar fashion on 2 December on an oral proposal by its Chairman, who told the Committee that Madagascar, following consultations with interested delegations, had requested deferral of the item.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/718.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 35/1123, para. 5, 11 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 263). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/432, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: G.A.: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.1 (16 Sep.); SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.47 (2 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/432

Adopted without vote

Approved by SPC (A/36/813) without vote. 2 December (meeting 47): oral proposal by Chairman on suggestion by Madagascar; agenda item 65.

Question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India

At its 100th plenary meeting, on 16 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, decided to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India".

## Armed attack against Seychelles

On 25 November 1981, an armed group landed in a civil aircraft at Seychelles International Airport on the main island of Mahé, fought at the airport with the Seychelles People's Defence Force and hijacked another aircraft to the South African port of Durban. Seychelles charged that South Africa had been involved in the incident and requested a Security Council meeting. The Council, by a resolution unanimously adopted on 15 December,<sup>(7)</sup> condemned the attack and established a commission of inquiry to investigate the incident.

COMMUNICATIONS. On 26 November,<sup>(2)</sup> Seychelles transmitted a telegram of the same date from its Minister for Foreign Affairs, stating that a group of mercenaries, presumably of South African origin, had attacked Seychelles International Airport on 25 November and taken its personnel hostage after landing on board a scheduled flight of Royal Air Swazi. The Seychelles People's Defence Force had brought the situation under control, freed most of the hostages and subjugated several invaders; others had fled, hijacking an Air India aircraft and diverting it to Durban with all passengers on board.

By a letter of 1 December,<sup>(3)</sup> Seychelles transmitted to the Secretary-General a note from its Foreign Ministry announcing strict security measures as a result of the attack and other recent airspace violations, and declaring that aircraft committing further violations would be shot down without warning. On 8 December, Sey-

chelles requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council on the incident.<sup>(4)</sup>

Also on 8 December, Kenya transmitted a government statement rejecting allegations made by one of the captured mercenaries that it was involved in the attempted coup.<sup>(1)</sup>

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION. By a resolution of 15 December,<sup>(7)</sup> prepared during consultations among its members and adopted unanimously, the Security Council affirmed that the territorial integrity and political independence of Seychelles must be respected and condemned the mercenary aggression against Seychelles and the subsequent hijacking. It decided to send a commission of three of its members to investigate the origin, background and financing of that aggression, as well as to assess and evaluate economic damages, and to report to the Council with recommendations not later than 31 January 1982. The members were to be appointed after consultations between the Council's President and members and Seychelles.

Before this action, the Council invited Botswana and Seychelles, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion, which took place at its meeting of 15 December.

Giving its account of the attack, Seychelles said that Royal Air Swazi, on whose flight the 44 foreign mercenaries had arrived, had confirmed that they had boarded the aircraft after arriving at Matsapha Airport in Swaziland by coach from South Africa, posing as members of a sports club. On their arrival at the Seychelles airport, security forces had been alerted after a sub-machine-gun was found in their luggage. The mercenaries had then taken control of the airport and of the 70 persons present. In the subsequent fighting, one mercenary had been killed and six captured, and damage estimated at \$30 million had been caused. Only five of the mercenaries escaping to Durban had been charged by South Africa with kidnapping and released on trivial bail, while the others had been set free without being charged, despite Seychelles' request that they be returned to Seychelles to stand trial before an international tribunal appointed by the United Nations.

The incident was condemned or deplored by most Council members, including China, France, the German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, the Niger, Tunisia, Uganda, the USSR and the United Kingdom. The dispatch of a commission of inquiry—which had been requested by Seychelles—was specifically endorsed by the majority of speakers, including Botswana, France, the German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, the Niger, the USSR and the United Kingdom. Japan recalled that it had repeatedly stressed the need to strengthen

the fact-finding capacity of United Nations organs, including the Security Council.

The United States, though joining the consensus on the resolution, said the Council should reflect on three broader issues: whether the intervention was a purely internal affair; whether the Council was prejudging the investigation by assuming that another State was involved; and whether a Government which had survived an attempted coup—and even one which had not—could always legitimately request a United Nations investigation and perhaps redress.

In the Niger's view, the incident was an armed attempt to overthrow an established Government, a violation of the territorial integrity of a sovereign State and an attempt to destabilize it. Botswana, Tunisia and Uganda expressed similar views. China said the invasion posed a grave threat to the sovereignty and security of an independent State. Ireland regarded the events not simply as an attempted coup d'état, but as a major attack from outside on a small State particularly vulnerable to such attack. Spain stated that the use of international banditry and mercenaries endangered world peace and security.

Botswana, speaking for the African Group, felt that South Africa's action and its attitude towards the mercenaries cast serious doubts and suspicion on its protestations of innocence. Uganda considered that the evidence of South Africa's involvement, widely reported by many independent sources, could not be ignored. The German Democratic Republic said it was typical that the mercenaries who had committed the attack were set free by South Africa. Mexico said that, according to the initial evidence, the aggression against Seychelles was part of a long chain of attacks from South Africa against neighbouring States.

Tunisia believed that, after having studied the inquiry commission's report, the Council would have to take measures required by the gravity of such acts. The USSR expressed its conviction that the Council, on receiving the report, would act to defend the sovereignty of Seychelles and to prevent acts of international terrorism carried out by mercenaries against the independence of developing States.

The United Kingdom announced that it had agreed to implement a previous agreement on aid to Seychelles and would view sympathetically any request for assistance in repairing the damage done to the airport.

The Council President, by a note of 24 December,<sup>(\*)</sup> reported that agreement had been reached in consultations with the Council members and Seychelles that the commission of inquiry would be composed of Ireland, Japan and Panama.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In its resolution of 17 December entitled "Acts of aggression by the apartheid régime against Angola and other independent African States",<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly condemned unprovoked acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola, Seychelles and other African States. The November invasion of Seychelles was mentioned, together with the January raid against Mozambique and the July invasion of Angola (p. 221), in a preambular paragraph condemning South African aggression.

In explanation of vote on this resolution, Australia, Ireland and the Netherlands, which voted in favour, said they wished to await the report of the Security Council's commission of inquiry in regard to Seychelles. New Zealand, though also supporting the text, believed that no country should be condemned before the evidence established the facts beyond reasonable doubt; it added that in the case of the Seychelles events, the circumstances were not clear. Canada also expressed reservations regarding the charge against South Africa in regard to Seychelles.

Responding to these remarks, Seychelles said it would be surprising if South Africa had not known about the invasion, given the number of white mercenaries involved with ties to its security services.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Kenya: 8 Dec., A/36/808-S/14785. Seychelles: <sup>(2)</sup>26 Nov., S/14769 & Corr.1; <sup>(3)</sup>1 Dec., S/14777; <sup>(4)</sup>8 Dec., S/14783.

Note: <sup>(5)</sup>SC President, S/14816.

Resolutions: <sup>(6)</sup>GA, 36/172 C, para. 1, 17 Dec. (p. 216);

<sup>(7)</sup>SC, 496(1981), 15 Dec., text following.

Meeting record: SC, S/PV.2314 (15 Dec.).

Security Council resolution 496(1981)

Adopted unanimously Meeting 2314 15 December 1981

Draft prepared in consultations among Council members S/1 4793).

The Security Council,

Taking note of the letter dated 8 December 1981 from the Charge d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Seychelles to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council,

Having heard the statement of the representative of the Republic of Seychelles,

Bearing in mind that all Member States must refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations,

1. Affirms that the territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Seychelles must be respected;

2. Condemns the recent mercenary aggression against the Republic of Seychelles and the subsequent hijacking;

3. Decides to send a commission of inquiry composed of three members of the Security Council in order to investigate the origin, background and financing of the mercenary aggression of 25 November 1981 against the Republic of Seychelles, as well as assess and evaluate economic damages, and to report to the Council with recommendations no later than 31 January 1982;



4. Decides that the members of the commission of inquiry will be appointed after consultations between the President and the members of the Security Council and the Republic of Seychelles;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the commission of inquiry with the necessary assistance;

6. Decides to remain seized of the question.

## Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity

In 1981, co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) continued in a number of areas, and the General Assembly called for a strengthening of co-operative activities between the two organizations.

In a report to the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General reviewed developments in five areas: a meeting at Geneva from 13 to 16 April between representatives of the OAU General Secretariat and the secretariats of the United Nations system; consultations and exchange of information; co-operation with regard to the situation in southern Africa; co-operation on economic and social development; and co-operation on information and publicity. The report also gave highlights of assistance rendered to African countries by the United Nations system.

The report noted that the Secretary-General had addressed the eighteenth OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government, held from 15 to 26 June at Nairobi, Kenya, where he also had held talks on matters of common concern with the OAU Chairman and other African leaders.

The report summarized the conclusions reached at the Geneva meeting of secretariat officials in April, which was attended by representatives of 37 United Nations organizations and units.

In regard to public information, the participants agreed on a regular exchange of programme material between an OAU radio service to be established and the United Nations radio service and other United Nations offices producing radio programmes. They further agreed that OAU should make available to the United Nations and the specialized agencies as soon as possible information on its activities and all press releases issued by it, invite heads of missions and delegations and representatives of agencies to its press conferences, and welcome the publication of articles on questions of interest to Africa in journals published by the United Nations and other organizations.

Concerning research relating to development

and science and technology, the meeting stressed the importance of facilitating OAU access to the results of such research conducted by the United Nations system, and said it would be useful to exchange visits and agree on lines of research. African research programmes and centres needed to be strengthened through bilateral and multilateral assistance, with United Nations help.

With regard to the training of personnel, it was agreed that the United Nations system should continue to orient its programmes to the needs of African countries and that it would be useful for the OAU secretariat to draw up training priorities. OAU also requested international organizations to consider helping to train the personnel of national liberation movements in various fields, according to their needs.

Other topics discussed at the meeting were the employment of Africans in United Nations organizations (p. 1319), refugees and assistance to liberation movements.

Instances mentioned in the Secretary-General's report of co-operation between the United Nations and OAU in regard to southern Africa included: collaboration by the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia in implementing projects of the OAU Bureau for Placement and Education of African Refugees; OAU participation in sectoral workshops for development of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia (p. 1174); OAU co-operation with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in organizing meetings with national liberation movements on plans for assisting their humanitarian and developments needs (p. 1098); a meeting organized by the International Labour Organisation (Livingstone, Zambia, 4-8 May) 'to help plan a joint programme of action against apartheid, in co-operation with OAU and the Special Committee against Apartheid; and a February visit by an OAU committee to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), to discuss possible assistance to front-line States in southern Africa.

In the field of economic and social development, the report stated that the Information Service of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and the OAU Bureau for refugees had jointly disseminated information on the 1981 International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (p. 1039). The ECA Information Service had also contributed towards the establishment of the Pan-African News Agency, participating in preparatory meetings. An ECA/OAU committee on modalities for implementing the 1980 Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa (p. 611) had begun to meet.

OAU, ECA and UNIDO had co-sponsored the Sixth Conference of African Ministers of Industry (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 23-25 November) (p. 621). UNIDO had convened a working group (Vienna, March 1981) at which it discussed with ECA and OAU representatives the outline of a joint programme to assist in implementing the Industrial Development Decade for Africa (1980-1990). As part of UNDP co-operation with OAU, projects had been approved relating to the social implications of the Lagos Plan of Action (UNDP contribution, \$411,266) and strengthening of OAU/UNDP co-operation (UNDP contribution, \$47,500).

The 54 resolutions and a declaration adopted by the OAU Council of Ministers at its thirty-seventh ordinary session (Nairobi, 15-26 June) and the two resolutions and two decisions adopted by the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government at its eighteenth ordinary session (Nairobi, 24-27 June) were transmitted to the Secretary-General by a letter of 18 September from Algeria.<sup>(1)</sup>

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** The OAU Chairman for 1981/1982, Daniel T. arap Moi, President of Kenya, addressed the General Assembly on 24 September 1981, discussing political and economic questions of concern to Africa. He saw no alternative to taking whatever steps were necessary to bring independence to Namibia, declared that there could be no compromise with apartheid and demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African forces from Angola. He asked Ethiopia and Somalia to apply the fundamental OAU principles of respect for boundaries and non-interference in internal affairs. He requested additional international assistance to alleviate Africa's refugee problems and said Africans recognized the need to deal with the causes of those problems. He called for new development strategies based on collective self-reliance and Africa's immense resources, since past strategies, dependent on foreign aid and export of primary commodities, had failed. He stressed Africa's needs in regard to food, industrial development, and transport and communications.

By a resolution of 9 December,<sup>(3)</sup> sponsored by 50 African States and adopted without vote, the General Assembly approved the decisions, recommendations, proposals and arrangements contained in the conclusions of the Geneva meeting of secretariat officials of OAU and the United Nations system, and called on United Nations organizations and bodies to consider those recommendations and proposals with the object of enhancing co-operation with OAU. The Assembly requested that the next such meeting be arranged at Rome, Italy, in April 1982. It asked

that adequate provision be made for technical assistance to the OAU secretariat and that measures be taken to strengthen political, economic, cultural and administrative co-operation with OAU. It called on United Nations bodies to continue to associate OAU closely with all their work concerning Africa and urged United Nations organizations to expand their co-operation with OAU and, through it, their assistance to national liberation movements.

In other provisions the Assembly urged support for economic assistance programmes in Africa (p. 497), recognized the importance of co-operative work for the social and economic development of Africa (p. 611) and called for increased aid to refugees in Africa (p. 1040) and equitable representation of Africans in secretariats of the United Nations system (p. 1319).

Explaining its position on the resolution, the United States commended OAU efforts to seek regional solutions to regional problems but voiced reservations with regard to references to the Lagos Plan of Action, regarded it as totally inappropriate to channel funds of the United Nations system through liberation movements, and objected to the use of the phrase "acts of aggression" in reference to South Africa's actions against front-line States, on the ground that the Assembly could not override the Security Council's discretion. Sierra Leone, on the other hand, stated that the co-operation of the specialized agencies with the liberation movements had always been of a humanitarian character; also, the definition of aggression by the Security Council, although left to the Council's discretion, should not be capricious.

The Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom reaffirmed their view that the Assembly should not in principle approve decisions taken in forums other than those of the United Nations. France expressed concern that it would be difficult to control the financial implications of the recommendations of the Geneva meeting.

Speaking in the debate, Botswana, as Chairman of the African Group, declared that OAU was determined to make its co-operation with the United Nations work.

The United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Community members, supported United Nations efforts to reinforce and intensify assistance to OAU and promised that the Community would continue to work closely with all African countries in promoting economic and social development. Endorsing these views, Belgium supported any regional effort to help Africa solve its problems.

The USSR expressed its conviction that continuing and growing co-operation between the

United Nations and OAU was in keeping with the interests of the struggle to eliminate the vestiges of colonialism, racism and apartheid and the task of consolidating peace and international security. The German Democratic Republic voiced appreciation for OAU efforts to strengthen co-operation among African States and solve the continent's problems.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, annexing OAU resolutions, 18 Sep., A/36/534.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/317 & Add.1, 2.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/80, 9 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/793; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/85.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.11, 90 (24 Sep., 9 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.66 (8 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/80

Adopted without vote Meeting 90 9 December 1981  
50-nation draft (A/36/L.19 and Corr.1); agenda item 29.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity,

Recalling its previous resolutions on the promotion of co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity and the practical measures taken for their implementation, in particular resolution 35/117 of 10 December 1980,

Taking note of the relevant resolutions, decisions and declarations adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-seventh ordinary session and by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of that organization at its eighteenth ordinary session, which were held at Nairobi from 15 to 27 June 1981,

Considering the important statement made by the current Chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity before the General Assembly on 24 September 1981, particularly on matters of concern to the two organizations,

Noting with satisfaction the continued co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in areas of common interest,

Deeply conscious of the special needs of the newly independent African States, particularly with regard to the consolidation of their national independence, their endeavours towards social and economic betterment and the adverse impact on their economies of the current international economic situation,

Gravely concerned about the adverse effect on African economies of the current international economic situation,

Recalling in this connection the Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its second extraordinary session, held at Lagos on 28 and 29 April 1980,

Recognizing the need for closer co-operation between the Organization of African Unity and all specialized organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system in realiz-

ing the goals and objectives set forth in the Lagos Plan of Action,

Convinced that the attendance at the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa, held at Geneva on 9 and 10 April 1981, bears evidence to the fact that the Conference drew international public attention to the grave situation and massive needs of African refugees,

Gravely concerned also at the need for special economic and emergency assistance programmes for a number of African States which face serious economic problems, in particular problems of displaced persons, resulting from natural or other disasters, to enable them to pursue effective economic development,

Gravely concerned further at the deteriorating situation in southern Africa arising from the continued domination of the peoples of the area by the minority racist régime of South Africa and conscious of the need to provide increased assistance to the peoples of the region and to their liberation movements in their struggle against colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid,

Conscious of its responsibilities to provide economic, material and humanitarian assistance to independent States in southern Africa to help them to cope with the situation caused by the acts of aggression committed against their territories by the apartheid régime of South Africa.

Recognizing the importance of taking effective steps to give the widest possible dissemination of information relating to the liberation struggle of the peoples of southern Africa,

Recognizing the need for continuous liaison, exchange of information at the secretariat level and technical co-operation on such matters as training and research between the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the meeting between representatives of the General Secretariat of the Organization of African Unity and the secretariats of the United Nations and other organizations of the United Nations system, held at Geneva from 13 to 16 April 1981,

Noting with satisfaction the useful decisions and proposals which emerged from the Geneva meeting for enhancing co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity and commends his efforts in strengthening such co-operation;

2. Notes with appreciation the increasing participation of the Organization of African Unity in the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and its constructive contribution to that work;

3. Commends the continued efforts of the Organization of African Unity to promote multilateral co-operation among African States and to find solutions to African problems of vital importance to the international community and notes with satisfaction the increased collaboration of various United Nations agencies in support of those efforts;

4. Reiterates the determination of the United Nations, in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity, to intensify its efforts to eliminate colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid in southern Africa;

5. Approves the decisions, recommendations, proposals and arrangements contained in the conclusions of the Geneva meeting of representatives of the General Secretariat of the Organization of African Unity and the secretariats of the United Nations and other organizations of the United Nations system;

6. Calls upon the competent organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to give urgent consideration to the various recommendations and proposals contained in the conclusions of the Geneva meeting with the objective of enhancing co-operation between the United Nations system and the Organization of African Unity;

7. Calls upon the competent organs, specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to ensure that their personnel and recruitment policies provide

for the just and equitable representation of Africa at all levels at their respective headquarters and in their regional and field operations and to give due consideration to the various suggestions and proposals in the relevant paragraphs of the conclusions and recommendations of the meeting;

8. Recommends that the pertinent organs and organizations of the United Nations system should take into account the various recommendations and proposals of the Geneva meeting in the fields of information, research and training;

9. Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, to arrange for the next meeting between representatives of the General Secretariat of that organization and the secretariats of the United Nations and other organizations of the United Nations system to be held at Rome in April 1982, as called for in the conclusions of the meeting held at Nairobi in June 1980;

10. Recognizes the importance of continued close association by the United Nations and the specialized agencies, where appropriate, with the efforts of the Organization of African Unity to promote social and economic development and to advance intra-African co-operation in this vital field;

11. Reaffirms the determination of the United Nations to work closely with the Organization of African Unity towards the establishment of the new international economic order in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and, in that regard, to take full account of the Lagos Plan of Action for the implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

12. Reiterates its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his efforts, on behalf of the international community, to organize and mobilize special economic assistance programmes for African States experiencing grave economic difficulties, in particular for newly independent African States and the front-line States, to help them to cope with the situation caused by the acts of aggression committed against their territories by the apartheid régime of South Africa;

13. Calls upon all Member States, regional and international organizations and organizations of the United Nations system to participate actively in the implementation of those special economic assistance programmes;

14. Requests the Secretary-General to keep the Organization of African Unity informed periodically of the response of the international community to those programmes and to coordinate efforts with all similar programmes initiated by the Organization of African Unity;

15. Requests the Secretary-General and the organizations

of the United Nations system to ensure that adequate facilities shall continue to be made available for the provision of technical assistance to the General Secretariat of the Organization of African Unity as required;

16. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to take the necessary measures to strengthen co-operation at the political, economic, cultural and administrative levels between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, particularly with regard to the provision of assistance to the victims of colonialism and apartheid in southern Africa, and in this connection draws once again the attention of the international community to the need to contribute to the Assistance Fund for the Struggle against Colonialism and Apartheid established by the Organization of African Unity;

17. Calls upon all Member States and organizations of the United Nations system to increase their assistance to the African States affected by serious economic problems, in particular problems of displaced persons, resulting from natural or other disasters, by mobilizing special economic and emergency assistance programmes;

18. Calls upon all Member States and regional and international organizations, in particular those of the United Nations system, and non-governmental organizations to increase substantially their aid to refugees in Africa;

19. Requests the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat and all the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to give wider publicity to and intensify the dissemination of information on social and economic development matters concerning Africa;

20. Calls upon United Nations bodies, in particular the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Special Committee against Apartheid and the United Nations Council for Namibia, to continue to associate closely the Organization of African Unity with all their work concerning Africa;

21. Urges the specialized agencies and the other organizations concerned within the United Nations system to continue and expand their co-operation with the Organization of African Unity and, through it, their assistance to the liberation movements recognized by that organization;

22. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report on the implementation of the present resolution and on the development of co-operation between the Organization of African Unity and the organizations concerned within the United Nations system.

## Chapter VI

### Asia

During 1981, situations in and around Afghanistan and Kampuchea, and the peace and security of South-East Asia, were the focus of debates and actions by the General Assembly.

On Western Asia, the Assembly, in November, again called for immediate foreign troop withdrawal from Afghanistan and requested the Secretary-General to continue efforts aimed at a political solution and guarantees for neighbouring States<sup>(3)</sup> with regard to Iran, the ongoing armed conflict with Iraq was the subject of letters

from the two sides to the Secretary-General (p. 238), and in October Kuwait complained of an aerial attack by Iran (p. 239). The United Nations was informed that United States Embassy personnel held in Iran since 1979 had been released (p. 239).

Concerning South-East Asia, a General Assembly-sponsored International Conference on Kampuchea met in July<sup>(1)</sup> and adopted a Declaration, approved by the Assembly in October,<sup>(2)</sup> that included four elements for negotiating

a comprehensive political settlement of the Kampuchea situation. The Assembly also discussed the question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia (p. 250). Other disputes in the area-pertaining to the Kampuchea-Thailand border (p. 249), an incident between the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Thailand (p. 249) and relations between China and Viet Nam (p. 250)—were the subject of communications from the States concerned.

A report from the United Nations Command concerning implementation of the 1953 Korean Armistice Agreement was submitted by the United States (p. 253).

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup> Report of the International Conference on Kampuchea (A/CONF.109/5), Sales No. E.81.I.20.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/5, 21 Oct. (p. 246); <sup>(3)</sup>36/34, 18 Nov. (p. 237).

## Western Asia

### Afghanistan situation

As it had decided in 1980,<sup>(19)</sup> the General Assembly took up again in 1981 the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security. It called once more for immediate foreign troop withdrawal, reaffirmed the Afghan people's right to determine their own form of government, requested continued efforts by the Secretary-General for a political solution, called for the creation of conditions for voluntary return of Afghan refugees and appealed for aid for them.<sup>(20)</sup> During the year, the Secretary-General and his newly appointed Personal Representative on the situation held talks with the parties aimed at facilitating negotiations.

Afghanistan, the socialist countries of Eastern Europe and others opposed the Assembly resolution and called for a negotiated political solution guaranteeing non-intervention in the country's internal affairs; they stated that Afghanistan was being threatened by counter-revolutionaries based in neighbouring Pakistan who sought to overthrow the Government established following the revolution of April 1978. Many of those supporting the resolution called for withdrawal of USSR troops sent to Afghanistan in December 1979, and the establishment of conditions that would permit the Afghan people to exercise self-determination.

The Secretary-General received a number of communications on the Afghanistan situation during the year. Also, several delegations recorded reservations in regard to the credentials of that country's representatives to the General Assembly (p. 237).

During 1981, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR.) continued to assist Afghan refugees in Pakistan (p. 1033).

COMMUNICATIONS (JANUARY-MID-NOVEMBER). The Secretary-General received several communications on the Afghanistan situation from January to mid-November.

A 19 January letter from Afghanistan<sup>(1)</sup> transmitted a 17 January statement by its Government repeating earlier offers of amnesty and guarantees to Afghans who had left the country and were willing to return. A further letter from Afghanistan, dated 23 January,<sup>(2)</sup> transmitted a 17 January statement by its Ministry of Foreign Affairs stating that any decision on the Afghanistan situation taken at the Third Islamic Summit Conference (Taif, Saudi Arabia, 25-28 January) would be illegal and not binding on Afghanistan, whose membership in the Organization of the Islamic Conference had been unjustly suspended.

On 24 March, the European Council (the heads of State and Government and the ministers for foreign affairs of the European Community (EC), in a statement issued at Maastricht, Netherlands, and transmitted by the Netherlands on 26 March,<sup>(7)</sup> expressed concern that developments in Afghanistan remained a threat to regional and world-wide stability, and emphasized the need for a solution entailing foreign troop withdrawal and allowing the Afghan people to exercise self-determination.

An Afghan Government statement of 24 August, transmitted two days later,<sup>(3)</sup> set out its views on the problem of a political settlement, including the following: the main aim must be to secure complete and reliable cessation of armed and any other intervention in Afghan affairs and to create conditions that would make future interference impossible; international guarantees to that effect should be provided by the USSR, the United States and others; with cessation and guaranteed non-recurrence of armed intervention and any other interference in its domestic affairs, the causes of Afghanistan's appeal for a limited USSR military contingent to be sent to its territory would cease to exist; Afghanistan was willing to negotiate with Iran and Pakistan, either bilaterally or trilaterally.

In letters of 10 September<sup>(8)</sup> and 20 October,<sup>(9)</sup> Pakistan complained of incursions into its territory by Afghan forces. It said that attacks by two aircraft in Baluchistan on 5 September had caused civilian casualties and property damage; on 7 September, 40 Afghan soldiers had penetrated a mile beyond the border near Chaman; and on 4 October, the Pakistan border post of Domandai had been strafed by two Afghan aircraft. In a note verbale of 23 Septem-

ber,<sup>(4)</sup> Afghanistan denied that there had been any border violations by its armed forces and aircraft, and said the anti-Afghan allegations were particularly regrettable at a time when Afghanistan had launched a new initiative aimed at normalizing relations through direct negotiation.

By a letter of 12 November,<sup>(5)</sup> Afghanistan transmitted a statement by its Minister for Foreign Affairs, stating that a proposal by the European Council for an international conference to discuss the Afghanistan situation without the participation of the Afghan Government constituted interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs; the process of a political settlement should begin with direct negotiations between Afghanistan and its neighbours, Iran and Pakistan.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In pursuance of a 1980 General Assembly request,<sup>(18)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted on 6 November 1981 a report on the Afghanistan situation.<sup>(15)</sup>

In efforts to facilitate negotiations among the parties so as to achieve a political solution, the report stated, the Secretary-General's Personal Representative, Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, appointed on 11 February, had twice travelled to Afghanistan and Pakistan (12-16 April, 4-9 August) and had met with President Mohammed Zia ul-Haq, Foreign Minister Agha Shahi and senior officials of Pakistan as well as with President Babrak Karmal, Prime Minister Sultan Ali Keshtmand, Foreign Minister Shah Mohammad Dost and senior officials of Afghanistan. In April, both Governments had emphasized the desire for a peaceful political solution and welcomed the visits as a positive step that might lead to negotiations. An understanding had been reached in August on the substantive issues to be negotiated, but not on their format. In the second half of September and early October, the Secretary-General and his representative had met separately on several occasions with the two Foreign Ministers, who had stressed their respective priorities on the issues to be negotiated and reaffirmed their desire to continue the diplomatic process. Meanwhile, during a visit of the Secretary-General to the USSR in May, the Soviet Government had stressed that it favoured a political settlement and supported continued efforts to resolve the problem peacefully.

The Secretary-General concluded that the approach adopted could facilitate the search for a fair political solution which would ensure that the Afghan people would be able to determine their own destiny, free from foreign intervention and interference. He would continue to pursue all possibilities for a peaceful settlement.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 18 November, the General Assembly adopted a resolution

on the Afghanistan situation<sup>(20)</sup> by a recorded vote of 116 to 23, with 12 abstentions. The draft, sponsored by 45 States, was introduced by Pakistan.

By wording similar to resolutions it had adopted in January<sup>(16)</sup> and November<sup>(17)</sup> 1980, the Assembly called for immediate foreign troop withdrawal from Afghanistan, reiterated that preservation of that country's sovereignty and territorial integrity was essential for a peaceful solution, and reaffirmed the Afghan people's right to determine their own form of government free from outside intervention. It called for creation of conditions, for the voluntary return of Afghan refugees and renewed its appeal for aid to them. Expressing appreciation for the Secretary-General's efforts in the search for a solution, the Assembly requested him to continue efforts to promote a political solution and explore ways to guarantee non-use or threat of force against all neighbouring States on the basis of strict non-interference in each other's internal affairs. It asked him to report at the earliest appropriate opportunity.

Afghanistan, explaining its vote against this resolution, said that no resolution, conference or committee would help settle the situation around Afghanistan; only direct negotiations based on equality between its Government and those of Iran and Pakistan could do so. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which also voted against, said the resolution constituted propaganda for the United States imperialist camp.

Among the States which voted for the resolution, Albania said it would have liked stronger and more explicit condemnation of USSR aggression and special emphasis on support for the liberation struggle of the Afghan people. Iran considered that the solution was the task of the Afghan mujahideen (freedom fighters) and of neighbouring States directly affected. Peru would have preferred a more comprehensive, up-to-date text and a more conciliatory tone, in view of the complex negotiations required for an agreement. Vanuatu felt that the resolution failed to set forth the context and provocations from which the current situation had evolved; Vanuatu also dissociated itself from any artificial distinction between covert and overt interference in a State's affairs, since it considered that the introduction of covert operatives was comparable to the introduction of foreign troops.

In the debate preceding adoption of the resolution, and in an address during the Assembly's general debate, Pakistan stated that the true intent of the Kabul authorities' proposals was to secure legitimacy for their régime and attribute internal conflict to external instigation; Pakistan was ready to engage in an exchange of views

through the Secretary-General and prepare the ground for trilateral talks with Iran and the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, and would co-operate in implementing any international guarantees linked to the complete withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan according to an established timetable.

Iran proposed a scheme leading to national elections for an Afghan Parliament that would write an Islamic constitution; it said details could be negotiated among the Afghan mujahideen, Pakistan, Iran and the USSR as soon as the USSR agreed to recognize Afghan rights and to withdraw its forces.

The majority of delegations speaking in the Assembly saw the situation in Afghanistan as a threat to regional stability, a danger to international peace and security and a threat to détente, and urged that a political settlement be based on the withdrawal of foreign troops and the exercise of the right to self-determination of the Afghan people. It was said that the resistance of the Afghan people in refusing to submit to an invasion belied the arguments put forward by the Afghan Government and its supporters.

A number of speakers criticized the USSR for maintaining troops in Afghanistan since December 1979 and called for their prompt withdrawal. In Canada's view, the Afghan régime was being maintained only through the pressure of an occupying USSR army, which had to contend with a resistance movement that controlled a large part of the countryside. The Federal Republic of Germany said that USSR support for the proposals of the Afghanistan régime served only to divert public opinion from the real issue—immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops. The United States said the Kabul régime was being propped up by 85,000 USSR troops who had used internationally prohibited anti-personnel weapons and, according to refugee reports, lethal and incapacitating chemical weapons in Afghanistan.

According to China, the USSR continued to ignore world opinion by stepping up its war of aggression against Afghanistan, including construction of permanent fortifications and a massacre of inhabitants by every means short of nuclear weapons.

France, Nepal, Norway, Portugal, Tunisia and Zaire were among those which said they were not prepared to accept any justification for military intervention, nor recognize a situation so created. The Comoros stated that if the USSR could invade an independent country with impunity at the invitation of a small minority for the benefit of exiled leaders and for the USSR's advantage, no country could be confident of its independence. A similar position was expressed

by Thailand. Tunisia cautioned that, if one precedent was accepted, it might degenerate into a practice particularly threatening to small countries. Saudi Arabia said its condemnation of the USSR military occupation was not on ideological grounds; it condemned any invasion of one country by another.

In New Zealand's view, the USSR invasion of Afghanistan and establishment of a puppet régime was an alarming example of a powerful nation using force to impose its will on a defenceless neighbour. Sweden said that to persist in efforts to subjugate a neighbouring nation by brute force betrayed an arrogance and lack of political wisdom which caused great concern all over the world. Austria and Turkey were concerned that the developments in Afghanistan had dealt a serious blow to détente.

Albania stated that, by its occupation of Afghanistan, the USSR had revealed itself as an imperialist Power that was increasing its threat to the independence of sovereign States. Democratic Kampuchea said that, in both Afghanistan and Kampuchea, an independent non-aligned State had fallen victim to an expansionist policy which was part of a global strategy for regional and world domination. Haiti, stressing the need to end the suffering of the Afghan people, called on all concerned to rise above selfish schemes and political tactics.

Somalia noted that both the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Non-Aligned Countries (New Delhi, India, 9-13 February) and the Organization of the Islamic Conference had called for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan. Sri Lanka urged the USSR to respond to such calls with at least a gesture of withdrawal. The Sudan said that the support given to the third world by the USSR did not justify the occupation or denial of the inalienable rights of the Afghan people. In Suriname's view, the continued presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan violated the principle of non-intervention and the right of self-determination. Yugoslavia voiced increasing concern at endeavours to legalize military intervention and other uses of force, and to justify them through theories based on a State's geographical position, social system or zone of security or interest.

Australia pointed out that, at the meeting of Commonwealth heads of Government (Melbourne, Australia, 30 September-7 October), despite differing perceptions of developments leading to the current situation, participants had been united in calling urgently for a political settlement based on foreign troop withdrawal, respect for Afghanistan's sovereignty and non-aligned status, strict observance of non-

interference principles and the right of Afghans to return home safely, and a negotiated settlement to allow them to determine their own future.

Bangladesh said peace could be secured by the withdrawal of all foreign troops, leaving the people free to determine their destiny without external intervention in any form. Sierra Leone called for the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops and also called on all concerned to refrain from interfering in the country's affairs.

Kuwait said that, in co-operation with its neighbours, it wished to keep the Persian Gulf area free from international rivalry and believed that the military involvement in Afghanistan endangered the area's peace and security. A similar point was made by Oman, which felt that the main shipping lanes in the Indian Ocean were threatened by the foreign presence in the area. Malaysia expressed concern that the Soviet action had led to an intensified arms race in the Indian Ocean area.

Speaking for the EC members, the United Kingdom recalled that the European Council, on 30 June, had put forward a plan for a two-stage conference on Afghanistan at which the question of Afghan representation would be postponed until a climate more conducive to agreement existed, while guaranteeing the representation and participation of the Afghan people in the conference's decisions. Thailand announced that the Association of South-East Asian Nations favoured this proposal for an international conference—a proposition to which Japan, Qatar and Spain also subscribed. Egypt stated that the idea of a conference was worthy of serious consideration and added that its support for the Afghan people derived from obligations to them based on a common Islamic bond and mutual membership of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. For Senegal, the existence of that Movement was threatened by the Afghanistan situation.

Singapore said that, since the political solution envisaged by Afghanistan and the USSR included recognition by Afghanistan's neighbours of the Babrak Karmal régime and acceptance of the results of the USSR armed intervention, Iran and Pakistan were right to reject such a proposal.

Widespread support was voiced for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General and his representative in discussions with those concerned and the hope was expressed that such dialogue would continue. Italy and Yugoslavia were concerned, however, about the limited progress achieved through these indirect contacts.

Afghanistan declared that the Assembly's debate on the so-called question of Afghanistan

was flagrant interference in its internal affairs and would only delay a political settlement. Statements that the situation posed a threat to regional security and that there was some kind of national resistance in Afghanistan were a distortion by hegemonists who were trying to build up military forces in the area. The Afghan revolution of 1978 was being resisted by counter-revolutionary terrorist groups based in Pakistan and trained by instructors from the United States, the United Kingdom, China, Egypt and Pakistan. Despite hostile activities carried out from neighbouring countries, Afghanistan was ready to begin talks with Iran and Pakistan for a political settlement based on the complete and reliable cessation of armed and any other intervention in its affairs and the creation of conditions that would make future intervention impossible.

Those speaking in support of Afghanistan's position—the socialist States of Eastern Europe, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia and Viet Nam—declared that the Assembly's 1980 resolution had not only failed to bring a political settlement closer, but had rendered such a settlement between Afghanistan and its neighbours more difficult. They emphasized the need to ensure complete cessation of armed or any other form of interference in that country's internal affairs before a political solution could be brought about. They endorsed the proposals for a political settlement made by Afghanistan in May 1980<sup>(21)</sup> and August 1981 (p. 232).

The USSR called for a political settlement which would create conditions for the withdrawal of Soviet troops; the sooner agreements that ruled out interference in Afghan affairs were reached and implemented, the earlier the withdrawal of Soviet troops would be initiated and completed. Also urging negotiations to create the conditions for withdrawal, the German Democratic Republic said it would be turning the problem upside-down to make the start of negotiations contingent on withdrawal. Poland stressed the importance of reliable international guarantees that interference in Afghan affairs would cease and not recur. USSR troops in Afghanistan were not a threat to any third country, Viet Nam stated; their presence was purely to help Afghanistan defend itself in the face of an undeclared war.

Hungary termed the situation around Afghanistan a vicious circle, since arms supplied to an anti-Government rebellion would not lead that Government to call for the withdrawal of Soviet troops. The Byelorussian SSR protested what it called anti-Afghan hysteria aimed at turning back the course of history to the time prior to the



1978 revolution. The Ukrainian SSR charged that support for Afghan counter-revolutionaries had become official United States policy as part of a broader plan to destabilize South-West Asia.

Bulgaria said that despite a subversive political campaign against an independent Afghanistan, the country was successfully remedying complex political and socio-economic problems. Czechoslovakia and Mongolia also pointed to the social and economic progress achieved by the Afghan people.

Democratic Yemen stated that the problem was not in Afghanistan but around it; once its neighbour reconciled itself to the Afghan revolution and ceased to interfere in its internal affairs, there would be no cause for tension. The Lao People's Democratic Republic appealed to the non-aligned countries not to encourage, directly or indirectly, or play into the hands of those organizing interference in the internal affairs of one of their own members.

Cuba regarded Afghanistan's proposals as realistic and said they should lead to negotiations with its neighbours at which the Secretary-General or his representative would be present.

India cautioned that adoption of a resolution unacceptable to those directly involved would be counter-productive; it urged restraint by them as well as by outside Powers in order to avoid further deterioration or exploitation of the situation.

Pakistan urged a continuation of international assistance to help it care for Afghan refugees who it said were continuing to flow into the country. It stated that nearly 2.5 million Afghans had taken shelter in Pakistan, mainly since the 1979 military intervention in their homeland. Despite international assistance, Pakistan had had to bear half the cost of their upkeep; in 1981 it would spend \$200 million. Iran put the total number of persons who had fled to Iran and Pakistan at close to 4 million.

A number of States endorsed the call for international assistance in what Canada described as the worst refugee situation in the world. Malaysia said the refugee problem was an international one and must be shared by the international community. Among those which indicated that they were co-operating in this effort were Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Norway and the United Kingdom (speaking for the EC members). Support for refugee assistance, including work done by UNHCR, was also voiced by Australia, China, Portugal, Singapore, Somalia and Sweden. Many of these speakers and others, including Bangladesh and New Zealand, also urged that conditions be created to enable the refugees to return home voluntarily and in safety.

Afghanistan said the refugee figures referred to in the debate were highly inflated by including seasonal migrations of nomads, migrant workers in Iran and counter-revolutionaries unlikely to return. The Afghan Government had made it clear on various occasions that bona fide refugees were welcome to return under a general amnesty, with guaranteed safety for their resettlement; thousands had returned recently.

Endorsing this view, the USSR said a change in a State's social and economic system often involved an exodus of people who did not accept the new régime, as shown by the history of England, France, Germany, Russia and many others.

FURTHER COMMUNICATIONS. During late November and throughout December, the Secretary-General received a number of additional communications relating to the Afghanistan situation.

Letters from Pakistan of 23 November,<sup>(10)</sup> 27 November,<sup>(11)</sup> 3 December<sup>(12)</sup> and 22 December<sup>(13)</sup> alleged further aerial attacks on Pakistani territory between 5 October and 18 December. Detailing eight incidents, Pakistan charged that Afghan aircraft, by strafing, bombing, firing flares and rockets and dropping mines, had caused military and civilian casualties as well as property damage inside Pakistan. In one incident, on 2 December, two helicopters were said to have strafed Amucha village and two buses, killing five persons.

Afghanistan, by a note verbale of 25 November,<sup>(6)</sup> rejected proposals contained in a "Plan on Afghanistan" released by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Iran on 10 November; it said the authors of the document were trying to impose on the Afghan people a government of foreign reactionary clergy and to subjugate them to foreign occupation by a so-called Islamic peace-keeping force of Iranian and Pakistani troops.

By a letter of 29 December<sup>(14)</sup> in reply to Afghanistan's statement of 12 November (p. 233), Pakistan said that allegations that it was allowing its territory to be used as a base of operations for the Afghan national resistance movement were false and aimed at misleading world opinion about the true nature of the resistance of the Afghan people.

Letters and notes verbales (nv): Afghanistan: <sup>(1)</sup>19 Jan., A/36/77; <sup>(2)</sup>23 Jan., A/36/80; <sup>(3)</sup>26 Aug., A/36/457-S/14649; <sup>(4)</sup>23 Sep., A/36/552-S/14706 (nv); <sup>(5)</sup>12 Nov., A/36/672; <sup>(6)</sup>25 Nov., A/36/723-S/14771 (nv). <sup>(7)</sup>Netherlands: 26 Mar., annexing European Council statement, A/36/153-S/14422. Pakistan: <sup>(8)</sup>10 Sep., A/36/493-S/14685; <sup>(9)</sup>20 Oct., A/36/614-S/14734; <sup>(10)</sup>23 Nov., A/36/717-S/14768; <sup>(11)</sup>27 Nov., A/36/730-S/14774; <sup>(12)</sup>3 Dec., A/36/768-S/14780; <sup>(13)</sup>22 Dec., A/37/56-S/14814; <sup>(14)</sup>29 Dec., A/37/58-S/14820 & Corr.1.  
Report: <sup>(15)</sup>S-G, A/36/653-S/14745.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(16)</sup>ES.6/2, 14 Jan. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 307); <sup>(17)</sup>35/37, 20 Nov. 1980 (*ibid.*, 308); <sup>(18)</sup> *ibid.* para. 7 (p. 309); <sup>(19)</sup> *ibid.*, para. 8 <sup>(20)</sup>(36/34, 18 Nov. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(21)</sup>1980, p. 303.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/695; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/49.

Meeting records: GA: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.1 (16 Sep.); plenary, A/36/PV.4, 8, 23, 26, 58-62 (18 Sep.-18 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.46 (18 Nov.)

#### General Assembly resolution 36/34

116-23-12 (recorded vote) Meeting 62 18 November 1981

45-nation draft (A/36/L.15 and Add.1); agenda item 26.

Sponsors: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Gambia, Guinea, Honduras, Jordan, Kuwait, Liberia, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Zaire.

The situation in Afghanistan and its implications  
for international peace and security

The General Assembly,

Having considered the item entitled "The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security",

Recalling its resolutions ES-6/2 of 14 January 1980 and 35/37 of 20 November 1980, adopted at the sixth emergency special session and the thirty-fifth session respectively,

Reaffirming the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the obligation of all States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of any State,

Reaffirming further the inalienable right of all peoples to determine their own form of government and to choose their own economic, political and social system free from outside intervention, subversion, coercion or constraint of any kind whatsoever,

Gravely concerned at the continuing foreign armed intervention in Afghanistan, in contravention of the above principles, and its serious implications for international peace and security,

Noting the increasing concern of the international community over the continued and serious sufferings of the Afghan people and over the magnitude of social and economic problems posed to Pakistan and Iran by the presence on their soil of millions of Afghan refugees, and the continuing increase in their numbers,

Deeply conscious of the urgent need for a political solution of the grave situation in respect of Afghanistan,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General, particularly of the appointment of his Personal Representative,

Recognizing the importance of the initiatives of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the efforts of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for a political solution of the situation in respect of Afghanistan,

1. Reiterates that the preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan is essential for a peaceful solution of the problem;

2. Reaffirms the right of the Afghan people to determine their own form of government and to choose their economic, political and social system free from outside intervention, subversion, coercion or constraint of any kind whatsoever;

3. Calls for the immediate withdrawal of the foreign troops from Afghanistan;

4. Calls upon all parties concerned to work for the urgent achievement of a political solution, in accordance with the provisions of the present resolution, and the creation of the

necessary conditions which would enable the Afghan refugees to return voluntarily to their homes in safety and honour:

5. Renews its appeal to all States and national and international organizations to continue to extend humanitarian relief assistance, with a view to alleviating the hardship of the Afghan refugees, in co-ordination with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

6. Expresses its appreciation for the efforts of the Secretary-General in the search for a solution to the problem and requests him to continue those efforts with a view to promoting a political solution, in accordance with the provisions of the present resolution, and the exploration of securing appropriate guarantees for non-use of force, or threat of use of force, against the political independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of all neighbouring States, on the basis of mutual guarantees and strict non-interference in each other's internal affairs and with full regard for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to keep Member States and the Security Council concurrently informed of the progress towards the implementation of the present resolution and to submit to Member States a report on the situation at the earliest appropriate opportunity;

8. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Benin, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cyprus, Finland, Guinea-Bissau, India, Mali, Nicaragua, Uganda.

#### Credentials of Afghanistan

In September and December 1981, while the General Assembly was examining the credentials submitted by Member States for their representatives to the eighth emergency special session and the thirty-sixth regular session, respectively (p. 351), several delegations commented on the credentials of Afghanistan.

In the Credentials Committee in both September<sup>(1)</sup> and December,<sup>(2)</sup> the United States said the fact that it had not raised any objection to the Afghan credentials did not imply acceptance of that country's régime nor acquiescence in the installation of USSR-directed authorities as a result of the USSR military invasion and con-

tinuing military occupation of Afghanistan. Similar reservations were voiced in the Committee by China, Papua New Guinea and Singapore, and in the Assembly by Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Pakistan and the United Kingdom. Turkey told the Assembly that its position should be understood in the context of its support for United Nations resolutions calling for foreign troop withdrawal.

In the Committee, the USSR called this position unfounded, stating that the Afghanistan Government had been established as a result of a popular revolution; casting doubt on its legitimacy was tantamount to denying the right of peoples to self-determination and was interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State.

Reports: Credentials Committee, <sup>(1)</sup>A/ES-8/6/Add.1,  
<sup>(2)</sup>A/36/517/Add.1.

#### Other aspects

Resolutions on the right of self-determination in Afghanistan were adopted in 1981 by the Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (p. 896). The Commission, on 6 March, reaffirmed its concern that the Afghan people continued to be denied their right to self-determination and called for a political settlement based on withdrawal of foreign troops, respect for Afghan independence and sovereignty, and non-intervention.<sup>(1)</sup> The Sub-Commission, on 9 September, expressed sympathy and support for Afghan refugees and called on the Commission to reaffirm the need for a political settlement.<sup>(2)</sup>

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 13(XXXVII), 6 Mar.; <sup>(2)</sup>SCPDP (report, E/CN-4/1512), 1 11(XXXIV), 9 Sep.

#### Questions concerning Iran

##### Iran and Iraq

The Secretary-General attempted in 1981 to promote a settlement of the continuing armed conflict between Iran and Iraq, which had broken out in September 1980.<sup>(10)</sup>

In his annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization, dated 12 September (p. 6), the Secretary-General stated that he had offered his good offices to Iran and Iraq and had appointed Olof Palme, former Prime Minister of Sweden, as his Special Representative. Mr. Palme had discussed a comprehensive settlement involving a cease-fire and withdrawal of forces as well as procedures for peacefully resolving disputed issues. He had also discussed possible measures to enable the commercial ships of different nationalities immobi-

lized by the conflict to leave the area. Although agreement on the overall issues had not been reached, the support for the mission shown by both parties had encouraged continued efforts.

From February to mid-December, the Secretary-General received several communications concerning this conflict.

To a letter of 18 February,<sup>(2)</sup> Iran annexed copies of notes dated 1 December 1980 and 14 January 1981 from its Ministry of Foreign Affairs to Iraq's Embassy in Teheran, rejecting what it referred to as Iraq's unilateral abrogation of the 1975 treaty on state frontiers and good-neighbourliness between the two countries and emphasizing that Iraq had consistently violated the treaty, which Iran considered still in effect, inviolable, permanent and conclusive.

In a letter of 10 March 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> Iraq responded that the continuous Iranian violations of the treaty had left Iraq with no treaty to implement; annexed to the letter were notes dated 6 December 1980 and 31 January 1981 by Iraq's Foreign Ministry to the Iranian Embassy in Baghdad, rejecting Iran's position as having no juridical value.

The Council of the League of Arab States, at an extraordinary session held at Baghdad on 11 June, called on both countries to respond to mediation efforts of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the United Nations, to stop the war and resolve their problems peacefully; the League's resolution was forwarded to the Security Council President by Yemen on 12 June.<sup>(9)</sup>

In a letter of 15 August,<sup>(5)</sup> Iraq's Foreign Minister quoted a statement by the leader of the Iranian Mujahideen Khalq organization, published on 3 August in the French newspaper *Le Matin*, which charged Iranian religious leaders with responsibility for the war against Iraq.

On 19 August, Iraq forwarded letters<sup>(6)</sup> from its Foreign Minister to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, charging that Iranian naval forces had seized a Danish vessel in the Strait of Hormuz and confiscated its cargo, destined for Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates, thereby violating international law and endangering peace and security and the interests of the Arab Gulf States.

A note by the Iraqi Foreign Ministry, annexed to a letter from Iraq dated 16 September,<sup>(7)</sup> cited several press reports of arms shipments from Israel to Iran since November 1980, including three flights from Tel Aviv to Teheran by an Argentine commercial transport aircraft said to have crashed on 18 July near Yerevan, Armenia, USSR. The Government of Argentina responded, in a letter of 21 August by its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Worship to the Iraqi Foreign

Minister, that it had no connection with the private Argentine airline TAR that had operated the aircraft; the text of the letter was forwarded to the Secretary-General by Argentina on 9 October.<sup>(1)</sup>

By a note verbale of 16 December,<sup>(3)</sup> Iran forwarded a communiqué from its Foreign Ministry charging Iraq with air and rocket attacks between 9 and 11 December resulting in 50 civilian deaths and 225 injured, as well as torture and execution of Iranian civilians and war prisoners. A message from Iraq's Foreign Minister, forwarded on 17 December,<sup>(8)</sup> countercharged that Iraqi war prisoners had been murdered by Iran.

Letters and note verbale (nv): <sup>(1)</sup>Argentina: 9 Oct., A/C.6/36/5. Iran: <sup>(2)</sup>18 Feb., S/14379; <sup>(3)</sup>16 Dec., A/36/842-S/14802 (nv) Iraq: <sup>(4)</sup>10 Mar., S/14401; <sup>(5)</sup>15 Aug., A/36/481-S/14678; <sup>(6)</sup>19 Aug., A/36/446 (S/14637); <sup>(7)</sup>16 Sep., A/36/518; <sup>(8)</sup>17 Dec., A/36/847 S/14806. <sup>(9)</sup>Yemen: 12 June, S/14529.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(10)</sup>1980, p. 312.

#### Iran and Kuwait

On 5 October 1981, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait in a letter to the Security Council President,<sup>(2)</sup> charged that, since the outbreak of hostilities between Iran and Iraq, the Iranian air force had attacked Kuwait's borders, positions and civilian installations several times, culminating in the bombing of a petroleum complex at Um Aleish on 1 October.

By a note verbale of 13 October,<sup>(1)</sup> Iran annexed a note of the previous day from its Foreign Minister, rejecting the accusations as attempts to overshadow recent defeats of Iraq's army and to mobilize the reactionary régimes of the region against Iran.

Letter and note verbale (nv): <sup>(1)</sup>Iran, 13 Oct., S/14725 (nv); <sup>(2)</sup>Kuwait, 5 Oct., S/14716.

#### Iran and the United States

In January 1981, agreement was reached between Iran and the United States to release a group of Americans from the United States Embassy at Teheran detained since November 1979.<sup>(5)</sup> This topic was the subject of two letters from the United States to the Secretary-General.

By a letter of 19 January,<sup>(1)</sup> the United States transmitted a message from its President informing the Secretary-General of the agreement to free the 52 Americans held hostage in Iran and adding that, with their release, the United States considered that Iran had complied fully with Security Council resolutions of 4 December<sup>(3)</sup> and 31 December 1979<sup>(4)</sup> and with the Judgment of the International Court of Justice of 24 May 1980.<sup>(6)</sup>

By a letter of 3 March,<sup>(2)</sup> the United States transmitted a message from its Secretary of State saying that it did not consider that Iran had re-

sponded fully to the letter or spirit of other requirements of the resolutions and Judgment, including the return of the property of the United States Embassy and of its consulates in Iran, as ordered by the International Court.

On 6 April and 1 May the United States, in letters to the Court, made clear that, in consequence of commitments it had entered into with Iran at Algiers, Algeria, on 19 January, all currently pending proceedings before the Court relating to claims for reparation should be discontinued (p. 1202).

Letters: United States: <sup>(1)</sup>19 Jan., S/14338; <sup>(2)</sup>3 Mar., S/14393.

Resolutions: SC: <sup>(3)</sup>457(1979), 4 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 311); <sup>(4)</sup>461(1979), 31 Dec. 1979 (ibid, p. 312).

Yearbook references: <sup>(5)</sup>1979, p. 307; <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 1121.

## South-East Asia

### Kampuchea situation

The situation in and around Kampuchea and the country's representation in the United Nations continued to occupy the attention of the Organization in 1981.

The International Conference on Kampuchea (New York, 13-17 July 1981)<sup>(51)</sup> met in accordance with a 1980 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(54)</sup> with a mandate to seek a comprehensive political settlement of the Kampuchean problem. The Conference adopted a Declaration setting out elements for negotiation and a resolution<sup>(53)</sup> by which it established an Ad Hoc Committee to assist in seeking a settlement.

On 21 October, the Assembly approved the decisions of the Conference, reiterated that withdrawal of all foreign forces and the Kampuchean people's right to determine their own destiny were principal components of any resolution of the problem, and appealed for continued aid to Kampucheans.<sup>(56)</sup>

A Special Representative of the Secretary-General, M'Hamed Essaafi, visited South-East Asia in March/April to consult with Governments in the region.

Numerous communications were received concerning various aspects of the situation and related issues, including the alleged use of chemical weapons (p. 73), the situation on the Kampuchea-Thailand border (p. 249) and general aspects of peace and security in South-East Asia (p. 250). The credentials of representatives of Democratic Kampuchea were discussed in other communications, as well as in the Assembly (p. 247). The United Nations continued to organize emergency relief for Kampucheans (p. 494) and to assist refugees in neighbouring countries (p. 1033).

COMMUNICATIONS (JANUARY-SEPTEMBER). The Secretary-General received a number of communications on the situation between Democratic Kampuchea and Viet Nam.

Democratic Kampuchea's military, political and diplomatic activities were assessed by its Council of Ministers in a 7 January statement reviewing 1980, transmitted on 12 January 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> and a 19 May statement covering the dry season (October 1980-April 1981), transmitted on 1 June.<sup>(10)</sup> On both occasions, the Council cited favourable developments in what it called the struggle for national survival against the Vietnamese aggressors.

The military situation was described in two communications from Democratic Kampuchea annexing information from the Military High Command of its National Army and guerrillas. According to a map and explanatory note on the February situation, transmitted on 16 March,<sup>(6)</sup> there had been a perceptible expansion of the zone under Democratic Kampuchea's control; and in a 12 May communiqué on the military results of the dry season, transmitted on 3 June,<sup>(11)</sup> the High Command stated that 45,000 of the enemy had been killed or wounded.

Viet Nam was accused of looting and destroying ancient monuments at Angkor, in a 28 January statement by the Ministry of Culture and Education of Democratic Kampuchea, transmitted on 10 February.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Non-Aligned Countries (New Delhi, India, 9-13 February) was the topic of two statements by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Democratic Kampuchea. By the first, dated 21 January and transmitted on 28 January,<sup>(2)</sup> Democratic Kampuchea called for restoration of its seat in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and requested that the Movement demand that Viet Nam withdraw its troops from Kampuchea. By the second, dated 2 February and transmitted two days later,<sup>(4)</sup> India's refusal to issue an entry visa to the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea was protested.

In a 25 June memorandum forwarded on 6 July,<sup>(12)</sup> Democratic Kampuchea's Foreign Ministry stated that the country would continue its struggle until Viet Nam withdrew its troops. This view was reiterated in a five-point programme for a great national union of Kampuchea against the Vietnamese Lê Duan clique, worked out at a meeting (28-30 June) of leaders of the Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea and government members, and transmitted by Democratic Kampuchea on 9 July;<sup>(14)</sup> the programme also called for United Nations-supervised elections for a national assembly after

foreign troop withdrawal and freedom of action for the various anti-Vietnamese national forces, which would avoid confrontation and keep their political organizations provided there was no infringement of the programme. A further memorandum from the Foreign Ministry of Democratic Kampuchea, dated 30 June and transmitted on 7 July,<sup>(13)</sup> charged the Hanoi authorities with attempting to legalize their aggression in Kampuchea.

In a 1 February press conference at Bangkok, Thailand, excerpts from which were transmitted by China on 10 February,<sup>(40)</sup> the Premier of China stated that, after complete Vietnamese troop withdrawal from Kampuchea, China would be willing to join an international guarantee of non-aggression against Kampuchean territory.

The Foreign Ministers of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN)—Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand—issued an 18 June communiqué on the Kampuchean situation, excerpts of which were transmitted by the Philippines the following day;<sup>(31)</sup> the Ministers deplored the continued presence of Vietnamese forces in Kampuchea, reaffirmed commitment to General Assembly decisions and proposed a political settlement including United Nations peace-keeping forces, foreign troop withdrawal and the disarming of all Khmer factions.

On 6 July,<sup>(24)</sup> the Lao People's Democratic Republic transmitted a statement ascribed to its Foreign Minister together with those of Viet Nam and the People's Republic of Kampuchea, rejecting the ASEAN proposal and stating that Vietnamese troops were in Kampuchea by agreement with the People's Republic and because of threats posed by China in collusion with others. Similar views were also contained in a statement by the three Foreign Ministers issued at a conference held at Phnom Penh on 13 and 14 June (p. 251).

Elections on 1 May to the National Assembly of the People's Republic of Kampuchea were the subject of several communications.

On 25 March,<sup>(29)</sup> the Philippine Foreign Minister, as Chairman of the ASEAN Standing Committee, transmitted a statement by which the ASEAN members denounced the elections as an attempt by the Heng Samrin régime to legitimize itself and as contravening the 1980 General Assembly resolution calling for United Nations-supervised elections.<sup>(54)</sup> Expressing a similar view, Democratic Kampuchea, in a government statement of 29 March transmitted on 2 April,<sup>(7)</sup> challenged the validity of elections held while the country was under occupation by more than 300,000 Vietnamese.

The ASEAN viewpoint was rejected as gross

intervention in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, in a 3 April statement attributed to the spokesman of its Ministry of Foreign Affairs, transmitted on 13 April<sup>(20)</sup> by the Lao People's Democratic Republic. Other communications concerning the elections and ascribed to organs of that régime were transmitted by the Lao People's Democratic Republic on 29 May<sup>(21)</sup> and 29 June,<sup>(23)</sup> giving election results and the composition of leading organs of the People's Republic, and conveying an appeal by the first session of the National Assembly (Phnom Penh, 24-27 June) for Kampucheans to continue fighting and boost production. A 1 June letter from Viet Nam<sup>(33)</sup> transmitted a 20 May statement by the Foreign Ministry of the People's Republic of Kampuchea charging China with attempting to unite all types of reactionary Khmers and stating that the election results confirmed the will of the Kampuchean people.

On 9 September,<sup>(15)</sup> Democratic Kampuchea transmitted a 6 August document of its Ministry of Social Affairs outlining activities at a national day of disabled persons held in Democratic Kampuchea on 30 July in connection with the 1981 International Year of Disabled Persons (p. 795).

**CONFERENCE ON KAMPUCHEA.** The International Conference on Kampuchea was the subject of several communications addressed to the Secretary-General between February 1981 and its convening in July.

Support for the holding of the Conference was voiced in statements by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Democratic Kampuchea, transmitted by that country in letters of 3 February,<sup>(3)</sup> 30 April<sup>(8)</sup> and 26 May.<sup>(9)</sup> The Ministry also denounced a proposal for a regional conference between Indo-Chinese and ASEAN States, made at a conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Viet Nam and the People's Republic of Kampuchea (Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam, 27 and 28 January) (p. 250).

In a press statement on 10 April, issued at Manila, Philippines, following a meeting with the Secretary-General's Special Representative on the Kampuchea situation, the Foreign Minister of the Philippines, as Chairman of the ASEAN Standing Committee, said the Kampuchea conflict had to be resolved within the framework of a United Nations-sponsored conference and not the proposed regional conference; the statement was transmitted by the Philippines on 14 April.<sup>(30)</sup>

A number of countries indicated their opposition to the International Conference.

A spokesman for the Vietnamese Foreign Ministry pointed out, in a 10 April interview

granted to the Viet Nam News Agency and forwarded on 13 April,<sup>(32)</sup> that it had been made clear to the Secretary-General's representative that Viet Nam regarded the 1980 General Assembly resolution on convening the Conference as a flagrant encroachment on the sovereignty of the People's Republic of Kampuchea and an imposition of views on the three Indo-Chinese countries. In a note verbale of 6 July,<sup>(34)</sup> Viet Nam reiterated this view and added that it would not participate in the Conference.

The Lao People's Democratic Republic stated that it would not participate in the Conference in two communications from its Vice-Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs: a 22 June note verbale<sup>(22)</sup> and an 11 July message conveyed two days later.<sup>(25)</sup> It said the Conference would harm the efforts of countries in the region to establish peace and co-operation through direct negotiations.

Several other States expressed opposition to the Conference, also on the ground that it constituted interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. They stated their refusal to participate, and most announced support for the proposed regional conference. Notes verbales or letters to this effect were received from: Mongolia,<sup>(46)</sup> on 9 June; Czechoslovakia,<sup>(42)</sup> on 11 June; Poland,<sup>(47)</sup> on 12 June; Afghanistan,<sup>(38)</sup> the German Democratic Republic,<sup>(43)</sup> Hungary<sup>(44)</sup> and Seychelles,<sup>(48)</sup> on 15 June; the USSR<sup>(50)</sup> on 16 June; Bulgaria,<sup>(39)</sup> on 19 June; and the Congo,<sup>(41)</sup> on 10 July.

In a letter of 18 June,<sup>(45)</sup> India also stated that it would not participate since it felt that a conference based on a resolution rejected by several countries directly concerned might retard prospects of a meaningful dialogue and result in a hardening of attitudes; what was needed was a dialogue among the countries of the region.

Seventy-nine Member States participated in the International Conference on Kampuchea, held at United Nations Headquarters from 13 to 17 July; 14 States and the European Community (EC) attended as observers (for a list of participating and observer States, see APPENDIX III). Twenty-seven States informed the Secretariat that they would not participate.

A proposal by Singapore that three political groups be invited to participate without vote was approved with respect to the Khmer People's National Liberation Front and the National United Front for an Independent, Neutral, Peaceful and Co-operative Cambodia. The Conference referred to its Bureau the question of the participation of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea.

Following a general debate in which 50 speakers (including the two invited political groups)

took part, the Conference on 17 July adopted by consensus a Declaration and a resolution on Kampuchea. These texts, presented by a Working Group which met from 14 to 17 July, were included in the Conference's report to the General Assembly.<sup>(51)</sup>

By the Declaration, the Conference reaffirmed the right of all States to the inviolability of their sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, and to determine their own destiny free from foreign interference, subversion and coercion. It expressed concern that the Kampuchea situation had resulted from the violation of those principles. It noted the serious international consequences that had arisen from the situation, in particular the escalation of tension in South-East Asia and major-Power involvement, and expressed its conviction that a political solution would be necessary for the long-term solution of the serious refugee problem.

The Conference identified the following as the principal components of a just and lasting solution: withdrawal of all foreign forces from Kampuchea; restoration and preservation of its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity; and a commitment by all States to non-interference in its internal affairs. It regretted that foreign armed intervention continued and that foreign forces had not been withdrawn, making it impossible for the Kampucheans to express their will in free elections.

With a view to reaching a comprehensive political settlement, it called for negotiations on: a cease-fire agreement by all parties and withdrawal of all foreign forces under supervision of a United Nations peace-keeping force/observer group; United Nations-supervised elections, with assurance that armed Kampuchean factions would not prevent or disrupt them and would respect the results; and maintenance of law and order. The Conference deemed it essential for Kampuchea to remain non-aligned and neutral, and for the five permanent Security Council members, all South-East Asian States and other States concerned to declare that they would: respect the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-aligned and neutral status of Kampuchea; recognize its borders as inviolable; and refrain from interfering in its internal affairs, bringing it into any military alliance inconsistent with its neutral status, introducing foreign troops or military bases, and threatening its security.

The Conference expressed hope that, following peaceful resolution of the Kampuchean conflict, an intergovernmental committee would be established to consider an aid programme for Kampuchea's economic reconstruction and for the economic and social development of all

States of the region. Noting the absence of Viet Nam and other States, the Conference urged them to attend future sessions and expressed hope that Viet Nam would participate in the negotiations.

By its resolution,<sup>(53)</sup> the Conference decided to establish an Ad Hoc Committee consisting of Japan, Malaysia, Nigeria, Senegal, Sri Lanka, the Sudan and Thailand, and authorized the Conference President, in consultation with Conference members, to include additional members in the Committee. The Committee was requested to assist the Conference in seeking a comprehensive political settlement and to undertake missions to that end, act as an advisory body to the Secretary-General and advise the Conference President as to when the Conference should be reconvened. The Conference also recommended that the General Assembly authorize it to reconvene at an appropriate time and request the Secretary-General to make a preliminary study of the future role of the United Nations.

Three communications addressed to the Secretary-General rejected the Declaration and resolution: a 20 July statement by the Vietnamese Foreign Ministry, transmitted by Viet Nam on 22 July,<sup>(35)</sup> said the decisions were illegal and had no validity; an 18 July statement by the Foreign Ministry of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, forwarded by the Lao People's Democratic Republic on 23 July,<sup>(26)</sup> condemned the resolution as ludicrous and considered it illegal, null and void—a view supported by the Lao People's Democratic Republic in a 21 July statement by its Foreign Ministry, transmitted on 28 July.<sup>(27)</sup> The three statements held China and the United States responsible for using the Conference to deceive world opinion about the Kampuchea situation.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In a report to the General Assembly dated 12 October,<sup>(52)</sup> submitted pursuant to the Assembly's 1980 resolution,<sup>(55)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that he had undertaken extensive consultations and maintained close contact with government leaders and representatives of States most directly concerned with the Kampuchea situation and with other interested parties, in the discharge of his responsibility relating to peace and security and in the exercise of his good offices. Also, between 23 March and 11 April, his Special Representative, M'Hamed Essaafi, had undertaken a mission to South-East Asia to consult with Governments.

The Secretary-General concluded that a fundamental solution could be found only with the achievement of a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the underlying political and military issues. Regrettably, it had not been

possible to bridge the gap between the strongly held views of the parties and States concerned. Reiterating his determination to continue to search for a peaceful solution, he stated that such a solution must be based on fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly respect for sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all States, non-interference and non-intervention in their internal affairs and non-use of force, and respect for self-determination of peoples and fundamental human rights.

The report also briefly described humanitarian assistance to Kampucheans (p. 494).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 21 October, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the Kampuchea situation<sup>(56)</sup> by a recorded vote of 100 to 25, with 19 abstentions.

By this resolution, the Assembly reiterated that withdrawal of foreign forces, restoration and preservation of Kampuchea's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, the Kampuchean people's right to determine their own destiny and commitment by all States to non-interference in Kampuchea's internal affairs were principal components of any just and lasting solution. The Assembly adopted the Declaration of the Conference on Kampuchea and its resolution establishing the Ad Hoc Committee. It decided to reconvene the Conference at an appropriate time and urged all South-East Asian States to attend. The Secretary-General was requested to exercise his good offices towards a comprehensive political settlement and to undertake a preliminary study of the future United Nations role. The Assembly also requested continued aid for the Kampucheans (p. 495), urged South-East Asian countries to renew efforts towards establishing a zone of peace and expressed hope that, following a comprehensive political solution, an intergovernmental committee would be established to consider economic aid to Kampuchea.

The Assembly also noted a joint statement issued in Singapore on 4 September, transmitted by Democratic Kampuchea on 11 September,<sup>(16)</sup> in which Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Son Sann and Khieu Samphan expressed the desire to form a coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea, announced agreement to set up a committee to study how that objective could be achieved and agreed to avoid clashes between anti-Vietnamese forces.

Introducing the 35-nation draft, which was revised by its sponsors before adoption, the Philippines stated that the Conference on Kampuchea was an important step in the quest for a comprehensive political settlement. Its Declaration, containing the major elements for negotiations, and the establishment of the Ad Hoc

Committee—in whose work the Secretary-General would be involved—were the basis for such a settlement.

Speaking in explanation of their votes against the resolution, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Seychelles said that consideration of the subject constituted interference in Kampuchea's internal affairs. The Lao People's Democratic Republic also objected to Assembly endorsement of the decisions of the International Conference and said the funds needed to implement the resolution, towards which its Government would not contribute, would be better spent on food and medicine for the Kampucheans. Viet Nam supported the position of the People's Republic of Kampuchea as outlined in a 16 October statement<sup>(36)</sup> (p. 245) and said the designs of China and the United States to use the United Nations against the Indo-Chinese peoples were doomed to failure.

Albania did not participate in the vote because of the text's reference to previous Assembly resolutions, international activities and documents about which it held reservations, and said the text did not reflect the causes of the situation or condemn all enemies of the Kampucheans.

Zimbabwe, which voted in favour, said that, although it did not favour any particular group, it supported efforts to find a solution that would not leave out anyone.

In the Assembly debate, Democratic Kampuchea reiterated its determination to continue military, political and diplomatic opposition to Vietnamese occupation, and reaffirmed its proposal for a peaceful solution based on the withdrawal of Viet Nam's forces, United Nations-supervised, free general elections, and international guarantees for an independent, united, peaceful, neutral and non-aligned Kampuchea. It stated that the régime in Phnom Penh had been set up by the Vietnamese invaders, that 50,000 Vietnamese civilians decided all matters in the occupied areas, that the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea was a branch of the Indo-Chinese Communist Party and that the May elections and new constitution were a sham.

Many speakers, including Egypt, Nepal, New Zealand, Mauritania, Pakistan, Senegal and Togo, felt that the Conference's Declaration provided a reasonable, balanced and practical basis for a settlement. Most of these countries urged Viet Nam to participate in the negotiating process leading to a solution to the Kampuchean problem and towards restoration of peace and stability in South-East Asia.

Although it supported the Declaration, Sweden said it found certain parts too detailed to be realistic at the current stage.



Japan was among those which regretted Viet Nam's boycott of the Conference and implored all concerned to participate in negotiations—a view shared by Austria and Sri Lanka, which saw such future involvement as a pre-condition for a settlement.

Speaking on behalf of the 10 EC members, the United Kingdom expressed support for ASEAN efforts to promote a solution and called on all concerned to use the United Nations framework in seeking a lasting solution; although the 10 members continued to abhor the régime of Pol Pot, they saw its record as no justification for invasion and occupation. Thailand agreed that Viet Nam had no right to try to impose a military solution on the Kampuchean people, who should be allowed their right of self-determination free from foreign occupation; it welcomed the efforts of the three Kampuchean leaders to form a nationalist coalition Government. China shared this view, adding that Viet Nam's claim that it had invaded Kampuchea because of a threat from or disputes with China was false.

Australia also said it would welcome the emergence of a nationalist coalition in Kampuchea, but stressed that it was the people themselves who must decide their future. For Norway, United Nations-supervised, free elections would guarantee that basic right. In Canada's view, the Kampucheans would choose neither the Vietnamese-backed régime nor the reprehensible regime of Pol Pot if they were allowed to choose freely.

According to Malaysia, any attempt to force acceptance of the Heng Samrin régime, contrary to General Assembly decisions, could only prolong the conflict. Indonesia supported the idea of a dialogue among countries of the region and also stressed the significance of the Ad Hoc Committee's role in bringing the parties together. Chile thought the Committee could facilitate the Secretary-General's task of creating a climate more conducive to negotiations.

Bangladesh, the Sudan, Tunisia and Yugoslavia called for strict implementation of the principles of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, particularly non-interference, foreign troop withdrawal and the right to self-determination; the Sudan and Yugoslavia supported the Conference Declaration as a basic framework for a comprehensive political solution. Zaire feared that, if the United Nations did not call for troop withdrawal and a reaffirmation of United Nations principles, the international community would give the unfortunate impression of accepting a flagrant violation of those principles.

Several speakers condemned what they regarded as Vietnamese aggression against Kam-

puchea and its continuing occupation of the country. The United States said that, if Viet Nam could invade, subjugate and occupy a neighbouring State by brute force and with impunity, and retain the prize of its aggression, the security of all States was substantially diminished.

The validity of the May elections in Kampuchea was challenged by several speakers. Singapore said they could not be described as free and democratic, since they were held under the guns of the occupying army and persons opposed to the Vietnamese occupation had not been allowed to participate.

India felt the approach embodied in previous Assembly decisions had not defused tension or led to a viable political solution and, for that reason, it had not participated in the Conference; it favoured a dialogue among the countries of the region and a solution based on non-use of force and non-interference in internal affairs.

Those speaking against the resolution said that discussion of the Kampuchea situation was interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which had made great progress towards normalization of economic, social and political life.

Viet Nam stated that its troops were in Kampuchea to help defend that country's independence and sovereignty against threats from China; they would be withdrawn as soon as those threats no longer existed, and there would be a partial withdrawal if peace and security were restored along the Kampuchea-Thailand border. The Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam denounced the aim of the Conference as an effort to restore to power the reactionary régime of Pol Pot.

The USSR evaluated the Conference as an attempt to erect a new obstacle to normalizing relations between Indo-Chinese and ASEAN countries and to exacerbate regional tensions. According to Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia and the Ukrainian SSR, the situation in Kampuchea, which was in accordance with the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, was irreversible; they, too, rejected the Conference decisions and supported the proposals of the countries of Indo-China for a conference between them and ASEAN on matters of mutual concern. Poland thought that those proposals should be looked at constructively by the international community and that the Assembly should welcome assurances with regard to troop withdrawal once the threat from China no longer existed.

Afghanistan and the German Democratic Republic were among those pledging support for the struggle of the People's Republic of Kam-

puchea to gain international recognition. The Byelorussian SSR said that the general elections in Kampuchea had demonstrated majority support for the progressive changes there and approved the policy of the People's Revolutionary Party to rebuild a socialist society. Cuba felt that the course proposed in the Assembly resolution would only lead to confrontation with the Kampuchians. In Ethiopia's view, the United Nations was being manipulated in regard to Kampuchea; its task should be to foster dialogue among the countries of the region and not to assume a partisan role.

Albania stated that the Kampuchean people continued to be victims of rivalry between China, the United States and the USSR; it opposed interference in Kampuchea's internal affairs.

Three communications to the Secretary-General set forth the view that the resolution ignored reality and distorted the situation in Kampuchea.

A 13 October telegram signed by the Vice-President of the Council of Ministers and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, annexed to a letter of the following day from the Lao People's Democratic Republic,<sup>(28)</sup> protested discussion of the resolution as gross and inadmissible interference in Kampuchea's internal affairs, rejected attempts to impose a comprehensive political settlement and stated that normal life had returned to Kampuchea. A 16 October statement from the same source, transmitted by Viet Nam on 19 October,<sup>(36)</sup> expressed similar views and charged that the resolution was a manoeuvre to thwart renaissance of the Kampuchians and to restore the Pol Pot régime. This position was supported in a 22 October statement by the Vietnamese Foreign Ministry, forwarded the following day.<sup>(37)</sup>

FURTHER COMMUNICATIONS (OCTOBER-DECEMBER). Late in 1981, the Secretary-General received four further communications on the Kampuchea situation.

By a letter of 16 October,<sup>(49)</sup> Singapore and the United Kingdom transmitted a communiqué of a meeting of Foreign Ministers of EC and ASEAN members (London, 13 and 14 October) by which the Ministers expressed hope that Viet Nam would participate in a negotiating process leading to peaceful resolution of the Kampuchea problem.

Democratic Kampuchea transmitted on 28 October<sup>(17)</sup> a résumé of a 2 October communiqué by its National Army's High Command on the military results of the 1981 rainy season (April-September), claiming that 36,300 enemy forces had been wiped out and more than 200,000 inhabitants had been liberated, raising to 1.7 million

the number of people living in areas controlled by the Democratic Kampuchea Government.

A 7 December letter by Democratic Kampuchea<sup>(18)</sup> transmitted a 30 November communiqué reporting partial agreement on a structure for a coalition Government, and annexing the political programme of such a government and a circular letter of the Standing Committee of the Assembly of the People's Representatives of Kampuchea, the Government of Democratic Kampuchea and the Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea, seeking the views of the populace on national union.

In a 6 December statement forwarded on 18 December,<sup>(19)</sup> the Council of Ministers of Democratic Kampuchea stated that the Vietnamese enemy had been strategically defeated and called on Kampuchean parties to avoid attacking each other.

#### Letters and notes verbales (nv):

Democratic Kampuchea: <sup>(1)</sup>12 Jan., A/36/71-S/14327; <sup>(2)</sup>28 Jan., A/36/84-S/14349; <sup>(3)</sup>3 Feb., A/36/91-S/14360; <sup>(4)</sup>4 Feb., A/36/93-S/14364; <sup>(5)</sup>10 Feb., A/36/98; <sup>(6)</sup>16 Mar., A/36/131-S/14408; <sup>(7)</sup>2 Apr., A/36/159-S/14425; <sup>(8)</sup>30 Apr., A/36/230-S/14471; <sup>(9)</sup>26 May, A/36/288-S/14489; <sup>(10)</sup>1 June, A/36/299-S/14494; <sup>(11)</sup>3 June, A/36/307-S/14505; <sup>(12)</sup>6 July, A/36/362-S/14579; <sup>(13)</sup>7 July, A/36/366-S/14581; <sup>(14)</sup>9 July, A/36/367-S/14582; <sup>(15)</sup>9 Sep., A/36/491; <sup>(16)</sup>11 Sep., A/36/498-S/14687; <sup>(17)</sup>28 Oct., A/36/634-S/14741; <sup>(18)</sup>7 Dec., A/36/791; <sup>(19)</sup>18 Dec., A/36/851-S/14810.

Lao People's Democratic Republic: <sup>(20)</sup>13 Apr., A/36/188-S/14440; <sup>(21)</sup>29 May, A/36/293-S/14493; <sup>(22)</sup>22 June, A/36/346-S/14570 (nv); <sup>(23)</sup>29 June, A/36/352-S/14575; <sup>(24)</sup>6 July, A/36/360-S/14577; <sup>(25)</sup>13 July, A/36/374-S/14588; <sup>(26)</sup>23 July, A/36/402-S/14616; <sup>(27)</sup>28 July, A/36/410-S/14621; <sup>(28)</sup>14 Oct., A/36/596-S/14728.

Philippines: <sup>(29)</sup>25 Mar., A/36/139-S/14417; <sup>(30)</sup>14 Apr., A/36/202-S/14444; <sup>(31)</sup>19 June, annexing ASEAN communiqué excerpts, A/36/337-S/14562.

Viet Nam: <sup>(32)</sup>13 Apr., A/36/189; <sup>(33)</sup>1 June, A/36/300-S/14495; <sup>(34)</sup>6 July, A/36/361-S/14578 (nv); <sup>(35)</sup>22 July, A/36/397-S/14611; <sup>(36)</sup>19 Oct., A/36/609; <sup>(37)</sup>23 Oct., A/36/628-S/14737.

Others: <sup>(38)</sup>Afghanistan: 15 June, A/36/350-S/14573 (nv). <sup>(39)</sup>Bulgaria: 19 June, A/36/351-S/14574.

<sup>(40)</sup>China: 10 Feb., A/36/99-S/14373. <sup>(41)</sup>Congo: 10 July, A/36/370-S/14584 (nv). <sup>(42)</sup>Czechoslovakia: 11 June, A/36/322 (nv). <sup>(43)</sup>German Democratic Republic: 15 June, A/36/326 (nv). <sup>(44)</sup>Hungary: 15 June, A/36/325-S/14541 (nv). <sup>(45)</sup>India: 18 June, A/36/335. <sup>(46)</sup>Mongolia: 9 June, A/36/318 (nv). <sup>(47)</sup>Poland: 12 June, A/36/323. <sup>(48)</sup>Seychelles: 15 June, A/36/331 & Corr.1. <sup>(49)</sup>Singapore, United Kingdom: 16 Oct., A/36/605. <sup>(50)</sup>USSR: 16 June, A/36/329.

Publication: <sup>(51)</sup> Report of the International Conference on Kampuchea (A/CONF.109/5), Sales No. E.81.I.20.

Report: <sup>(52)</sup> S-G, A/36/583.

Resolutions: <sup>(53)</sup> Conference on Kampuchea: I(I), 17 July. GA: <sup>(54)</sup> 35/6, 22 Oct. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 334); <sup>(55)</sup> *ibid.*, para. 12 (P. 335); <sup>(56)</sup> 36/5, 21 Oct. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.5/36/18/Add.1; 5th Committee report, A/36/607; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/18.

Meeting records: GA: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.I (16 Sep.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.14 (19 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.36-40 (19-21 Oct.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/5

100-25-19 (recorded vote) Meeting 40 21 October 1981  
35-nation draft (A/36/L.3/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1); agenda item 22.

Sponsors: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mauritania, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Swaziland, Thailand, United Kingdom, Upper Volta, Uruguay.

#### The situation in Kampuchea

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 34/22 of 14 November 1979 and 35/6 of 22 October 1980.

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/6,

Welcoming the convening of the International Conference on Kampuchea, held at United Nations Headquarters from 13 to 17 July 1981, as a step forward towards a comprehensive political settlement of the Kampuchean problem,

Noting the joint statement issued in Singapore on 4 September 1981 by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Mr. Son Sann and Mr. Khieu Samphan concerning their agreement, in principle, to form a coalition,

Bearing in mind the Declaration on Kampuchea and resolution 1 (I) adopted by the Conference on 17 July 1981, as contained in the report of the Conference,

Deploping that foreign armed intervention continues and that foreign forces have not been withdrawn from Kampuchea, thus causing continuing hostilities in that country and seriously threatening international peace and security,

Greatly concerned that the continuing deployment of foreign forces in Kampuchea near the Thai-Kampuchean border has heightened tension in the region,

Gravely disturbed that the continued fighting and instability in Kampuchea have forced more Kampucheans to flee to the Thai-Kampuchean border in search of food and safety,

Recognizing that the assistance extended by the international community has continued to reduce the widespread food shortages and health problems of the Kampuchean people,

Emphasizing that it is the inalienable right of the Kampuchean people who have sought refuge in neighbouring countries to return safely to their homeland,

Emphasizing further that no effective solution to the humanitarian problems can be achieved without a just and lasting political settlement of the Kampuchean conflict,

Convinced that, to bring about durable peace in South-East Asia, there is an urgent need for a comprehensive political solution to the Kampuchean problem which will provide for the withdrawal of all foreign forces and ensure respect for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and neutral and non-aligned status of Kampuchea, as well as the right of the Kampuchean people to self-determination free from outside interference,

Convinced further that, after the comprehensive political settlement of the Kampuchean question through peaceful means, the countries of the South-East Asian region can pursue efforts to establish a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia so as to lessen international tensions and to achieve lasting peace in the region,

Reaffirming the need for all States to adhere strictly to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which call for respect for the national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, non-recourse to the threat or use of force, and peaceful settlement of disputes,

1. Reaffirms its resolutions 34/22 and 35/6 and calls for their full implementation;

2. Reiterates its conviction that the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Kampuchea, the restoration and preservation of its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, the right of the Kampuchean people to determine their own destiny and the commitment by all States to non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of Kampuchea are the principal components of any just and lasting resolution to the Kampuchean problem;

3. Approves the report of the International Conference on Kampuchea and adopts:

(a) The Declaration on Kampuchea, which includes four elements of negotiations for a comprehensive political settlement of the Kampuchean problem;

(b) Resolution 1(I) in which the Conference, inter alia, established the Ad Hoc Committee of the International Conference on Kampuchea;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to consult with, to assist and to provide the Conference and the Ad Hoc Committee with the necessary facilities to carry out their functions;

5. Authorizes the Ad Hoc Committee to convene during regular sessions of the General Assembly in order to carry out its tasks;

6. Further requests the Secretary-General to undertake a preliminary study of the possible future role of the United Nations, taking into account the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee and the elements of negotiations for a comprehensive political settlement as set out in paragraph 10 of the Declaration on Kampuchea;

7. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for taking appropriate steps in convening the Conference;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to follow the situation closely and to exercise his good offices in order to contribute to a comprehensive political settlement;

9. Decides to reconvene the Conference at an appropriate time in accordance with Conference resolution 1 (I);

10. Urges all States of South-East Asia and others concerned to attend future sessions of the Conference;

11. Requests the Conference to report to the General Assembly on its future sessions;

12. Expresses its deep appreciation to donor countries, the United Nations and its agencies and other national and international humanitarian organizations which have rendered relief assistance to the Kampuchean people, and appeals to them to continue to assist Kampucheans who are still in need, especially those along the Thai-Kampuchean border and in the holding centres in Thailand;

13. Deeply appreciates the efforts of the Secretary-General in co-ordinating humanitarian relief assistance and in monitoring its distribution, and requests him to continue such efforts as are necessary to deal with the situation;

14. Urges the countries of South-East Asia, once a comprehensive political solution to the Kampuchean conflict is achieved, to exert renewed efforts to establish a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia;

15. Expresses the hope that, following a comprehensive political solution, an intergovernmental committee will be established to consider a programme of assistance to Kampuchea for the reconstruction of its economy and for the economic and social development of all States of the region;

16. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report on the implementation of the present resolution;

17. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "The situation in Kampuchea".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland,

Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Seychelles, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Vanuatu,<sup>a</sup> Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Benin, Cape Verde, Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Panama, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

### Credentials of Democratic Kampuchea

The credentials of the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea were discussed at two 1981 General Assembly sessions (eighth emergency special and thirty-sixth regular) together with those submitted for representatives of other United Nations Member States (p. 351). Several communications on the subject were also received.

Two letters were addressed to the President of the Economic and Social Council. On 10 July,<sup>(2)</sup> 13 States, mainly Eastern European, said they considered the presence of the Democratic Kampuchea delegation at the July session of the Council to be illegal since, they claimed, the only existing Kampuchean State was the People's Republic of Kampuchea. Democratic Kampuchea replied, in a letter of 15 July,<sup>(3)</sup> that the 13-nation document was intended to disrupt the Council's work and its authors had spurned efforts to find a political solution.

The question of Democratic Kampuchea's credentials to the Assembly's eighth emergency special session was raised in the Credentials Committee on 10 September.<sup>(10)</sup>

The USSR stated that the only legal representative of the Kampuchean people was the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Committee should return the seat of Kampuchea to its legal representatives.

China regarded the objection as groundless, since Democratic Kampuchea's Government was the only legal representative of the country and the credentials it had issued had been confirmed at other Assembly sessions. Singapore agreed, while the United States said it continued to deplore Democratic Kampuchea's human rights record but accepted that Government's credentials as valid.

In the Assembly discussion on credentials on 11 September, the German Democratic Republic, speaking also for Bulgaria, the Byelorussian

SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said the People's Republic was the only legitimate representative of Kampuchea; those posing as its representatives represented only the overthrown clique. The Lao People's Democratic Republic also objected to the presence of the Democratic Kampuchea delegation. India, regarding the People's Republic as the legal Government, expressed reservations on Democratic Kampuchea's representation.

Democratic Kampuchea replied that the Assembly should condemn the manoeuvres of Viet Nam in raising the representation issue after invading and occupying the country with more than 300,000 troops. Pakistan, agreeing with those who favoured acceptance of Democratic Kampuchea's credentials, said foreign military intervention could never be justified.

Four communications were addressed to the Secretary-General concerning the representation of Kampuchea at the Assembly's thirty-sixth session.

On 10 September,<sup>(5)</sup> Viet Nam transmitted a telegram of the previous day from the Vice-President of the Council of Ministers and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, stating that no problem affecting Kampuchea could be resolved in any international organization without participation of the representatives of the Council of State of the People's Republic, and urging restoration of Kampuchea's seat to those representatives. Responding by a letter of 14 September,<sup>(4)</sup> Democratic Kampuchea charged that the telegram was from a Vietnamese-installed administration and requested an urgent meeting of the Credentials Committee.

Two further telegrams from the People's Republic of Kampuchea were forwarded by Viet Nam. One, dated 10 September and transmitted on 15 September,<sup>(7)</sup> named a delegation for the Assembly's thirty-sixth session. The other, dated 12 September and transmitted two days later,<sup>(6)</sup> said there had been great progress in Kampuchea since 1979 under the Government of the People's Republic: elections had been held (in May 1981), security was assured, agricultural production had increased, literacy campaigns were under way and public health was improving.

An immediate meeting of the Credentials Committee to consider the credentials of Kampuchea was also requested in a 15 September note verbale<sup>(8)</sup> transmitted by Viet Nam and also signed by Cuba, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Grenada, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Nicaragua and Seychelles.

When the Committee met on 16 September to consider the credentials of representatives to the

session,<sup>(11)</sup> Panama and the USSR maintained that the sole legitimate representative of Kampuchea was the Council of State of the People's Republic.

China and the United States felt that the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea were in good order and valid—a view shared by Papua New Guinea, which added that the other régime had been installed by an outside Power. Paraguay said it could not accept the credentials of a régime imposed by force; as those of Democratic Kampuchea had been recognized by the Assembly, it would accept them. The Niger also accepted the credentials.

The Netherlands explained that, as no authority could claim to represent Kampuchea, it could not support acceptance of the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea and would abstain in any vote. Ghana also said it would abstain since the situation in Kampuchea was unclear and it believed the people must choose their own representatives.

On 18 September, the Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(12)</sup> approving the report of its Credentials Committee, after rejecting, by a recorded vote of 77 to 37, with 31 abstentions, a 14-nation amendment to have the report approved except with regard to the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea.<sup>(13)</sup>

Introducing the amendment, the Lao People's Democratic Republic stated that Democratic Kampuchea had not existed since January 1979 when the Pol Pot régime was overthrown and that Kampuchea's seat in the United Nations belonged to the Government of the People's Republic. A similar position was taken by Afghanistan, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Viet Nam; India added that the Assembly should at least disapprove the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea.

Supporting this position, the German Democratic Republic, speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, stated that the People's Republic represented the revolutionary forces that had ousted a régime of genocide; it held power firmly and irreversibly. Cuba felt that South-East Asian peace and security could be protected only by recognition of the Government of the People's Republic.

Madagascar, supporting the amendment, said the Assembly could not hide indefinitely behind a formalism but must take a political decision.

Opposing the amendment, China described it as an attempt to deprive Democratic Kampuchea of its rightful seat and to force the international community to recognize Viet Nam's occupation as a *fait accompli*; the situation in Kampuchea was by no means irreversible. Costa Rica, Japan,

Nepal, Singapore and the United States were among those which said there was no justification for acceptance of credentials of a régime installed through foreign military intervention. These countries, together with Canada and New Zealand, regarded Democratic Kampuchea's credentials as legally and technically valid, but said they in no way supported the policies of Pol Pot.

Papua New Guinea said it continued to recognize Democratic Kampuchea's credentials because its Government had not been replaced by processes within the country. Thailand said the occupying Power was trying to deprive Democratic Kampuchea of its legitimate representation in the United Nations, having failed to eliminate the nationalist resistance on the ground. In Zaire's view, developments had confirmed the Assembly's 1980 decision to recognize the validity of Democratic Kampuchea's credentials.<sup>(13)</sup>

Several delegations explained their abstentions: France said it could not recognize a régime established by military intervention and had never had any relations with the Pol Pot régime; Austria found unacceptable both Democratic Kampuchea's human rights record and the installation of a régime by foreign intervention; and Australia and Sweden felt that neither régime represented the Kampuchians.

Explaining negative votes, the United Kingdom stressed that it had no intention of contributing to the re-establishment of the Pol Pot régime; Denmark gave its reasons as legal and procedural but said it should not be regarded as supporting either Government; Belgium recognized the validity of Democratic Kampuchea's credentials, while Pakistan saw that Government as the sole legal representative so long as foreign military intervention continued and the people were denied self-determination.

On 22 September,<sup>(9)</sup> Viet Nam transmitted a statement of the previous day by the Foreign Ministry of the People's Republic of Kampuchea condemning the Assembly's decision as an encouragement to China, the United States and their allies to resuscitate the corpse of Democratic Kampuchea.

Amendment rejected: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Benin, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Grenada, Guyana, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nicaragua, Seychelles, Viet Nam, A/36/L.2 & Add.1.

Letters and note verbale (nv): <sup>(2)</sup>Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam: 10 July, E/1981/98. Democratic Kampuchea: <sup>(3)</sup>15 July, E/1981/99; <sup>(4)</sup>14 Sep., A/36/506. Viet Nam: <sup>(5)</sup>10 Sep., A/36/492; <sup>(6)</sup>14 Sep., A/36/508; <sup>(7)</sup>15 Sep., A/36/510; <sup>(8)</sup>15 Sep., A/36/511 (nv); <sup>(9)</sup>22 Sep., A/36/548.

Reports: Credentials Committee, <sup>(10)</sup>A/ES-8/6/Add.1, <sup>(11)</sup>A/36/517.

Resolution: <sup>(12)</sup>GA, 36/2 A, 18 Sep. (p. 352).  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(13)</sup>1980, p. 331.

## Questions concerning Thailand

### Kampuchea-Thailand border

During 1981, the Secretary-General received a number of letters concerning the situation on the Kampuchea-Thailand border.

Several were from Thailand and complained of incursions and attacks into Prachinburi and Trat provinces from Kampuchean territory by Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces.

On 5 January,<sup>(3)</sup> Thailand charged that since June 1980 there had been over 80 separate violations of its sovereignty and territory; in the most recent, on 3 January, two Thai soldiers had been killed and another wounded in an attack on a Thai Army unit about 700 metres inside the border. Between 5 and 26 January, shellings and an armed incursion had left 10 Thais injured and one dead, Thailand alleged on 27 January.<sup>(4)</sup> A letter of 25 March<sup>(5)</sup> stated that a 17 March attack on a Thai marine unit had left two naval officers killed and four injured. Further incidents were detailed in a letter of 28 August:<sup>(6)</sup> attacks on 25 and 26 August had resulted in one Thai villager dead, one wounded, property damage and livestock losses; those incidents were among more than 46 serious territorial violations since 1 May, involving four Thai deaths, Thailand added. On 27 November,<sup>(7)</sup> Thailand listed incidents between 9 and 23 November in which two of its soldiers and one civilian had been killed, four civilians wounded, livestock killed or injured and property damaged.

An 8 January statement from Democratic Kampuchea's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, transmitted on 22 January,<sup>(1)</sup> also charged that Vietnamese soldiers had intruded into Thai territory on 3 and 5 January and that the latter incident had left five Thais seriously wounded.

Letters were received from Viet Nam denying these charges and countercharging that Thailand, while claiming neutrality with regard to the Kampuchean situation, had consistently collaborated with China against the Kampucheans by allowing Thai territory to be used for armed action against the People's Republic of Kampuchea by the remnants of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime together with other Khmer reactionaries.

On 6 January,<sup>(8)</sup> Viet Nam forwarded a 5 January statement from its Ministry of Foreign Affairs that, on 3 January, Thailand had conducted a provocation on the Kampuchea-Thailand border and had attempted to discredit Kampuchea and Viet Nam. An 11 January state-

ment from the same source, transmitted on 15 January,<sup>(9)</sup> reaffirmed Viet Nam's respect for Thailand's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, and demanded that Thailand reciprocate with regard to the Indo-Chinese countries. On 6 February,<sup>(10)</sup> Viet Nam annexed a report of the previous day by the SPK (Sapora-means Kampuchea) news agency of the People's Republic of Kampuchea charging that, during January, Thailand had increasingly violated Kampuchean territory, airspace and territorial waters by 67 overflights and 515 artillery attacks, some of them in support of incursions by Pol Pot bandits, causing damage and numerous civilian casualties. A further Vietnamese Foreign Ministry statement, issued and forwarded on 28 August,<sup>(11)</sup> denied a charge by Thailand's Foreign Ministry, broadcast on Bangkok radio two days earlier, that Vietnamese forces in Kampuchea had shelled Thai territory.

Charges that Thailand and reactionary Khmers had violated Kampuchean territory on numerous occasions throughout 1980—including more than 1,400 bombardments from August to December, 500 overflights during the second half of the year, 35 incursions in December and violations of Kampuchea's territorial waters—were detailed in a 10 January 1981 statement by the Foreign Ministry of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, transmitted by the Lao People's Democratic Republic on 19 January.<sup>(2)</sup>

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Democratic Kampuchea: 22 Jan., A/36/78-S/14339. <sup>(2)</sup>Lao People's Democratic Republic: 19 Jan., A/36/76-S/14336. Thailand: <sup>(3)</sup>5 Jan., A/36/66-S/14323; <sup>(4)</sup>27 Jan., A/36/82-S/14345; <sup>(5)</sup>25 Mar., A/36/152-S/14420; <sup>(6)</sup>28 Aug., A/36/463-S/14667; <sup>(7)</sup>27 Nov., A/36/735-S/14775. Viet Nam: <sup>(8)</sup>6 Jan., A/36/67; <sup>(9)</sup>15 Jan., A/36/74-S/14334; <sup>(10)</sup>6 Feb., A/36/97-S/14369; <sup>(11)</sup>28 Aug., A/36/465.

### Lao People's Democratic Republic and Thailand

On 13 February 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> Viet Nam forwarded to the Secretary-General an 11 February statement by its Foreign Ministry stating that Thailand had recently committed repeated and serious armed provocations against the Lao People's Democratic Republic, particularly on 7 February when shelling and an invasion of Vientiane province had caused tension on the border.

In response, Thailand forwarded on 3 March<sup>(1)</sup> excerpts of a 27 February press release by its Foreign Ministry which stated that, in speaking for the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Viet Nam had misrepresented the situation and heightened tension; the incidents, which had resulted from deliberate sabotage by a third party, had been satisfactorily resolved by the two countries.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Thailand, 3 Mar., A/36/118-S/14392; <sup>(2)</sup>Viet Nam, 13 Feb., A/36/103-S/14374.

### China and Viet Nam

Between January and September 1981, the Secretary-General received letters from China and Viet Nam, each charging the other with armed attacks and other aggressive acts along their common border.

On 8 January 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> Viet Nam transmitted a memorandum of 29 December 1980 from its Ministry of Foreign Affairs accusing China of intensifying, throughout 1980, hostile land, sea and air activities against Viet Nam, sowing discord between Indo-Chinese countries and members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and obstructing negotiations between China and Viet Nam which, it said, China had broken off unilaterally on 6 March 1980.

By letters of 18 February<sup>(6)</sup> and 3 April 1981,<sup>(7)</sup> Viet Nam transmitted communiqués dated 16 February and 30 March, respectively, containing allegations of hostile actions by China against Viet Nam made by a commission of inquiry into Chinese expansionists' and hegemonists' war crimes. The first communiqué listed alleged crimes in 1979 and 1980; the second, hostile actions during the first quarter of 1981, including armed attacks, troop build-ups, intrusions by sea, overflights, spying activities, political sabotage and psychological warfare in Cao Bang, Ha Tuyen, Hoang Lien Son, Lai Chau, Lang Son, Phu Khanh and Quang Ninh provinces.

On 5 May<sup>(1)</sup> and 16 May,<sup>(2)</sup> China transmitted notes of the same dates from its Foreign Ministry to the Vietnamese Embassy in China. By the first, China cited shelling incidents and armed incursions by Vietnamese into Guangxi Zhuang autonomous region and Yunnan province from January to April, resulting in numerous civilian casualties and deaths, kidnappings, and losses of livestock and property; by the second, China alleged further incursions by Vietnamese troops on 5, 7 and 13 May.

For its part, Viet Nam transmitted on 8 May<sup>(8)</sup> a 6 May statement by its Foreign Ministry and a note of the same date to China's Foreign Ministry charging China with numerous armed intrusions into Vietnamese territory by sea and air, ambushes, shellings and land-grabbing operations, and stating that China had refused Viet Nam's proposal for the resumption of Viet Nam-China negotiations. Similar incidents between 6 and 14 May were alleged in a 17 May note from Viet Nam's Foreign Ministry to its Chinese counterpart, forwarded by Viet Nam on 19 May.<sup>(9)</sup>

A proposal for an immediate end to armed conflict in the border area and for the start of a third round of the China-Viet Nam talks, preferably in July, was made in a 13 June note from

the Vietnamese to the Chinese Foreign Ministry, transmitted on 17 June.<sup>(10)</sup>

On 13 July,<sup>(3)</sup> China forwarded a Foreign Ministry memorandum of that date attributing responsibility for deterioration of relations between the two countries to Viet Nam's hostile policies against China which, it claimed, were designed to disguise USSR and Vietnamese expansionism in South-East Asia. In response, Viet Nam forwarded on 22 July<sup>(11)</sup> a 17 July editorial of the Vietnamese daily *Nhan Dan* rejecting China's allegations and charging it with expansionist ambitions against Viet Nam and other Indo-Chinese countries.

Two later notes between the respective Foreign Ministries were also forwarded to the Secretary-General. On 1 September,<sup>(12)</sup> Viet Nam forwarded its Ministry's note of 31 August suggesting September for the third round of negotiations. China replied to the 13 June and 31 August notes on 7 September, in a note transmitted the same day,<sup>(4)</sup> rejecting the Vietnamese proposals and stating that Viet Nam, in continuing its intrusions into Chinese territory, showed no desire to normalize relations and that the basis for resuming negotiations did not exist.

Letters: China: <sup>(1)</sup>5 May, A/36/234-S/14475; <sup>(2)</sup>16 May, A/36/256-S/14481; <sup>(3)</sup>13 July, A/36/377-S/14589; <sup>(4)</sup>7 Sep., A/36/484-S/14679. Viet Nam: <sup>(5)</sup>8 Jan., A/36/68-S/14325; <sup>(6)</sup>18 Feb., A/36/106-S/14377; <sup>(7)</sup>3 Apr., A/36/170-S/14428; <sup>(8)</sup>8 May, A/36/238-S/14478; <sup>(9)</sup>19 May, A/36/257-S/14483; <sup>(10)</sup>17 June, A/36/332-S/14555; <sup>(11)</sup>22 July, A/36/396-S/14610; <sup>(12)</sup>1 Sep., A/36/473-S/14675.

### Peace and security of South-East Asia

A number of letters addressed to the Secretary-General during 1981 concerned general aspects of relations among the nations of South-East Asia. Most were circulated as documents under the General Assembly's agenda item on the "Question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia"—an item which the Assembly discussed in November without taking substantive action.

COMMUNICATIONS. On 29 January,<sup>(7)</sup> the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam transmitted a statement and communiqué issued by their Foreign Ministers and that of the People's Republic of Kampuchea at a conference held in Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam, on 27 and 28 January. The Ministers proposed that a regional conference between two groups of countries—those of Indo-China and ASEAN—and Burma be convened in March to discuss mutual problems of peace, stability, friendship and co-operation in South-East Asia, and that after conclusion of a peace treaty between the two groups a broad international conference be held to recognize and guarantee the treaty.

Opposing this proposal in a 1 February press conference at Bangkok, Thailand, the Premier of China stated that the aim of its sponsors was to cajole the international community into recognizing Indo-China as a sphere of influence of Viet Nam, to dupe ASEAN countries into giving de facto recognition to the Heng Samrin régime, to counter the International Conference on Kampuchea (p. 241) and to distort the root cause of tension in South-East Asia; excerpts from the press conference were transmitted by China on 10 February.<sup>(1)</sup>

Referring to the proposal in a 6 February statement transmitted on 25 February,<sup>(10)</sup> the Foreign Minister of the Philippines, also in his capacity as Chairman of the ASEAN Standing Committee, said it ignored the root cause of the problem—blatant breach in Kampuchea of fundamental principles of both the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Charter of the United Nations. In a press statement of 10 April following a meeting at Manila, Philippines, with the Secretary-General's Special Representative on Kampuchea (p. 241), transmitted by the Philippines on 14 April,<sup>(12)</sup> the Foreign Minister said the ASEAN countries did not regard a regional conference as an appropriate forum because of the international dimensions of the Kampuchea conflict.

By a letter of 25 February sent on behalf of ASEAN,<sup>(11)</sup> the Philippine Foreign Minister transmitted an extract from the final declaration adopted at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Non-Aligned Countries (New Delhi, India, 9–13 February) in which the Ministers urged all States of the region to undertake a dialogue leading to resolution of their differences and establishment of durable peace and stability in the area, as well as the elimination of involvement and threats of intervention by outside Powers.

A press communiqué issued following consultations at Vientiane, Lao People's Democratic Republic, on 24 April between the Foreign Ministers of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the People's Republic of Kampuchea and Viet Nam, and transmitted by the Lao People's Democratic Republic on 27 April,<sup>(4)</sup> announced that the Vietnamese Foreign Minister had been appointed to act on behalf of the three countries in conducting regional consultations with ASEAN countries. Subsequently, a message of 19 May to the Secretary-General from the three Foreign Ministers, transmitted two days later by the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam,<sup>(8)</sup> announced that consultations had been held with Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines, with initial positive results.

The ASEAN Foreign Ministers, in a joint communiqué of 18 June issued at the conclusion of their meeting at Manila, excerpts from which

were transmitted by the Philippines on the following day,<sup>(13)</sup> said the regional conference proposed in January could not provide an appropriate forum for any useful discussion that could lead to a durable solution, since the Kampuchea conflict involved outside Powers; they were not opposed to regional consultations and dialogues, but those could be no substitute for the conference on Kampuchea.

A revised proposal for regional action was set out in a statement and communiqué of a conference held at Phnom Penh on 13 and 14 June by the three Foreign Ministers responsible for the January proposal, and forwarded by a letter of 15 June from the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam.<sup>(9)</sup> They proposed to hold a regional conference with the Secretary-General and other mutually agreed upon countries participating as observers; to continue the regional consultations in the event that ASEAN States were not prepared to participate in such a conference; and to hold an international conference with broader participation—possibly to be convened by the United Nations provided that it stopped recognizing the Pot Pot régime—which would guarantee agreements reached in either the regional conference or consultations.

On 19 June,<sup>(2)</sup> Democratic Kampuchea transmitted a statement of 15 June by its Foreign Ministry denouncing the Phnom Penh proposal as a manoeuvre to divert attention from the Conference on Kampuchea and to legalize the Vietnamese administration installed in Kampuchea. Also on 19 June,<sup>(14)</sup> the Philippines transmitted a press statement of that date by its Foreign Minister, rejecting the proposal as containing nothing new and as an inappropriate framework for solution of the Kampuchean problem.

On 29 September,<sup>(5)</sup> the Lao People's Democratic Republic forwarded a memorandum from its Foreign Ministry suggesting that a standing committee of Indo-Chinese and ASEAN States, possibly including Burma, be established to resolve problems and apply the principles of peaceful coexistence in such matters as respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-intervention, self-determination of peoples, dispute settlement, economic co-operation, negotiation of differences over maritime zones and islands, and transit rights for land-locked countries.

This memorandum was characterized by Democratic Kampuchea, in a note of 7 October transmitted the same day,<sup>(3)</sup> as interference in its internal affairs, aimed at making the international community accept the fait accompli brought about by Viet Nam's invasion of Kampuchea.

On 28 December,<sup>(6)</sup> the Lao People's Democratic Republic transmitted the final docu-



ment of a working consultative meeting of the Deputy Foreign Ministers of Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, the People's Republic of Kampuchea, Poland, the USSR and Viet Nam (Vintiane, 18 and 19 December), in which they reviewed the situation in the region and expressed support for the proposed regional conference.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. The question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia was considered by the General Assembly on 2 and 3 November.

A number of States supported the proposals for a regional conference and, after conclusion of a treaty between Indo-Chinese and ASEAN countries, for an international conference to recognize and guarantee that treaty.

Among the countries taking this position, the Lao People's Democratic Republic stated that intervention by an Asiatic super-Power in the internal affairs of the Indo-Chinese countries constituted the fundamental source of tension in South-East Asia. In the USSR's view, rapprochement between China and the United States and the development of military co-operation between them posed a threat to the region. Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic also warned of dangers resulting from collusion between those States, and the Ukrainian SSR added that China and the United States, supported by members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, had been pressuring ASEAN into confrontation with the Indo-Chinese countries. The States of the region would make a great mistake, said Cuba, if they did not realize the danger to them posed by two great Powers and did not decide to engage in dialogue.

Viet Nam pointed to its suggestions to resume the China-Viet Nam talks and the proposals to sign peace treaties with China—supported by Poland and others—and stressed the need for consultation and dialogue between the two groups of States in the region in order to counter the deterioration in relations linked to intervention and aggression by outside Powers. The Byelorussian SSR felt that encouragement of such dialogue would assure creation of a zone of peace and stability in South-East Asia.

Hungary considered that the principles outlined by the Lao People's Democratic Republic on 29 September (p. 251) were the framework for negotiations. Angola supported this view, stating that the international community had a duty to encourage regional initiatives aimed at genuine peace and co-operation, and to thwart counter-moves aimed at sabotaging such approaches. Ethiopia and Mongolia also favoured these initia-

tives. Bulgaria remarked that, should ASEAN not be ready for a regional conference, bilateral and multilateral negotiations might be continued on a broad spectrum of questions, as proposed by the three Indo-Chinese countries.

The Congo voiced support for the position taken in February by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Non-Aligned Countries in favour of a dialogue to resolve differences among the countries of South-East Asia (p. 251).

The ASEAN States, along with Papua New Guinea, said that Vietnamese intervention in Kampuchea was the main cause of regional tension and urged Viet Nam to join in the search for a settlement in accordance with the Assembly's resolution of 21 October on the Kampuchea situation.<sup>(15)</sup> Malaysia stated that it would be futile to discuss peace and security in South-East Asia in isolation from the events in Kampuchea and that the legitimate interests of major Powers in the region must be recognized. Thailand stated that the proposals of the Lao People's Democratic Republic ignored the Kampuchean problem and were intended to accomplish what foreign forces had failed to achieve. Singapore's view—shared by Australia—was that, until Viet Nam recognized that its occupation was the root of tension in the region, talk about desirability of dialogue was hollow.

China maintained that Vietnamese expansionism and aggression, backed by the USSR, threatened peace and stability in South-East Asia; the proposed regional conference was an attempt to move the issue out of the United Nations.

Speaking for the member States of the European Community, the United Kingdom said they could not support any proposals on the item which omitted the Kampuchea problem. Democratic Kampuchea and Japan pointed out that, in its resolution on the Kampuchea situation, the Assembly had mentioned the urgent need to solve that problem in order to bring peace to South-East Asia.

Albania said that political, economic and military pressures by China, the United States and the USSR were preventing the establishment of genuine regional peace and stability.

At the conclusion of the debate on 3 November, the Assembly decided without vote,<sup>(17)</sup> on an oral proposal of its President, to include this item in the provisional agenda of its 1982 session.

Previously, on 21 October, in its resolution on the Kampuchea situation,<sup>(16)</sup> the Assembly urged the South-East Asian countries, once a comprehensive political solution to the Kampuchea conflict was achieved, to renew efforts to establish a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>China: 10 Feb., A/36/99-S/14373. Democratic Kampuchea: <sup>(2)</sup>19 June, A/36/339-S/14564; <sup>(3)</sup>7 Oct., A/36/589. Lao People's Democratic Republic: <sup>(4)</sup>27 Apr., A/36/227-S/14467; <sup>(5)</sup>29 Sep., A/36/561; <sup>(6)</sup>28 Dec., A/37/57-S/14818. Lao People's Democratic Republic, Viet Nam: <sup>(7)</sup>129 Jan., A/36/86-S/14351; <sup>(8)</sup>21 May, A/36/286-S/14488; <sup>(9)</sup>15 June, A/36/328-S/14547. Philippines: <sup>(10)</sup>25 Feb., A/36/111-S/14386; <sup>(11)</sup>25 Feb., annexing non-aligned countries declaration extract, A/36/113-S/14388 & Corr.1; <sup>(12)</sup>14 Apr., A/36/202-S/14444; <sup>(13)</sup>19 June, annexing ASEAN communiqué, A/36/337-S/14562; <sup>(14)</sup>19 June, A/36/338-S/14563. Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(15)</sup>GA, 36/5, 21 Oct. (p. 246); <sup>(16)</sup>ibid., para. 14. Dec.: <sup>(17)</sup>GA, 36/404, 3 Nov., text following. Meeting records: GA: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.1 (16 Sep.); plenary, A/36/PV.43, 44 & Corr.1, 45(2, 3 Nov.).

General Assembly decision 36/404

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President: agenda item 34.

Question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia

At its 45th plenary meeting, on 3 November 1981, the General Assembly decided to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia".

## Korean question

A report of the United Nations Command concerning the maintenance of the 1953 Korean Armistice Agreement<sup>(2)</sup> between 16 December 1980 and 16 December 1981 was submitted by a letter of 21 April 1982<sup>(1)</sup> from the United

States to the President of the Security Council, on behalf of the unified command established pursuant to a 1950 Council resolution.<sup>(3)</sup>

The report stated that the Korean People's Army/Chinese People's Volunteers side continued to conduct hostile acts against the forces of the United Nations Command and the Republic of Korea. An appendix gave details of two 1981 incidents submitted by the Command to the Military Armistice Commission established under the Armistice Agreement; these were described as infiltration by a North Korean, initially sighted in the Imjin River on 29 June and killed south of the river on 4 July, and a North Korean surface-to-air missile attack on a United Nations Command aircraft in international airspace off the west coast on 26 August. The report added that a United Nations Command member of the Commission, at a meeting on 9 November, had reiterated a proposal that the two sides form joint observer teams to investigate incidents, but the other side had failed to respond.

The report concluded that the Command would continue to fulfil its obligations under its mandate from the Armistice Agreement and the Security Council until the parties directly concerned could arrive at a more permanent arrangement for peace.

Letter and report: <sup>(1)</sup>United States, 21 Apr. 1982, annexing United Nations Command report, S/15042.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 725(VIII), annex, 7 Dec. 1953 (YUN 1953, p. 136); <sup>(3)</sup>SC, 84(1950), 7 July 1950 (YUN 1950 p. 230).

## Chapter VII

## Latin America

Although no disputes involving Latin American countries were formally discussed by United Nations bodies in 1981, several situations were the subject of communications to the Organization from the States concerned. These involved border incidents between Ecuador and Peru (see below), the El Salvador situation (p. 254), a territorial dispute between Guyana and Venezuela (p. 254), and complaints by Nicaragua against the United States and Honduras (p. 255).

### Ecuador and Peru

Border incidents between Ecuador and Peru in January 1981 were the subject of communications to the United Nations Secretary-General or the President of the Security Council from those countries and from the Secretary-General

of the Organization of American States (OAS), circulated as Council documents.

By a telegram of 30 January,<sup>(5)</sup> the OAS Secretary-General transmitted the text of a resolution adopted in Washington, D. C., on 29 January by which the OAS Permanent Council, at the request of Ecuador, convoked the nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs to consider the situation and urged the Governments to refrain from action that could aggravate it.

By a letter of 1 February,<sup>(2)</sup> Ecuador brought the matter to the Security Council's attention, stating that there had been a serious aggression by Peruvian armed forces since 22 January in the Cordillera del Cóndor area of south-eastern Ecuador.

The OAS Meeting, which took place in Wash-

ington, D. C., adopted on 5 February a resolution by which it noted with satisfaction the announcement of a cease-fire by Ecuador and Peru, urged both countries to demobilize and restrict themselves to normal border-patrol troops, and noted their acceptance of a committee composed of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States to observe the cease-fire and create conditions of peace. The resolution was transmitted by a telegram of 5 February from the OAS Secretary-General,<sup>(6)</sup> as well as by letters from Ecuador dated 5 February<sup>(3)</sup> and from Peru dated 10 February.<sup>(4)</sup>

Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States transmitted on 23 February<sup>(1)</sup> the text of a statement they had made at the OAS Meeting in their capacity as guarantors of the 1942 Peruvian-Ecuadorian Protocol of Peace, Friendship and Frontiers; they declared their determination to continue contributing to peace efforts and said their vote for the resolution did not affect the responsibilities they would continue to assume as guarantors of the Protocol. Peru also transmitted this statement in its letter of 10 February, together with a statement by its Minister for Foreign Affairs that it had voted for the resolution, which was indissolubly linked to the four-nation statement.

In his annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization, the United Nations Secretary-General observed that Ecuador and Peru had decided to negotiate after the armed skirmishes early in the year, thereby arresting an escalation of hostilities (p. 8).

During the general debate at the 1981 regular session of the Assembly, Peru said it remained willing to have markers placed along a 78-kilometre stretch of the border that had already been delimited. However, Ecuador maintained that Peru continued to occupy territory to which Ecuador had a historical claim dating back to the discovery of the Amazon River in the sixteenth century.

Letters and telegrams (t): <sup>(1)</sup>Argentina, Brazil, Chile, United States: 23 Feb., S/14384. Ecuador: <sup>(2)</sup>1 Feb., S/14353; <sup>(3)</sup>5 Feb., S/14363. <sup>(4)</sup>Peru: 10 Feb., S/14371. OAS: <sup>(5)</sup>30 Jan., S/14352 (l); <sup>(6)</sup>5 Feb., S/14362 (t).  
Meeting records: GA, A/36/PV.6, 31 (21 Sep., 8 Oct.).

### El Salvador situation

In a joint declaration issued on 28 August and transmitted to the Security Council President by France and Mexico on that date,<sup>(2)</sup> the Foreign Ministers of the two countries recognized the alliance of the Farabundo Martí Front for National Liberation (FMLN) and the Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR) as a representative political force that should legitimately participate in instituting the mechanisms of rapproche-

ment and negotiation required for a political settlement of the crisis in El Salvador.

Addressing the General Assembly on 29 September, the President of the Revolutionary Junta of the Government of El Salvador, José Napoleón Duarte, said his Government was trying to build a democratic society, undeterred by terrorist activities supported from outside. It was implementing a political timetable leading to free elections, and had appealed to FDR to cease its armed struggle and take part in that process. The Government would not negotiate with organized armed sectors but would welcome in the electoral process any group that laid down its arms.

By a letter of 13 October,<sup>(3)</sup> Nicaragua transmitted to the Council President proposals by the FMLN-FDR alliance for peace talks between itself and the Governing Junta of El Salvador, to discuss a restructuring of the armed forces and full democratic participation of the various sectors and forces of the Salvadorian people.

On 2 November,<sup>(1)</sup> Cuba transmitted to the Secretary-General a government statement issued on 28 October, denying an article in the Washington Post of 19 October which stated that Cuba had in September sent 500 to 600 troops to Nicaragua with the aim of taking over El Salvador and setting up a revolutionary Marxist government in the eastern part of the country.

The General Assembly, on 16 December, adopted a resolution on human rights in El Salvador<sup>(4)</sup> in which it requested the Salvadorian parties to reach a negotiated political solution, appealed to States to abstain from intervening in the country's internal situation, and urged the Government to ensure respect for human rights.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Cuba, 2 Nov., A/36/650-S/14744; <sup>(2)</sup>France, Mexico, 28 Aug., S/14659; <sup>(3)</sup>Nicaragua, 13 Oct., S/14726.  
Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/155, 16 Dec. (p. 962).  
Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.17 (29 Sep.).

### Guyana and Venezuela

A territorial dispute between Guyana and Venezuela over the Essequibo (Guyana Esequiba) area was taken up in communications addressed by the two Governments to the Secretary-General during the latter part of 1981.

The meeting of Commonwealth heads of Government (Melbourne, Australia, 30 September-7 October), in its final communiqué,<sup>(1)</sup> expressed deep concern at the threat to Guyana's territorial integrity arising from Venezuela's claim to more than two thirds of its territory and called for a peaceful settlement through established procedures and with full respect for the sanctity of treaties. By a letter of 30 October,<sup>(3)</sup> Venezuela transmitted a press release issued on 7 October

by its Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stating that this reference in the Commonwealth communiqué could lead to improper internationalization of an issue which should be kept within the bounds agreed by the parties.

By a letter of 2 November,<sup>(2)</sup> Guyana submitted a memorandum by its Ministry of Foreign Affairs, giving historical and legal background on the dispute and declaring that the Venezuelan claim disregarded the boundary between the two countries as defined by an international arbitral tribunal in 1899. By a letter of 23 November,<sup>(4)</sup> Venezuela transmitted a memorandum by its Foreign Ministry refuting the validity of the 1899 judgement as a vestige of colonialism and recalling the Geneva Agreement of 1966, by which the two countries agreed to seek a solution to the dispute by peaceful means.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Australia: 9 Oct., annexing Commonwealth communiqué, A/36/587. <sup>(2)</sup>Guyana: 2 Nov., A/C.1/36/9. Venezuela: <sup>(3)</sup>30 Oct., A/36/837; <sup>(4)</sup>23 Nov., A/C.1/36/12.

### Questions concerning Nicaragua

A plenary meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, convened in New York on 14 December 1981 at the request of Nicaragua, expressed concern about the situation in the region and appealed to all States to refrain from interference in the internal or external affairs of independent countries there; the communiqué of the meeting was transmitted to the Secretary-General on the same date by a note verbale from Cuba.<sup>(1)</sup>

Note verbale: <sup>(1)</sup>Cuba, 14 Dec., annexing non-aligned countries communiqué, A/37/59.

#### Nicaragua and the United States

Scheduled military exercises of the United States in Central America and relations between Nicaragua and the United States were the subjects of letters by those countries addressed to the President of the Security Council in 1981.

On 25 September,<sup>(1)</sup> Nicaragua condemned plans announced by the United States for joint military exercises with Honduras in areas close to Nicaraguan territory, stating that they would disrupt peace efforts in Central America and oblige Nicaragua to adopt a state of general alert. In a response of 2 October,<sup>(3)</sup> the United States said the exercises were not a threat to Nicaragua or to peace and security; if Nicaragua wished to observe them on an exceptional basis, the United States would consider such a request.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua, in a letter of 16 November transmitted the following day,<sup>(2)</sup> charged that United States officials had made false accusations and aggressive threats against Nicaragua, and called on the United States to repudiate publicly the threat or use of force in international relations and to respect the right of the Nicaraguan people to decide their future.

Letters: Nicaragua: <sup>(1)</sup>25 Sep., S/14710; <sup>(2)</sup>17 Nov., S/14757. <sup>(3)</sup>United States: 2 Oct., S/14718.

#### Nicaragua and Honduras

In a letter of 23 November to the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> Nicaragua referred to border attacks on 13 and 17 November, which it said had been committed by members of the Honduran armed forces, and stressed the need for a meeting between the Ministers for Defence of the two countries as agreed at a meeting of their Presidents at the El Guasale frontier post on 13 May. Annexed was a Nicaraguan Government note of 11 November to the Honduran President, stating that armed bands of persons who had belonged to the National Guard under Nicaragua's former régime were planning to attack a Honduran frontier village and then blame the Nicaraguan Army for the attack.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Nicaragua, 23 Nov., A/C.1/36/13.

## Chapter VIII

### Middle East

In 1981, the situation in the Middle East continued to occupy the attention of the Security Council, the General Assembly and several other United Nations bodies. Aside from the annual debate on the Middle East situation as a whole (p. 257), the major aspects considered were the Palestine question (p. 263), the situation between individual Arab States and Israel (p. 275), the situation in the territories occu-

pied by Israel (p. 300) and Palestine refugees (p. 325). The United Nations continued to maintain two major peace-keeping operations in the region financed by special assessments on Member States (p. 294).

By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(38)</sup> arising from its consideration of the Middle East situation, the Assembly declared once more that peace in the Middle East must be based on a

comprehensive, just and lasting solution under United Nations auspices, and rejected all partial agreements and separate treaties.

In connection with its consideration of disarmament items, the Assembly, on 9 December, adopted three resolutions relating to the proposed establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East (p. 49). It decided to include the subject in the provisional agenda of its 1982 regular session,<sup>(10)</sup> declared it imperative that Israel place its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards,<sup>(11)</sup> and requested the Security Council to prohibit all nuclear co-operation with Israel.<sup>(12)</sup>

On 10 December, the Assembly adopted six resolutions on the Palestine question. It reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the Palestinians, including the right to their own State, and demanded that Israel withdraw from the Arab territories occupied since 1967.<sup>(16)</sup> It expressed strong opposition to all partial agreements and treaties which violated Palestinian rights,<sup>(18)</sup> and determined once more that Israeli measures to alter the character and status of Jerusalem were null and void and a threat to international peace and security.<sup>(17)</sup> The Assembly decided to convene an International Conference on the Question of Palestine not later than 1984,<sup>(15)</sup> and authorized continuing work by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People<sup>(13)</sup> and the United Nations Secretariat's Special Unit on Palestinian Rights.<sup>(14)</sup>

The Committee on Palestinian rights, in its 1981 report to the Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> reiterated the validity of its 1976 recommendations, which included a call for Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories according to a timetable to be fixed by the Security Council and the establishment of an independent Palestinian entity.<sup>(47)</sup>

The United Nations continued to assist Palestinians in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and neighbouring Arab States. Aside from refugee assistance, much of this aid was rendered by the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Children's Fund. The General Assembly requested the continuation of such assistance on 4 December.<sup>(8)</sup>

The Israeli aerial bombing on 7 June of a nuclear research centre near Baghdad, Iraq, was condemned by the Security Council on 19 June<sup>(41)</sup> and by the Assembly on 13 November.<sup>(5)</sup>

In southern Lebanon along the border with Israel, where the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) was stationed, the cease-fire was broken a number of times. Lebanon complained several times to the Security Council that Israeli forces had attacked civilian targets and repeatedly bombarded cities and villages,

while Israel charged that armed elements of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) had attempted to cross into Israel through UNIFIL lines.

On 20 March, through a statement by its President, the Security Council condemned attacks on UNIFIL which had caused the death and injury of Force personnel, and addressed a serious warning to all the forces responsible for acts violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and preventing the full deployment of the Force. The Council extended the UNIFIL mandate twice—first until 19 December<sup>(42)</sup> and then for another six months, until 19 June 1982.<sup>(46)</sup> On 21 July, the Council unanimously called for an immediate cessation of all armed attacks and reaffirmed its commitment to Lebanon's sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence.<sup>(43)</sup>

The United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) continued to supervise the observance of the cease-fire in the area of separation between the forces of Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic in the Golan Heights. Twice during the year, the Council extended the UNDOF mandate for six months: first until 30 November 1981<sup>(40)</sup> and the second time until 31 May 1982.<sup>(44)</sup>

The General Assembly in 1981 appropriated a total of \$177,099,248 for the two United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East. Of this sum, \$146,166,000 was for UNIFIL for the period 19 December 1980 to 18 December 1981<sup>(19)</sup> and \$30,933,248 for UNDOF from 1 June 1981 to 31 May 1982.<sup>(6)</sup> The Assembly also continued an arrangement under which certain unexpended appropriations for UNIFIL<sup>(20)</sup> and UNDOF<sup>(7)</sup> were retained rather than returned to Member States.

The situation in the territories occupied by Israel was again considered by United Nations bodies. The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, in a report to the Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> stated that Israel's annexation and settlements policy continued unabated, with Israeli settlers playing a considerably increased role in implementing that policy. It added that Israel continued to follow a policy of extreme provocation of civilians and severe repression of any reaction to that provocation.

On 16 December, the General Assembly adopted seven resolutions on this subject. One of them<sup>(31)</sup> contained the Assembly's strong condemnation of a series of Israeli policies and practices, including annexation, establishment and expansion of Israeli settlements, expulsion and transfer of Arabs, confiscation of property, transformation and pillaging of cultural property, destruction of houses, mass arrests, ill-treatment of detainees, interference with religious freedoms,

family customs, education, development and freedom of movement, and illegal exploitation of natural resources and population. The Assembly demanded that Israel desist from those policies and practices and, by another resolution,<sup>(30)</sup> determined that Israeli measures designed to change the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, had no legal validity. By four other resolutions, the Assembly demanded that Israel facilitate the immediate return of the Mayors of Hebron and Halhul and the Islamic Judge of Hebron,<sup>(32)</sup> report on assassination attempts against three other mayors,<sup>(35)</sup> rescind orders for the closure of three universities<sup>(34)</sup> and desist from repressive measures against Syrians in the Golan Heights.<sup>(33)</sup> The Assembly also reaffirmed that the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War was applicable to the occupied territories and demanded that Israel comply with its provisions.<sup>(29)</sup>

In separate resolutions relating to the occupied territories, the Assembly demanded that Israel cease implementing its project for a Mediterranean-Dead Sea canal<sup>(36)</sup> and desist from excavations and transformations of the historical, cultural and religious sites of Jerusalem.<sup>(4)</sup> It called on States and institutions not to assist Israel in exploiting the territories' resources.<sup>(37)</sup> It condemned Israel for the Palestinians' deteriorating living conditions and requested a report on the matter from the Secretary-General.<sup>(9)</sup>

Following the Israeli Parliament's decision on 14 December to apply Israeli laws, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights, both the Security Council<sup>(45)</sup> and the Assembly<sup>(39)</sup> demanded on 17 December that Israel rescind its decision, which many countries characterized in the debate as tantamount to annexation.

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) continued to provide education, health and relief services to Palestine refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and the Israeli-occupied territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip (p. 325). The UNRWA Commissioner-General reported to the General Assembly<sup>(3)</sup> that an acute financial crisis early in the year threatened a major part of the Agency's education programme; but later in the year, the receipt of additional pledges, together with cut-backs in both recurrent and non-recurrent expenditure, made it possible to continue this programme through the end of 1981. The Assembly decided to keep its regular 1981 session open until early 1982 to await proposals on ways of

meeting the deficit forecast for the Agency's 1982 budget.

On 16 December, the Assembly adopted eight resolutions on Palestine refugees. It called on all Governments as a matter of urgency to make the most generous efforts to meet UNRWA's anticipated needs,<sup>(26)</sup> requested the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA to continue its efforts for another year<sup>(25)</sup> and endorsed the Agency's efforts to continue providing humanitarian assistance to other persons displaced as a result of the 1967 hostilities and in serious need of continued assistance.<sup>(24)</sup> It called on Israel to take immediate steps for the return of all displaced inhabitants of the territories occupied since 1967,<sup>(22)</sup> demanded that it desist from removing and resettling Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip and from destroying their shelters,<sup>(21)</sup> and requested the Secretary-General to take all appropriate steps for the protection and administration of Arab property, assets and property rights in Israel.<sup>(23)</sup> It called on Israel to remove obstacles to the establishment of a university at Jerusalem for Palestine refugees,<sup>(27)</sup> and appealed for additional special governmental and non-governmental contributions for scholarships and grants to them.<sup>(28)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Israeli practices in occupied territories, A/36/579; <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on Palestinian rights, A/36/35; <sup>(3)</sup>UNRWA Commissioner-General, A/36/13 & Corr.1.

Resolutions:

General Assembly: <sup>(4)</sup>36/15, 28 Oct. (p. 317); <sup>(5)</sup>36/27, 13 Nov. (p. 282); <sup>(6)</sup>36/66 A (p. 296), <sup>(7)</sup>36/66 B (p. 297), 30 Nov.; <sup>(8)</sup>36/70 (p. 274), <sup>(9)</sup>36/73 (p. 322), 4 Dec.; <sup>(10)</sup>36/87 A (p. 50), <sup>(11)</sup>36/87 B (p. 54) <sup>(12)</sup>36/98 (p. 52), 9 Dec.; <sup>(13)</sup>36/120 A (p. 272), <sup>(14)</sup>36/120 B (p. 273), <sup>(15)</sup>36/120 C (p. 271), <sup>(16)</sup>36/120 D (p. 268), <sup>(17)</sup>36/120 E (p. 270), <sup>(18)</sup>36/120 F (p. 268), 10 Dec.; <sup>(19)</sup>36/138 A (p. 299), <sup>(20)</sup>36/138 B (p. 299), <sup>(21)</sup>36/146 A (p. 335), <sup>(22)</sup>36/146 B (p. 334), <sup>(23)</sup>36/146 C (p. 336), <sup>(24)</sup>36/146 D (p. 334), <sup>(25)</sup>36/146 E (p. 330), <sup>(26)</sup>36/146 F (p. 330), <sup>(27)</sup>36/146 G (p. 339), <sup>(28)</sup>36/146 H (p. 338), <sup>(29)</sup>36/147 A (p. 307), <sup>(30)</sup>36/147 B (p. 305), <sup>(31)</sup>36/147 C (p. 305), <sup>(32)</sup>36/147 D (p. 314), <sup>(33)</sup>36/147 E (p. 308), <sup>(34)</sup>36/147 F (p. 316), <sup>(35)</sup>36/147 G (p. 315), <sup>(36)</sup>36/150 (p. 320), 16 Dec.; <sup>(37)</sup>36/173 (p. 324), <sup>(38)</sup>36/226 A (p. 262), <sup>(39)</sup>36/226 B (p. 313), 17 Dec.  
Security Council: <sup>(40)</sup>485(1981), 22 May (p. 294); <sup>(41)</sup>487(1981) (p. 282), <sup>(42)</sup>488(1981) (p. 292), 19 June; <sup>(43)</sup>490(1981), 21 July (p. 292); <sup>(44)</sup>493(1981), 23 Nov. (p. 294); <sup>(45)</sup>497(1981), 17 Dec. (p. 312); <sup>(46)</sup>498(1981), 18 Dec. (p. 292).

Yearbook references: <sup>(47)</sup>1976, p. 235; text, 1980, p. 394.

## General aspects

### Middle East situation

The situation in the Middle East was again considered in 1981 as an item on the General Assembly's agenda. Two resolutions were adopted under this item in December, one of them on

general aspects of the situation (p. 259) and the other on the Golan Heights (p. 311).

COMMUNICATIONS (JANUARY-DECEMBER). In 1981, the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General received a number of letters concerning the situation in the Middle East, dealing with general policy matters as well as individual incidents.

Israel, by a letter of 14 September,<sup>(15)</sup> complained that a number of attempts had been made at the United Nations to inject the Arab-Israel conflict into discussions having no bearing on, or relevance to, that conflict.

By a letter of 13 October,<sup>(23)</sup> the USSR transmitted a government statement addressed to the United States, condemning what it described as attempts by the United States to interfere in the internal affairs of Egypt by dispatching warships to the Egyptian coasts, placing marine units in the Mediterranean region in a high state of military readiness and setting up the so-called rapid deployment force. In reply, Egypt, on 23 October,<sup>(22)</sup> transmitted a government statement describing the USSR statement as an infringement of Egyptian sovereignty and adding that relations between Egypt and the United States were characterized by the full liberty of peoples to decide for themselves.

Iraq, by a letter of 14 October,<sup>(2)</sup> transmitted the final communique of a 3 October meeting in New York by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, in which they stated that the strategic agreements concluded or to be concluded between the United States and Israel were aimed at liquidating the Palestinian cause and impeding the implementation of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

By a letter dated 25 November,<sup>(19)</sup> Israel, referring to the resolutions adopted by the Twelfth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers (Baghdad, 1-5 June), stated that it was difficult to see how the call for "Holy War" against Israel could be reconciled with the Charter of the United Nations or Security Council resolutions on the Middle East. The resolutions in question were transmitted to the United Nations by Iraq on 5 August.<sup>(1)</sup>

In a letter of 2 December,<sup>(21)</sup> Israel expressed its strong protest at what it called the renewed misuse of United Nations premises by allowing PLO to mount an exhibition in the context of the International Year of Disabled Persons (1981).

The Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council received a number of letters from Israel concerning specific incidents said to have been perpetrated by PLO.

A letter of 14 January<sup>(3)</sup> cited what were described as PLO terrorist acts against citizens, kill-

ing one Israeli and wounding 12 between 25 December 1980 and 11 January 1981. Letters of 11 March<sup>(4)</sup> and 16 March<sup>(5)</sup> reported attacks on 9 and 14 March against two civilian buses near Jerusalem.

In letters dated 3 April<sup>(6)</sup> and 17 April,<sup>(8)</sup> Israel charged that, on the evenings of 30 March and 13 April, a number of Katyusha rockets had been fired from Jordanian territory in the direction of villages and towns in the upper Jordan valley.

Israeli letters of 10 April,<sup>(7)</sup> 6 May,<sup>(9)</sup> 28 May,<sup>(10)</sup> 30 July,<sup>(11)</sup> 17 August,<sup>(12)</sup> 28 August,<sup>(13)</sup> 17 September,<sup>(16)</sup> 2 October<sup>(17)</sup> and 30 November<sup>(20)</sup> contained accounts of what were described as terrorist incidents for which PLO had claimed responsibility, in which bombs, hand grenades and other explosive devices had been detonated or discovered in bus stations, markets, parks and other public places in Jerusalem, cities and villages in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and Israeli facilities in other countries. Some 28 incidents were reported, resulting in five deaths and the wounding of 45 persons. An attack on a synagogue at Vienna, Austria, on 29 August, resulting in two deaths and injury to 19 persons, was ascribed to PLO terrorists in an Israeli letter of 31 August.<sup>(14)</sup>

By a letter of 18 November,<sup>(18)</sup> Israel charged PLO with a campaign of political assassinations against Arabs who favoured living in peace with Israel in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District, as evidenced by an ambush on 17 November in which the head of a village association in the Ramallah area had been injured and his son killed.

There were also communications regarding Israel and Lebanon (p. 283), the situation in the Golan Heights (p. 308) and the situation in the territories occupied by Israel (p. 300).

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. On 11 November 1981, the Secretary-General submitted to the General Assembly and the Security Council a report on the situation in the Middle East,<sup>(24)</sup> as called for by the Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(25)</sup>

After an account of various aspects of the situation as described in other United Nations documents, the report stated that the situation in the Middle East continued to be of central concern to the entire international community, containing an explosive potential of conflict endangering world peace. The heightening of tension between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic, the Israeli attack on the nuclear facility in Iraq and the continuing cycle of violence in and around Lebanon had underlined the dangers inherent in the absence of progress towards a settlement that ultimately could ensure a peaceful and just

future for all the nations and peoples of the region. The Secretary-General expressed his continued belief that the United Nations provided a universal forum in the framework of which efforts to evolve a peaceful settlement might best be pursued.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 17 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the Middle East situation<sup>(29)</sup> by a recorded vote of 94 to 16, with 28 abstentions. The resolution was sponsored by Cuba, India, Madagascar, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

By this resolution, the Assembly reaffirmed that a just and comprehensive Middle East settlement could not be achieved without the participation on an equal footing of all the parties to the conflict, including PLO as the representative of the Palestinian people. It declared once more that Middle East peace must be based on a comprehensive, just and lasting solution, under United Nations auspices. It rejected all partial agreements and separate treaties in so far as they violated the recognized rights of the Palestinians and contradicted just and comprehensive solutions. It considered that the agreements on strategic co-operation between the United States and Israel signed on 30 November would encourage Israel to pursue its aggressive and expansionist policies and practices in the occupied territories, have adverse effects on peace efforts and threaten the region's security. It called on all States to end the flow to Israel of any military, economic and financial resources that would encourage it to pursue its aggressive policies. The Secretary-General was requested to report again to the Assembly and the Security Council.

Other provisions of the resolution dealt with particular aspects of the situation. The Assembly demanded Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories, condemned its aggression and practices against Palestinians, and demanded that its 1980 decision to annex Jerusalem be rescinded (p. 302). The Assembly reaffirmed that peace could not be achieved without the full exercise by the Palestinians of their national rights (p. 265). It condemned Israel's annexationist policies in the Golan Heights—in a paragraph adopted by a separate vote (p. 311)—and its aggression against Lebanon (p. 291).

On 9 December, the Assembly adopted three resolutions concerning the Middle East in connection with its consideration of disarmament items. By the first,<sup>(26)</sup> it decided to include in the provisional agenda of its 1982 session the item on establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. By the second,<sup>(27)</sup> the Assembly declared it imperative that Israel place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. By the

third,<sup>(28)</sup> the Assembly demanded that Israel renounce any possession of nuclear weapons.

The resolution on the Middle East situation was introduced by Cuba, which stated that it had been prepared in the Arab Group and in a working group of States belonging to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

Among those voting against the resolution, Israel maintained that its purpose was to impede a peaceful solution of the Arab-Israel conflict, that it contradicted the Security Council's 1967 resolution on principles for a Middle East peace<sup>(30)</sup>—the only basis for a negotiated settlement—and that it was in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter. The United States said it rejected the Assembly's challenge to its sovereign right to enter into its recent agreement on strategic co-operation with Israel; also, it believed that rejection of the Camp David peace process was irresponsible, that a call for sanctions was beyond the Assembly's competence and that the resolution failed to recognize Israel's right to live in peace.

Chile, El Salvador, the Philippines, Spain and Turkey, which voted for the resolution, expressed reservations on the paragraph on strategic co-operation agreements. Similar reservations were voiced by Ecuador, which abstained on the text as a whole, stating that the agreements cited had been freely contracted by sovereign countries.

The Bahamas, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico and the Philippines also had reservations on the paragraph by which the Assembly rejected partial agreements and separate treaties. Chile considered that States had the sovereign right to conclude whatever agreements they deemed necessary; the Dominican Republic, which abstained in the vote on the resolution, considered that the agreements in question constituted true contributions to the search for peace. The Philippines voiced reservations also on the paragraph by which the Assembly called on States to end the flow of resources that would encourage Israel to pursue its aggressive policies.

Among those which abstained, Austria said a number of elements were missing in the text, including reference to the Security Council's 1967 resolution and to the right of all States in the area to exist within secure and safe boundaries. Peru thought the resolution contained provocative language and did not include basic elements included in Security Council resolutions. Sweden said that, in addition to the general lack of balance, the resolution included elements it could not accept.

Brazil and Trinidad and Tobago, though voting in favour, voiced doubts on some elements



of the resolution. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said its positive vote did not mean that it agreed with all United Nations resolutions cited therein.

Canada and the United States expressed reservations regarding the paragraph on Israeli policies and practices in the occupied Golan Heights (p. 311).

In the debate preceding adoption of this resolution, most speakers listed recognition of Palestinian rights to self-determination and independence and Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, as essential to a Middle East peace. The Palestine question was viewed as the core of the problem. Among those taking this position were Bangladesh, Djibouti, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Mauritania, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, Sri Lanka, Turkey, the USSR and Yugoslavia. In Tunisia's view, true security for Israel meant living in peace with its neighbours, giving up its role as the Prussia of the Middle East, and recognizing the existence of the Palestinian people and their inalienable right to self-determination.

Egypt, which described its 1979 peace treaty with Israel as a glimmer of hope in the area, said peace in the Middle East should be based on twin elements: the right of the Palestinian people to exist as an independent national entity and to security, and Israel's right to existence and security; the conflict could not be resolved without Israel's withdrawal from all the occupied territories.

Israel said the Assembly, in examining the Middle East situation, should not focus exclusively on the Arab-Israel conflict. Tensions in the area were the product of the domestic political situations of Arab régimes and their external behaviour. The framework of the Camp David accords, which had already yielded spectacular results in the form of the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel, carried the potential for an overall solution.

Stating the position of the European Community members, the United Kingdom restated two principles first set out by them in June 1980: the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to existence and security, and justice for all the peoples, including recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. Austria saw three elements as necessary to peace: first, recognition of the right of all States in the area, including Israel, to exist within secure and recognized boundaries, and recognition of the national rights of the Palestinians, including the right to have a State of their own; second, the right of the Palestinians to participate in the search for a solution, through representatives of their choice;

and third, Israeli withdrawal from the territories occupied in 1967, including Jerusalem.

Finland, Japan, Portugal and Sweden stated that both the Palestinians' right to self-determination and Israel's right to exist must be mutually recognized. Sweden specified that Palestinian rights included the right to an independent State. These countries also urged negotiations between the parties to achieve those goals, with Japan and Sweden adding that PLO must participate. Brazil, Nepal and Senegal stressed four elements: withdrawal of Israel's occupation forces, Palestinian self-determination, PLO participation in peace negotiations, and recognition of the right of all States to live in peace within recognized borders.

Peace could not be achieved, the United States said, without recognizing the legitimate rights of the Palestinians and the right of all States, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries; the only path to peace was through negotiations among those sincerely committed to peace.

The Eastern European States expressed support for a USSR proposal to convene an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all parties and other nations, including the USSR and the United States. Endorsing this proposal, Bulgaria said its great merit lay in the fact that it provided for a settlement of the whole problem by collective effort, to the benefit of all. Romania also favoured such a conference, stating that it should be convened by the Assembly and that the United Nations should be an active participant.

Oman voiced support for principles for a Middle East settlement suggested earlier in the year by Crown Prince Fahd Ibn Abdul Aziz of Saudi Arabia. Austria, Brazil, Morocco and Turkey also welcomed this initiative.

In the view of Lebanon, any solution of the Middle East crisis that was not based on a solution of the Lebanese problem would lead to a deterioration of the crisis and threaten international peace.

If the Palestine question was not resolved, said the PLO observer, the Middle East question would not be resolved and the situation would deteriorate, leading to a crisis that would reach beyond the Middle East.

Arab States generally were of the view, as expressed by Kuwait, that Israel bore the primary responsibility for the Middle East crisis. The United Arab Emirates spoke of Israeli aggression against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples as well as its violation of the airspace of Iraq, Lebanon and Saudi Arabia, and propaganda against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Syrian Arab Republic. Eastern European countries

took a similar view: Poland, for example, remarked that for years Israel's policy of adventurism had made it impossible to find a lasting and just solution. Sri Lanka said Israel's policies were designed not so much to seek a lasting settlement but rather to establish a State of Israel whose boundaries were visualized in the Biblical context of an undefined greater Israel.

Some countries urged stronger action to ensure implementation of United Nations resolutions by Israel. Djibouti urged that comprehensive mandatory sanctions be applied against Israel to ensure that it abandoned its acts of war against the Arab nation. The German Democratic Republic felt that it was high time to adopt decisive measures against the aggressor, Israel. Indonesia said it was prepared to support any effective measures sanctioned by the United Nations Charter to ensure that resolutions were carried out. Pakistan believed that, if Israel was so impervious to the will of the world community, the Security Council must take firm and decisive action. Mauritania thought the United Nations should multiply all instruments of investigation to ensure that world public opinion knew all aspects of Israeli practices against the Palestinians and other Arabs. Norway, however, stated that any attempt to adopt sanctions against Israel or to deprive it of its right to participate in international organizations would be totally unacceptable and counter-productive.

United States support for Israel, and the signing in November of a strategic agreement between the two countries, were criticized by a number of speakers, including Arab States and socialist States of Eastern Europe. Iran viewed such support as part of an assault on the great Islamic culture. Jordan described it as tantamount to acquiescence in Israeli aggression and called it a hostile act against the entire Middle East, particularly the Palestinians. In Qatar's view, Israel would not have been able to defy United Nations resolutions without the unlimited political, military and economic support of the United States. The Syrian Arab Republic said a balance of forces between the parties was a prerequisite to peace, but the United States and the parties to the Camp David accords had, through their alliance and collaboration, caused an imbalance of forces in the interests of settler and expansionist imperialism. For the Ukrainian SSR, exercises by the United States rapid deployment force, plans to establish a bridgehead in the Middle East in the guise of a so-called multinational force and the conclusion of a strategic agreement—essentially a military pact between the United States and Israel—were means of establishing political, military and

economic domination over the region's people and natural resources. Yemen described United States vetoes in the Security Council as a new Israeli weapon brandished before the Arabs.

In Albania's view, both the USSR and the United States were benefiting from Israel's aggressive policies by finding pretexts for their political and military presence in the area and their manoeuvres to control oil deposits and strategic positions, while turning the region into an outlet for their weapons. Algeria criticized the so-called strategic consensus doctrine, stating that it viewed the Middle East in terms of super-Power rivalry as if there were no Israeli-Arab or Israeli-Palestinian problem. Yemen saw this doctrine as a smoke-screen behind which the United States was creating the spectre of a bogus enemy only to shield Israel.

Many Arab States, the socialist countries of Eastern Europe and a number of others were critical of the 1978 Camp David accords between Egypt and Israel, particularly in so far as they dealt with the Palestine question. In Cuba's view, any initiative which disregarded Palestinian rights or attempted to turn the Middle East into a sphere of influence of imperialism would be null and void. Iraq stated that the accords were bound to fail because they did not meet Arab aspirations and did not restore Arab rights or land to the legitimate owners.

The Byelorussian SSR saw the Camp David agreements as contradicting fundamental Arab interests and as designed to split the Arabs and consolidate Israeli colonialism. Speaking of the multinational force which was to be sent to the Sinai peninsula in 1982 under the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel, Czechoslovakia stated that the presence of United States forces would be a new source of tension. In Hungary's view, separate deals based on a partial approach could not fundamentally change the situation, could not eliminate the root cause of the conflict and could never result in a just and lasting settlement. In the view of the USSR, Camp David had exacerbated the Middle East problem, allowing Israel to step up its aggressive acts against the Arabs; with the help of the Camp David collusion, the United States sought to increase its presence in the Middle East and militarize countries there. Yugoslavia considered that separate, partial solutions introduced additional elements of exacerbation; additional efforts must be exerted in the United Nations framework to create conditions for a peaceful solution, with the active and equal participation of all parties.

On the other hand, Egypt said it saw no alternative to its path to peace, and the United States said it was dedicated to the successful comple-

tion of the negotiations begun by Egypt and Israel.

During the debate, most speakers also touched on specific aspects of Arab-Israeli relations, considered in greater detail in discussions on other agenda items. These included the Palestine question (p. 266), Israel's policy in the occupied territories (p. 303), the Israeli attack against Iraqi nuclear installations (p. 280), the Golan Heights (p. 311) and the situation in southern Lebanon (p. 283).

Letters:

Iraq: <sup>(1)</sup>5 Aug., annexing res. and communiqué of Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, A/36/421-S/14626 & Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>14 Oct., annexing communiqué of Organization of Islamic Conference, A/36/603 & Add.1.

Israel: <sup>(3)</sup>14 Jan., A/36/72-S/14328; <sup>(4)</sup>11 Mar., A/36/127-S/14403; <sup>(5)</sup>16 Mar., A/36/132-S/14409; <sup>(6)</sup>3 Apr., A/36/169-S/14427; <sup>(7)</sup>10 Apr., A/36/186-S/14438; <sup>(8)</sup>17 Apr., A/36/211-S/14448; <sup>(9)</sup>6 May, A/36/235-S/14476; <sup>(10)</sup>28 May, A/36/292-S/14492; <sup>(11)</sup>30 July, A/36/413 (S/14622); <sup>(12)</sup>17 Aug., A/36/437-S/14631; <sup>(13)</sup>28 Aug., A/36/464-S/14668; <sup>(14)</sup>31 Aug., A/36/468 (S/14670); <sup>(15)</sup>14 Sep., A/36/507-S/14691; <sup>(16)</sup>17 Sep., A/36/520-S/14696; <sup>(17)</sup>2 Oct., A/36/574-S/14714; <sup>(18)</sup>18 Nov., A/36/700-S/14760; <sup>(19)</sup>25 Nov., A/36/722; <sup>(20)</sup>30 Nov., A/36/736-S/14776; <sup>(21)</sup>2 Dec., A/36/763 & Corr.1.

Others: <sup>(22)</sup>Egypt: 23 Oct., A/36/627-S/14736. <sup>(23)</sup>USSR: 13 Oct., A/36/595-S/14727.

Report: <sup>(24)</sup>S-G, A/36/655-S/14746.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(25)</sup>35/207, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 376); <sup>(26)</sup>36/87 A, 9 Dec. 1981 (p. 50); <sup>(27)</sup>36/87 B, 9 Dec. (p. 54); <sup>(28)</sup>36/98, 9 Dec. (p. 52); <sup>(29)</sup>36/226 A, 17 Dec., text following, <sup>(30)</sup>SC: 242(1967), 22 Nov. 1967 (YUN 1967, p. 257).

Meeting records: GA, A/36/PV.95-97, 99, 103 (11-17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/226 A

94-16-28 (recorded vote) Meeting 103 17 December 1981

5-nation draft (A/36/L.59 and Add.1): agenda item 33.

Sponsors: Cuba, India, Madagascar, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

The General Assembly,

Having discussed the item entitled "The situation in the Middle East",

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General of 11 November 1981.

Welcoming the world-wide support extended to the just cause of the Palestinian people and the other Arab countries in their struggle against Israeli aggression and occupation in order to achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East and the full exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights, as affirmed by previous resolutions of the General Assembly relating to the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East,

Gravely concerned that the Arab and Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, still remain under Israeli occupation, that the relevant resolutions of the United Nations have not been implemented and that the Palestinian people is still denied the restoration of its land and the exercise of its inalienable national rights in conformity with international law, as reaffirmed by resolutions of the United Nations,

Reaffirming the applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, to all the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem,

Reiterating all relevant United Nations resolutions which emphasize that the acquisition of territory by force is inad-

missible under the Charter of the United Nations and the Principles of international law and that Israel must withdraw unconditionally from all the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem,

Reaffirming further the imperative necessity of establishing a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region, based on full respect for the Charter and the principles of international law,

Gravely concerned also at recent Israeli actions involving the escalation and expansion of the conflict in the region, which further violate the principles of international law and endanger international peace and security,

1. Condemns Israel's continued occupation of the Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of international law and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, and demands the immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of Israel from all these occupied territories;

2. Reaffirms its conviction that the question of Palestine is the core of the conflict in the Middle East and that no comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region will be achieved without the full exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights;

3. Reaffirms further that a just and comprehensive settlement of the situation in the Middle East cannot be achieved without the participation on an equal footing of all the parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization as the representative of the Palestinian people;

4. Declares once more that peace in the Middle East is indivisible and must be based on a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the Middle East problem, under the auspices of the United Nations, which ensures the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and which enables the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, to exercise its inalienable rights, including the right to return and the right to self-determination, national independence and the establishment of its independent sovereign State in Palestine, in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations relevant to the question of Palestine, in particular General Assembly resolutions ES-7/2 of 29 July 1980 and 38/120 A to F of 10 December 1981;

5. Rejects all partial agreements and separate treaties in so far as they violate the recognized rights of the Palestinian people and contradict the principles of just and comprehensive solutions to the Middle East problem to ensure the establishment of a just peace in the area;

6. Deplores Israel's failure to comply with Security Council resolutions 476(1980) of 30 June 1980 and 478(1980) of 20 August 1980 and General Assembly resolution 35/207 of 16 December 1980, determines that Israel's decision to annex Jerusalem and to declare it its "capital", as well as the measures to alter its physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure and status, are null and void and demands that they be rescinded immediately, and calls upon all Member States, the specialized agencies and all other international organizations to abide by the present resolution and all other relevant resolutions, including Assembly resolution 38/120 E;

7. Condemns Israel's aggression and practices against the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories and outside these territories, particularly in the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon, including the expropriation and annexation of territory, the establishment of settlements, assassination attempts and other terrorist, aggressive and repressive measures, which are in violation of the Charter and the principles of international law and the pertinent international conventions;

8. Strongly condemns Israeli annexationist policies and practices in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights, the establishment of settlements, the confiscation of lands, the diversion of water resources, the intensification of repressive measures against the Syrian citizens therein and the forcible

imposition of Israeli citizenship on Syrian nationals, and declares all these measures null and void as they constitute violations of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons In Time of War, of 12 August 1949;

9. Strongly condemns the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the continuous bombardment and destruction of its cities and villages, and all acts that constitute a violation of its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and the security of its people and prevent the full implementation of Security Council resolution 425(1978) of 19 March 1978, including the full deployment of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon up to the internationally recognized borders;

10. Calls for strict respect of the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon and supports the efforts of the Government of Lebanon, with regional and international endorsement, to restore the exclusive authority of the Lebanese State over all of its territory up to the internationally recognized boundaries;

11. Deplores Israeli violations of the airspace of various Arab countries and demands their immediate cessation;

12. Considers that the agreements on strategic co-operation between the United States of America and Israel signed on 30 November 1981 would encourage Israel to pursue its aggressive and expansionist policies and practices in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, would have adverse effects on efforts for the establishment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East and would threaten the security of the region;

13. Calls upon all States to put an end to the flow to Israel of any military, economic and financial resources that would encourage it to pursue its aggressive policies against the Arab countries and the Palestinian people;

14. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council periodically on the development of the situation and to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a comprehensive report covering the developments in the Middle East in all their aspects.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Burma, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt,<sup>a</sup> Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Zaire.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to vote in favour.

#### Credentials of Israel in the General Assembly

In a letter dated 17 September 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the Sudan, as Chairman of the Arab Group for September, conveyed the Group's reservations on the credentials of Israel to the 1981 regular session of the General Assembly and its non-recognition of those credentials. The Arab Group based its reservations on what it consid-

ered Israel's violation of the United Nations Charter, its defiance of United Nations resolutions on Palestine and the Middle East, its policy of aggression against the Arab peoples and States, and its proclamation of Jerusalem as its capital. Similar reservations by the Islamic Group were conveyed on 18 September by Iraq, Chairman of the Group for September.<sup>(1)</sup>

In letters of 18 September<sup>(2)</sup> and 22 September,<sup>(3)</sup> Israel stated that its credentials had been accepted by the Credentials Committee and that the reservations were attempts to abuse the credentials procedure in order to introduce extraneous matters. The first letter added that such an approach was liable to affect adversely the ability of the United Nations to perform its primary functions for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup> Iraq, for Islamic Group: 18 Sep., A/36/523.

Israel: <sup>(2)</sup> 18 Sep., A/36/527; <sup>(3)</sup> 22 Sep., A/36/550.

<sup>(4)</sup> Sudan, for Arab Group: 17 Sep., A/36/516.

#### Palestine question

The Palestine question continued in 1981 to be a concern of the General Assembly and of its Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. In addition to their consideration of the political aspects of the problem, United Nations bodies continued to examine the situation in the territories occupied by Israel (p. 300) and to provide and encourage assistance to Palestinians (p. 273).

Also, the Commission on Human Rights, on 11 February, reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination without external interference and the establishment of a fully independent and sovereign State in Palestine (p. 956).

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON PALESTINIAN RIGHTS. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People continued to follow developments in the territories occupied by Israel and actions by Israel which the Committee regarded as violations of international law or of United Nations resolutions. The Committee brought such actions, including Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, expropriation by Israeli authorities of Arab-owned lands and other matters affecting the rights of the Palestinians, to the attention of the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council.

In its report,<sup>(2)</sup> submitted to the Assembly under a covering letter dated 15 September, the Committee expressed again its conviction that positive action by the Security Council on the Committee's recommendations would create the necessary conditions for a just and lasting peace. It, therefore, unanimously decided to reiterate

the validity of the recommendations it had first made in 1976<sup>(15)</sup> and which had been repeatedly endorsed by the General Assembly. These called, among other things, for the establishment by the Council of a timetable for Israeli withdrawal, a United Nations take-over of the evacuated territories, handing the territories over to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as representative of the Palestinian people, and establishment of an independent Palestinian entity.

The Committee also recommended four principles to guide the Council: (1) the Palestine question was at the heart of the Middle East problem and no solution could be envisaged without taking into account the rights of the Palestinian people; (2) the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinians to return to their homes and to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty would contribute to resolving the Middle East crisis; (3) the participation of PLO, the representative of the Palestinian people, on an equal footing, was indispensable in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on the Middle East under United Nations auspices; and (4) the acquisition of territory by force was inadmissible and Israel must withdraw completely from all occupied territory.

The Committee again declared that all agreements and treaties that could affect the Palestinians' future, their inalienable rights and the status of the occupied Palestinian territories, and which ignored, infringed, violated or denied those rights or were negotiated without PLO participation, contravened Assembly resolutions and had no validity.

During the year, the Committee Chairman sent several letters to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council on developments in the territories occupied by Israel and in Lebanon. These dealt with the confiscation of Arab lands (p. 300), excavations affecting historic Islamic buildings in Jerusalem (p. 316), the Israeli project for a canal linking the Mediterranean and Dead Seas (p. 319) and the effects of Israeli attacks in Lebanon (pp. 285 and 289).

By a letter of 23 October to the Security Council President,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee Chairman said the Committee would be grateful if the Council acted on a December 1980 resolution<sup>(4)</sup> by which the Assembly requested the Council to consider adopting effective measures under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter (covering enforcement action) in the light of Israel's non-compliance with relevant United Nations resolutions.

The Committee met at United Nations Headquarters on 30 November in observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestin-

ian People. Addressing the meeting, the Chairman said it was part of a campaign to end the injustice foisted on the Palestinian people and a way of drawing attention to a situation which threatened peace. The New York meeting and a similar one at Geneva were addressed by a number of United Nations officials and government representatives.

With the Committee's participation, two seminars on Palestinian rights were organized by the United Nations Secretariat's Special Unit on Palestinian Rights, the first at Colombo, Sri Lanka, from 10 to 14 August, and the second at Havana, Cuba, from 31 August to 4 September. The reports of the seminars were annexed to the Committee's report to the Assembly.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 10 December, the General Assembly adopted six resolutions on the Palestine question. Two of these dealt with general aspects and the rest with specific aspects of the question—the status of Jerusalem,<sup>(16)</sup> the convening of an International Conference on the Question of Palestine,<sup>(8)</sup> the work programme of the Committee on Palestinian rights,<sup>(6)</sup> and the strengthening of the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights.<sup>(7)</sup> All of these resolutions were introduced by Senegal on behalf of their sponsors, which included members of the Committee on Palestinian rights.

By the first of its general resolutions,<sup>(9)</sup> the Assembly reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and a sovereign State, and reaffirmed that just and lasting peace could not be established without Israeli withdrawal from all occupied territories and a just solution to the Palestine problem. It expressed opposition to all policies and plans to resettle the Palestinians outside their homeland, and demanded Israel's complete and unconditional withdrawal from all occupied territories, including Jerusalem. It called for PLO participation on an equal footing in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on the Palestine question and the Middle East situation under United Nations auspices. It endorsed the recommendations of the Committee on Palestinian rights and requested the Security Council to consider adopting effective measures to implement them.

The Assembly also called for the early return of the Palestinians to their homes and property in Palestine (p. 333) and demanded Israel's compliance with United Nations resolutions on Jerusalem (p. 269).

This 18-nation resolution was adopted, as revised by its sponsors, by a recorded vote of 111 to 13, with 20 abstentions. Paragraph 9, by which the Assembly endorsed the Committee's recommendations and drew the Security Council's attention to the fact that action on them was

long overdue, was adopted by a recorded vote of 96 to 16, with 26 abstentions.

By the second of its two general resolutions on the Palestine question,<sup>(11)</sup> the Assembly expressed strong opposition to all partial agreements and separate treaties which flagrantly violated the rights of the Palestinian people, and declared that agreements and separate treaties had no validity in so far as they purported to determine the future of the Palestinians and of the occupied Palestinian territories. It declared that no State had the right to undertake any actions, measures or negotiations that could affect the future of the Palestinian people, its inalienable rights and the occupied Palestinian territories, without PLO participation on an equal footing; and decided that all actions, measures and negotiations to implement such accords and agreements were null and void in so far as they purported to determine the future of the Palestinians and the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel.

This 14-nation resolution, revised by its sponsors, was adopted by a recorded vote of 88 to 21, with 36 abstentions.

The Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December on the Middle East situation,<sup>(12)</sup> reaffirmed its conviction that the Palestine question was the core of the Middle East conflict and that no comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region would be achieved without the full exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights.

By a resolution of 28 October on the right of peoples to self-determination,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly strongly condemned the expansionist activities of Israel in the Middle East and the continuous bombing of Palestinian civilians as a serious obstacle to the realization of the self-determination and independence of the Palestinian people. This paragraph, and another condemning Israeli aggression against Lebanon (p. 291), was orally revised by its sponsor (Angola, on behalf of the African Group); the original paragraph would have had the Assembly condemn Israel's expansionist activities in the Middle East, such as constant violations of the territorial integrity of Lebanon and the continuous bombing of civilian, and in particular Palestinian, population and the destruction of their villages and encampments, as a serious obstacle to the realization of self-determination and independence of the Palestinian people. By the same resolution, the Assembly also urged States and international organizations to support the Palestinian people through its representative, PLO, in its struggle to restore its right to self-determination and independence.

Canada, Israel, Norway and the United

States, which voted against the 18-nation resolution on the Palestine question, and Costa Rica, which abstained, argued that it lacked balance, prejudged elements which should be resolved by negotiation and did not reflect the principles for a Middle East settlement contained in Security Council resolutions of 1967<sup>(13)</sup> and 1973.<sup>(14)</sup> Chile voted for the resolution but objected to two of its provisions; in its view, the Assembly had exceeded its powers in requesting the Council to consider adopting measures to implement the recommendations of the Committee on Palestinian rights, and the Assembly should not grant exclusive representation to PLO until the Palestinians exercised their right to self-determination.

Also voting for the resolution, Iraq said the mention in its preamble of the Assembly's 1947 resolution on the partition of Palestine<sup>(5)</sup> did not prevent the Palestinian people from determining their own fate and establishing a State. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said its vote did not alter its position towards the 1947 resolution.

Reservations to paragraph 9, on the Committee's recommendations, were voiced by Argentina, Egypt, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Spain and Sweden. Argentina said the paragraph made critical judgements on partial efforts already made towards peace and security. Egypt could not agree with what it called the insinuations in the Committee's statement about the invalidity of agreements that violated Palestinian rights. New Zealand, speaking of this paragraph and the one on Israeli withdrawal, said account must also be taken of the principles on termination of belligerency and respect for the right of every State to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. Spain did not want to prejudice its position in the Security Council.

Explaining its vote against the resolution on partial agreements, Canada said it was short-sighted to dismiss by implication the efforts being made within the framework of the Camp David accords to lay the groundwork for a comprehensive settlement. Israel said the resolution sought to hamper the only constructive peace process that had emerged with regard to the Arab-Israel conflict; the Assembly had no authority to question the validity of those accords. The United States considered it wrong for the Assembly to attack a treaty designed to lead to a just and lasting peace, or to attempt to undermine a process aimed at settling the Palestine problem in the absence of a realistic alternative.

Among those abstaining on this resolution, Chile challenged the Assembly's competence to question the validity of international agreements and said it would support all peace initiatives based on the use of peaceful settlement pro-

cedures envisaged by the United Nations Charter. Ecuador thought the United Nations should aim to promote peace and not foment tensions or criticize steps that could lead to a settlement. In Egypt's view, the resolution tended to restrict the right of States to work for a just solution to the Palestine problem and a lasting Middle East peace; moreover, Egypt rejected the simplistic and prejudicial insertion in Assembly resolutions of notions about the invalidity of certain international agreements. Peru thought the resolution limited the right of States to enter into treaties and seek peaceful solutions to the Palestine question.

Among those voting for the resolution, Costa Rica said any agreement which claimed to dispose of the Palestinians' future without their participation lacked validity and effectiveness; however, Costa Rica endorsed any peace agreement, and specifically the Camp David accords, which tended to consolidate peace between Egypt and Israel. Thailand said it would have abstained if there had been a separate vote on the paragraph by which the Assembly reaffirmed its rejection of provisions of the accords which ignored, infringed, violated or denied the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

In the Assembly's debate on the Palestine question, Israel stated that the Palestinian Arabs already had their own independent State—Jordan—and there was no justification for the creation of a second one. As to the call for the return to the territorial status quo prevailing before June 1967, no responsible Government would agree to return to those totally insecure lines; to do so would be suicidal for Israel. PLO had advocated a two-stage policy to do away with Israel: establishment of a second Palestinian Arab State, and the use of that State as a launching pad for the attempted overthrow of Israel. If the United Nations had a contribution to make, it was to encourage the Arab States to negotiate with Israel directly, without pre-conditions.

Jordan stated that Israel could not solve the problem of the Palestinian people's dispersal and exile by dumping them on Jordan, Lebanon or any other Arab country; the Palestinians would accept no place other than their ancestral homeland. Lebanon said Israel would have no peace as long as the Palestinians sought their homeland while Israel drove them out, thus spreading the war to all the other Arab countries. Israel and its collaborators might think the Palestinian people would yield to force, repression and terrorism, said Bahrain, but the new generation was no less enthusiastic than past generations in its desire to regain its rights.

In the view of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, peace would not come to the Arab world as long

as the Zionists adhered to their thesis founded on the creation of a Zionist State and the expulsion of the Arabs in order to replace them by a larger number of immigrants. Zambia stated that Israel and its supporters should have the magnanimity and courage to change their policies and demonstrate willingness to recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinians, including their right to a national homeland in Palestine.

Albania stated that the Palestinians were engaged in an unequal but heroic struggle against a number of savage enemies: Israel, which had robbed them of their motherland; the United States, which supported Israel and had turned it into the faithful guardian of its interests in the Middle East; the USSR, which was engaged in a fierce struggle with the United States to the detriment of the Arabs; and Arab reactionary forces, which had on more than one occasion stabbed the Palestinians in the back.

Egypt said the solution of the Palestinian problem must be based on Israel's withdrawal from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, evacuation of its military and civilian presence and its settlements, security measures applying mutually and equally to the Palestinians and the Israelis, and the right of the Palestinians to create their own independent State in the West Bank at the end of a limited transitional period.

Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Malaysia, Mongolia, Romania, Sri Lanka, Turkey, the USSR and Viet Nam—together with the Arab countries—were among those advocating recognition of the right of the Palestinians to their own independent State. These States also called for the participation of PLO as a full partner in the peace process.

China said it would always support the just struggle of the Palestinian and Arab peoples for the restoration of their national rights and the recovery of their lost lands. Japan's position was that both the Palestinians' right to self-determination—including the right to establish an independent State—and Israel's right to exist must be mutually recognized and that PLO must participate in the peace process. Sri Lanka paid tribute to PLO for having succeeded against tremendous obstacles in unifying a dispersed people in a common commitment to their goals of a return to their lands, self-determination and an independent State in Palestine. Within the framework of its support for the heroic struggle of the Palestinians, said the USSR, it had granted diplomatic status to the PLO mission in Moscow.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community (EC) members, said the essence

of any solution must be the reconciliation of Israel and the Palestinian people, so that those two realities could live together in peace and security. The United States said a just and lasting settlement must provide for both the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and for Israel's recognition by all its Arab neighbours; as long as PLO endorsed the destruction of a United Nations Member State, the United States did not believe it had any role to play in deliberations to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict.

A number of States, including Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Indonesia, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Viet Nam, urged Security Council action against Israel to ensure a solution to the Palestine problem. The Sudan said the Council's inability to assume its responsibilities allowed Israel to pursue its policy of depriving the Palestinians of their rights. The United Arab Emirates ascribed the Council's inaction to the position of certain countries, primarily the United States, which continued to deny Palestinian rights.

The PLO observer said that, if Israel was not restrained and if the full rights of the Palestinian people, foremost among which was the right to establish their own independent State on their national soil, were not recognized, it would be fatally naïve not to expect more problems and complications.

With regard to the issue of agreements and treaties bearing on the Palestine question, the Eastern European countries and a number of Arab States contended that the Camp David agreements between Egypt and Israel, and the negotiations between those States in regard to further agreements, threatened the rights of the Palestinians.

Algeria said the impasse reached in the Camp David peace attempt was to be expected, since it was based on a denial of the Palestinians' national rights. Democratic Yemen viewed the accords as designed to consolidate Israeli aggression and to transform the problem into one of "autonomy" for the Palestinians instead of recognition of their right to their own State. Iraq stated that the Camp David agreements amounted to recognition of aggression and occupation and a denial of legitimate Palestinian rights. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said it rejected the Camp David accords; it rejected any conspiracy against Palestinian rights and refused to ratify aggression and occupation as well as the policy of fait accompli which some were trying to impose on the Arab nation. In the view of the Syrian Arab Republic, the American-Israeli-Egyptian alliance was trying, through the Camp David agreements, to eliminate the Palestinian cause and extend the domination of imperialism and zionism throughout the Middle East. Tunisia

said the Camp David process had been reduced by Israel to a separate peace in which it was giving free rein to its expansionist policy in the occupied territories.

The PLO observer confirmed his organization's continued rejection of the Camp David accords adding it would fight to the utmost against the plot called "administrative civil autonomy".

Albania said the accords totally ignored the inalienable national rights of the Palestinians. Bulgaria and Hungary stated that agreements and plans arrived at behind the back of the Arab peoples, without PLO participation and not aimed at solving the Palestinian problem, were doomed to fail. The Byelorussian SSR said the Camp David deal was a tool used by Israeli and United States politicians for their own purposes, at the expense of Palestinian rights. Czechoslovakia described the process as anti-Arab, concluded without the participation of the Palestinians and against their will. Mongolia said the negotiations on so-called administrative autonomy for the Palestinians on the West Bank and in the Gaza sector were nothing more than an attempt to maintain the occupation of the Arab territories in a new form. The Ukrainian SSR and the USSR added that those negotiations were aimed at avoiding a just solution of the Palestine question.

Cuba stated that any attempt to promote piecemeal agreements or resolve the question without PLO participation, as in the case of the Camp David accords, was invalid. The Palestine question would be solved, said Iran, only if the Palestinians remained faithful to their principles and refused to adhere to compromising plans like that of Camp David.

Egypt said the accord it had signed was a first step towards a just and comprehensive settlement of the problem in all aspects and envisaged a limited transitional phase during which the occupied Palestinian territories would pass from Israeli domination and occupation to the authority and control of the Palestinian people, paving the way to self-determination and permitting peaceful coexistence between Palestinians and Israelis leading to mutual recognition.

Israel stated that the Camp David framework invited the Palestinian Arab residents of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District to play an active role in shaping their future, by calling on them to participate in current negotiations, in negotiations which would determine the final status of the areas they lived in, and in eventual negotiations on a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan. Difficult problems remained in the negotiations for autonomy, but Israel was determined not to relax its efforts.

The United States said the Camp David ac-



cords deserved United Nations support; they offered the surest guarantee that Palestinian rights would be respected and provided a formula for Palestinian participation in forging their future.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Palestinian rights Chairman, 23 Oct., S/14739.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on Palestinian rights, A/36/35.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>181(II), 29 Nov. 1947 (YUN 1947-48, p. 247); <sup>(4)</sup>35/169 A, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 393); <sup>(5)</sup>36/9, paras. 18 & 20, 28 Oct. 1981 (p. 896); <sup>(6)</sup>36/120 A, 10 Dec. (p. 272); <sup>(7)</sup>36/120 B, 10 Dec. (p. 273); <sup>(8)</sup>36/120 C, 10 Dec. (p. 271); <sup>(9)</sup>36/120 D, 10 Dec., text following; <sup>(10)</sup>36/120 E, 10 Dec. (p. 270); <sup>(11)</sup>36/120 F, 10 Dec., text following; <sup>(12)</sup>36/226 A, para. 2, 17 Dec. (p. 262). SC: <sup>(13)</sup>242(1967), 22 Nov. 1967 (YUN 1967, p. 257); <sup>(14)</sup>338(1973), 22 Oct. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 213).

Yearbook references: <sup>(15)</sup>1976, p. 235; text, 1980, p. 394.

Meeting records: GA, A/36/PV.80-85, 93 (2-10 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/120 D

111-13-20 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981

18-nation draft (A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1); agenda item 31.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Congo, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mongolia, Pakistan, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the recommendations contained therein,

Having heard the statement of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the representative of the Palestinian people,

Expressing its extreme concern that no just solution to the problem of Palestine has been achieved and that this problem therefore continues to aggravate the Middle East conflict, of which it is the core, and to endanger international peace and security,

Reaffirming that a just and comprehensive lasting peace in the Middle East requires a just solution to the problem of Palestine through the attainment by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights,

Resolutely emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force,

Recognizing the need to work for a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East,

Recalling and reaffirming its previous relevant resolutions, particularly resolutions 181(II) of 29 November 1947, 194(III) of 11 December 1948, 3236(XXIX) of 22 November 1974 and ES-7/2 of 29 July 1980.

1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and property in Palestine, from which they have been displaced and uprooted, and calls for their early return;

2. Reaffirms also the inalienable rights in Palestine of the Palestinian people, including:

(a) The right to self-determination without external interference, and to national independence and sovereignty;

(b) The right to establish its own independent sovereign State;

3. Reaffirms, in particular, that a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East cannot be established without the withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and without the achievement of a just solution of the problem of Palestine on the basis of the attainment by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights in Palestine, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations;

4. Expresses its opposition to all policies and plans aimed at the resettlement of the Palestinians outside their homeland;

5. Demands that Israel should withdraw completely and unconditionally from all the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since June 1967, including Jerusalem, with all property and services intact;

6. Further demands that Israel should fully comply with all the resolutions of the United Nations relevant to the historic character of the Holy City of Jerusalem, in particular Security Council resolutions 476(1980) of 30 June 1980 and 478 (1980) of 20 August 1980, and rejects the enactment of a "Basic Law" by the Israel Knesset proclaiming Jerusalem the capital of Israel;

7. Demands that Israel should fully comply with the provisions, in particular, of Security Council resolution 465(1980) adopted unanimously on 1 March 1980;

8. Reaffirms the basic principle that the future of the Palestinian people can only be considered with its participation and calls for the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the representative of the Palestinian people, in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on the question of Palestine and on the situation in the Middle East to be held under the auspices of the United Nations, on an equal footing and on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations;

9. Endorses the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People contained in paragraphs 49 to 53 of its report and draws the attention of the Security Council to the fact that action on the Committee's recommendations, as endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 31/20 of 24 November 1976, is long overdue;

10. Requests the Security Council to convene in order to consider the situation and the adoption of effective measures to implement the recommendations of the Committee as endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 31/20;

11. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Question of Palestine".

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Austria, Burma, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Nepal, New Zealand, Paraguay, Portugal, Sweden.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/120 F

88-21-36 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981

14-nation draft (A/36/L.52/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1); agenda item 31.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Congo, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Senegal, Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

The General Assembly,

Recalling and reaffirming its resolutions 34/65 A and B of 29 November 1979, 34/65 C and D of 12 December 1979 and 35/169 B of 15 December 1980.

Taking note of paragraphs 26, 27 and 52 of the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People,

1. Strongly reaffirms its rejection of those provisions of the accords which ignore, infringe, violate or deny the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of return, the right of self-determination and the right to national Independence and sovereignty in Palestine, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, and which envisage and condone continued Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem;

2. Expresses its strong opposition to all partial agreements and separate treaties which constitute a flagrant violation of the rights of the Palestinian people, the principles of the Charter and the resolutions adopted in the various international forums on the Palestinian issue, as well as the principles of international law, and declares that all agreements and separate treaties have no validity in so far as they purport to determine the future of the Palestinian people and of the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem;

3. Declares that no State has the right to undertake any actions, measures or negotiations that could affect the future of the Palestinian people, its inalienable rights and the occupied Palestinian territories without the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization on an equal footing, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, rejects all such actions, measures and negotiations, and considers all such actions, measures and negotiations as a flagrant violation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people;

4. Decides that all actions, measures and negotiations to implement or execute such accords and agreements, or any part thereof, are null and void in so far as they purport to determine the future of the Palestinian people and of the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Mexico, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

#### Status of Jerusalem

The General Assembly, on 10 December 1981, adopted a resolution on the status of Jerusalem<sup>(2)</sup> by a recorded vote of 139 to 2, with 4 abstentions. By that resolution, sponsored by 18 States, it determined once again that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel which altered or purported to

alter the character and status of the Holy City, in particular the so-called "Basic Law" and the proclamation of Jerusalem as Israel's capital (1978), were null and void and must be rescinded forthwith. The Assembly reaffirmed its resolution not to recognize the "Basic Law" and other Israeli actions that, as a result of that law, sought to alter the character and status of Jerusalem. It urged States and international organizations not to conduct any business not in conformity with the relevant resolutions, and demanded that Israel fully comply with all United Nations resolutions on the historic character of the city.

Paragraph 2, by which the Assembly affirmed that Israel's actions on this matter constituted a serious obstacle to a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, and a threat to international peace and security, was adopted by a recorded vote of 113 to 2, with 26 abstentions.

A demand that Israel comply with United Nations resolutions on Jerusalem was included in a 10 December resolution on the Palestine question, in which the Assembly also rejected the enactment of the "Basic Law" on Jerusalem.<sup>(1)</sup>

By a resolution of 17 December on the Middle East situation,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly determined that Israel's decision to annex Jerusalem and to declare it its capital, as well as the measures to alter its physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure and status, were null and void. It demanded that they be rescinded immediately and called on all Member States, specialized agencies and other international organizations to abide by the relevant resolutions.

Voting against the resolution on Jerusalem, Israel said a united Jerusalem would remain the eternal capital of Israel. The United States said that, while unilateral actions on Jerusalem could not prejudice the city's ultimate status, it had voted negatively because the resolution lacked any reference to negotiations among the parties and because the mention of a threat to peace and security raised the implication of sanctions.

Although voting for the resolution, Canada, Portugal and the United Kingdom, the last speaking for the EC members, stated reservations to the reference to international peace and security in paragraph 2; Canada and Portugal said such a finding was within the Security Council's competence. Sweden had strong objections to that paragraph.

The resolution was adopted following the Assembly's debate on the Palestine question, in which a number of speakers condemned Israel's actions with regard to the status of Jerusalem.

The Comoros said it could not agree to the city's current status, which was based on hatred, selfishness and usurpation. Cuba said the Israeli action showed scorn for the feelings of the

majority of mankind and the intolerant and exclusivist nature of zionism. India stated that Jerusalem was part of the territories that must be vacated by Israel. For Kuwait, Israel's decision to annex Jerusalem indicated that its policies were based on expansionism, domination and usurpation, reflecting a racist philosophy that insulted man and his spiritual values. Israel did not care, said Malaysia, if its actions offended the feelings of billions of people who attached deep spiritual and cultural values to the city.

Morocco stated that Israel's actions, to the detriment of inalienable Arab rights over the city as well as Islamic religious feelings, had given rise to a justified reaction throughout the world. Nigeria regarded the Israeli action as an affront to Arab and Islamic people everywhere. Jerusalem could not become the spoils of war, declared Pakistan; it must be returned to Arab sovereignty. Tunisia saw Israel's actions as a flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions, defiance of the opinions of millions of believers throughout the world and an inadmissible attack, on the right of the inhabitants to self-determination. Turkey said Israel's continued failure to comply with United Nations resolutions on Jerusalem would make a solution of the Palestine question more difficult.

Speaking for the EC members, the United Kingdom said they could accept no unilateral initiative aimed at changing the status of Jerusalem.

Israel stated that any assault on Jerusalem, political or otherwise, was an assault on Israel as a whole. United Jerusalem epitomized the restoration of Israeli sovereignty in its homeland. At the same time, Israel was conscious of the city's deep meaning and concern for Christians and Moslems as well as Jews.

The Assembly dealt during 1981 with other matters pertaining to Jerusalem, especially the protection of cultural property there (p. 316).

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>36/120 D, 10 Dec. (p. 268); <sup>(2)</sup>36/120 E, 10 Dec., text following; <sup>(3)</sup>36/226 A, para. 6, 17 Dec. (p. 262).

Meeting records: GA, A/36/PV.80-85, 93 (2-10 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/120 E

139-2-4 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981  
18-nation draft (A/36/L.51 and Add.1); agenda item 31.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Congo, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Pakistan, Senegal, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

The General Assembly,

Recalling and reaffirming its resolutions 2253(ES-V) of 4 July 1967, 2254(ES-V) of 14 July 1967, 35/169 E of 15 December 1980 and 36/15 of 28 October 1981,

Recalling the resolutions of the Security Council relevant to the character and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, in particular resolutions 252(1968) of 21 May 1968, 267(1969) of

3 July 1969, 271(1969) of 15 September 1969, 298(1971) of 25 September 1971, 465(1980) of 1 March 1980, 476(1980) of 30 June 1980 and 478(1980) of 20 August 1980,

Reaffirming that the acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible,

Bearing in mind the specific status of Jerusalem and, in particular, the need for protection and preservation of the unique spiritual and religious dimension of the Holy Places in the city,

Recalling the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,

Deploing the persistence of Israel in changing the physical character, the demographic composition, the institutional structure and the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem,

1. Determines once again that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, the occupying Power, which have altered or purport to alter the character and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, and, in particular, the so-called "Basic Law" on Jerusalem and the proclamation of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, are null and void and must be rescinded forthwith;

2. Affirms that such actions constitute a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, and a threat to international peace and security;

3. Reaffirms its resolution not to recognize that "Basic Law" and such other actions by Israel that, as a result of this law, seek to alter the character and status of Jerusalem and calls upon all States, specialized agencies and other international organizations to comply with the present resolution and other relevant resolutions and urges them not to conduct any business which is not in conformity with the provisions of the present resolution and the other relevant resolutions;

4. Demands that Israel should fully comply with all the resolutions of the United Nations relevant to the historic character of the Holy City of Jerusalem, in particular Security Council resolutions 476(1980) and 478(1980);

5. Requests the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of those resolutions within six months.

Recorded vote Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Jamaica.

#### Convening of a Conference on the Question of Palestine

On 10 December 1981, the General Assembly decided to convene, under United Nations auspices, an International Conference on the Ques-

tion of Palestine not later than 1984.<sup>(1)</sup> It authorized the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to act as the Preparatory Committee for the Conference and to recommend its site and scheduling. United Nations bodies and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations were invited to co-operate.

The resolution was sponsored by 15 countries and adopted by a recorded vote of 122 to 4, with 20 abstentions.

Canada, explaining its vote against the resolution, said it doubted whether the Conference could make any contribution to resolving the essential problem of getting the parties together to negotiate a settlement of their differences. Israel stated that the Conference was not likely to advance the cause of peace; it would only involve the squandering of \$700,000. The United States said that, in the absence of agreement on basic issues arrived at in advance among all interested States, such conferences were doomed to failure; to hold one for propaganda purposes was mischievous.

Sweden, which abstained in the vote, said it believed that a decision to hold an international conference on the basis provided was not likely to produce positive results.

The United Kingdom, on behalf of the EC members, said they believed that the convening of an international conference would be worth while only if it was likely to assist progress towards a just, lasting and comprehensive peace settlement.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/120 C, 10 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/794; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/84.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.80-85, 93 (2-10 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.66 (8 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 38/120 C

122-4-20 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981 15-nation draft (A/36/L.33/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1); agenda item 31.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Congo, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Mali, Senegal, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People,

Recalling its relevant resolutions, particularly resolutions 31/20 of 24 November 1976 and ES-7/2 of 29 July 1980,

Gravely concerned that no just solution to the problem of Palestine has been achieved and that this problem therefore continues to aggravate the Middle East conflict, of which it is the core, and to endanger international peace and security,

Convinced that wider international recognition of the facts underlying the question of Palestine will lead to a just solution of the problem,

Recognizing that a lasting peace in the Middle East requires a just solution of the problem of Palestine through the attainment and exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights,

Emphasizing the need for a comprehensive effort to seek effective ways and means to enable the Palestinian people to attain and to exercise those rights,

1. Decides to convene, under the auspices of the United Nations, an international Conference on the Question of Palestine not later than 1984, on the basis of General Assembly resolution ES-7/2;

2. Authorizes the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to act as the Preparatory Committee for the Conference and to take all the necessary steps for its organization, to hold sessions particularly for this purpose and to make recommendations regarding, inter alia, the site, scheduling of and participation in the Conference, and the provisional agenda of the Conference;

3. Invites all appropriate United Nations bodies, the specialized agencies and other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to co-operate with the Committee in the implementation of the present resolution;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to appoint a Secretary-General of the Conference and to provide all the necessary assistance to the Committee in the organization of the Conference.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, Israel, Norway, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Sweden, United Kingdom.

#### Work programme of the Committee on Palestinian rights

On 10 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to keep the Palestine question under review and to report to the Assembly or the Security Council. It authorized the Committee to continue to promote the implementation of its recommendations; requested the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine and other United Nations bodies associated with the Palestine question to co-operate fully with the Committee; and urged United Nations bodies to act in accordance with the Committee's implementation programme.

The 18-nation resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 121 to 2, with 23 abstentions.

Voting against the resolution, Israel stated that the United Nations was being asked to squander resources on a Committee which had proved itself utterly biased and irresponsible.

The United States said the highly partisan Committee and the United Nations Secretariat's Special Unit on Palestinian Rights (see below) seriously undermined the dignity, objectivity and moral authority of the United Nations. Portugal, which voted for the resolution, said it had reservations on some provisions; its support did not imply a change in position regarding the resolutions mentioned in the preamble.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/120 A, 10 Dec., text following.  
Meeting records; GA, A/36/PV.80-85, 93 (2-10 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/120 A

121-2-23 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981  
18-nation draft (A/36/L.31/Rev.1 and Rev.1/ADD.1); agenda item 31.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Congo, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3376(XXX) of 10 November 1975, 31/20 of 24 November 1976, 32/40 A and B of 2 December 1977, 33/28 A to C of 7 December 1978, 34/65 A and B of 29 November 1979, 34/65 C and D of 12 December 1979, ES-7/2 of 29 July 1980 and 35/169 A to E of 15 December 1980,

Having considered the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People for its efforts in performing the tasks assigned to it by the General Assembly;

2. Requests the Committee to keep the situation relating to the question of Palestine under review and to report and make suggestions to the General Assembly or the Security Council, as appropriate;

3. Authorizes the Committee to continue to exert all efforts to promote the implementation of its recommendations, to send delegations or representatives to international conferences where such representation would be considered by it to be appropriate, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session and thereafter;

4. Requests the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, established under General Assembly resolution 194(III) of 11 December 1948, as well as other United Nations bodies associated with the question of Palestine, to co-operate fully with the Committee and to make available to it, at its request, the relevant information and documentation which they have at their disposal;

5. Decides to circulate the report of the Committee to all the competent bodies of the United Nations and urges them to take the necessary action, as appropriate, in accordance with the Committee's programme of implementation;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Committee with all the necessary facilities for the performance of its tasks.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania,

Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe,  
Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Samoa,<sup>a</sup> Sweden, United Kingdom.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to vote in favour.

#### Strengthening the Unit on Palestinian Rights

By a resolution of 10 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to ensure that the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights continued to discharge its tasks, to provide the Unit with additional resources, to redesignate it in keeping with the political importance of its work and its expanded programme, and to ensure the continued co-operation of the Department of Public Information and other Secretariat units. The Assembly authorized the annual organization of a seminar in North America, in addition to regional seminars (previously authorized), broader dissemination of the Unit's publications and their translation into more languages, and the production of a film on Palestinian rights and other visual material.

The 16-nation resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 119 to 3, with 22 abstentions.

Explaining its negative vote, Israel Said the Unit worked for all practical purposes under the guidance of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and the proposals in the resolution involved a gross misuse of United Nations resources. The United States, speaking in the debate on the Palestine question, deplored the activities of the Unit and the Committee on Palestinian rights (see above), stated that they had allowed themselves to become instruments in PLO hands, and said the United States Congress had agreed again in 1981, as it had done since 1978, that the United States should withhold any contribution in support of those bodies.

Portugal, which voted for the resolution, voiced the same reservations it had to the resolution on the work programme of the Committee on Palestinian rights.<sup>(1)</sup>

In the debate on the Palestine question, a number of delegations praised the Unit for its contribution to a better understanding of that question.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>36/120 A, 10 Dec. (P. 272); <sup>(2)</sup>36/120 B, 10 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/794; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/83 & Corr.1.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.80-85, 93 (2-10 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.66 (8 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/120 B  
119-3-22 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981

16-nation draft (A/36/L.32 and Add.1); agenda item 31.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Congo, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Madagascar, Mali, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People,

Taking note, in particular, of the information contained in paragraphs 39 to 48 of that report,

Recalling its resolutions 32/40 B of 2 December 1977, 33/28 C of 7 December 1978, 34/65 D of 12 December 1979 and 35/169 D of 15 December 1980.

1. Takes note with appreciation of the action taken by the Secretary-General in compliance with General Assembly resolution 35/169 D;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat continues to discharge the tasks detailed in paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 32/40 B and paragraph 2 (b) of Assembly resolution 34/65 D, in consultation with the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and under its guidance;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights with the necessary additional resources to accomplish its tasks and to expand its work programme, inter alia through:

(a) The organization annually of a seminar in North America in addition to the regional seminars;

(b) More widespread dissemination of its publications in all the official languages;

(c) The translation of those publications into languages other than the official languages of the United Nations;

4. Also requests the Secretary-General to take necessary action on the redesignation of the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights, as requested in paragraph 1 of resolution 34/65 D, in keeping with the political importance of its work and its expanded work programme;

5. Further requests the Secretary-General to ensure the continued co-operation of the Department of Public Information and other units of the Secretariat in enabling the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights to perform its tasks, inter alia through the production, in consultation with the Committee, of a film on Palestinian rights and through the provision of copies of the photographic exhibit on Palestinian rights installed at United Nations Headquarters and of other visual material for use by the Special Unit and United Nations information centres;

6. Invites all Governments and organizations to lend their co-operation to the Committee and the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights in the performance of their tasks;

7. Takes note with appreciation of the action taken by Member States to observe annually on 29 November the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People and the issuance by them of special postage stamps for the occasion.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trini-

dad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Sweden, United Kingdom.

#### Assistance to Palestinians

During 1981, United Nations assistance was being provided to Palestinians in the West Bank and neighbouring Arab States. This was in addition to aid provided to Palestine refugees by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (p. 325).

Assistance in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip continued to be financed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). By the end of 1981, 11 of the 17 projects for those areas authorized by the UNDP Governing Council in 1979 were under implementation or prepared for implementation and some had been largely completed. Among the projects under way (with their planned costs in parentheses) were: provision of furniture and equipment to primary schools (\$245,000), organization of technical and vocational courses (\$354,320), provision of fellowships for health manpower development (\$948,000), furnishing of supplies and equipment to health institutions (\$668,000) and assistance to children's institutions (\$584,000).

The Governing Council, on 23 June,<sup>(7)</sup> authorized the UNDP Administrator to increase, where necessary, the notional amount of expenditures for individual projects, keeping within the allocation of \$3.5 million from the UNDP Programme Reserve which the Council had authorized in 1979.<sup>(8)</sup>

UNDP also continued to finance regional activities benefiting Palestinians either directly or indirectly. For example, the Institute of Education at Amman, Jordan, the Regional Institute for Training and Research in Statistics at Baghdad, Iraq, and the Arab Planning Institute in Kuwait, which provided training and research facilities for Palestinian students and scholars, continued to receive UNDP assistance in an amount of \$5.2 million by the end of 1981.

The Industrial Development Board of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), on 29 May,<sup>(1)</sup> after examining a report on UNIDO assistance to Palestinians, took note with appreciation of the participation of Palestinian trainees in group training programmes organized by UNIDO and sought the expansion of those activities. It noted with regret that other technical assistance projects had not been implemented, and condemned and deplored the obstacles placed by Israeli occupying

authorities which had prevented UNIDO officials from visiting the occupied West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The Board urged the UNIDO secretariat to take all possible measures to increase technical assistance to the Palestinian people in co-operation with PLO, and requested a further progress report from the UNIDO Executive Director in 1982, including proposals on ways of expanding the programme. These conclusions were adopted by 26 votes to 1 (United States), with 11 abstentions.

The Commission on Human Settlements requested on 6 May<sup>(3)</sup> that the Executive Director of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements continue efforts to implement General Assembly resolutions on assistance to the Palestinian people and to report the results to the Commission in 1982. The Commission also urged the Assembly to deplore the occupying authorities in Palestine for the obstacles set up to hinder the implementation of these resolutions and to reiterate the necessity of implementing them.

The United Nations Children's Fund spent \$482,100 in 1981 on assistance to Palestinian mothers and children in Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, for health, education, family welfare and social welfare services. This included \$219,100 in the West Bank and Gaza for kindergarten teacher training, furniture and equipment, musical instruments and other supplies.

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** In response to an Assembly request of December 1980,<sup>(4)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted to the Economic and Social Council in June 1981 a report on assistance to the Palestinian people rendered by 22 United Nations organs and organizations.<sup>(2)</sup> The Council, on 22 July, decided to transmit the report to the Assembly.<sup>(6)</sup> This decision was adopted, without vote, on recommendation of the Council's Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee, which approved the draft without vote on 10 July, as orally proposed by its Chairman.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 4 December, the General Assembly adopted, by 99 votes to 2, with 18 abstentions, a resolution on assistance to the Palestinian people.<sup>(5)</sup> By this resolution, the Assembly urged United Nations organizations to take steps, in consultation and co-operation with PLO, for the full implementation of resolutions on assistance to the Palestinians. It strongly urged all parties to facilitate the full implementation of all the projects approved by the UNDP Governing Council and requested UNDP to undertake direct execution of the projects in the occupied Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem, in co-ordination with local Palestinian organizations and bodies. It requested that United

Nations assistance to the Palestinians in the Arab host countries should be rendered in consultation with the parties concerned and in accordance with United Nations resolutions. Finally, it requested another progress report from the Secretary-General in 1982.

This resolution was recommended by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, which approved the text on 20 November by a recorded vote of 112 to 2, with 21 abstentions. The 39-nation draft, revised three times by its sponsors, was introduced by Pakistan.

Explaining in the Second Committee its vote against the resolution, Israel stated that it was not opposed to rendering assistance to the Palestinians provided that the assistance was for the direct benefit of the population and not PLO. The United States, which also voted against, said it rejected the introduction of political elements alien to the Committee's economic and humanitarian concerns.

The United Kingdom, explaining the abstentions of the European Community (EC) members, said they had not changed their position on the paragraph urging co-operation with PLO as representative of the Palestinian people; moreover, in referring to the occupied Palestinian territories, the text should have specified the territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

Voting for the resolution, Japan said it supported United Nations assistance to national liberation movements.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/305 & Add 1, 2.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8): 4/3, 6 May. GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/111. 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 398); <sup>(5)</sup>36/70, 4 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decisions: <sup>(6)</sup>ESC: 1981/171, 22 July, text following.

<sup>(7)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1): 81/13, 23 June.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(8)</sup>1979, p. 372.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.4, 5, 7, 8 (6-10 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.39 (22 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.4. 7-10, 16-18, 21, 24, 25, 27, 32, 35, 41, 42 (25 Sep.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.84 (4 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/171

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/97) without vote, 10 July (meeting 8); draft orally proposed by Chairman; agenda item 20.

#### Assistance to the Palestinian people

At its 39th plenary meeting, on 22 July 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Secretary-General on assistance to the Palestinian people and decided to transmit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/70

99-2-18 Meeting 84 4 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/691/Add.1) by recorded vote (112-2-21), 20 November (meeting 42); 39-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3); agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

#### Assistance to the Palestinian people

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 33/147 of 20 December 1978, 34/133 of 14 December 1979 and 35/111 of 5 December 1980,

Recalling also its resolutions 3236(XXIX) and 3237(XXIX) of 22 November 1974,

Taking note of Economic and Social Council decision 1981/171 of 22 July 1981 and recalling the relevant resolutions of the Council,

Taking note with satisfaction of the report of the Secretary-General on assistance to the Palestinian people,

Taking note also of the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme on its twenty-eighth session,

1. Notes with satisfaction the action taken by the Administrator and the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme in response to the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

2. Urges the relevant agencies, organizations, organs and programmes of the United Nations system to take the necessary steps, in consultation and co-operation with the Palestine Liberation Organization, the representative of the Palestinian people, for the full implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council on assistance to the Palestinian people;

3. Strongly urges all parties concerned to facilitate the full implementation of all the projects approved by the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme at its twenty-sixth session;

4. Requests the United Nations Development Programme to undertake direct execution of the projects in the occupied Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem, in co-ordination with the relevant local Palestinian organizations and bodies;

5. Also requests that United Nations assistance to the Palestinian people in the Arab host countries should be rendered through the specialized agencies, programmes, organs and other bodies of the United Nations system in consultation with the parties concerned and in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, through the Economic and Social Council, on the progress made in the implementation of the present resolution.

## Situation between individual Arab States and Israel

### Iraq and Israel

On 7 June 1981, Israeli aircraft bombed the Tuwaitha nuclear research centre near Baghdad. The action was condemned by the Security Council on 19 June and by the General Assembly on 13 November.

COMMUNICATIONS. On 8 June, by a letter to the Security Council President,<sup>(3)</sup> the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq requested an immediate meeting of the Council to deal with what he

described as a grave act of aggression. At 1837 hours on 7 June, he stated, Israeli war-planes had raided Baghdad with the object of destroying the nuclear reactor installations. Iraq was a party to the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons<sup>(46)</sup> and not a single violation by Iraq of the nuclear safeguards agreement (drawn up in accordance with that Treaty) had ever been registered by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). In a further letter of 10 June,<sup>(4)</sup> the Iraqi Foreign Minister stated that the attack by nine Israeli aircraft was not the first of its kind, as there had been two raids aimed at the nuclear installations on 27 September 1980.

Israel, on 8 June,<sup>(6)</sup> transmitted to the Council President and to the Secretary-General a special announcement of the same date by its Government, stating that a raid by the Israel Air Force had destroyed the "Osirak" (Tamuz-1) reactor and that all aircraft had returned safely to base. Israel had learnt that the reactor was designed to produce atomic bombs whose target would have been Israel, as the ruler of Iraq had announced after an Iranian raid which had slightly damaged the reactor. Under no circumstances would Israel allow an enemy to develop weapons of mass destruction against it. On 19 October,<sup>(9)</sup> Israel transmitted a document issued by its Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its Atomic Energy Commission detailing information on what was described as Iraq's preparations for the production by 1985 of nuclear weapons whose principal target was to be Israel.

By a telegram of 12 June,<sup>(1)</sup> the IAEA Director-General transmitted a resolution of that date by which the Agency's Board of Governors condemned Israel for the attack and recommended that consideration be given to suspending its membership rights in IAEA (p. 279). The records of the Board's discussion (9-12 June) were transmitted on 15 June.<sup>(2)</sup>

By a letter of 15 June,<sup>(7)</sup> Israel reaffirmed its support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East (p. 49).

A number of States sent letters or statements to the Council President condemning Israel's action as an act of aggression, a violation of international law and a threat to world peace. Letters were received from Egypt,<sup>(22)</sup> Japan<sup>(29)</sup> and Spain<sup>(37)</sup> (9 June); Panama<sup>(33)</sup> (10 June); the German Democratic Republic,<sup>(23)</sup> Pakistan,<sup>(32)</sup> the Philippines,<sup>(10)</sup> Tunisia<sup>(12)</sup> and the USSR<sup>(40)</sup> (11 June); Hungary,<sup>(26)</sup> India,<sup>(27)</sup> Qatar,<sup>(35)</sup> Romania,<sup>(36)</sup> Viet Nam<sup>(41)</sup> and Zambia<sup>(43)</sup> (12 June); Bangladesh<sup>(18)</sup> (13 June); Czechoslovakia,<sup>(20)</sup> Grenada,<sup>(24)</sup> Indonesia<sup>(28)</sup> and Poland<sup>(34)</sup> (15 June); Democratic Yemen<sup>(21)</sup> and Guyana<sup>(25)</sup>



(16 June); Jordan, transmitting a letter of 10 June from King Hussein to the United States President,<sup>(30)</sup> and Suriname<sup>(38)</sup> (17 June); and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya<sup>(31)</sup> (18 June). The Czechoslovak statement asked that the Council decide on the imposition of sanctions against Israel; the Libyan letter suggested the application of Article 6 of the Charter of the United Nations (which provides for the expulsion from the United Nations of a State that persistently violates Charter principles).

On 12 June,<sup>(42)</sup> Yemen forwarded to the Council President and the Secretary-General a resolution adopted at Baghdad on 11 June by the Council of the League of Arab States, by which the Council condemned the Israeli aggression; affirmed the right of all States to establish technological and nuclear development programmes for peaceful purposes; and called on the States that supported Israel and provided it with economic, political, military and technological aid, notably the United States, to put an end to the Israeli aggression and to terminate such aid.

On 16 June,<sup>(19)</sup> Cuba transmitted a communique adopted by an extraordinary plenary meeting of non-aligned countries held in New York on that day, stating that the meeting had condemned the Israeli aggression; affirmed the right of countries to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes; called on all States, in particular the United States, to refrain from economic, political, military and technological aid to Israel; and called on the Security Council to take effective measures against Israel in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter (on action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression).

On 17 June,<sup>(11)</sup> the Philippines forwarded a statement by the Foreign Ministers of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, describing the Israeli attack as a dangerous and irresponsible act that would escalate tension in the area and seriously threaten peace. Also on 17 June,<sup>(16)</sup> the Acting Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) transmitted a decision adopted on 15 June at Nairobi, Kenya, by the OAU Council of Ministers, stating that the Israeli act of aggression was further proof of its arrogance.

**SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION.** On 19 June, the Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution<sup>(52)</sup> prepared in the course of consultations, by which it strongly condemned Israel's attack; called on Israel to refrain from any such acts or threats; considered that the attack constituted a serious threat to the IAEA safeguards regime; fully recognized the inalienable sovereign right of Iraq and all other States, especially the devel-

oping countries, to establish nuclear development programmes for peaceful purposes, consistent with the objectives of nuclear non-proliferation; called on Israel urgently to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards; and considered that Iraq was entitled to appropriate redress for the destruction it had suffered.

Speaking after the Council acted, Israel rejected the resolution as biased, one-sided and ignoring the fact that, in removing a nuclear threat to its existence, Israel had exercised its legitimate right of self-defence.

Iraq said it was not satisfied with the resolution, as it did not include sanctions; the resolution could have been a better reflection of world public opinion had it not been for United States support of Israel. Uganda said the Council ought to have acted decisively in accordance with the punitive provisions of the Charter and should have characterized Israel's act as unjustified aggression; nevertheless, the resolution rejected Israel's dangerous notion of the doctrine of self-defence, under which it claimed the right to attack on the basis of a speculative conjecture that a nation might use its technology for offensive purposes.

Explaining its vote for the resolution, the German Democratic Republic stated that, while the text provided for the minimum of measures to be taken against the aggressor, General Assembly resolutions demanding the complete termination of nuclear and military collaboration with Israel must be implemented. Tunisia, though pleased with the consensus achieved, thought the resolution was far from commensurate with the serious nature of Israel's act of aggression. The USSR said the demands for decisive measures, including sanctions against Israel, were not duly reflected in the resolution; nevertheless, the Council's consideration of Iraq's complaint had demonstrated Israel's isolation on the international scene and should serve as a serious warning to Israel.

France, while reiterating its commitment to the existence and security of Israel, said it believed that recourse to force would not serve the interests of Israel's security. Japan said the resolution contained the minimum common elements voiced by the international community concerning the various problems caused by the incident. The United States said its judgement that Israeli actions had violated the United Nations Charter was based solely on the conviction that Israel had failed to exhaust peaceful means; further, the question of appropriate redress had to be understood in the full legal context of the relationships in the region.

The Council held nine meetings on the subject from 12 to 19 June. Algeria, Bangladesh, Bra-

zil, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia were invited, at their request, to participate without vote in the debate.

On 12 June, the Council decided that an invitation should be accorded to a PLO representative to participate in the debate and that the invitation would confer on it the same rights of participation as those conferred on a Member State invited to participate under rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.<sup>a</sup> The Council took this decision by a vote, requested by the United States, of 11 to 1 (United States), with 3 abstentions (France, Japan, United Kingdom). The proposal to invite PLO was made by Tunisia in a letter of 11 June.<sup>(13)</sup>

The Council acted without vote to extend invitations under rule 39<sup>b</sup> to the Secretary-General and the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, as proposed by Tunisia in letters of 11 June<sup>(14)</sup> and 16 June,<sup>(15)</sup> respectively, and to the IAEA Director-General, as requested by Uganda in a letter of 16 June.<sup>(39)</sup>

Opening the debate, the Foreign Minister of Iraq stated that the motives behind the Israeli attack were to cover up Israel's possession of nuclear weapons and, more importantly, the determination not to allow the Arab nation to acquire scientific or technical knowledge. Iraq, in 1969, had been one of the first adherents to the non-proliferation Treaty; it had concluded in 1972 an agreement with IAEA for the application of safeguards to all its nuclear activities, and at the latest safeguards inspection at the Iraqi centre, in January 1981, all nuclear material there had been accounted for Iraq actively supported initiatives in the General Assembly for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. While every country had the right to develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, Israel had had a nuclear-weapon capability for years. The Council could not limit itself to condemning Israel's act of aggression, but should impose mandatory sanctions and decide that all States, especially the United States, should refrain from providing Israel with any military, material or technical co-operation or assistance which might encourage it to pursue expansion and aggression.

Israel said that, in destroying the "Osirak" nuclear reactor, it had performed an act of self-preservation and exercised its inherent right of self-defence. A threat of nuclear obliteration was being developed against Israel by Iraq, which

had declared itself in a state of war with Israel since 1948 and had rejected all United Nations efforts for peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. Israel had repeatedly urged the European countries involved to stop assisting Iraq's drive for military nuclear capability, but its public and diplomatic efforts had gone unheeded. Within weeks "Osirak" would have gone "hot", after which time any attack on it would have blanketed Baghdad with lethal radioactive fall-out. Israel invited the Council to consider its proposal, made repeatedly since 1974, for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

The IAEA Director-General told the Council that periodic inspections of the three nuclear research reactors near Baghdad, most recently in January 1981, had revealed no non-compliance with the safeguards agreement; all nuclear material had been satisfactorily accounted for.

Most speakers in the debate condemned Israel's attack as a violation of the United Nations Charter and international law and as a threat to international peace and security. They could not accept Israel's argument that it had acted in self-defence to prevent a nuclear strike against it; they said Article 51 of the Charter limited the right of self-defence to a case of armed attack and did not allow for preventive action. They considered Israel's attack a dangerous precedent, rejected Israel's allegation that the Iraqi reactor was intended to produce nuclear weapons and underlined the right of States to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

France stated that the sole purpose of the Tamuz reactor was scientific research; agreements between France and Iraq excluded its use for military purposes. The United Kingdom said it did not believe Iraq had the capacity to manufacture fissionable materials for nuclear weapons. The Iraqi bomb, stated the Niger, existed only in the imagination of the Israeli leaders. Spain said the Charter did not allow any right to preventive action by which a State could set itself up as judge and policeman in respect to another country.

India, Kuwait, the Niger, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Viet Nam, Yemen and others regarded the Israeli attack as a continuation of Israeli aggression against the Arab

<sup>a</sup> Rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure states: "Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council may be invited, as the result of a decision of the Security Council, to participate, without vote, in the discussion of any question brought before the Security Council when the Security Council considers that the interests of that Member are specially affected, or when a Member brings a matter to the attention of the Security Council in accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Charter."

<sup>b</sup> Rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure states: "The Security Council may invite members of the Secretariat or other persons, whom it considers competent for the purpose, to supply it with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence."

people in Lebanon, Palestine and elsewhere, and as a denial of the rights of the Palestinian people. Its objective was to prevent Arab scientific and technological progress so as to enable Israel to maintain its supremacy in the region. Mexico described the attack as the climax of escalating violations of international law, including territorial annexation by conquest, persistence in illegal occupation, denial of Palestinian rights, and aggression and harassment against neighbouring States.

Bulgaria and the Syrian Arab Republic considered the act a consequence of the Camp David accords between Egypt and Israel, which had freed the hands of extremist circles in Israel for further aggression. Israel's act, the USSR said, was a logical consequence of the Middle East policy of the United States, aimed at dividing the Arab world. Egypt maintained that the accords did not justify or permit acts of aggression; the Israeli aggression could only lead to Israel's isolation.

Several speakers cited reports that Israel had developed nuclear weapons. Guyana remarked that Israel would shrink from no aggression or terrorist act to maintain a nuclear monopoly in the Middle East.

References were made to an appeal by the General Assembly in 1979,<sup>(48)</sup> reaffirmed in 1980,<sup>(49)</sup> that States end co-operation with Israel which might help it to acquire nuclear weapons. The German Democratic Republic said the danger of a further aggravation of the situation in the region, for which Israel was responsible, made it imperative to cease all nuclear and military collaboration with the aggressor. Somalia hoped that the recent decision of the United States to suspend its planned delivery of four fighter-bombers to Israel was the beginning of a reassessment of the dangers of its supply of arms.

Several countries, including Egypt, France, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Kingdom and Yemen, regarded the Israeli attack as a challenge to the nuclear safeguards system. If Israel suspected that Iraq intended to produce atomic bombs, said Japan, it should have sought to settle the matter by peaceful means, such as submitting it to IAEA. Perhaps it had not done so, the Philippines observed, because it was not a party to the non-proliferation Treaty. Many States, including Jordan and the Sudan, called on the Council to find ways of subjecting Israeli nuclear activities to regular international inspection and supervision.

A number of speakers, among others Egypt, Ireland, Japan and the United States, held that further efforts should be made to prevent the

proliferation of nuclear weapons and that States which were not party to the non-proliferation Treaty, including Israel, should accede to it as soon as possible. Lebanon called for compulsory means of subjecting Israel's nuclear superiority to the imperatives of international compacts.

A number of States-including Cuba (on behalf of the non-aligned countries), Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, the USSR and Yemen-called for mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. China thought the Council should take effective measures resolutely to put an end to Israeli aggression and to punish Israel in accordance with the Charter. Kuwait said any objection to the imposition of sanctions would be explained by the Arab people and peoples of the third world as an act of bias in favour of the aggressor.

Ireland questioned the wisdom of imposing sanctions in the face of the complex situation of conflict in the Middle East. The United States, while condemning the Israeli action as damaging to the regional confidence necessary for peace, said it would approve no decision that harmed Israel's basic interests, was unfairly punitive or created new obstacles to a just and lasting peace.

Many speakers, including France, Guyana, Italy, Jordan, Morocco, the Niger, Sri Lanka and Turkey, were of the view that Israel should compensate Iraq for the losses resulting from its aggression. A call for compensation was also included in a resolution by the Islamic Group of Member States at the United Nations, adopted on 16 June and read to the Council by Iraq.

Israel, maintaining that the non-proliferation Treaty was no effective guarantee against the proliferation of nuclear weapons, expressed the view that the most constructive step towards the security of all States in the area would be to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Czechoslovakia, which supported the establishment of such a zone, said this idea should not be utilized to camouflage Israel's aggressive policies towards neighbouring Arab countries. Egypt stated that Israel's unwarranted air raid had cast serious doubts about its support for a nuclear-weapon-free zone; Egypt reiterated its call on all States, pending the establishment of such a zone, to declare that they would reciprocally refrain from producing, acquiring or in any way possessing nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices, and to deposit their declarations with the Security Council.

The Secretary-General of the League of Arab States stated that, by its act of aggression, Israel

wanted to delay the technological progress of the Arabs, which was the guarantee of their independence and of their invulnerability. The League's Permanent Observer to the United Nations added that, when the world community sought punitive sanctions and measures, it did so not out of revenge but to deter the aggressor.

The PLO representative said Israel was not satisfied to invoke national security in the military field and on questions relating to borders; it wished to arrogate the power to impede the development of other countries in the region.

By a letter of 29 June to the Council President,<sup>(8)</sup> Israel expressed regret that it had not, during the Council debate, given a complete quotation of a passage from a lecture by Sir Humphrey Waldock, President of the International Court of Justice, on the self-defence provisions of Article 51 of the Charter; it added that Iraq, in pointing out the omission during the debate, had omitted another sentence suggesting that preparations for atomic warfare would have to be treated as an armed attack under Article 51. Iraq replied on 24 July<sup>(5)</sup> that the sentence omitted by Iraq supported Iraq's position rather than that of Israel, since it was Israel which had possessed nuclear weapons for some time and therefore Iraq and other Arab States parties to the non-proliferation Treaty were entitled to treat those weapons as an armed attack.

**OTHER ACTION.** The United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 689), by a 21 August resolution on the right of nations to develop and control non-fossil energy resources,<sup>(45)</sup> strongly condemned the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear research centre. The text, sponsored by Iraq, Morocco and Pakistan, was adopted by a roll-call vote of 61 to 1 (Israel), with 26 abstentions.

Israel objected to the resolution as a blatant act of politicization which violated the non-political mandate of the Conference and added that it did not bother to reaffirm rights which Iraq had systematically violated for over 30 years. Australia, Canada, the United States and Uruguay said they had abstained because the resolution was extraneous to the purpose and mandate of the Conference.

The IAEA Board of Governors, on 12 June, adopted a resolution<sup>(1)</sup> by which it strongly condemned Israel for its attack. It recommended that the Agency's General Conference consider all the implications, including the suspension of Israel's membership privileges and rights, and that the Conference suspend IAEA technical assistance to Israel. The Board urged the Agency's member States to provide emergency assistance to Iraq to deal with the aftermath of the attack and reaffirmed its confidence in the effec-

tiveness of the Agency's safeguards system as a reliable means of verifying peaceful use of a nuclear facility.

The General Conference, by a resolution of 26 September,<sup>(44)</sup> decided to suspend IAEA assistance to Israel, as the Board had recommended. It also decided to consider at its 1982 regular session the suspension of Israel from the exercise of the privileges and rights of Agency membership if by that time it had not complied with the Security Council resolution of 19 June.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 13 November, the General Assembly adopted, by a roll-call vote of 109 to 2, with 34 abstentions, a resolution entitled "Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security".<sup>(50)</sup>

By this resolution, the Assembly strongly condemned Israel for its act of aggression; warned it to cease threatening and committing such attacks against nuclear facilities; reiterated its call to all States to cease providing Israel with arms and related material which would enable it to commit acts of aggression; requested the Security Council to investigate Israel's nuclear activities and the collaboration of other States and parties in those activities; reiterated its request that the Council institute effective enforcement action to prevent Israel from further endangering peace and security; demanded that Israel pay prompt and adequate compensation for the material damage and loss of life; and requested the Secretary-General to keep Member States and the Council informed of the resolution's implementation and to report to the Assembly in 1982.

By a resolution of 9 December<sup>(51)</sup> in connection with disarmament issues, the Assembly stated that the Israeli attack adversely affected prospects for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Provisions on the attack were also included in an Assembly resolution of 11 November on the annual IAEA report (p. 712).

Introducing the 36-nation draft resolution adopted on 13 November, Iraq observed that, unlike the Council's resolution, the Assembly text qualified the Israeli action as an act of aggression—a phrase the Council had not used for political considerations pertaining to the position adopted by certain permanent members.

Israel, explaining its negative vote, said it rejected the resolution for not taking into account several facts, such as the nuclear option Iraq had been developing, Iraq's consistent violations of the prohibition against the threat or use of force, its open rejection of Security Coun-

cil resolutions on the Middle East, its attempts to bypass its obligations under the non-proliferation Treaty and the safeguards agreement with IAEA, and Israel's attempts by diplomatic means to remove the mortal threat to its existence, leaving it with no alternative but to destroy the nuclear reactor in self-defence. The United States said it strongly opposed the resolution for six reasons: the Security Council had already acted on the matter; the unbalanced text could only complicate the search for peace; the description of Israel's action as aggression was objectionable, prejudiced and legally troublesome; the text diverted attention from the pursuit of peace and security; the call for the United States to alter its relationship with Israel was one-sided, as other major Powers were not asked to stop their arms supplies to Israel's neighbours; and the request for a Security Council investigation of Israel's nuclear activities was politically motivated and would not have positive results.

Speaking in explanation of vote, several countries expressed reservations. The United Kingdom, explaining the abstentions of the EC members, said they did not believe the proposed enforcement action, including a selective arms embargo, would be appropriate, practicable or desirable in terms of the search for a just, lasting and comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East. Fiji abstained on similar grounds, adding that its position was not to be interpreted as endorsement of Israel's attack.

Austria, Canada, Finland, New Zealand, Norway and Sweden said they abstained because they felt the Assembly was assuming responsibilities that, under the Charter, belonged to the Security Council. New Zealand added that it had reservations about the paragraph calling for a Council investigation of Israel's nuclear activities, which appeared to call for the duplication of investigations already being undertaken at the Assembly's request; also, it found somewhat gratuitous the references in the preamble to arms supplied to Israel by the United States. Turkey, though voting in favour, would have preferred that no particular country be singled out as a supplier of weapons.

Chile thought the resolution contained exaggerated language and would not lead to the proper implementation of the Council's June resolution. In Zaire's view, the resolution contained a superficial analysis that did not cover all aspects of Middle East problems.

Reservations about the wording were also expressed by certain States which voted in favour. Panama thought the coercive measures mentioned in the resolution were a matter for the Security Council. Portugal had reservations

about what it considered as discriminatory language and elements contrary to the essential functioning of the Assembly and the United Nations. Venezuela was concerned about some of the terms used, as well as about the Assembly's making reference to enforcement action by the Council.

Spain made a similar point and added a reservation regarding references in the preamble to 1978 and 1979 Assembly resolutions on military and nuclear collaboration with Israel<sup>(47)</sup> and Israeli nuclear armament,<sup>(48)</sup> on which it had abstained; also, it would have preferred a more balanced drafting of the preambular paragraph referring to the misuse of aircraft and weapons by Israel.

Brazil, India and Zambia stated that their vote in favour was without prejudice to their position on the non-proliferation Treaty, which they had not signed.

In Samoa's view, the Assembly's call not to supply Israel with arms did not conform with the kind of balanced approach necessary to lessen tension in the Middle East. Uruguay thought that this paragraph, as well as the Assembly's requests for enforcement action and an arms embargo, prejudged the future attitude of a State.

Most of the delegations which abstained or expressed reservations stressed their condemnation of the Israeli attack.

The inclusion of the item on the agenda of the 1981 regular Assembly session was requested by 43 countries in a letter of 12 August.<sup>(17)</sup> In view of the importance of the question for international peace and security, they stated, it was incumbent on the Assembly to deal with the question in all its aspects.

During the debate, many speakers, including Algeria, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Jordan, Malaysia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam, expressed regret that the Security Council had not imposed sanctions on Israel or demanded redress for the damage suffered by Iraq. A number of countries, such as the Byelorussian SSR, China, Czechoslovakia, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Pakistan, Qatar, the Sudan, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam, also favoured effective enforcement action. Many of these States, along with Yugoslavia, specifically advocated a halt to the supply of arms to Israel, and Mauritania urged an embargo on all nuclear materials for that country. Sri Lanka said the matter had been brought to the Assembly to seek a vital action that the Council had been unable to provide—cessation of the provision of arms to Israel.

Several States, including Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, appealed to the Assembly to adopt a resolution requesting the Council to take every

necessary measure to ensure strict implementation of its resolution of 19 June and other United Nations resolutions, and to prevent Israel from repeating its aggression and its violation of the rights of other States.

Iraq said the Council had failed to adopt effective measures because of the threat by the United States to use the veto, in spite of the fact that the Council had previously warned Israel that the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter would be applied should it again resort to aggression. Since the Council had been prevented from fully shouldering its responsibilities, Iraq added, the Assembly was called upon to remedy the situation within its competence and to try to restore the dignity of the Organization, especially considering that Israel had rejected the unanimous Council decision.

The Syrian Arab Republic requested the Assembly not only to adopt a resolution condemning Israeli aggression and placing the attack on the reactor within the framework of official acts of terrorism committed by Israel against Arab peoples, but also condemning the United States, which continued to provide Israel with instruments of destruction as part of its strategic alliance. A number of other countries, including Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and Viet Nam, criticized the support and encouragement of Israel's policies by the United States.

Most speakers rejected Israel's argument that it had performed an elementary act of self-preservation and exercised its inherent right of self-defence. Many reiterated that the assault also constituted an attack on the IAEA safeguards régime. A number of countries, including Cyprus, Poland, Romania and Turkey, stressed the right of States to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

Israel maintained that its military operation against the Iraqi nuclear reactor was neither an attack on IAEA nor an expression of no confidence in the Agency's safeguards system. Iraq had already acquired weapons-grade plutonium; it could have proceeded with its nuclear-weapons programme and then withdrawn from the non-proliferation Treaty on three months' notice, without fear of sanctions.

China underscored the inalienable right of all countries to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, but said it firmly opposed the clandestine development of nuclear weapons by Israel as a menace to neighbouring States and a threat to peace and security.

Egypt viewed the Israeli attack not as an act of self-defence but rather an act of self-

destruction; peace and security in the Middle East could be achieved not by aggression or preemptive attacks but by the elimination of fear, suspicion and centuries-old hatred and through serious and responsible efforts to ensure a just and peaceful settlement.

Albania, India, Morocco and others said it was impossible to separate Israel's constant aggressive conduct against its Arab neighbours from its continual refusal to acknowledge the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, reiterated their condemnation of the Israeli attack, said there must be no repetition of such action by Israel or any other country, emphasized the central role of the IAEA safeguards system in the non-proliferation régime and urged all Middle East States including Israel to refrain from any action that would increase the danger which would result from the development of nuclear weapons in the region. Austria said it was essential for the Assembly to retain the unanimity reached in the Security Council on this matter. Japan was among a number of countries that urged Israel and other non-parties to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty.

The IAEA Director-General, rejecting the argument that the Agency's safeguards inspection system would not have detected diversion of plutonium from the Tamuz reactor for weapons purposes, said the Israeli attack had also been an attack against IAEA, the non-proliferation Treaty and the climate of trust generated by the Treaty and its verification mechanism.

Israel, as it had done before the Security Council, advocated a regional non-proliferation régime and arms control arrangements and the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone through direct negotiations among the States concerned, a proposal which was supported by the United States. A number of countries, for example Jordan, regarded this suggestion as contradictory and deceptive because of Israel's continued refusal to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty, the only multinational instrument to prevent proliferation.

The USSR stated that Israel's refusal to comply with United Nations decisions was eloquent proof that its real objective was to establish its own nuclear domination in the Middle East. This view was shared by most Arab States: Lebanon, for example, said the raid had revealed Israel's decision to ensure its right to police 20 Arab countries.

Letters and telegram (t):

IAEA: <sup>(1)</sup>12 June, S/14532 (t); <sup>(2)</sup>15 June, S/14532/Add.1.

Iraq: <sup>(3)</sup>8 June, S/14509; <sup>(4)</sup>10 June, S/14514; <sup>(5)</sup>24 July, S/14619.

Israel: <sup>(6)</sup>8 June, A/36/313 (S/14510); <sup>(7)</sup>15 June, A/36/315 (S/14534); <sup>(8)</sup>29 June, S/14576; <sup>(9)</sup>19 Oct., A/36/610-S/14732.

Philippines: <sup>(10)</sup>11 June, S/14518; <sup>(11)</sup>17 June, transmitting statement of ASEAN States, S/14551.

Tunisia: <sup>(12)</sup>11 June, S/14520; <sup>(13)</sup>11 June, S/14521; <sup>(14)</sup>11 June, S/14524; <sup>(15)</sup>16 June, S/14545.

Others: <sup>(16)</sup>OAU: 17 June, S/14553; <sup>(17)</sup>Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Cape Verde, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: 12 Aug., A/36/194 & Add.I, 2; <sup>(18)</sup>Bangladesh: 13 June, S/14530; <sup>(19)</sup>Cuba: 16 June, transmitting communiqué of non-aligned countries, S/14544; <sup>(20)</sup>Czechoslovakia: 15 June, S/14533; <sup>(21)</sup>Democratic Yemen: 16 June, S/14560; <sup>(22)</sup>Egypt: 9 June, A/36/314-S/14513; <sup>(23)</sup>German Democratic Republic: 11 June, S/14516; <sup>(24)</sup>Grenada: 15 June, S/14549; <sup>(25)</sup>Guyana: 16 June, S/14543; <sup>(26)</sup>Hungary: 12 June, S/14527. <sup>(27)</sup>India: 12 June, S/14523; <sup>(28)</sup>Indonesia: 15 June, S/14536; <sup>(29)</sup>Japan: 9 June, S/14512; <sup>(30)</sup>Jordan: 17 June, S/14550; <sup>(31)</sup>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya: 18 June, S/14559; <sup>(32)</sup>Pakistan: 11 June, S/14517; <sup>(33)</sup>Panama: 10 June, S/14515; <sup>(34)</sup>Poland: 15 June, S/14542; <sup>(35)</sup>Qatar: 12 June, S/14535; <sup>(36)</sup>Romania: 12 June, S/14528; <sup>(37)</sup>Spain: 9 June, S/14511; <sup>(38)</sup>Suriname: 17 June, S/14552; <sup>(39)</sup>Uganda: 16 June, S/14540; <sup>(40)</sup>USSR: 11 June, S/14525; <sup>(41)</sup>Viet Nam: 12 June, S/14526; <sup>(42)</sup>Yemen: 12 June, transmitting League of Arab States resolution, A/36/320 S/14529; <sup>(43)</sup>Zambia: 12 June, S/14522.

Report: <sup>(44)</sup>IAEA, transmitted by S-G note, A/37/382 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(45)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (report, A/CONF.100/11, Sales No. E.81.I.24): 2, para. 1, 21 Aug. GA: <sup>(46)</sup>2373(XXII), annex, 12 June 1968 (YUN 1968, p. 17); <sup>(47)</sup>33/71 A, 14 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 65); <sup>(48)</sup>34/89, 11 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979 p. 59); <sup>(49)</sup>35/157, 12 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 63); & <sup>(50)</sup>36/27, 13 Nov. 1981, text following; <sup>(51)</sup>36/87 B, 9 Dec. (p. 54). <sup>(52)</sup>SC: 487(1981), 19 June, text following.

Meeting records: GA: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.1. 2 (16 Sep.); plenary, A/36/PV.52-56 (11-13 Nov.). SC: S/PV.2280-2288 (12-19 June).

#### Security Council resolution 487(1981)

Adopted unanimously Meeting 2288 19 June 1981  
Draft prepared in consultations among Council members (S/14556).

The Security Council,

Having considered the agenda contained in document S/Agenda/2280,

Having noted the contents of the letter dated 6 June 1981 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq,

Having heard the statements made on the subject at its 2280th through 2288th meetings,

Taking note of the statement made by the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency to the Agency's Board of Governors on the subject on 9 June 1981 and his statement to the Security Council at its 2288th meeting on 19 June 1981,

Taking note also of the resolution adopted by the Board of Governors of the Agency on 12 June 1981 on the "military attack on Iraqi nuclear research centre and its implications for the Agency",

Fully aware of the fact that Iraq has been a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons since it came into force in 1970, that in accordance with that Treaty Iraq has accepted Agency safeguards on all its nuclear activities, and that the Agency has testified that these safeguards have been satisfactorily applied to date.

Noting furthermore that Israel has not adhered to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons,

Deeply concerned about the danger to international peace and security created by the premeditated Israeli air attack on Iraqi nuclear installations on 7 June 1981, which could at any time explode the situation in the area, with grave consequences for the vital interests of all States,

Considering that, under the terms of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, "all members shall refrain in their International relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations",

1. Strongly condemns the military attack by Israel in clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct;

2. Calls upon Israel to refrain in the future from any such acts or threats thereof;

3. Further considers that the said attack constitutes a serious threat to the entire safeguards régime of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which is the foundation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons;

4. Fully recognizes the inalienable sovereign right of Iraq and all other States, especially the developing countries, to establish programmes of technological and nuclear development to develop their economy and industry for peaceful purposes in accordance with their present and future needs and consistent with the internationally accepted objectives of preventing nuclear-weapons proliferation;

5. Calls upon Israel urgently to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency;

6. Considers that Iraq is entitled to appropriate redress for the destruction it has suffered, responsibility for which has been acknowledged by Israel;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council regularly informed of the implementation of the present resolution.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/27

109-2-34 (roll-call vote) Meeting 56 13 November 1981

36-nation draft (A/36/L.14/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1); agenda item 130.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bahrain, Cape Verde, Chad, Comoros, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraq nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and International peace and security

The General Assembly,

Having considered the item entitled "Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security",

Expressing its deep alarm over the unprecedented Israeli act of aggression against the Iraq nuclear installations on 7 June 1981, which created a grave threat to international peace and security.

Recalling its resolutions 33/71 A of 14 December 1978 concerning military and nuclear collaboration with Israel and 34/89 of 11 December 1979 on Israeli nuclear armament,

Further recalling Security Council resolution 487(1981) of 19 June 1981 and noting with concern Israel's refusal to comply with that resolution,

Taking note of the resolution adopted on 12 June 1981 by the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency and of resolution GC(XXV)/RES/381 adopted on 26 September 1981 by the General Conference of the Agency, in which the Conference, *inter alia*, considered that the Israeli act of aggression constituted an attack against the Agency and its safeguards régime and decided to suspend the provision of any assistance to Israel,

Fully aware of the fact that Iraq, being a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, has subscribed to the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards régime, and that the Agency has testified that these safeguards have been satisfactorily applied,

Noting with concern that Israel has refused to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and, in spite of repeated calls, including that of the Security Council, to place its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards,

Alarmed by the increasing information and evidence regarding Israel's activities aiming at the acquisition and development of nuclear weapons,

Gravely concerned over the misuse by Israel, in committing its acts of aggression against Arab countries, of aircraft and weapons supplied by the United States of America,

Condemning the Israeli threats to repeat such attacks on nuclear installations if and when it deems it necessary,

Affirming the inalienable sovereign right of all States to develop technological and nuclear programmes for peaceful purposes, in accordance with the internationally accepted objectives of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons,

1. Strongly condemns Israel for its premeditated and unprecedented act of aggression in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct, which constitutes a new and dangerous escalation in the threat to International peace and security;

2. Issues a solemn warning to Israel to cease its threats and the commission of such armed attacks against nuclear facilities;

3. Reiterates its call to all States to cease forthwith any provision to Israel of arms and related material of all types which enable it to commit acts of aggression against other States;

4. Requests the Security Council to investigate Israel's nuclear activities and the collaboration of other States and parties in those activities;

5. Reiterates its request to the Security Council to institute effective enforcement action to prevent Israel from further endangering international peace and security through its acts of aggression and continued policies of expansion, occupation and annexation;

6. Demands that Israel, in view of its International responsibility for its act of aggression, pay prompt and adequate compensation for the material damage and loss of life suffered as a result of that act;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to keep Member States and the Security Council informed of progress towards the implementation of the present resolution and to submit a report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

8. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security".

Roll-call vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR,

Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Sweden, United Kingdom, Zaire.

## Israel and Lebanon

In southern Lebanon along the border with Israel, where the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) was stationed, the first half of 1981 saw a period of heavy and frequent exchanges of fire between the forces and armed elements in the area. These intensified in July, leading the Security Council to call unanimously for an immediate cessation of all armed attacks and to reaffirm its commitment to Lebanon's sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence. A new cease-fire was reported on 24 July.

The Council twice decided on six-month extensions of the mandate of UNIFIL, established in 1978 to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces, restore international peace and security, and assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area.

COMMUNICATIONS (30 JANUARY- 10 MARCH). Between January and March 1981 the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General received a number of communications concerning incidents in the Israel-Lebanon sector.

By a letter of 30 January,<sup>(28)</sup> Lebanon charged that Israeli aircraft had attacked Lebanese communities on 29 January, resulting in at least eight deaths and 42 people wounded, and that Israel had shelled four areas the following day.

Israel, by a letter dated 2 February,<sup>(10)</sup> stated that 10 civilians had been injured in rocket attacks between 28 and 30 January which PLO had carried out from Lebanese territory against the town of Qiryat Shemona and other Israeli civilian centres in Galilee.

Lebanon, by a letter of 24 February,<sup>(29)</sup> charged that on the night of 22/23 February Israeli forces had shelled several villages and landed troops near Nabatiyah, killing seven persons and wounding three in a four-hour operation.



By a letter dated 8 March,<sup>(11)</sup> Israel charged that, on 7 March, two PLO terrorists had attempted to fly single-seat gliders from Lebanon into Israel with the intent of taking hostages and demanding the release of PLO members detained in Israeli gaols. On 10 March,<sup>(12)</sup> it complained of incidents on 2 and 3 March in which towns and villages in northern Israel had been attacked by rockets fired by PLO members operating from Lebanon; annexed was a list of 26 PLO rocket attacks directed at civilian targets in northern Israel and attempted crossings from Lebanese territory between 7 April 1980 and 7 March 1981.

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION, (MARCH). The Security Council met on 9 and 19/20 March to consider the situation in southern Lebanon. Lebanon, on 3 March,<sup>(30)</sup> had requested a Council meeting to address the continuing problem of what it termed repeated Israeli aggression against Lebanon.

At their request, Israel and Lebanon were invited to participate without vote in the discussion.

Lebanon said it had asked for the meeting because the situation in southern Lebanon had developed into a state of constant warfare, which threatened international peace and security as well as the security of UNIFIL. Israeli leaders had proclaimed that the violence was part of a considered policy of pre-emptive strikes. Such a policy would produce a predictable reaction leading to total war. Military and paramilitary operations had escalated, civilian life in southern Lebanon had been disrupted, and a general state of disintegration and terror had exploded throughout the Middle East. Lebanon asked the Council to initiate a mechanism for peace in Lebanon, specifically along the border with Israel.

The USSR, citing Israeli air raids on 2 March near Tyre in southern Lebanon in which 14 people were reported killed, urged the Council to condemn Israeli aggression against Lebanon, call for its cessation, and oblige Israel to respect Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity and cease all intervention in its internal affairs.

The Secretary-General, in a special report of 16 March,<sup>(55)</sup> informed the Council that elements of the de facto forces (Christian and associated militias) in southern Lebanon had that morning fired tank rounds into the village of Al Qantarah, in the Nigerian battalion sector of UNIFIL, killing a Nigerian captain and a corporal and injuring 11 Nigerian soldiers. (The casualty figures were later revised to three Nigerian soldiers killed and 20 wounded.<sup>(56)</sup>) Tanks had also fired at the village of Yatar in the Netherlands battalion sector to press a demand

for the removal of a platoon of Lebanese soldiers from Al Qantarah. The incidents had been preceded on 13 and 14 March by the kidnapping of four Lebanese army medical personnel and a mortar attack in which three civilians had been wounded.

The Secretary-General reported that the UNIFIL Commander had made it clear to the de facto forces that there was no question of withdrawing the Lebanese platoon, which had been located in Al Qantarah since April 1979. The United Nations had been in touch with the Israeli authorities, urging them to make all possible efforts to bring an end to the irresponsible behaviour of the de facto forces. In recent months, UNIFIL had also had to contend with constant efforts by various factions of armed elements to the north and west to infiltrate its area of operation and had sustained casualties in the process, including the death of a Fijian soldier on 17 January.

Recalling that one of the most important principles on which UNIFIL was established was the full co-operation of all parties, the Secretary-General said it had been all too clear throughout the history of UNIFIL that that co-operation was not forthcoming. All possible efforts should be made to impress on those concerned that provocation, harassment and military offensives against UNIFIL could not be accepted and that their co-operation was required to fulfil its mandate.

At a meeting in the early morning of 20 March, the Council President, on behalf of the Council members, read out the following statement:<sup>(52)</sup>

"The members of the Security Council are deeply shocked and outraged at the report received about the repeated attacks on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and the continuing killing of peace-keeping soldiers in southern Lebanon.

These renewed barbaric acts against a peace-keeping force are a direct defiance of the authority of the Security Council and a challenge to the mission of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security which cannot be tolerated.

The Council condemns these outrageous actions by the so-called de facto forces which have caused the death and injury of Force personnel present in Lebanon under international mandate. In strongly condemning these latest outrageous acts of the so-called de facto forces, the Council calls on all those who share in the responsibility for this tense situation to put an end to any act which might increase the threat to international peace and security and to put an end to military assistance to any forces which interfere with the Force in the exercise of its mandate.

The Council addresses a serious warning to all the forces responsible for these dangerous acts violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of

Lebanon, preventing the full deployment of the Force, including the deployment of the Lebanese armed forces in the area, and severely hampering the Force in the fulfilment of the mandate as expressed in resolution 425(1978), which states:

[For text of resolution 425(1978) of 19 March 1978, see YUN 1978, p. 312.]

The Council emphasizes that it is essential that the Force receive the full co-operation of all parties to enable it to carry out its mandate in the entire area of operation up to the internationally recognized boundaries, thus contributing to full implementation of resolution 425(1978).

The Council calls for the immediate release of Lebanese military personnel and of all those persons who were kidnapped by the so-called *de facto* forces during the recent hostilities.

The Council extends its sympathy and deep-felt condolences to the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and the families of the victims.

The Council also commends the valiant action and the courage, under the most adverse circumstances, of the commanders and soldiers of the Force and expresses full support for their efforts."

COMMUNICATIONS (25 MARCH-5 JUNE). By a letter of 25 March,<sup>(48)</sup> the Netherlands transmitted a statement issued on 24 March in Maastricht, Netherlands, by the European Council, calling for the immediate and full co-operation of all interested parties to enable UNIFIL to carry out its mandate. In communications to the Secretary-General dated 9 April,<sup>(47)</sup> 16 April,<sup>(43)</sup> 17 April<sup>(45)</sup> and 1 May,<sup>(50)</sup> Japan, Argentina, Egypt and Uruguay, respectively, expressed deep concern over the escalation of violence in Lebanon and urged respect for Lebanon's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Serious concern was also expressed in a letter of 8 May<sup>(2)</sup> from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, who feared counteractions in response to Israeli attacks against Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon and said it seemed obvious that Israel intended to destroy the PLO infrastructure.

By letters dated 10 April<sup>(8)</sup> and 21 April,<sup>(9)</sup> Democratic Yemen transmitted four letters from PLO charging that Israeli forces had repeatedly attacked areas of southern Lebanon using warplanes, artillery and naval vessels, and that on 20 and 21 April Israeli war-planes had attacked refugee camps and other Lebanese localities, causing numerous civilian casualties. Israel by letters of 17 April<sup>(13)</sup> and 21 April,<sup>(14)</sup> stated that on 16 April a balloon attempting to penetrate Israel from Lebanese territory had been shot down, and that on 20 and 21 April civilian centres in northern Israel had been shelled by PLO elements operating from Lebanon.

Tunisia, on 28 April,<sup>(35)</sup> transmitted a PLO

letter dated 27 April, calling for Security Council action to put an end to genocidal Israeli attacks and holding the United States equally responsible through its supply of war material and moral support. Further Israeli air strikes and gunboat attacks between 27 May and 2 June were reported in PLO letters of 2 and 3 June, transmitted by Yemen on 5 June.<sup>(51)</sup>

Cuba, by a note verbale of 5 June,<sup>(5)</sup> transmitted a communiqué adopted on 4 June at an extraordinary plenary meeting of the non-aligned countries held in New York, condemning the Israeli attacks on Palestine refugee camps in southern Lebanon and expressing grave concern at United States support of Israeli policies and practices.

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION (JUNE). As the mandate of UNIFIL was due to expire on 19 June, the Secretary-General, on 16 June, submitted a report<sup>(56)</sup> on the activities of the Force for the period from 12 December 1980 to 15 June 1981. He observed that UNIFIL had continued to encounter serious difficulties in fulfilling its mandate, as the parties had not extended full co-operation. UNIFIL personnel as at 15 June numbered 6,000, with contingents from Fiji, France, Ghana, Ireland, Italy, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Senegal and Sweden, assisted by 67 military observers from the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine (UNTSO). The Nepalese battalion, which had been withdrawn in May 1980 and temporarily replaced by an additional Ghanaian battalion, had begun rejoining the Force as of 1 June 1981. As of 15 February, Lieutenant-General William Callaghan of Ireland had succeeded Major-General Emmanuel Alexander Erskine of Ghana as Commander of UNIFIL.

During the period under review, there had been heavy and frequent exchanges of fire across the UNIFIL area between the *de facto* forces to the south, supported and supplied by Israel, and armed elements to the north, mainly PLO and the Lebanese National Movement. UNIFIL positions and personnel had come under close fire by the armed elements in 42 incidents. During the reporting period, eight UNIFIL members had been killed as a result of hostile actions, raising the total of such deaths to 31 since the Force's establishment in 1978. Armed elements had tried to infiltrate the UNIFIL area and relocate some of their positions in the area. The *de facto* forces had continued to resist further UNIFIL deployment in the enclave held by them. Restrictions on freedom of movement of UNIFIL and UNTSO personnel in the enclave had also continued to complicate UNIFIL operations.

Activities of the Israel Defence Forces in and near the UNIFIL area had increased. Israeli mili-

tary forces had repeatedly violated Lebanese airspace and territorial waters, and had launched many attacks against targets in Lebanon outside the UNIFIL area.

The Secretary-General stated that, despite many difficulties, UNIFIL had continued in its endeavours to consolidate its position and, in co-operation with the Lebanese Government, to strengthen and make more effective the Lebanese presence, both civilian and military, in its area of operation. The strength of the Lebanese army in the south had increased during the period by more than 700 and currently stood at 1,350.

He declared that, although the Force had not been able to fulfil its mandate, he had no doubt that its presence and activities in southern Lebanon were an indispensable element in maintaining peace in the area and the Middle East as a whole. It would be disastrous if UNIFIL were to be removed at a time of tension and conflicts in the area. He therefore recommended that the UNIFIL mandate be extended for another six months, and renewed his appeal to all concerned to co-operate with UNIFIL, strictly observe the cease-fire and avoid actions leading to violence.

Annexed to the report was a letter dated 16 June, by which Lebanon asked that the renewal of the mandate should accent the interim character of the Force by creating objective conditions for its success, within an immediate time-frame and according to a phased programme of action.

On 19 June,<sup>(63)</sup> the Security Council renewed the mandate of UNIFIL for six months, until 19 December. The resolution containing this decision, drawn up in consultations among the Council members, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (German Democratic Republic, USSR), with one member (China) not participating in the vote.

By this resolution, the Council also reaffirmed its call for strict respect for Lebanon's political independence, unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity. It condemned actions that had prevented the full implementation of the UNIFIL mandate. Expressing support for rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts by the Lebanese Government in southern Lebanon and its deployment of Lebanese army contingents in the UNIFIL area, the Council requested the Secretary-General to assist Lebanon in establishing a joint phased programme aimed at the total implementation of the 1978 resolution defining the UNIFIL mandate.<sup>(61)</sup> It reaffirmed its determination to examine practical ways to secure the unconditional fulfilment of the mandate.

Speaking after the vote, the Secretary-General informed the Council that two UNIFIL soldiers from Fiji had been killed on 19 June in an inci-

dent in which armed elements had tried to infiltrate into the UNIFIL area. He added that recent developments and the accompanying tension had underlined the importance of UNIFIL as a conflict control mechanism.

Before adopting the resolution, the Council invited Israel and Lebanon, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion.

Lebanon, while expressing gratitude for the presence of UNIFIL, cautioned that the Force might be in danger of becoming a static fixture in an escalating war of attrition. It stressed the importance of the Council's renewed call, first voiced in 1979,<sup>(62)</sup> for a phased programme of activities to be carried out jointly by the Force and the Lebanese Government. Substantial advances had been made in that regard, including improved freedom of movement and observation for the Force, and the operation of Lebanese army contingents under UNIFIL command.

Israel stated that its position with regard to Lebanon was well known. As to the deaths of the two Fijian soldiers, they, like the bulk of UNIFIL soldiers killed in the line of duty, had lost their lives through the activities of PLO. If the Council reacted with a resolution or presidential statement, that would be a departure from past practice, as it had expressed itself on killings of UNIFIL soldiers only when PLO involvement was not suspected.

France appealed for observance of the cease-fire and for the dismantling of positions set up in the UNIFIL area by other parties, and endorsed efforts by the Secretary-General to reactivate the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission (ILMAC). Ireland supported the efforts of UNIFIL, in conjunction with the Government of Lebanon, to strengthen and make more effective the Lebanese presence, civilian and military, in the UNIFIL area, as a step towards the return of full Lebanese sovereignty.

Japan saw the need for all parties to refrain from the use of force, hoped particularly that Israel would heed international opinion and act responsibly, and stated that terrorist actions must not be condoned as a means of settling international disputes. The United States reiterated its support for UNIFIL and for the determined efforts of Lebanon to continue to work for the reassertion of its full authority within its national borders.

Tunisia urged the unconditional withdrawal of Israel from Lebanon, stating that its assistance to the de facto forces rebelling against the legal authorities in Lebanon maintained a state of tension.

The German Democratic Republic said it had abstained in the voting because of reservations about the mandate, composition and financing

of UNIFIL; the resolution did not contain any resolute measures to put an end to the aggressive actions of Israel and the bands of Major Saad Haddad (the de facto forces).

The USSR stressed the need for urgent measures to prevent Israel from pursuing its aggressive and expansionist policy towards Lebanon and to ensure the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from southern Lebanon, and emphasized that all expenditures involved in eliminating the consequences of Israel's armed aggression should be borne by the aggressor.

By a letter dated 23 June,<sup>(46)</sup> Fiji transmitted a statement by its Prime Minister declaring that his Government deeply deplored and condemned the actions of armed elements which had resulted in the killing of the two Fijian soldiers.

On 25 June, following consultations among the Council members, the President of the Council issued the following statement on the deaths of the two UNIFIL soldiers:<sup>(53)</sup>

"At the end of the 2289th meeting of the Council, I made a statement to note the deep sorrow shared by all members of the Council over the loss of two United Nations soldiers in Lebanon, as well as all those others who have fallen in fulfilment of their duty in the cause of peace.

I also said that I was certain that I spoke on behalf of the Council when I conveyed our condolences to the Government and people of Fiji as well as to the families of the victims.

As President of the Council, I wish to condemn the killing on 19 June 1981 by so-called armed elements of two Fijian peace-keeping soldiers of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon.

This outrage against members of a peace-keeping force is a direct defiance of the authority of the Council and a challenge to the mission of the Force, as stipulated in resolution 425(1978).

In this connection, I am encouraged to learn that a group has already been established to investigate these events and that in the mean time appropriate steps are being taken by all concerned, in co-operation with the command of the Force, to prevent a recurrence of such incidents.

I also commend the valiant action and the courage, under the most adverse circumstances, of the soldiers of the Force and express full support for their efforts."

**FURTHER COMMUNICATIONS (JULY).** By a letter dated 13 July,<sup>(31)</sup> Lebanon protested the continued Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the numerous civilian casualties and the destruction of property caused by several air attacks conducted on 10 and 12 July.

Israel, by letters of 15 July<sup>(15)</sup> and 16 July,<sup>(16,17)</sup> stated that three civilians had been killed and 33 wounded in rocket attacks against northern Israel on 10, 15 and 16 July, carried out by PLO terrorists operating from Lebanon.

Considerable property damage was reported in the towns of Qiryat Shemona and Nahariya.

On 17 July<sup>(36)</sup> and 20 July,<sup>(39)</sup> Tunisia transmitted to the Secretary-General six PLO letters complaining about a series of Israeli air strikes and coastal shelling against Palestine refugee camps and Lebanese villages which had resulted in many civilian deaths and injuries, as well as material destruction and damage. The letters cited preliminary figures of 87 killed and 479 wounded in a raid against west Beirut on 17 July, and at least 50 killed in earlier attacks on Sidon.

By letters of 19 July,<sup>(18)</sup> 20 July,<sup>(19,20)</sup> 21 July,<sup>(21,22)</sup> 22 July,<sup>(23,24,25)</sup> 23 July<sup>(26)</sup> and 24 July, Israel submitted further complaints of indiscriminate shelling of towns and villages along its northern border by PLO elements operating from Lebanese territory, resulting in six deaths and 59 persons wounded, as well as property damage, since the shellings began on 15 July. Israel reported a steady build-up of arms in PLO hands and a widening of the organization's operational infrastructure in Lebanon.

Cuba, as Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, transmitted on 24 July<sup>(6)</sup> a communiqué of an emergency meeting of the Movement's Co-ordinating Bureau held on 21 July, demanding the immediate cessation of all Israeli acts of aggression and military operations against Lebanon and the Palestinian people, and calling on the Security Council to consider mandatory sanctions against Israel.

Bangladesh, on 21 July,<sup>(44)</sup> transmitted a message from its Minister for Foreign Affairs describing the Israeli attacks as a serious threat to global peace and security, and urging the Secretary-General to use his good offices to prevent any further Israeli armed attacks on Lebanon. Qatar, on 22 July,<sup>(49)</sup> and Afghanistan, in a note verbale of 24 July,<sup>(42)</sup> also condemned the air raids. Afghanistan, in a government declaration, stated that they had been carried out with United States encouragement and demanded the imposition of international sanctions against Israel, while Qatar urged immediate international measures to halt Israeli aggression and renewed its call on the Arab nation to mobilize all its potential to confront the attack and those behind it.

**SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION (JULY).** On 21 July, the Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution<sup>(64)</sup> sponsored by Ireland, Japan and Spain, by which it called for an immediate cessation of all armed attacks and reaffirmed its commitment to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. The Council requested the Secretary-General to report within

48 hours on implementation of the resolution. It reaffirmed an appeal made by the Council's President and members on 17 July for an immediate end to all armed attacks and for the greatest restraint so that peace and quiet might be established in Lebanon and a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Spain, introducing the resolution, said it was aimed at an immediate cessation of hostilities, without interfering with broader efforts by other delegations.

The action was taken at the second of two meetings, on 17 and 21 July, held at the request of Lebanon. The request for an urgent meeting on the deteriorating situation in southern Lebanon and the Israeli attacks against civilian targets in Beirut was made in a letter of 17 July.<sup>(32)</sup>

During the Council's consideration of this matter, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Mauritania, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen were invited, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion.

On 17 July, the Council decided that an invitation should be accorded to a PLO representative to participate in the debate and that the invitation would confer on it the same rights of participation as those conferred on a Member State invited to participate under rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.<sup>c</sup> The Council took this decision by a vote, requested by the United States, of 11 to 1 (United States), with 3 abstentions (France, Japan, United Kingdom). The proposal to invite the PLO representative was made by Tunisia in a letter of 17 July.<sup>(37)</sup>

The Council also extended an invitation under rule 39<sup>d</sup> to the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, as proposed by Tunisia in a letter of the same date.<sup>(38)</sup>

At each of the two Council meetings, the Secretary-General made a statement on developments in southern Lebanon. On 17 July, he said that on 10 July the Israeli air force had attacked targets in southern Lebanon and, the same evening, Palestinian elements had fired artillery and rockets into northern Israel. Since then, there had been exchanges of shelling involving the Israel Defence Forces and the *de facto* forces, on the one hand, and armed elements, mainly Palestinians, on the other. He expressed deep concern at the heavy escalation of violence and, in particular, at the bombing of population centres, and he appealed to all concerned to return immediately to the cease-fire.

On 21 July, the Secretary-General said PLO had agreed to a cease-fire proposal by the UNIFIL Commander provided the other side accepted. Efforts were continuing to secure a similar commitment from the Israeli authorities.

Meanwhile, shelling from both sides was continuing.

In the debate, Lebanon blamed Israel for the cycle of violence which had resulted in the killing of 300 people and the wounding of 800, among them a large number of women and children, as well as severe property damage. Israel, it said, was trying to destabilize Lebanon and could undermine the whole peace-keeping effort. Lebanon was being turned, against its will, into an arena for a fifth Arab-Israeli war. Lebanon called on the Council to pronounce itself on the necessity of reactivating ILMAC and said it would like the Council to support UNIFIL morally and politically, enabling it to implement its mandate to restore the authority and sovereignty of the Lebanese Government throughout its territory.

Israel attributed the tension in the area to PLO domination over large parts of Lebanon and said hundreds of people, Israelis and others, had been murdered in PLO atrocities in recent years, without incurring United Nations condemnation. PLO had engaged in a massive arms build-up, with weapons supplied by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Syrian Arab Republic and the USSR. Israel's response to PLO terror was what any self-respecting sovereign State would do in similar circumstances. While supporting the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries, Israel expected that Lebanese territory would not be permitted to serve as a launching pad for murderous attacks against Israeli citizens.

France said it was most urgent for the Council unambiguously to speak out in favour of an immediate cease-fire, respected by all parties. France condemned any resort to so-called pre-emptive actions that could not be justified by any interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter (on self-defence), a view shared by several other speakers, including Egypt, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Kingdom.

Tunisia said the attacks against Lebanon hardly left any hope that Israel would abide by any Security Council measure unless it was accompanied by sanctions. The call for sanctions was supported by Democratic Yemen, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen, as well as by the League of Arab States; the Syrian Arab Republic considered that Israel's expulsion from the United Nations was required. The need for decisive measures was also underscored by the German Democratic Republic and Jordan.

China urged the Council to condemn Israel

<sup>c</sup> See footnote a on p. 277.

<sup>d</sup> See footnote b on p. 277.

and take effective measures to put an end to Israeli aggression against Lebanon. Egypt considered it to be the Council's responsibility to adopt adequate measures and enforce its decision, and to reinforce and widen the peace-keeping functions of UNIFIL, in order to ensure full respect for Lebanese sovereignty. The USSR said the latest Israeli actions in Lebanon constituted a new stage in Israel's policy, encouraged by the United States, of international terrorism against the Arab States; the Council should strongly condemn Israel for those acts of aggression and demand that it halt them and not commit any similar acts.

The German Democratic Republic stated that the supply of highly sophisticated weapons by the United States encouraged Israel to continue its terror raids.

Jordan maintained that the Israeli attacks were a continuation of 11 years of aggression against the Lebanese people and their Palestine refugee guests, whose only wish was to return to their homeland in occupied Palestine; the United States, which had officially sanctioned Israeli aggression against Lebanon, bore moral responsibility towards the victims of the barbarous raids. The Syrian Arab Republic also regarded the United States as responsible for the Israeli aggression.

The United Kingdom criticized PLO violence but believed that the scale of Israeli actions and the resulting deaths, particularly the civilian casualties, could in no way be justified.

The PLO representative gave a detailed account of the Israeli air raids in southern Lebanon, held the United States to be criminally responsible, and appealed to the Council to use its authority and the Charter of the United Nations to bring peace to the Middle East and enable the Palestinians to return home; otherwise, they would have to force their way back.

In pursuance of the Council resolution, the Secretary-General reported on 23 July<sup>(57)</sup> that he had instructed the UNIFIL Commander and the UNTSO Chief of Staff to exert all possible efforts to ensure an immediate cessation of all armed attacks. PLO had stated that it had given approval for a cease-fire but, despite constant contacts with the parties, it had not been possible to achieve an immediate cessation of hostilities. However, there had been a measure of de-escalation of violence, which he hoped would soon lead to a complete cessation of armed attacks. The Government of Lebanon had expressed the opinion that he should continue his efforts, which he intended to do.

In an addendum to this report issued on 24 July, the Secretary-General informed the Council that he had received from the United States a

statement made in Jerusalem the same day by Philip Habib, Personal Representative of the United States President, that all hostile military action between Lebanese and Israeli territory in either direction would cease as of 1330 hours (local time). Israel had endorsed that statement, Lebanon had welcomed it and PLO had said it would respect the Council resolution. The UNIFIL Commander had reported that as of 1320 hours the area was quiet.

COMMUNICATIONS (SEPTEMBER-DECEMBER). By a letter of 17 September to the Secretary-General,<sup>(3)</sup> the Chairman of the Committee on Palestinian rights transmitted the report of a delegation of the Committee (Pakistan, Senegal, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR) which had visited Lebanon from 24 to 26 August at the invitation of Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, to see the damage done by the Israeli attacks in July. The delegation reported that the extensive damage, as far as could be seen, was entirely confined to civilian targets and appeared to be aimed at terrorizing the civilian population. Cuba, by a letter of 14 September,<sup>(7)</sup> transmitted the report of a mission of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on a visit to Lebanon from 20 to 23 August, stating that there had been indiscriminate slaughter of civilians, revealing the Israeli intention to exterminate the Palestinian people.

By a letter of 6 October to the Secretary-General,<sup>(4)</sup> the Chairman of the Committee on Palestinian rights expressed concern over a series of bomb attacks against Palestinians based in Lebanon, especially an explosion which reportedly had killed at least 50 people and wounded more than 250 near the PLO offices in Beirut.

Lebanon, by a letter of 3 December,<sup>(33)</sup> transmitted a resolution on Lebanon adopted on 25 November at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference in Fez, Morocco, by which the Conference resolved to elaborate a comprehensive Arab strategy to prevent and counter Israeli aggression, to support the Lebanese Government's efforts to deploy its army in the south, to assist Lebanon in restoring its civil and military institutions, and to provide financial assistance for reconstruction.

By a letter of 21 December to the Council President,<sup>(41)</sup> Tunisia transmitted a PLO letter charging Israel with moving army units into the areas of Al Bayyadah, Marjayoun and Shabaa.

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION (DECEMBER). As the mandate of UNIFIL was due to expire on 19 December, the Secretary-General, on 11 December, submitted a report<sup>(58)</sup> on the activities of the Force for the period from 16 June to 10 December, in which he noted that the situation in

southern Lebanon remained precarious and fundamentally unstable. The Force had made strenuous efforts to maintain the cease-fire of 24 July, and an unusual degree of calm had prevailed in its area of operation.

Armed elements had continued attempts to infiltrate personnel and weapons into the UNIFIL area and to strengthen their positions. No progress had been made in deploying UNIFIL further in the enclave controlled by the *de facto* forces. Restrictions on freedom of movement of UNIFIL and UNTSO personnel in the enclave continued to complicate UNIFIL operations. Israeli forces continued to be active in and near the UNIFIL area, particularly during the July hostilities. Violations by the Israeli army of Lebanese airspace and territorial waters continued.

During the period under review, two members of the Force lost their lives and seven were injured as a result of hostile actions. This raised to 70 the number of lives lost since the Force's inception, 33 of them as a result of firing and mine explosions. The number of UNIFIL personnel remained at 6,000, and there were 85 military observers from UNTSO.

The Secretary-General further reported that, in order to consolidate the cease-fire and achieve progress in the fulfilment of the UNIFIL mandate, talks had been regularly conducted both at United Nations Headquarters and in the area. PLO had reiterated assurance of its co-operation with UNIFIL in the maintenance of the cease-fire.

In spite of all the difficulties faced by UNIFIL, the Secretary-General considered that its presence and activities in southern Lebanon were an indispensable element in maintaining peace in the immediate area and the Middle East as a whole. Therefore he recommended that the mandate of the Force be extended for another six months.

By a letter of 14 December to the Secretary-General,<sup>(34)</sup> Lebanon, while agreeing in principle to a further renewal of the mandate, reiterated its position that the Security Council had to enable the Force to implement its mandate within an immediate time-frame. To that end, Lebanon requested that the Council call for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the border area where UNIFIL had not been allowed to deploy, for the reactivation of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Lebanon, and for an increase in the strength of the Force by no less than 1,000 troops. It asked for clear support from the Council for the phased programme of activities intended to assist the Lebanese Government in ensuring the return of its effective authority.

The Security Council, on 18 December,<sup>(65)</sup> renewed the UNIFIL mandate for another six

months, until 19 June 1982. It reaffirmed past resolutions, particularly its repeated calls for strict respect of Lebanon's political independence, unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity. It reiterated its determination to implement the UNIFIL mandate in the totality of its area of operation up to the internationally recognized boundaries. The Council called on all concerned to work towards the consolidation of the July cease-fire and expressed support for the Lebanese Government's rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts in southern Lebanon. Finally, it requested the Secretary-General to continue discussions with the Lebanese Government, with a view to establishing a joint phased programme of activities for the total implementation of the UNIFIL mandate.

The resolution, prepared in consultations among Council members, was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (German Democratic Republic, USSR).

Speaking after the vote, the Secretary-General said UNIFIL would continue to exert all possible efforts to carry out its task; he hoped Council members would use their influence so that the parties would heed the Council.

At their request, Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic were invited to participate without vote in the debate. At Tunisia's request, conveyed in a letter of 18 December,<sup>(40)</sup> an invitation under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure<sup>c</sup> was extended to the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States.

Israel stated that as long as non-Lebanese elements—25,000 Syrian troops and over 15,000 PLO terrorists—were allowed to operate within and from Lebanon, no real progress would be achieved towards the return of the Lebanese Government's authority over its territory. The completion of Israel's withdrawal had been confirmed by the UNIFIL Commander on 13 June 1978,<sup>(66)</sup> but peace and security had not been restored in Lebanon because of the continuing presence of the Syrian occupation army and the massive presence of PLO terrorists. Israel continued to support Lebanon's independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity within its internationally recognized boundaries. The restoration of peace in Lebanon and the solution of its problems did not have to be contingent on the attainment of an overall solution to the Arab-Israel conflict.

Lebanon considered the resolution a satisfactory compromise although, together with Tunisia, it had suggested a different draft. However, it deplored the fact that the Council had not

<sup>c</sup> See footnote b on p. 277.

responded fully to its request to strengthen UNIFIL. Moreover, Israel had not withdrawn from Lebanese territory and the Council should examine ways to assure such withdrawal. Lebanon added that there was hope also in the fact that China had found it possible for the first time to vote on a resolution renewing the mandate of the Force.

The German Democratic Republic, observing that the resolution did not contain any vigorous steps to end Israel's aggressive actions and the actions of the Haddad bands against Lebanon and the Palestinians, reiterated its reservations on the mandate, composition and financing of the Force. Voicing similar reservations, the USSR said the Council should have focused on protecting Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and should have taken vigorous and effective steps to counter Israel's aggressive designs towards Lebanon and to secure the full withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Lebanese territory.

Kuwait, speaking on behalf of the Arab Group, said Israel's friends, notably the United States, should contribute towards stabilizing the area by pressuring Israel to stop its exploitation of a dangerous and explosive situation in Lebanon. The Arab League representative said his organization was committed to the diplomatic United Nations option for resolving the Middle East crises pertaining to Lebanon.

The Syrian Arab Republic said the duty of the Arab Defence Force in Lebanon was to stop a civil war, prevent the partition of the country into mini-States and enable the Lebanese people to determine its own destiny without external interference; the Syrian Arab Republic would never relinquish its duty to defend Lebanon's unity and peace.

France appealed to all parties to continue to respect the cease-fire, to refrain from any action liable to lead to violent reactions and to make a resolute effort to allow consolidation of the UNIFIL area; it favoured the earliest possible resumption of ILMAC and welcomed the ideas of strengthening the means and objectives of UNIFIL, as advocated by the Lebanese Government. In Ireland's view, UNIFIL had achieved considerable success but a peace-keeping force was not a substitute for an effort to negotiate a settlement. In the view of the United States, the existence of UNIFIL, with all its imperfections, had helped materially to reduce dangerous confrontations; the United States pledged to help towards the restoration of the Lebanese Government's authority in the south.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In its resolution of 28 October on the right of peoples to self-determination,<sup>(59)</sup> as well as in a resolution on

the Middle East situation adopted on 17 December,<sup>(60)</sup> the General Assembly strongly condemned the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the continuous bombardment and destruction of cities and villages, and all acts that violated Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and the security of its people and that prevented implementation of the Security Council's 1978 resolution establishing UNIFIL.<sup>(61)</sup>

The original draft of the resolution on self-determination, as submitted by Angola on behalf of the African Group, would have had the Assembly condemn Israel's expansionist activities, such as the constant violations of Lebanon's territorial integrity and the continuous bombing of civilian, particularly Palestinian, populations and the destruction of their villages and encampments, as a serious obstacle to Palestinian self-determination and independence. Lebanon proposed an amendment<sup>(1)</sup> to replace this paragraph by one condemning the expansion of Israeli activities, particularly the constant violation of Lebanon's territorial integrity and the continuous bombing of civilians in south Lebanon and Beirut, and generally the non-implementation of resolutions condemning violence against Lebanon. Lebanon withdrew its amendment after the sponsors revised their text to insert the wording on Lebanon paraphrased in the preceding paragraph, and to place in a separate paragraph the phrase in their original draft whereby the Assembly condemned Israel's expansionist activities and the continuous bombing of Palestinian civilians as a serious obstacle to Palestinian self-determination and independence.

Speaking before the vote in the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, Israel said it would vote against the resolution, since it distorted the facts by failing to mention the underlying causes of the Lebanon situation, including the Syrian occupation and the more than 100,000 civilian deaths which had resulted.

Amendment withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Lebanon, A/C.3/36/L.17.

Letters and notes verbales (nv):

Committee on Palestinian rights Chairman: <sup>(2)</sup>8 May, A/36/237-S/14477; <sup>(3)</sup>17 Sep., A/36/521-S/14698;

<sup>(4)</sup>6 Oct., A/36/578-S/14719.

Cuba: <sup>(5)</sup>5 June, A/36/311-S/14508, transmitting communiqué of non-aligned countries (nv); <sup>(6)</sup>24 July, transmitting communiqué of non-aligned countries, S/14618; <sup>(7)</sup>14 Sep., A/36/547-S/14704.

Democratic Yemen: <sup>(8)</sup>10 Apr., S/14435; <sup>(9)</sup>21 Apr., A/36/217.

Israel: <sup>(10)</sup>2 Feb., A/36/88-S/14355; <sup>(11)</sup>8 Mar., S/14394 (9 Mar., A/36/122); <sup>(12)</sup>10 Mar., S/14398 (11 Mar., A/36/130); <sup>(13)</sup>17 Apr., A/36/212-S/14449; <sup>(14)</sup>21 Apr., S/14454 (22 Apr., A/36/219); <sup>(15)</sup>15 July, S/14591; <sup>(16)</sup>16 July, S/14594; <sup>(17)</sup>16 July, A/36/387; <sup>(18)</sup>19 July, S/14600; <sup>(19)</sup>20 July, S/14602; <sup>(20)</sup>20 July, S/14603; <sup>(21)</sup>21 July, A/36/393; <sup>(22)</sup>21 July, A/36/394; <sup>(23)</sup>22 July, A/36/400; <sup>(24)</sup>22 July, S/14605; <sup>(25)</sup>22 July,



S/14606; <sup>(26)</sup>23 July, A/36/401; <sup>(27)</sup>24 July, A/36/404 (S/14617).

Lebanon: <sup>(28)</sup>30 Jan., A/36/87 (S/14354); <sup>(29)</sup>24 Feb., A/36/109 (S/14381); <sup>(30)</sup>3 Mar., S/14391; <sup>(31)</sup>13 July, A/36/375 (S/14586); <sup>(32)</sup>17 July, S/14596; <sup>(33)</sup>3 Dec., A/36/767 (S/14779); <sup>(34)</sup>14 Dec., S/14792.

Tunisia: <sup>(35)</sup>28 Apr., S/14470. <sup>(36)</sup>17 July, A/36/389-S/14601; <sup>(37)</sup>17 July, S/14597; <sup>(38)</sup>17 July, S/14598; <sup>(39)</sup>20 July, A/36/395-S/14609; <sup>(40)</sup>18 Dec., S/14804; <sup>(41)</sup>21 Dec., S/14811.

Others: <sup>(42)</sup>Afghanistan: 24 July, A/36/405-S/14620 (nv); <sup>(43)</sup>Argentina: 16 Apr., A/36/210-S/14447;

<sup>(44)</sup>Bangladesh: 21 July, A/36/398-S/14614; <sup>(45)</sup>Egypt:

17 Apr., A/36/213-S/14450 & Corr.1; <sup>(46)</sup>Fiji: 23 June, S/14568; <sup>(47)</sup>Japan: 9 Apr., A/36/184-S/14436 (nv);

<sup>(48)</sup>Netherlands: 25 Mar., S/14421; <sup>(49)</sup>Qatar: 22 July,

S/14612; <sup>(50)</sup>Uruguay: 1 May, A/36/231-S/14472;

<sup>(51)</sup>Yemen: 5 June, A/36/310-S/14507.

Notes: SC President, <sup>(52)</sup>S/14414, <sup>(53)</sup>S/14572, <sup>(54)</sup>S/14599.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(55)</sup>S/14407, <sup>(56)</sup>S/14537, <sup>(57)</sup>S/14613 & Corr.1 & Add.1, <sup>(58)</sup>S/14789 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(59)</sup>36/9, para. 19, 28 Oct. (p. 896);

<sup>(60)</sup>36/226 A, paras. 9 & 10, 17 Dec. (p. 263). SC:

<sup>(61)</sup>425(1978), 19 Mar. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 312);

<sup>(62)</sup>444(1979), 19 Jan. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 338);

<sup>(63)</sup>488(1981), 19 June 1981, text following; <sup>(64)</sup>490

(1981), 21 July, text following; <sup>(65)</sup>498(1981), 18 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(66)</sup>1978, p. 305.

Meeting records: SC: S/PV.2265, 2266 (9, 19 Mar.); S/PV.2289, 2292, 2293 (19 June & 17, 21 July); S/PV.2320 (18 Dec.).

#### Security Council resolution 488(1981)

12-0-2 Meeting 2289 19 June 1981

Draft prepared in consultations among Council members (S/14557).

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 425(1978), 426(1978), 427(1978), 434(1978), 444(1979), 450(1979), 459(1979), 467(1980), 474(1980) and 483(1980),

Recalling the statement made by the President of the Security Council at the 2266th meeting, on 19 March 1981.

Noting with concern the violations of the relevant Security Council resolutions which had prompted the Government of Lebanon repeatedly to ask the Council for action, and particularly its complaint of 3 March 1981,

Recalling the terms of reference and general guidelines Of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, as stated in the report of the Secretary-General of 19 March 1978 confirmed by resolution 426(1978), and particularly:

(a) That the Force "must be able to function as an integrated and efficient military unit",

(b) That the Force "must enjoy the freedom of movement and communication and other facilities that are necessary for the performance of its tasks",

(c) That the Force "will not use force except in self-defence",

(d) That "self-defence would include resistance to attempts by forceful means to prevent it from discharging its duties under the mandate of the Security Council",

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 16 June 1981, and taking note of the conclusions and recommendations expressed therein,

Convinced that the deterioration of the present situation has serious consequences for international security in the Middle East and impedes the achievement of a just, comprehensive and durable peace in the area,

1. Reaffirms its repeated call upon all concerned for the strict respect for the political independence, unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and reiterates the Council's determination to implement resolution 425(1978) and

the ensuing resolutions in the totality of the area of operation assigned to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon up to the internationally recognised boundaries;

2. Condemns all actions contrary to the provisions of the above-mentioned resolutions that have prevented the full implementation of the mandate of the Force, causing death, injury and destruction to the civilian population as well as among the peace-keeping force;

3. Supports the efforts of the Government of Lebanon in the civilian and military fields of rehabilitation and reconstruction in southern Lebanon, and supports, in particular, the deployment of substantial contingents of the Lebanese army in the area of operation of the Force;

4. Decides to renew the mandate of the Force for another period of six months, that is, until 19 December 1981;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to assist the Government of Lebanon in establishing a joint phased programme of activities to be carried out during the present mandate of the Force, aimed at the total implementation of resolution 425(1978), and to report periodically to the Security Council;

6. Commends the efforts of the Secretary-General and the performance of the Force, as well as the support of the troop-contributing Governments and of all Member States who have assisted the Secretary-General, his staff and the Force in discharging their responsibilities under the mandate;

7. Decides to remain seized of the question and reaffirms its determination, in the event of continuing obstruction of the mandate of the Force, to examine practical ways and means to secure its unconditional fulfilment.

Vote in Council as follows:

In favour: France, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States.

Against: None.

Abstaining: German Democratic Republic, USSR.

China did not participate in the vote.

#### Security Council resolution 490(1981)

Adopted unanimously Meeting 2293 21 July 1981

3-nation draft (S/14604).

Sponsors: Ireland, Japan, Spain.

The Security Council,

Reaffirming the urgent appeal made by the President and the members of the Security Council on 17 July 1981, which reads as follows:

"The President of the Security Council and the members of the Council, after hearing the report of the Secretary-General, express their deep concern at the extent of the loss of life and the scale of the destruction caused by the deplorable events that have been taking place for several days in Lebanon.

"They launch an urgent appeal for an immediate end to all armed attacks and for the greatest restraint so that peace and quiet may be established in Lebanon and a just and lasting peace in the Middle East as a whole."

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General in this respect,

1. Calls for an immediate cessation of all armed attacks;

2. Reaffirms its commitment to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to report back to the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution as soon as possible and not later than forty-eight hours from its adoption.

#### Security Council resolution 498(1981)

13-0-2 Meeting 2320 18 December 1981

Draft prepared in consultations among Council members (S/14803).

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 425(1978), 426(1978), 427(1978), 434(1978), 444(1979), 450(1979), 459(1979),

467(1980), 474(1980), 483(1980), 488(1981) and 490 (1981).

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force In Lebanon of 11 December 1981, and taking note of the conclusions and recommendations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the Secretary-General dated 14 December 1981,

Convinced that the deterioration of the present situation has serious consequences for peace and security in the Middle East.

1. Reaffirms its resolution 425(1978), in which it:

(a) Calls for strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

(b) Calls upon Israel immediately to cease its military action against Lebanese territorial integrity and withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory;

(c) Decides, in the light of the request of the Government of Lebanon, to establish immediately under its authority a United Nations interim force for southern Lebanon for the purpose of confirming the withdrawal of Israeli forces, restoring international peace and security and assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area, the force to be composed of personnel drawn from Member States;

2. Reaffirms its past resolutions and particularly its repeated calls upon all concerned for the strict respect of the political independence, unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon;

3. Reiterates its determination to implement resolution 425(1978) in the totality of the area of operation assigned to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon up to the internationally recognized boundaries so that the Force may fulfil its deployment and so that the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization may resume its normal functions, unhindered, under the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement of 1949;

4. Calls upon all concerned to work towards the consolidation of the cease-fire called for by the Security Council in resolution 490(1981) and reiterates its condemnation of all actions contrary to the provisions of the relevant resolutions;

5. Calls attention to the terms of reference and general guidelines of the Force, as stated in the report of the Secretary-General of 19 March 1978 confirmed by resolution 426(1978), and particularly:

(a) That the Force "must be able to function as an integrated and efficient military unit";

(b) That the Force "must enjoy the freedom of movement and communication and other facilities that are necessary for the performance of its tasks";

(c) That the Force "will not use force except in self-defence";

(d) That "self-defence would include resistance to attempts by forceful means to prevent it from discharging its duties under the mandate of the Security Council";

6. Supports the efforts of the Government of Lebanon in the civilian and military fields of rehabilitation and reconstruction in southern Lebanon, and supports, in particular, the restoration of the authority of the Government of Lebanon in that region and deployment of substantial contingents of the Lebanese army in the area of operation of the Force;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to continue his discussions with the Government of Lebanon, with a view to establishing a joint phased programme of activities to be carried out during the present mandate of the Force, aimed at the total implementation of resolution 425(1978), and to report periodically to the Security Council;

8. Decides to renew the mandate of the Force for six months, that is, until 19 June 1982;

9. Commends the efforts of the Secretary-General and the performance of the Force, as well as the support of the troop-contributing Governments, and of all Member States

who have assisted the Secretary-General, his staff and the Force in discharging their responsibilities under the mandate;

10. Decides to remain seized of the question and to review, within two months, the situation as a whole in the light of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the Secretary-General dated 14 December 1981.

Vote in Council as follows:

In favour: China, France, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States.

Against: None.

Abstaining: German Democratic Republic, USSR.

## Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic

The United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) continued in 1981 to supervise the observance of the cease-fire between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic and to ensure, in accordance with its mandate, that there were no military forces in the area of separation. The mandate of the Force was renewed twice by the Security Council, each time for six months.

Both the General Assembly and the Council adopted resolutions dealing with the situation in the Golan Heights occupied by Israel and Israel's decision to apply Israeli law to that territory (p. 307).

REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. Towards the end of each of the six-month UNDOF mandates, the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report in which he recommended the extension of the mandate for a further six months.

The first report, dated 20 May,<sup>(3)</sup> gave an account of the Force's activities since 21 November 1980. The Secretary-General observed that UNDOF had continued to supervise the observance of the cease-fire in the area of separation between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic and the areas of limitation of armaments and forces, in accordance with the terms of the 1974 Agreement on Disengagement between Israeli and Syrian Forces in the Golan Heights.<sup>(8)</sup> With the use of fixed observation posts and patrols the cease-fire had been maintained, no complaints having been lodged by either side in that regard. The Secretary-General noted, however, that restrictions on the contingents' freedom of movement still existed and efforts to correct that situation would continue.

As at 20 May, the strength of the Force was 1,279, with contingents drawn from Austria, Canada, Finland and Poland, and including 14 military observers from UNTSO. On 25 February, Major-General Erkki Raine Kaira of Finland, formerly Chief of Staff of UNTSO, succeeded Major-General Guenther G. Greindl of Austria as Commander of UNDOF.

The Secretary-General noted that, despite the prevailing quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the Middle East situation as a whole was likely to

remain dangerous without a comprehensive settlement. He expressed hope that determined efforts would be made by all concerned to arrive at a just and durable peace settlement.

He considered the continued presence of UNDOF to be essential and recommended that the Council extend its mandate for another six months. He added that the Governments concerned had agreed to the proposed extension.

With the UNDOF mandate due to expire on 30 November, the Secretary-General, on 20 November, submitted a report<sup>(4)</sup> on the activities of the Force for the period from 21 May to 20 November. He stated that UNDOF had continued, with the co-operation of the parties, to fulfil the tasks entrusted to it. The situation in the sector had remained quiet and there had been no serious incidents. The strength of the Force as at 20 November was 1,277, made up of contingents from Austria (527), Canada (219), Finland (393) and Poland (126), and with 12 United Nations military observers detailed from UNTSO.

The Secretary-General again observed that, despite the prevailing quiet in the sector, the overall situation in the Middle East remained potentially dangerous. He therefore considered the continued presence of UNDOF to be essential, recommended that its mandate be extended until 31 May 1982 and indicated that the Governments concerned had agreed.

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION. On 22 May<sup>(6)</sup> and 23 November,<sup>(7)</sup> the Security Council renewed the UNDOF mandate for another six months, until 30 November 1981 and 31 May 1982, respectively. Each time, the decision was taken, without debate, by 14 votes to none, with one member (China) not participating in the vote. The Council also called on all parties to implement immediately its 1973 resolution calling for a cease-fire and peace negotiations,<sup>(5)</sup> and requested the Secretary-General to report to it in six months.

After each vote, the President made almost identical statements on the Council's behalf,<sup>(1,2)</sup> as follows:

"As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph [26] [27], that 'despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached'. This statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council."

Notes: SC President, <sup>(1)</sup>S/14485, <sup>(2)</sup>S/14764.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(3)</sup>S/14482, <sup>(4)</sup>S/14759.

Resolutions: SC: <sup>(5)</sup>338(1973), 22 Oct. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 213); <sup>(6)</sup>485(1981), 22 May 1981, text following;

<sup>(7)</sup>493(1981), 23 Nov., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(8)</sup>1974, p. 198.

Meeting records: SC: S/PV.2278, 2311 (22 May, 23 Nov.).

Security Council resolution 485(1981)

140

Meeting 2278

22 May 1981

Draft (S/14484).

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

(a) To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately Security Council resolution 338(1973);

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1981;

(c) To request the Secretary-General to submit at the end of this period a report on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement resolution 338(1973).

vote in Council as follows:

In favour: France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Against: None.

China did not participate in the vote.

Security Council resolution 493(1981)

140

Meeting 2311

23 November 1981

Draft (S/14761).

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

(a) To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately Security Council resolution 338(1973);

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 1982;

(c) To request the Secretary-General to submit at the end of this period a report on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement resolution 338(1973).

Vote In Council as follows:

In favour: France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Against: None.

China did not participate in the vote.

## Financing of UN peace-keeping forces in the Middle East

The General Assembly in 1981 appropriated a total of \$177,099,248 for the two United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East. Of this sum, \$30,933,248 was for the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) in the Israel-Syria sector for the period 1 June 1981 to 31 May 1982 and \$146,166,000 was for the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) from 19 December 1980 to 18 December 1981. The dates corresponded to the varying mandates of the Forces as established by the Security Council. The Assembly also provided for financial authority to meet the expenses of UNDOF and UNIFIL for specified periods beyond these dates in the event the

Council decided to continue them beyond the expiry of the six-month mandates in effect when the Assembly acted.

In each case, the Assembly apportioned the expenses for the Forces among all Member States in accordance with the special scale used for this purpose since the establishment of the former United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) in 1973.<sup>(1)</sup> Under this arrangement, the permanent members of the Security Council were assessed more than under the scale of assessments for the United Nations regular budget, while most developing countries were assessed 80 per cent less and the least developed countries 90 per cent less than under the regular scale. According to the preambles of the appropriation resolutions, this arrangement took into account the fact that the economically more developed countries were in a position to make relatively larger contributions and that the economically less developed countries had a relatively limited capacity to contribute towards peace-keeping operations involving heavy expenditures.

In respect of both Forces, the Assembly decided that Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Zimbabwe, admitted to the United Nations in 1980, would be placed in the category of least developed States for assessment purposes.

The Assembly decided to suspend certain provisions of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations to enable the Organization to retain the surplus balances of \$2,694,446 for UNDOF and \$3,759,109 for UNFIL, instead of having to return these "book surpluses" to Member States as a credit against their subsequent assessments. The Assembly recognized that, because of the withholding of contributions by certain States, the surplus balances in the UNDOF and UNFIL Special Accounts had been fully drawn upon to supplement the income received from contributions for meeting the expenses of the Forces. Applying the rules, it added, would aggravate the already difficult financial situations of the Forces.

The Assembly acted on the basis of financial estimates submitted in reports of the Secretary-General and of recommendations by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ).

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 3101(XXVIII), 11 Dec. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 222).

#### UNDOF financing

The General Assembly made appropriations for UNDOF spanning the two six-month extensions of the Force's mandate approved by the Security Council in 1981—1 June to 30 November 1981<sup>(7)</sup> and 1 December 1981 to 31 May 1982.<sup>(8)</sup>

By a resolution of 30 November 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> appropriations were made in the amounts of \$14,959,248 gross \$14,801,748 net of staff assessment) for the six months from 1 June to 30 November 1981 and \$15,974,000 gross (\$15,785,000 net) for the period from 1 December 1981 to 31 May 1982. Also by this resolution, the Assembly authorized the Secretary-General to enter into financial commitments for UNDOF for the period from 1 June to 30 November 1982, should the Security Council decide to continue the Force beyond the existing mandate. It limited such commitments to the monthly rate of \$2,662,333 gross (\$2,630,833 net) corresponding to the expenditure rate of the six months ending 31 May 1982.

The resolution also contained provisions relating to the apportionment of expenses among Member States (see above).

The Assembly adopted the resolution by a recorded vote of 94 to 3, with 17 abstentions, following its approval in the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee on 25 November by a recorded vote of 72 to 2, with 17 abstentions.

In a second resolution of 30 November,<sup>(6)</sup> the Assembly acted to make additional funds available to UNDOF by suspending certain provisions of the Financial Regulations so as to enable the United Nations to retain the unspent portion of 1980 appropriations for UNDOF, amounting to \$2,694,446 as at 31 December 1980, which otherwise would have had to be surrendered as a credit against the subsequent assessments of Member States. The Assembly decided that this amount was to be entered in the account which it had created in 1978 when it took a similar action for the first time.<sup>(3)</sup>

This resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 91 to 16, with 8 abstentions, following approval by the Fifth Committee on 25 November by a recorded vote of 70 to 13, with 8 abstentions.

In a report of 23 October,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General gave cost estimates for the period from 1 December 1981 to 30 November 1982 totalling \$32,248,000, or \$2,687,333 gross (\$2,655,833 net) per month, assuming maintenance of the current average strength of 1,275 troops and continuance of UNDOF's existing responsibilities.

The Secretary-General reported a shortfall of approximately \$2.8 million in contributions to the Force for the period from 25 October 1979 to 30 November 1981 owing to non-payment by certain Member States. The shortfall of previous periods for UNDOF and for UNEF, until its liquidation in 1980, was estimated at \$58.9 million. This situation, the Secretary-General said, placed a heavy burden on the troop contributors, as reimbursements to them had not been made on time or in accordance with agreed rates.

The appropriation and authorization figures approved by the Assembly for the 12 months beginning 1 December 1981 were in accordance with an ACABQ recommendation<sup>(1)</sup> that the Secretary-General's estimate be reduced by \$300,000, to \$31,948,000 gross (\$31,570,000 net). The Committee did not recommend specific reductions for particular items, but felt that savings should result if attention was paid to economy and efficiency.

Introducing both resolutions in the Fifth Committee, Canada, on behalf of the eight sponsors (Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Norway, Sweden), explained that the formula proposed for financing UNDOF paralleled that approved by the Assembly in 1980.<sup>(4)</sup> Canada believed that all Member States had a responsibility to support UNDOF and viewed with continued concern the refusal by a number of countries to pay their assessed contributions.

Albania, Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic, which voted against the resolutions, reiterated their refusal to take part in the Force's financing; the Syrian Arab Republic added that Israel and its supporters should bear the whole cost. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which did not participate in the voting, took the same position, stating that the presence of peace-keeping forces in the Middle East had not contributed to a solution.

Democratic Yemen, which abstained, also refused financial responsibility, declaring that the Force was becoming permanent because of Israel's intransigent and expansionist policies, and that the aggressor should pay the costs of the aggression. Also abstaining in the Fifth Committee were Mauritania, which doubted whether the Force served any useful purpose, and Yemen, which said the resolution was an endorsement of occupation by force and the financing should be borne by the aggressor.

The USSR took exception to the \$2.3 million increase estimated for UNDOF expenditures over the previous year's level, stating that substantial savings should be possible under several headings where the increase was not tied to inflation, such as purchase and maintenance of equipment, supplies and services, and water and electricity.

Israel, Japan, Jordan, Morocco and Peru supported the resolutions. Israel described the renewal of the UNDOF mandate as an imperfect solution but better than any alternative. Jordan stated that the stationing of peace-keeping forces in the territories occupied by Israel was preferable to the presence of other troops, while Morocco stressed the temporary nature of the forces and urged the international community to work towards removing all traces of aggression in the Middle East. In Japan's view, effective measures would have to be introduced sooner or

later to ensure the payment of contributions withheld by certain States.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/704; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/600 & Corr.1. Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>33/13 E, 14 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 323); <sup>(4)</sup>35/45 A, 1 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 366); <sup>(5)</sup>36/66 A, 30 Nov. 1981, text following; <sup>(6)</sup>36/66 B, 30 Nov., text following. SC: <sup>(7)</sup>485(1981), 22 May (p. 294); <sup>(8)</sup>493(1981), 23 Nov. (p. 294).

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.54, 55 (25 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.77 (30 Nov.).

UNDOF assessment: 1 June 1981-31 May 1982, ST/ADM/SER.B/256.

General Assembly resolution 36/66 A

93-3-17 (recorded vote) Meeting 77 30 November 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/720) by recorded vote (72-2-17). 25 November (meeting 55); 8-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.15, part A), orally revised: agenda item 110 (a).

Sponsors: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Norway, Sweden.

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the financing of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, as well as the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

Bearing in mind Security Council resolutions 350(1974) of 31 May 1974, 363(1974) of 29 November 1974, 369(1975) of 28 May 1975, 381(1975) of 30 November 1975, 390(1976) of 28 May 1976, 398(1976) of 30 November 1976, 408(1977) of 26 May 1977, 420(1977) of 30 November 1977, 429(1978) of 31 May 1978, 441(1978) of 30 November 1978, 449(1979) of 30 May 1979, 456(1979) of 30 November 1979, 470(1980) of 30 May 1980, 481(1980) of 26 November 1980, 485(1981) of 22 May 1981 and 493(1981) of 23 November 1981,

Recalling its resolutions 3101(XXVIII) of 11 December 1973, 3211 B (XXIX) of 29 November 1974, 3374 C (XXX) of 2 December 1975, 31/5 D of 22 December 1976, 32/4 C of 2 December 1977, 33/13 D of 8 December 1978, 34/7 C of 3 December 1979, 35/44 of 1 December 1980 and 35/45 A of 1 December 1980,

Reaffirming its previous decisions regarding the fact that, in order to meet the expenditures caused by such operations, a different procedure is required from that applied to meet expenditures of the regular budget of the United Nations,

Taking into account the fact that the economically more developed countries are in a position to make relatively larger contributions and that the economically less developed countries have a relatively limited capacity to contribute towards peace-keeping operations involving heavy expenditures,

Bearing in mind the special responsibilities of the States permanent members of the Security Council in the financing of such operations, as indicated in General Assembly resolution 1874(S-IV) of 27 June 1963 and other resolutions of the Assembly,

## I

Decides to appropriate to the Special Account referred to in section II, paragraph 1, of General Assembly resolution 3211 B (XXIX) the amount of \$14,959,248 gross (\$14,801,748 net) authorized and apportioned by section III of Assembly resolution 35/45 A for the operation of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for the period from 1 June to 30 November 1981, inclusive;

## II

1. Decides to appropriate to the Special Account an amount of \$15,974,000 for the operation of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for the period from 1 December 1981 to 31 May 1982, inclusive;

2. Decides further, as an ad hoc arrangement, without prejudice to the positions of principle that may be taken by

Member States in any consideration by the General Assembly of arrangements for the financing of peace-keeping operations:

(a) To apportion an amount of \$9,315,973 for the above-mentioned six-month period among the Member States referred to in paragraph 2 (a) of General Assembly resolution 3101(XXVIII), in the proportions determined by the scale of assessments for the years 1980, 1981 and 1982;

(b) To apportion an amount of \$6,272,080 for the above-mentioned six-month period among the Member States referred to in paragraph 2 (b) of resolution 3101(XXVIII) and section II, paragraph 2 (b), of resolution 3374 C (XXX), in the proportions determined by the scale of assessments for the years 1980, 1981 and 1982;

(c) To apportion an amount of \$378,440 for the above-mentioned six-month period among the Member States referred to in paragraph 2 (c) of resolution 3101(XXVIII), section II, paragraph 2 (c), of resolution 3374 C (XXX) and section V, paragraph 1, of resolution 33/13 D, in the proportions determined by the scale of assessments for the years 1980, 1981 and 1982;

(d) To apportion an amount of \$7,507 for the above-mentioned six-month period among the Member States referred to in paragraph 2 (d) of resolution 3101(XXVIII), section V, paragraph 1, of resolution 3374 C (XXX), section V, paragraph 1, of resolution 31/5 D, section V, paragraph 1, of resolution 32/4 C, section V, paragraph 1, of resolution 33/13 D, section V, paragraph 1, of resolution 34/7 C and section V, paragraph 1, of resolution 35/45 A, in the proportions determined by the scale of assessments for the years 1980, 1981 and 1982;

3. Decides that there shall be set off against the apportionment among Member States, as provided in paragraph 2 above, their respective share in the estimated income of \$10,000 other than staff assessment income approved for the period from 1 December 1981 to 31 May 1982, inclusive;

4. Decides that, in accordance with the provisions of its resolution 973(X) of 15 December 1955, there shall be set off against the apportionment among Member States, as provided for in paragraph 2 above, their respective share in the Tax Equalization Fund of the estimated staff assessment income of \$179,000 approved for the period from 1 December 1981 to 31 May 1982, inclusive;

### III

Authorizes the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force at a rate not to exceed \$2,662,333 gross (\$2,630,833 net) per month for the period from 1 June to 30 November 1982 inclusive, should the Security Council decide to continue the Force beyond the period of six months authorized under its resolution 493(1981), the said amount to be apportioned among Member States in accordance with the scheme set out in the present resolution;

### IV

1. Stresses the need for voluntary contributions to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force both in cash and in the form of services and supplies acceptable to the Secretary-General;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to take all necessary action to ensure that the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force is conducted with a maximum of efficiency and economy;

### V

1. Decides that Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Zimbabwe shall be included in the group of Member States mentioned in paragraph 2 (d) of General Assembly resolution 3101 (XXVIII) and that their contributions to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions of the resolution adopted by the Assembly at the current session regarding the scale of assessments;

2. Decides further that, in accordance with regulation 5.2 (c) of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations, the contributions to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force until 30 November 1981 of the Member States referred to in paragraph 1 of the present section shall be treated as miscellaneous income to be set off against the appropriations apportioned in section II above.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Albania, Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Chad, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Mongolia, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

General Assembly resolution 36/66 B

91-16-8 (recorded vote) Meeting 77 30 November 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/720) by recorded vote (70-13-8), 25 November (meeting 55); 8-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.15, part B); agenda item 110 (a).

Sponsors: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Norway, Sweden.

The General Assembly,

Having regard to the financial position of the Special Account for the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, as set forth in the report of the Secretary-General, and referring to paragraph 5 of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions,

Mindful of the fact that it is essential to provide the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force with the necessary financial resources to enable it to fulfil its responsibilities under the relevant resolutions of the Security Council,

Concerned that the Secretary-General is continuing to face growing difficulties in meeting the obligations of the Forces on a current basis, particularly those due to the Governments of troop-contributing States,

Recalling its resolutions 33/13 E of 14 December 1978, 34/7 D of 17 December 1979 and 35/45 B of 1 December 1980,

Recognizing that, in consequence of the withholding of contributions by certain Member States, the surplus balances in the Special Account for the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force have, in effect, been drawn upon to the full extent to supplement the income received from contributions for meeting expenses of the Forces,

Concerned that the application of the provisions of regulations 5.2 (b), 5.2 (d), 4.3 and 4.4 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations would aggravate the already difficult financial situation of the Forces,

Decides that the provisions of regulations 5.2 (b), 5.2 (d), 4.3 and 4.4 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations shall be suspended in respect of the amount of \$2,694,446, which otherwise would have to be surrendered pursuant to those provisions, this amount to be entered in the account referred to in the operative part of General Assembly resolution 33/13 E and held in suspense until a further decision is taken by the Assembly.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa, Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Chad, Democratic Yemen, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Romania.

#### UNIFIL financing

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 16 December 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> appropriated funds covering the two extensions of the mandate of UNIFIL approved by the Security Council for the period through mid-December 1981—from 19 December 1980 to 18 June 1981<sup>(7)</sup> and from 19 June to 18 December 1981.<sup>(8)</sup> For each six-month mandate, appropriations totalled \$73,083,000 gross (\$72,360,996 net) of staff assessment). Also by this resolution, the Assembly authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for UNIFIL, should the Council continue the Force beyond the existing mandate. The authorization covered the period from 19 December 1981 to 18 December 1982, at a monthly expenditure rate not to exceed \$13,316,666 gross (\$13,177,500 net). The Council, on 18 December 1981, renewed the Force's mandate until 19 June 1982.<sup>(9)</sup>

The resolution also included provisions relating to the apportionment of expenses among Member States (p. 295).

The resolution was adopted by 98 votes to 16, with 3 abstentions. By another resolution,<sup>(6)</sup> adopted on the same day by 102 votes to 15, the Assembly authorized suspension of certain provisions of the United Nations Financial Regulations to enable UNIFIL to retain a "surplus" balance of \$3,759,109. This procedure was similar to that approved for UNDOF.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Fifth Committee, on 14 December, approved the two resolutions together by 73 votes to 13, with 2 abstentions.

The authorization for the year beginning 19 December 1981 amounted to \$3,591,000 less for each six-month period than the \$83,491,000 which the Secretary-General had estimated in a report on the financing of the Force,<sup>(2)</sup> based on an average strength of 6,000 troops. The \$3.6 million reduction was recommended by ACABQ,<sup>(1)</sup>

which suggested that savings could be made in such areas as: construction of premises; purchase, maintenance and repair of vehicles and other equipment; and supplies and services. It also recommended that any future estimates for UNIFIL be presented on a 12-month basis.

As to the status of contributions, the Secretary-General reported that the shortfall attributed to Member States which had said they did not intend to pay had risen from \$84.1 million in 1980 to \$114.9 million as at 30 September 1981, out of the \$491 million in assessments of Member States from the inception of the Force in 1978 to 18 December 1981. There continued to be difficulties in meeting the Force's obligations on a current basis, particularly payments due to the troop contributors, which had again conveyed their serious concern over the heavy burden placed on their Governments. Only \$11,700 had been contributed to a special account established under a 1979 Assembly resolution<sup>(3)</sup> for voluntary contributions to alleviate the financial burden on troop contributors.

Sweden, introducing the resolutions in the Fifth Committee on behalf of their 17 sponsors, said all Member States had a collective responsibility to share the financial burden of such operations equitably. Growing deficits undermined efficiency and made it increasingly difficult to find additional States to take part in the operations, given the disproportionate financial burden borne by the troop contributors. Because of non-payment by certain States, troop contributors were receiving less than half of their entitlement to reimbursement under the standard rates approved by the Assembly.

Ireland expressed hope that a satisfactory solution would be found to the problem of withholding, in order to safeguard the peace-keeping role of the United Nations. The United States appealed to States withholding their contributions to reconsider their position, and welcomed China's intention to contribute.

The USSR said all expenditures to eliminate the vestiges of aggression against Lebanon should be borne by the aggressor; it would therefore vote against the resolutions and not contribute to the financing of UNIFIL. Similar statements were made by Albania, Hungary, Iraq, Mongolia, Poland and the Syrian Arab Republic.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/797; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/601 & Corr.1,2.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>34/9 D, 17 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 352); <sup>(4)</sup>36/66 B, 30 Nov. 1981 (p. 297); <sup>(5)</sup>36/138 A, 16 Dec., text following; <sup>(6)</sup>36/138 B, 16 Dec., text following. SC: <sup>(7)</sup>483(1980), 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 360); <sup>(8)</sup>488(1981), 19 June 1981 (p. 292); <sup>(9)</sup>498(1981), 18 Dec. (p. 292).

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.74 (14 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

## General Assembly resolution 38/138 A

98-16-3 Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/720/Add.1) by vote (73-13-2), 14 December (meeting 74); 17-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.39, parts A and B together); agenda item 110 (b).

Sponsors: Australia, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Ireland, Italy, Lebanon, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Senegal, Sweden.

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions,

Bearing in mind Security Council resolutions 425(1978) and 426(1978) of 19 March 1978, 427(1978) of 3 May 1978, 434(1978) of 18 September 1978, 444(1979) of 19 January 1979, 450(1979) of 14 June 1979, 459(1979) of 19 December 1979, 474(1980) of 17 June 1980, 483(1980) of 17 December 1980 and 488(1981) of 19 June 1981,

Recalling its resolutions S-8/2 of 21 April 1978, 33/14 of 3 November 1978, 34/9 B of 17 December 1979, 35/44 of 1 December 1980 and 35/115 A of 10 December 1980,

Reaffirming its previous decisions regarding the fact that, in order to meet the expenditures caused by such operations, a different procedure from the one applied to meet expenditures of the regular budget of the United Nations is required,

Taking into account the fact that the economically more developed countries are in a position to make relatively larger contributions and that the economically less developed countries have a relatively limited capacity to contribute towards peace-keeping operations involving heavy expenditures,

Bearing in mind the special responsibilities of the States permanent members of the Security Council in the financing of peace-keeping operations decided upon in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,

## I

Decides to appropriate to the Special Account referred to in section I, paragraph 1, of General Assembly resolution S-8/2 an amount of \$73,083,000 gross (\$72,380,996 net), being the amount authorized and apportioned under the provisions of section III of Assembly resolution 35/115 A for the operation of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon from 19 December 1980 to 18 June 1981 inclusive;

## II

Decides to appropriate to the Special Account referred to in section I, paragraph 1, of General Assembly resolution S-8/2 an amount of \$73,083,000 gross (\$72,360,996 net), being the amount authorized and apportioned under the provisions of section III of Assembly resolution 35/115 A for the operation of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon from 19 June to 18 December 1981 inclusive;

## III

Authorizes the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon at a rate not to exceed \$13,316,666 gross (\$13,177,500 net) per month for the period from 19 December 1981 to 18 December 1982 inclusive, should the Security Council decide to continue the Force beyond the period of six months authorized under its resolution 488(1981), the said amount to be apportioned among Member States in accordance with the scheme set out in General Assembly resolution 33/14 and the provisions of section V, paragraph 1, of resolution 34/9 B and section VI, paragraph 1, of resolution 35/115 A, in the proportions determined by the scale of assessments for the years 1980, 1981 and 1982;

## IV

1. Renews its invitation to Member States to make voluntary contributions to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon

both in cash and in the form of services and supplies acceptable to the Secretary-General;

2. Invites Member States to make voluntary contributions in cash to the Suspense Account established in accordance with its resolution 34/9 D of 17 December 1979;

## V

Requests the Secretary-General to take all necessary action to ensure that the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon shall be administered with a maximum of efficiency and economy;

## VI

1. Decides that Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Zimbabwe shall be included in the group of Member States mentioned in section I, paragraph 2 (d), of General Assembly resolution S-8/2 and that their contributions to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions of the resolution adopted by the Assembly at the current session regarding the scale of assessments;

2. Decides further that, in accordance with regulation 5.2 (c) of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations, the contributions to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon until 18 December 1981 of the Member States referred to in paragraph 1 of the present section shall be treated as miscellaneous income to be set off against the apportionments authorized in section III above.

## General Assembly resolution 36/138 B

102-15 Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee together with draft of resolution 36/138 A above, with same sponsors.

The General Assembly,

Having regard to the financial position of the Special Account for the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, as set forth in the report of the Secretary-General, and referring to paragraph 7 of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions,

Mindful of the fact that it is essential to provide the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon with the necessary financial resources to enable it to fulfil its responsibilities under the relevant resolutions of the Security Council,

Concerned that the Secretary-General is continuing to face growing difficulties in meeting the obligations of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon on a current basis, particularly those due to the Governments of troop-contributing States,

Recalling its resolutions 34/9 E of 17 December 1979 and 35/115 B of 10 December 1980,

Recognizing that, in consequence of the withholding of contributions by certain Member States, the surplus balances in the Special Account for the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon have, in effect, been drawn upon to the full extent to supplement the income received from contributions for meeting expenses of the Force,

Concerned that the application of the provisions of regulations 5.2 (b), 5.2 (d), 4.3 and 4.4 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations would aggravate the already difficult financial situation of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon,

Decides that the provisions of regulations 5.2 (b), 5.2 (d), 4.3 and 4.4 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations shall be suspended in respect of the amount of \$3,759,109, which otherwise would have to be surrendered pursuant to those provisions, this amount to be entered in the account referred to in the operative part of General Assembly resolution 34/9 E and held in suspense until a further decision is taken by the Assembly.



## Situation in the territories occupied by Israel

### General aspects

During 1981, the situation in the territories occupied by Israel as a result of previous armed conflict in the Middle East was again considered by the General Assembly and its Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories. The Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities dealt with human rights violations in the territories (p. 955). The occupied territories consisted of the West Bank of the Jordan River (including East Jerusalem), the Golan Heights, the Gaza Strip and part of the Sinai peninsula.

COMMUNICATIONS. A number of communications on this subject were addressed during the year to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council.

Tunisia, on 25 March,<sup>(13)</sup> transmitted a letter of 17 March from the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) calling attention to recent attempts by Israel to consolidate its illegal presence in occupied Palestinian lands through the expansion of settlements and their conversion into "self-governing" townships.

Jordan, on 10 July,<sup>(8)</sup> transmitted charges, based on excerpts from an article published in *The Jerusalem Post* on 22 June, that Israeli colonization of the West Bank, including Jerusalem and its environs, had reached 35 to 40 per cent of the occupied areas. In letters dated 22 July<sup>(10)</sup> and 27 August,<sup>(12)</sup> Jordan gave an account of Israeli settlement activity in the West Bank and Jerusalem during June and July, indicating that hundreds of dunums (1,000 dunums = 1 sq km) of Arab lands had been confiscated for the purpose of establishing new settlements and enlarging existing ones.

On 14 July,<sup>(9)</sup> Jordan transmitted an article published in the Israeli newspaper *Al-Hamishmar* on 5 June, according to which almost 250,000 inhabitants of the occupied territories had been in Israeli gaols or detention camps at one time or another during 14 years of occupation.

On 19 August,<sup>(11)</sup> Jordan complained that Israeli prohibitions against Arab and other private contributions to municipalities, charitable institutions and other societies could lead to cessation of essential services to the citizens of the occupied territories and bankruptcy of vital institutions.

On 6 November<sup>(14)</sup> and 16 November,<sup>(15)</sup>

Tunisia transmitted three PLO letters, dated 5, 11 and 12 November, stating that there had been a serious escalation of tension in the occupied West Bank as a result of Israel's decision to impose a new military governor under the pretext of establishing a new civilian administration, and charging Israel with a campaign of repression, including the closure of the Arab University of Bir Zeit, the arrest of several prominent Palestinians and the wounding of a school-boy by Israeli troops.

Throughout the year, a number of communications were also addressed to the Secretary-General on behalf of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, dealing with general and special aspects of the situation in the occupied territories.

The Committee's Acting Chairman, by a letter of 27 February,<sup>(1)</sup> conveyed the Committee's serious concern at Israel's continued confiscation of Arab land, and the Committee's view that further United Nations action, particularly by the Security Council, was needed to call Israel's attention to the danger of its annexation policies and the necessity for its immediate and complete withdrawal. On 19 June,<sup>(2)</sup> he transmitted a copy of a September 1980 document of the World Zionist Federation on Israel's settlement policy, which left no doubt, the Acting Chairman said, that Israel intended to annex the territories it had illegally occupied and that the "autonomy" it envisaged would not apply to the territories but only to their Arab population.

By a letter of 15 July,<sup>(3)</sup> the Chairman expressed the Committee's deep concern at Israel's complete disregard for the rights of the Palestinian people, as evidenced by Israeli press reports of school and university closings, the establishment of new settlements, and desecration of the Moslem cemetery at Haifa to clear land for the construction of administrative offices and commercial centres. By a letter of 24 August,<sup>(4)</sup> the Acting Chairman protested the reported Israeli ban on channelling Arab funds through the Joint Committee for the Occupied Territories at Amman, Jordan.

On 15 October,<sup>(5)</sup> the Chairman referred to news reports that the Israeli Government planned to establish four new Israeli settlements in the occupied territories and to strengthen existing ones.

On 13 November,<sup>(6)</sup> he voiced the Committee's concern at reports of a tense situation, including strikes and protest marches, following the appointment on 1 November of a civilian to head the civilian administration of the occupied West Bank.

Israel and Jordan sent communications concerning arrests of Islamic religious leaders in the

West Bank (p. 314), protection of cultural property in Jerusalem (p. 316), other developments relating to Jerusalem (p. 318) and the Mediterranean-Dead Sea canal project (p. 319).

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND ITS SUB-COMMISSION.** On 11 February, the Commission on Human Rights adopted two resolutions dealing with the violation of human rights in the occupied territories<sup>(18)</sup> (p. 955). By the first, it condemned a series of Israeli policies and practices in the territories, including annexation, the establishment of Israeli settlements, violence against Arab civilians, population transfer, mass arrests and property confiscation. By the second, it condemned Israel's failure to acknowledge the applicability to the occupied territories of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and called on Israel to abide by that Convention and other rules of international law.

The Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities, by a resolution of 9 September,<sup>(28)</sup> recommended that the Commission deplore the human rights violations committed by Israeli authorities in the occupied territories and urge Israel to withdraw.

**ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ISRAELI PRACTICES IN THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES.** The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, in its annual report submitted on 4 September,<sup>(16)</sup> presented information on the situation of the civilian population in the occupied territories. Obtained without the co-operation of Israel, this information was gathered from a variety of sources, including oral and written testimony of persons with first-hand experience, Israeli press reports of statements by Israeli Government officials, other news reports, and from governmental and non-governmental bodies.

The Committee regarded as particularly disturbing the policy statement of the new Israeli Government that it would raise a claim of Israeli sovereignty over the occupied territories in the near future.

The Committee found that, during the period covered by its thirteenth report (25 July 1980-31 August 1981), Israel's annexation and settlement policy had continued unabated. Israeli settlers were playing a considerably increased role in implementing Israel's annexation policy. During the period, the Committee had received information on some 40 settlements that had been either established or inaugurated or whose construction had commenced; in addition, it noted the continuing construction and expansion of Israeli settlements in occupied Jerusalem.

The transfer of Israeli civilians to the occupied territories was contrary to the Convention on protection of civilians (p. 306).

Referring to the treatment of the population of the territories, the Committee stated that Israel continued to follow a policy of extreme provocation of civilians and severe repression of any reaction to that provocation. Despite sporadic reports of steps by the authorities to protect civilians from infringement of their rights by Israeli settlers, the overall picture confirmed the connivance and complicity of the authorities with the settlers. That policy not only denied the right to self-determination but also was the source of continuing and systematic human rights violations.

The Committee reiterated its conclusion, reached in its 1980 report,<sup>(29)</sup> that there were no judicial remedies available to the civilian population other than applying to the High Court of Justice. It had become apparent, the Committee stated, that even that residual possibility was meaningless, mainly because of Israel's conscious efforts to circumvent the judicial authorities. In the Committee's view, the fact that the occupying authorities had changed the law in virtually every field, substituting a legal régime based on Israeli lines, was a form of creeping legal annexation.

Expressing again its concern about the absence of a serious Israeli Government mechanism to supervise detention conditions and examine allegations of ill-treatment, the Committee found that interrogation procedures continued to be accompanied by violence and that detention conditions remained extremely poor. It called for drastic revision.

The Committee recommended, as it had done in previous years, the establishment of a mechanism (the protecting-Power formula based on the Convention on protection of civilians) to safeguard the human rights of the population in the occupied territories and the proper representation of their interests.

The Committee held two series of meetings in 1981: from 21 April to 1 May and from 26 August to 4 September, at Geneva.

The Secretary-General, in a report<sup>(17)</sup> prepared in response to a 1980 General Assembly request,<sup>(19)</sup> described the measures taken to provide facilities to the Committee, including an additional staff member, and to ensure the widest circulation of the Committee's report and dissemination of information on its activities and findings.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** After considering the report of the Committee on Israeli practices in the occupied territories, the General Assembly, on 16 December, adopted, seven res-

olutions on the recommendation of its Special Political Committee (SPC).

One of these resolutions<sup>(22)</sup> contained the Assembly's strong condemnation of a series of Israeli policies and practices, including annexation, establishment and expansion of Israeli settlements, expulsion and transfer of Arabs, confiscation of property, transformation and pillaging of cultural property, destruction of houses, mass arrests, ill-treatment of detainees, interference with religious freedoms, family customs, education, development and freedom of movement, and illegal exploitation of natural resources and people.

The Assembly demanded that Israel desist from those policies and practices, reaffirmed that occupation itself constituted a grave violation of human rights, declared that Israel's grave breaches of the Convention on protection of civilians were war crimes and an affront to humanity, and reiterated its call for non-recognition of changes carried out by Israel in the territories. Deploring Israel's refusal to allow access to the territories by the investigating Committee, the Assembly requested the Committee to continue its work and the Security Council to initiate measures to halt the policies and practices in question.

This resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 111 to 2, with 31 abstentions. SPC approved it on 30 November by a recorded vote of 93 to 2, with 26 abstentions. Paragraph 6, declaring that Israel's grave breaches of the Convention on protection of civilians were war crimes, was adopted by the Assembly by a recorded vote of 96 to 18, with 29 abstentions, after the Committee approved it by a recorded vote of 81 to 17, with 21 abstentions. The request in paragraph 15 that the Security Council ensure Israel's compliance with the Convention and initiate measures to halt Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories was adopted by a recorded vote of 111 to 18, with 12 abstentions, following approval in Committee by a recorded vote of 91 to 18, with 7 abstentions. Bangladesh introduced the resolution, which was also sponsored by Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Pakistan and the Ukrainian SSR.

By another resolution,<sup>(21)</sup> the Assembly determined that all Israeli measures designed to change the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, were in violation of the Convention on protection of civilians, constituted a serious obstruction of efforts to achieve peace in the Middle East and had no legal validity. It strongly deplored Israel's persistence in carrying out such measures, particularly

the establishment of settlements; demanded that Israel comply with its international obligations and desist forthwith from taking such measures; and urgently called on all States parties to the Geneva Convention to respect and ensure compliance with its provisions in all territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem.

This resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 142 to 1, with 3 abstentions, following approval by SPC on 30 November by a recorded vote of 117 to 1, with 2 abstentions. It was introduced in SPC by Pakistan, also on behalf of Bangladesh, India and Indonesia.

By other resolutions adopted on 16 December in connection with the report of the Committee on Israeli practices in the occupied territories, the Assembly demanded Israeli compliance with the Convention on protection of civilians,<sup>(20)</sup> and demanded that Israel facilitate the immediate return of the Mayors of Hebron and Halhul and the Islamic Judge of Hebron,<sup>(23)</sup> report on assassination attempts against three other mayors,<sup>(26)</sup> rescind orders for the closure of three universities<sup>(25)</sup> and desist from repressive measures against Syrians in the Golan Heights.<sup>(24)</sup> Also, by a resolution of 17 December on the Middle East situation,<sup>(27)</sup> the Assembly condemned Israel's continued occupation of the Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and demanded immediate, unconditional and total Israeli withdrawal.

Israel voted against the resolution containing a condemnation of Israeli practices, saying that it reflected the biased attitude of the Committee's report and reproduced false allegations and conclusions based on unreliable evidence and testimony. The United States said it had voted against because of the resolution's bias and polemical tone.

Sweden abstained on the ground that the resolution contained generalizations which could not be substantiated and elements which went beyond the Assembly's competence. The European Community (EC) members, the United Kingdom declared, had abstained because of reservations regarding the paragraphs voted on separately and the paragraph by which the Assembly condemned specified Israeli policies and practices. Canada, while agreeing with the thrust of the resolution, could not support that paragraph or the condemnation of Israel's violations and grave breaches of the Convention on protection of civilians and their characterization as war crimes and an affront to humanity. Objection to these terms was voiced as well by New Zealand, which also did not approve of the request to the Security Council to initiate measures to halt Israeli practices.

Thailand voted for the resolution but abstained on the "affront to humanity" paragraph, on the ground that only a legal body could make such an assertion; it also had reservations on the condemnation of interference with the educational system and freedom of movement, and believed that no territories other than those occupied since 1967 should be mentioned.

Explaining its opposition to the resolution on Israeli settlements and other measures tending to change the occupied territories, Israel said SPC was not competent to pronounce on the legal validity of actions taken by Israel in those territories; also, it was particularly out of place to claim that such policies obstructed peace efforts.

The United States said it had abstained because the resolution sought to pronounce on the legality of Israeli settlements; the United States continued to oppose their establishment and saw them as creating obstacles to peace, but was convinced that repetitive pronouncements on legal issues were not likely to cause Israel to reflect on its policy.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, said they had voted for the resolution as it reflected their view that the settlements were illegal and a serious obstacle to peace. Sweden declared that the dismantling of settlements would be a constructive step.

Sri Lanka, introducing in SPC the report of the Committee on Israeli practices in the occupied territories, said the situation of the people in those areas had not improved and, on occasion, had perhaps worsened. It therefore wondered whether another formula should not be sought, acceptable to both the international community and the Israeli Government, to reverse the process and improve the human rights situation in the territories.

Israel rejected the report as replete with false accusations and distortions of truth. International law clearly recognized that the authorities had a duty to protect the population of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District against disorder and terrorism. Despite terrorist acts, Israel had never applied the death penalty in the areas. It had given the local population access to Israeli courts, permitted them to travel and trade with neighbouring Arab countries, and allowed them to take part in democratic elections. No displacement of the local population had taken place, and the Arab population in the administered areas had even increased by about 20 per cent since 1967. The Israeli legal system provided numerous safeguards for the rights of the inhabitants. It was time to end the Committee's activities, which were designed to obstruct reconciliation and peace.

Many speakers considered that the Committee's conclusions were valid and that the Arab population in the occupied territories were denied their human rights. A number of countries, such as Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, the United Kingdom, Yemen and Zambia, called for Israel's withdrawal from the territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and the implementation of the rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to establish its own State.

Austria said that, contrary to international law, the Israeli administration had radically altered the legal and demographic status of the occupied territories, creating tension in the region and undermining the search for a peaceful negotiated settlement. Pakistan said that, even if Israel was telling the truth when it spoke of social and educational amenities in the occupied territories, that would not justify its occupation. Senegal stated that Israel, in defiance of human rights and international norms, persisted in its policy of creating a predominantly Jewish State, including most of the Arab territories under military occupation since 1967.

Oman stated that the Israeli policy of collective punishment, from which old people, women and children were not excluded, appeared to be worse than the Nazi policy in the Second World War. Saudi Arabia also stated that Israeli practices were no less dangerous than the methods used by the Nazis.

Many States expressed concern at evidence that Israeli settlements in the occupied territories were being established and expanded at an accelerated pace. The Syrian Arab Republic and Zambia saw this as proof that Israel had no intention of withdrawing from the territories.

In Algeria's view, Israel's aim was to uproot the Arabs once and for all from their homes. Kuwait said the strategy to transform Palestine into a totally Jewish "national homeland" had been manifested in three parallel thrusts: initial attempts to secure a continued influx of Jewish migrants to Palestine with the assistance of the former Mandatory Power, the acquisition of Arab lands by any method and the gradual displacement of Arab inhabitants. Yemen stated that Israeli measures of oppression in the territories were part of a plot to force the inhabitants to leave their lands so that Jewish settlers might replace them.

Iraq remarked that the Zionists had expropriated the territories' only major resource—

water—by drilling wells for the new Jewish colonies while forbidding the Arabs to drill wells or increase their capacity.

Several speakers, among them Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Iraq, Mongolia, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and the United Arab Emirates, maintained that the support given by the United States encouraged Israel to continue its occupation policy.

In Albania's view, the Camp David accords had enabled Israel to extend its aggressive activities against the Palestinians, while the USSR helped Israel by providing it with a steady flow of Jewish emigrants to people the new settlements in the occupied territories.

The USSR condemned the Israeli policy of mass repression and racial discrimination, adding that such excesses in the occupied territories could be ended only by a comprehensive Middle East peace settlement.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, urged an end to Israeli occupation, to the construction and expansion of settlements, and to expulsion of Palestinian notables, but said the EC members could not accept the Committee's report as fully authoritative, since it had been unable to obtain sufficient first-hand evidence or prepare a complete account. The United States described the report as incomplete, partial, partisan and based on selective sources of information; the United States was concerned about the situation of Jewish minorities in certain States of the region and about the terrorist acts which violated the human rights of Palestinian moderates as well as about the situation of those Palestinians whose rights had on some occasion been violated.

Egypt outlined proposals it had made to Israel for what it described as confidence-building measures in relation to the occupied territories, including: freezing of settlement; return of expropriated land and property; freeing of frozen or confiscated bank deposits; lifting of the ban on political gatherings and permitting freedom of expression; abolition of restrictions on freedom of movement; release of Palestinian detainees; return of displaced persons and of all political exiles; desisting from military manœuvres; return of the judicial system in the West Bank to its pre-occupation form; cessation of all violations of civil and political rights, including property rights and the right to academic freedom; and lifting of restrictions on water use in agriculture.

Cyprus reaffirmed the right of all displaced persons to return to their homes and lands of origin, and maintained that the civil, political, cultural and religious rights of the Palestinians

must be protected. Spain saw a lack of will on Israel's part to settle the dispute over the territories, and urged action to prepare the ground for peaceful coexistence, free of the animosity that had accumulated over the years. Qatar said that, if the international community was unable to apply international law in defence of the Palestinian people, the Palestinians should continue to struggle by every means at their disposal to eliminate the effects of the occupation and exercise their rights.

Bangladesh called for an immediate cessation of Israeli exploitation of the natural resources and population of the occupied territories, and for prompt and decisive steps by the international community to put an end to Israeli occupation.

China believed that the Committee on Israeli practices in the occupied territories should continue its work to draw attention to the plight of the Arab and Palestinian peoples, and the Assembly should take steps to force Israel to comply with United Nations resolutions and international obligations in regard to the territories. Jordan said it was inescapable that the Committee should intervene promptly to end Israel's occupation of Arab and Palestinian lands.

Kenya considered it the duty of the Assembly and the Security Council to help promote the economic development of a Palestinian State, and urged them to call on Israel to reverse its settlement, expropriation and annexation policies.

Morocco recalled that the Twelfth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers (Baghdad, Iraq, 1-5 June) had called for suspension of Israel's United Nations membership and the application of sanctions as provided in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.<sup>(7)</sup> The need to consider sanctions was underlined by Bahrain, the Byelorussian SSR and the Syrian Arab Republic. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya called for effective international deterrent measures and the Sudan for intervention by the international community to put an end to Israel's annexation policy.

Letters: Committee on Palestinian rights Chairman and Acting Chairman (AC): <sup>(1)</sup>27 Feb., A/36/114-S/14389 (AC); <sup>(2)</sup>19 June, A/36/341-S/14566 (AC); <sup>(3)</sup>15 July, A/36/382-S/14593; <sup>(4)</sup>24 Aug., A/36/449-S/14641 (AC); <sup>(5)</sup>15 Oct., A/36/604-S/14730; <sup>(6)</sup>13 Nov., A/36/688-S/14754. <sup>(7)</sup>Iraq: 5 Aug., transmitting res. of Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, A/36/421-S/14626. Jordan: <sup>(8)</sup>10 July, A/36/373-S/14585; <sup>(9)</sup>14 July, A/36/381-S/14592; <sup>(10)</sup>22 July, A/36/399-S/14615; <sup>(11)</sup>19 Aug., A/36/444-S/14634; <sup>(12)</sup>27 Aug., A/36/460-S/14657. Tunisia: <sup>(13)</sup>25 Mar., S/14418; <sup>(14)</sup>6 Nov., S/14747; <sup>(15)</sup>16 Nov., S/14753.

Reports: <sup>(16)</sup>Committee on Israeli practices in occupied territories, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/579; <sup>(17)</sup>S-G, A/36/588.

Resolutions: <sup>(18)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 1 A & B (XXXVII), 11 Feb. GA: <sup>(19)</sup>35/122 C. 11 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980. p. 431); <sup>(20)</sup>36/147 A,

16 Dec. 1981 (p. 307); <sup>(21)</sup>36/147 B, 16 Dec., text following; <sup>(22)</sup>36/147 C, 16 Dec., text following; <sup>(23)</sup>36/147 D, 16 Dec. (p. 314); <sup>(24)</sup>36/147 E 16 Dec. (p. 308); <sup>(25)</sup>36/147 F, 16 Dec. (p. 316); <sup>(26)</sup>36/147 G, 16 Dec. (p. 315); <sup>(27)</sup>36/226 A, para. 1, 17 Dec. (p. 262). <sup>(28)</sup>SCPDPM (report, E/CN.4/1512): 9(XXXIV), 9 Sep. Yearbook reference: <sup>(29)</sup>1980, p. 417.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.5/36/70/Add.1; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/70. Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.11-13, 33-39, 46 (22 Oct.-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.42, 100 (28 Oct., 16 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.66 (8 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/147 B

142-1-3 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/632/Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1) by recorded vote (117-1-2), 30 November (meeting 46); 4-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.19); agenda item 64.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Pakistan.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 32/5 of 28 October 1977, 33/113 B of 18 December 1978, 34/90 C of 12 December 1979 and 35/122 B of 11 December 1980,

Recalling also Security Council resolution 465(1980) of 1 March 1980,

Expressing grave anxiety and concern at the present serious situation in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem, as a result of the continued Israeli occupation and the measures and actions taken by the Government of Israel, as the occupying Power, designed to change the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of those territories.

Considering that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, is applicable to all Arab territories occupied since 5 June 1967, including Jerusalem,

1. Determines that all such measures and actions taken by Israel in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, are in violation of the relevant provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, and constitute a serious obstruction of efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, and therefore have no legal validity;

2. Strongly deplures the persistence of Israel in carrying out such measures, in particular the establishment of settlements in the Palestinian and other occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem;

3. Demands that Israel comply strictly with its international obligations in accordance with the principles of international law and the provisions of the Geneva Convention;

4. Demands once more that the Government of Israel, the occupying Power, desist forthwith from taking any action which would result in changing the legal status, geographical nature or demographic composition of the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem;

5. Urgently calls upon all States parties to the Geneva Convention to respect and to exert all efforts in order to ensure respect for and compliance with its provisions in all Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia,

Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Guatemala, Jamaica, United States.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/147 C

111-2-31 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/632/Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1) by recorded vote (93-2-26), 30 November (meeting 46); 9-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.20 and Corr.1); agenda item 64.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Pakistan, Ukrainian SSR.

The General Assembly,

Guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and by the principles and provisions Of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Bearing in mind the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, as well as of other relevant conventions and regulations,

Recalling all its resolutions on the subject, in particular resolutions 32/91 B and C of 12 December 1977, 33/113 C of 18 December 1978, 34/90 A of 12 December 1979 and 35/122 C of 11 December 1980, and also those adopted by the Security Council, the Commission on Human Rights and other United Nations organs concerned and by the specialized agencies,

Having considered the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, which contains, inter alia, public statements made by the leaders of the Government of Israel,

1. Commends the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories for its efforts in performing the tasks assigned to it by the General Assembly and for its thoroughness and impartiality;

2. Deplures the continued refusal by Israel to allow the Special Committee access to the occupied territories;

3. Demands that Israel allow the Special Committee access to the occupied territories;

4. Reaffirms the fact that occupation itself constitutes a grave violation of the human rights of the civilian population of the occupied Arab territories;

5. Condemns the continued and persistent violation by Israel of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, and other applicable international instruments, and condemns in particular those violations which the Convention designates as "grave breaches" thereof;

6. Declares that Israel's grave breaches of the Geneva Convention are war crimes and an affront to humanity;

7. Strongly condemns the following Israeli policies and practices:

(a) Annexation of parts of the occupied territories, including Jerusalem;

(b) Establishment of new Israeli settlements and expansion of the existing settlements on private and public Arab lands, and transfer of an alien population thereto;

(c) Evacuation, deportation, expulsion, displacement and transfer of Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories and denial of their right to return;

(d) Confiscation and expropriation of private and public Arab property in the occupied territories and all other transactions for the acquisition of land involving the Israeli authorities, institutions or nationals on the one hand and the inhabitants or institutions of the occupied territories on the other;

(e) Excavations and transformations of the landscape and the historical, cultural and religious sites, especially in Jerusalem;

(f) Destruction and demolition of Arab houses;

(g) Mass arrests, administrative detention and ill-treatment of the Arab population;

(h) Ill-treatment and torture of persons under detention;

(i) Pillaging of archaeological and cultural property;

(j) Interference with religious freedoms and practices as well as family rights and customs;

(k) Interference with the system of education and with the social and economic development of the population in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories;

(l) Interference with the freedom of movement of individuals within the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories;

(m) Illegal exploitation of the natural wealth, resources and population of the occupied territories;

8. Reaffirms that all measures taken by Israel to change the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure or status of the occupied territories, or any part thereof, including Jerusalem, are null and void, and that Israel's policy of settling parts of its population and new immigrants in the occupied territories constitutes a flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention and of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations;

9. Demands that Israel desist forthwith from the policies and practices referred to in paragraphs 7 and 8 above;

10. Urges the international organizations and the specialized agencies, in particular the International Labour Organisation, to examine the conditions of the Arab workers in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem;

11. Reiterates its call upon all States, in particular those States parties to the Geneva Convention, in accordance with article 1 of the Convention, and upon international organizations and the specialized agencies not to recognize any changes carried out by Israel in the occupied territories and to avoid actions, including those in the field of aid, which might be used by Israel in its pursuit of the policies of annexation and colonization or any of the other policies and practices referred to in the present resolution;

12. Requests the Special Committee, pending the early termination of the Israeli occupation, to continue to investigate Israeli policies and practices in the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, to consult, as appropriate, with the International Committee of the Red Cross in order to ensure the safeguarding of the welfare and human rights of the population of the occupied territories and to report to the Secretary-General as soon as possible and whenever the need arises thereafter;

13. Requests the Special Committee to continue to investigate the treatment of civilians in detention in the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967;

14. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To provide all necessary facilities to the Special Committee, including those required for its visits to the occupied territories, with a view to investigating the Israeli policies and practices referred to in the present resolution;

(b) To continue to make available additional staff as may be necessary to assist the Special Committee in the performance of its tasks;

(c) To ensure the widest circulation of the reports of the Special Committee and of information regarding its activities and findings, by all means available through the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, and, where necessary, to reprint those reports of the Special Committee that are no longer available;

(d) To report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the tasks entrusted to him in the present paragraph;

15. Requests the Security Council to ensure Israel's respect for and compliance with all the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, in Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and to initiate measures to halt Israeli policies and practices in those territories;

16. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Saint Lucia, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom.

## Observance by Israel of the 1949

### Convention on protection of civilians

By a resolution of 16 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly reaffirmed that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949 (fourth Geneva Convention), was applicable to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem. It condemned Israel's failure to acknowledge the Convention's applicability and demanded that Israel comply with its provisions.

The resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 142 to 1, with 3 abstentions, on the recommendation of SPC, which approved the nine-nation draft on 30 November by a recorded vote of 117 to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Assembly adopted paragraph 1, reaffirming the applicability of the Convention to the occupied territories, by a recorded vote of 142 to 1 (Israel), following its approval by SPC, also by recorded vote, of 118 to 1. Paragraph 2, condemning Israel's failure to acknowledge the Convention's applicability to the occupied territories, was adopted by a recorded vote of 140 to 2 (Israel, United States), after SPC approved it by a recorded vote, requested by the United States, of 114 to 2, with 2 abstentions.

By the same resolution and in another of the same date,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly urgently called on all States parties to the Convention to exert all efforts in order to ensure compliance with its provisions in all Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem. The applicability of the Convention was reaffirmed by a third resolution adopted that day.<sup>(5)</sup>

In a fourth resolution,<sup>(4)</sup> also of 16 December, the Assembly condemned Israel's persistent violation of the Convention and other international instruments, condemned in particular those violations which the Convention designated as "grave breaches" and declared such breaches to be war crimes and an affront to humanity.

On 17 December, both the Assembly<sup>(6)</sup> and the Security Council<sup>(7)</sup> determined that the Convention continued to apply to the Syrian territory of the Golan Heights occupied by Israel since 1967.

The resolution devoted to Israel's observance of the Convention was sponsored by Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Pakistan and Yugoslavia. Introducing it, Indonesia said it was similar to resolutions of previous years because the reason for them—Israeli occupation—continued to exist.

Explaining its negative vote, Israel said it did not acknowledge the applicability of the Convention to the areas administered by it, but it applied the Convention's principles and went even further by granting the local population privileges not provided for in the Convention.

The United States said it believed that the Convention applied to Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza and it would continue to measure Israel's practices there against the obligations of an occupying Power, but it had abstained in the vote because it considered it inappropriate to condemn Israel's failure to acknowledge that applicability.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members which voted in favour, noted that the language of the text was stronger than in the corresponding resolution of 1980,<sup>(1)</sup> and said they did not consider all changes to be justified.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>35/122 A, 11 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 430); <sup>(2)</sup>36/147 A, 16 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(3)</sup>36/147 B para. 5, 16 Dec. (p. 305). <sup>(4)</sup>36/147 C, paras. 5 & 6, 16 Dec. (p. 305); <sup>(5)</sup>36/147 F, para. 1, 16 Dec. (p. 316); <sup>(6)</sup>36/226 B, para. 2, 17 Dec. (p. 313). <sup>(7)</sup>SC: 497(1981), para. 3, 17 Dec. (p. 312).

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.33-38, 39, 46 (17-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/147 A

142-1-3 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981  
Approved by SPC (A/36/632/Add.1) by recorded vote (117-1-2), 30 November (meeting 46); 9-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.18); agenda item 64.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Pakistan, Yugoslavia.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3092 A (XXVIII) of 7 December 1973, 3240 B (XXIX) of 29 November 1974, 3525 B (XXX) of 15 December 1975, 31/106 B of 16 December 1976, 32/91 A of 13 December 1977, 33/113 A of 16 December 1978, 34/90 B of 12 December 1979 and 35/122 A of 11 December 1980,

Recalling also Security Council resolution 465(1980) of 1 March 1980 in which, *inter alia*, the Council affirmed that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, is applicable to the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem,

Considering that the promotion of respect for the obligations arising from the Charter of the United Nations and other instruments and rules of international law is among the basic purposes and principles of the United Nations,

Bearing in mind the provisions of the Geneva Convention,

Noting that Israel and those Arab States whose territories have been occupied by Israel since June 1967 are parties to that Convention,

Taking into account that States parties to that Convention undertake, in accordance with article 1 thereof, not only to respect but also to ensure respect for the Convention in all circumstances,

1. Reaffirms that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, is applicable to Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem;

2. Condemns the failure of Israel as the occupying Power to acknowledge the applicability of the Geneva Convention to the territories it has occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem;

3. Demands that Israel acknowledge and comply with the provisions of the Geneva Convention in Palestinian and other Arab territories it has occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem;

4. Urgently calls upon all States parties to the Geneva Convention to exert all efforts in order to ensure respect for and compliance with its provisions in Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Guatemala, Jamaica, United States.

## Special aspects

### Status of the Golan Heights

The situation in the Golan Heights, a part of the Syrian Arab Republic that had been occupied by Israel since 1967, was the subject of several communications during 1981 and of a



resolution by which the General Assembly called on Israel to desist from repressive measures against Syrians as well as measures to change the character and status of the area. Following the Israeli Parliament's decision on 14 December to apply Israeli laws, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights, both the Security Council and the Assembly demanded that Israel rescind its decision (p. 309).

COMMUNICATIONS. By notes verbales of 24 February<sup>(2)</sup> and 17 March,<sup>(3)</sup> the Syrian Arab Republic charged Israel with practising terrorism, pressure and coercion in the Golan Heights and changing its physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure and legal status, with the aim of annexation. Syrian citizens, it said, had been compelled to renounce their original nationality and obtain Israeli citizenship, and 30 Israeli settlements had been established, populated by 7,000 Israeli settlers.

Israel, by a letter of 11 March,<sup>(1)</sup> rejected these allegations, in particular the charge that Syrian citizens had been forced to renounce their nationality or become Israelis.

On 22 June,<sup>(4)</sup> the Syrian Arab Republic stated in a note verbale that 30 leaders in the Golan Heights had signed a declaration asserting that the area was and would remain Syrian, and deciding to refuse to deal with any individual accepting Israeli identity. The text of the declaration, dated 25 March, was transmitted to the Secretary-General on 9 July.<sup>(5)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In December, the General Assembly adopted two resolutions on the Golan Heights. The first, on 16 December, arose from consideration by SPC of the situation in the territories occupied by Israel, and was prepared before the decision of the Israeli Parliament on 14 December to apply Israeli law to the area. The second, demanding that Israel rescind its decision, was adopted on 17 December in the context of the Assembly's consideration of the Middle East situation.<sup>(7)</sup>

By its resolution of 16 December,<sup>(6)</sup> the Assembly condemned Israel's persistence in changing the character and status of the Golan Heights and its refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions. All legislative and administrative measures to that end, it determined, were null and void. It called on Member States not to recognize such measures and on Israel to desist from enacting them. It also strongly condemned Israel for attempting to impose Israeli citizenship and identity cards on Syrian citizens in the area, and called on it to desist from repressive measures against the population. The Assembly requested a report from the Secretary-General at its 1982 session on implementation of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 141 to 1, with 3 abstentions, following approval by SPC on 30 November by a recorded vote of 96 to 2, with 24 abstentions. The text was sponsored by Bangladesh, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Pakistan and the Ukrainian SSR.

Speaking in explanation of vote in SPC, Israel opposed the resolution, calling it a weapon in the ongoing warfare against Israel waged by the Syrian Arab Republic, which refused to negotiate with Israel. For years, the Syrian Arab Republic had used the Golan Heights to launch attacks on Israel by regular and irregular forces.

The United States said it had voted against the text in SPC because of its bias and polemical tone.

Explaining their positive votes in the Assembly, Canada, Norway and Sweden, which had abstained in the Committee, stated that they had changed their positions in the light of the Israeli Parliament's decision of 14 December. However, Canada and Norway maintained strong reservations particularly concerning the condemnation of measures to impose Israeli citizenship on the Syrian citizens of the Golan Heights.

During the SPC debate in November on the situation in the occupied territories, the Syrian Arab Republic said that, since the occupation of the Golan Heights in 1967, Israel had expelled 90 per cent of the people, leaving only four inhabited villages with a total population of no more than 15,000, and had established 38 Israeli settlements. In implementing its policy aimed at ultimate annexation, Israel had adopted its customary defiance of international law and the will of the international community.

Letter (1) and notes verbales: <sup>(1)</sup>Israel: 11 Mar., A/36/126-S/14402 (1). Syrian Arab Republic: <sup>(2)</sup>24 Feb., A/36/110-S/14383; <sup>(3)</sup>17 Mar., A/36/134-S/14411; <sup>(4)</sup>22 June, A/36/345-S/14569; <sup>(5)</sup>9 July, A/36/369-S/14583.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(6)</sup>36/147 E, 16 Dec., text following; <sup>(7)</sup>36/226 B, 17 Dec. (p. 313).

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.33-38, 39, 46 (17-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/147 E

141-1-3 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/632/Add.1) by recorded vote (96-2-24), 30 November (meeting 46); 8-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.22), orally revised; agenda item 64.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Ukrainian SSR.

The General Assembly,

Deeply concerned that the Arab territories occupied since 1967 have been under continued illegal Israeli military occupation,

Recalling its previous resolutions, in particular resolutions 3414(XXX) of 5 December 1975, 31/61 of 9 December 1976, 32/20 of 25 November 1977, 33/28 and 33/29 of 7 December 1978, 34/70 of 6 December 1979 and 35/122 E of 11 December 1980, in which it, inter alia, called upon Israel to

put an end to its illegal occupation of the Arab territories and to withdraw from all those territories,

Gravely concerned at reports indicating measures being taken by the Israeli authorities to enact legislation embodying changes in the character and status of the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights,

Reaffirming that the acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible under the Charter of the United Nations and that all territories thus occupied by Israel must be returned,

Recalling the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,

1. Condemns the persistence of Israel in Changing the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure and legal status of the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights;

2. Strongly condemns the refusal by Israel, the occupying Power, to comply with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council;

3. Determines that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken or to be taken by Israel, the occupying Power, that purport to alter the character and legal status of the Syrian Arab Golan Heights are null and void and constitute a flagrant violation of international law and of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, and have no legal effect;

4. Strongly condemns Israel for its attempts and measures to impose forcibly Israel citizenship and Israeli identity cards on the Syrian citizens in the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights and calls upon it to desist from its repressive measures against the population of the Syrian Arab Golan Heights;

5. Calls upon Member States not to recognize any of the legislative or administrative measures and actions referred to above;

6. Calls upon Israel, the occupying Power, to desist forthwith from enacting such legislative or administrative measures;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report on the implementation of the present resolution.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Dominican Republic, Guatemala, United States.

#### Annexation by Israel

The Security Council and the General Assembly adopted resolutions on 17 December 1981 in connection with the enactment by the Israeli Parliament, on 14 December, of a law which many speakers in the Council characterized as

tantamount to annexation by Israel of the Golan Heights. The legislation extended Israeli laws, jurisdiction and administration to the area.

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION. Meeting at the request of the Syrian Arab Republic, the Security Council, on 17 December, unanimously adopted a resolution<sup>(17)</sup> prepared in the course of consultations, by which it decided that the Israeli decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the Golan Heights was null and void, and demanded that Israel rescind that decision. It determined that all the provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War continued to apply to the Syrian territory occupied since 1967 (p. 307). Requesting the Secretary-General to report to the Council within two weeks on implementation of the resolution, the Council decided that, in the event of Israel's non-compliance, it would meet not later than 5 January 1982 to consider taking appropriate measures.

Speaking after the Council acted, Israel said it could not accept the resolution, which ignored the Syrian Arab Republic's persistent aggressions against Israel since 1948 and its refusal to recognize Israel, negotiate and make peace with it. The resolution could only be construed by the Syrian Arab Republic as an encouragement to persist in its aggression.

The United States said that, in voting for the resolution, it expressed opposition to Israel's action purporting to extend permanent control over the Golan Heights; the United States called on Israel to reaffirm its commitment to a negotiated settlement, including the future status of the Golan Heights.

The Council met on 16 and 17 December in response to a request by the Syrian Arab Republic on 14 December<sup>(7)</sup> for an urgent meeting. By a note verbale of 14 December,<sup>(2)</sup> Cuba transmitted a communiqué adopted at a plenary meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held in New York on the same day, supporting that request and calling on the Council to take appropriate measures to restore the full sovereignty of the Syrian Arab Republic over all its occupied territories.

The Council invited Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zaire, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion, in accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.<sup>f</sup>

The Council also invited, at Tunisia's request of 16 December,<sup>(9)</sup> the Permanent Observer of

<sup>f</sup> See footnote a on p. 277.

the League of Arab States, in accordance with rule 39.<sup>8</sup>

During the debate, most speakers expressed the opinion that Israel's action was an annexation of Syrian territory, a violation of international law and a new, serious obstacle to a settlement of the Middle East conflict. Several States, including China, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Uganda and Yugoslavia, condemned the Israeli action and supported the Syrian demand that Israel revoke its decision. A number of speakers, such as China, Cuba, India, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, the USSR, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia, called for consideration of sanctions or firm action in the case of Israel's non-compliance with the Council decision.

Several countries, for example the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Uganda and Viet Nam, said Israel's action had to be seen in the larger context of its expansion and annexation policy. The need for Israel's withdrawal, not only from the Golan Heights but from all the territories occupied since 1967, was underlined by a number of States, among them Mexico, Romania, Turkey and Zaire.

In the Syrian Arab Republic's view, Israel's action epitomized a process of colonization begun in 1967 with a twofold objective: first, to create a de facto settler-colonialist situation, and second, to prevent the displaced Syrian Arab citizens, numbering approximately 200,000, from returning to their homes and property in the Golan Heights. It saw Israel's act not only as a breach of the cease-fire but as an act of war, and declared that it would not spare any effort to defend its territory and its national interests. It expected the Council to demand that Israel rescind its annexation of Syrian territory and, in the case of non-compliance, to impose sanctions.

Israel said it had occupied the Golan Heights in self-defence, following frequent Syrian bombardment of Israeli towns. Since then, the Syrian Arab Republic had refused to respond to Israel's repeated appeals for peace. In 1981, the Syrian Arab Republic had stepped up its subversive activities to incite the local Druze population of the Golan Heights against Israel and had been tightening its links with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Israel's decision to apply its laws, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights had been taken in order to regularize the situation, as all the authorities there, military and civilian, were Israelis. No responsible Government could agree to return to the totally insecure pre-1967 armistice demarcation lines. Israel again appealed to the Syrian Arab Republic to start negotiations on all outstanding issues, including the international boundary.

Egypt, stating that the Israeli action undermined the Middle East peace process, urged Israel to rescind that act and desist from similar measures and called on the United Nations to put an end to the Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories. Kuwait stated that the timing of the sudden Israeli decision and the attempts to convince the Syrian population of the Golan Heights to become Israeli citizens or, at least, carry Israeli identification cards indicated that Israel had planned to annex that territory a long time ago. Lebanon expressed unconditional support for the Syrian Arab Republic in the face of Israel's new aggression, adding that the world would become lawless if nations were allowed to get away with such actions. Tunisia believed that Israel's recent steps were not an isolated incident but were designed to strengthen a premeditated and systematic policy of transforming fact into law and occupation into outright annexation.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya stated that Israel would not have dared carry out its aggression against the Golan Heights had it not been for the support from and alliance with the United States. A similar view was held by several other speakers, such as the German Democratic Republic, the USSR and Viet Nam. The Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States hoped the United States would rejoin the international consensus on the current occasion, instead of allowing Israel to create new colonial and annexationist legitimacy.

The Niger considered that Israel's action confirmed its periodically revealed determination to maintain a state of successive crises in order to cement its policy of aggression, war and domination. Stating that any step towards confrontation must be discouraged, Senegal said the Council had the duty to render Israel's decision inoperative. Uganda said Israel could achieve security not by the annexation of occupied territories and aggression against neighbouring Arab States but only through a negotiated and comprehensive peace, beginning with a just settlement of the Palestine question.

China said the Council should reaffirm that Israel's action was illegal, null and void and should be revoked; it should call on Israel to withdraw from the territories occupied since 1967. Japan also urged Israel to withdraw and said Israel must realize that only by pursuing a solution to the Middle East problem through peaceful means could its own security be more effectively guaranteed. The Philippines viewed the action by the Israeli Parliament as complicating and obstructing the search for a just and lasting solution in the Middle East.

<sup>8</sup> See footnote b on p. 277.

Cuba stated that Israel's policy, aimed at annexing all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, was an integral part of its determination to de-Arabize the territory of Palestine, to deny the Palestinians the exercise of their inalienable national rights and to prevent any genuine settlement of the Middle East conflict. Israel's action, said Mexico, showed its refusal to seek solutions through negotiation and jeopardized the partial agreements already concluded. Panama hoped Israel would correct an action which, in its view, violated international law and showed lack of respect for the United Nations.

The German Democratic Republic said it shared the view of the Syrian Arab Republic that Israel should be called upon by a certain deadline to annul its action on the Golan Heights. In the view of the USSR, Israel's attempt to annex part of Syrian territory was aimed at consolidating the effects of Israeli aggression; it worsened a tense situation and set new obstacles to peace in the region.

France condemned Israel for an act amounting to annexation and appealed to it to abide by the rules of international law and not to jeopardize the chances of peace. Ireland believed that Israel's decision could be dangerous to its own interests, as it aggravated tensions in the region. The position of the United Kingdom was that the Golan Heights belonged to the Syrian Arab Republic, and it could not accept any unilateral initiative by Israel to change the status of that area from occupied territory to an area subject to Israeli law, jurisdiction and administration. In Spain's opinion, it was contrary to international law for the occupying Power to replace existing law in the territory by the law of the occupier just so that Israeli law could be applied to individuals.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(16)</sup> the General Assembly declared that Israel's decision to apply Israeli law to the Golan Heights was null and void and had no legal validity. It demanded that Israel rescind its decision and all related measures, and called on States and international institutions not to recognize that decision. It requested the Security Council, in the event of Israel's failure to comply, to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations (on action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression), and requested the Secretary-General to report by 21 December.

This resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 121 to 2, with 20 abstentions. Paragraph 6, containing the request to the Security Council, was adopted by a recorded vote of 92 to 19, with 26 abstentions. Cuba, which introduced the 13-nation text, observed that it had been drafted by

the Arab Group and the Working Group on the Middle East and Palestine of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The Assembly's main resolution on the Middle East situation, also adopted on 17 December, contained a provision<sup>(15)</sup> by which the Assembly strongly condemned, and declared null and void, Israeli annexationist policies and practices in the Golan Heights, the establishment of settlements, land confiscation, the diversion of water resources, the intensification of repressive measures against Syrians in that territory and the forcible imposition of Israeli citizenship on them. This paragraph was adopted by a recorded vote of 132 to 1, with 7 abstentions.

Israel rejected the resolution on the Golan Heights, saying that it ignored the persistent aggression of the Syrian Arab Republic against Israel since 1948 and its adamant refusal to recognize Israel, negotiate and make peace with it. The Assembly was precluded from adopting such a resolution, as the Security Council was seized of the matter.

The United States, although opposing any unilateral change in the status of the Golan Heights, voted against the resolution and abstained on the paragraph because the resolution invoked Chapter VII of the Charter and because it was improper for the Assembly to make recommendations on a situation before the Council.

Australia, Canada, Chile, New Zealand, Sweden and the United Kingdom—the last speaking for the European Community (EC) members—deplored Israel's decision but said they were unable to support the request to the Council because the Assembly should not act on questions that were before the Council. Reservations with regard to that request were also expressed by Austria, Chile and Uruguay, which supported the text. Canada did not believe some of the allegations about Israel's actions against Syrians in the Golan Heights.

During the debate on the Middle East situation, Democratic Yemen saw the decision to apply Israeli law to the Golan Heights as an instance of arrogance and contempt for the United Nations. Djibouti regarded the Israeli action as defiance of the United Nations and a violation of the principle that territory must not be acquired by war. Nicaragua said Israel's decision made clear its intention to reject political solutions and to perpetuate its colonialist policy throughout the occupied territories. Norway deplored the action as a step that would seriously undermine the search for peace in the Middle East. The decision was also condemned by Oman, Pakistan, Turkey, the USSR and Yemen.

**FURTHER COMMUNICATIONS.** During the latter half of December, several countries sent

comments and information on the Golan Heights in communications to the Secretary-General and the Security Council President.

Japan, by a note verbale of 15 December,<sup>(3)</sup> expressed deep concern that the Israeli action would impair a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and heighten tension. Romania, on 16 December,<sup>(6)</sup> transmitted a statement by the Romanian Press Agency, AGERPRES, saying that Israel should annul the illegal annexation of the Golan Heights in order to strengthen confidence and create a climate favourable to a peaceful settlement. On the same day,<sup>(1)</sup> Afghanistan transmitted a government statement declaring its readiness to support any effective measure against Israel, including sanctions.

The United Kingdom, by a letter of 17 December,<sup>(12)</sup> transmitted a statement of 15 December by the EC Foreign Ministers, stating that the Israeli step was tantamount to annexation, contrary to international law and further complicated the search for a comprehensive peace. Malaysia, by a letter of 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> transmitted a statement of the previous day by its Minister for Foreign Affairs, condemning the Israeli action as part of a policy of systematic aggression and expansionism, and stating that Malaysia would go along with all efforts to deal with the dangerous threat to international peace and security.

The Syrian Arab Republic, by a note verbale dated 18 December,<sup>(8)</sup> reported that the Syrian citizens of the Golan Heights had reacted to Israel's decision by strikes and demonstrations, notwithstanding pressure by the occupying authorities.

On 21 December,<sup>(10)</sup> Tunisia transmitted a letter of 18 December from the Palestine Liberation Organization to the President of the Security Council, stating that Israel had moved armoured battalions and heavy artillery into the Golan area and asking for the Council's immediate intervention to prevent wide-scale confrontation and further Israeli acts of aggression.

On the same day,<sup>(11)</sup> the USSR transmitted a statement by the TASS news agency declaring Israel's action to extend its laws to the Golan Heights a direct consequence of the Camp David accords and a tangible example of the strategic co-operation between the United States and Israel. Madagascar, on 22 December,<sup>(4)</sup> transmitted a message of 17 December by its President, condemning the Israeli action as an aggravation of an already dangerous situation and calling on the United Nations to denounce the involvement and responsibility of Israel's allies in the pursuit of Israel's policy.

REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.  
Reporting on 21 December<sup>(13)</sup> on implementa-

tion of the General Assembly resolution of 17 December, the Secretary-General stated that Israel had informed him that its position remained as indicated following adoption of the Security Council resolution of 17 December, namely, that it could not and did not accept the Council's resolution.

On 31 December, the Secretary-General reported to the Council<sup>(14)</sup> that he had asked Israel for information on action taken by it with regard to implementation of the Council's resolution. On 29 December, Israel had replied that it could not be expected to maintain indefinitely a military administration merely to accommodate the Syrian Arab Republic's interest in persistent conflict. The legislation concerning the Golan Heights did not in the slightest manner diminish the rights of the local population. Israel reiterated its willingness to negotiate unconditionally for a lasting peace with the Syrian Arab Republic, as with its other neighbours; the Golan Heights law did not preclude or impair such negotiations. Israel hoped the Council would focus on attaining peace through negotiations between the States directly concerned and on preventing the threat or use of force.

Letters and notes verbales (nv): <sup>(1)</sup>Afghanistan: 16 Dec., A/36/841-S/14801 (nv). <sup>(2)</sup>Cuba, for non-aligned countries: 14 Dec., A/37/59 (nv). <sup>(3)</sup>Japan: 15 Dec., A/36/835-S/14797 (nv). <sup>(4)</sup>Madagascar: 22 Dec., S/14815. <sup>(5)</sup>Malaysia: 17 Dec., S/14800. <sup>(6)</sup>Romania: 16 Dec., S/14796. Syrian Arab Republic: <sup>(7)</sup>14 Dec., S/14791; <sup>(8)</sup>18 Dec., A/36/850-S/14808 (nv). Tunisia: <sup>(9)</sup>16 Dec., S/14795; <sup>(10)</sup>21 Dec., S/14811. <sup>(11)</sup>USSR: 21 Dec., S/14813. <sup>(12)</sup>United Kingdom: 17 Dec., A/36/848-S/14807.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(13)</sup>A/36/846-S/14805 & Corr.1, <sup>(14)</sup>S/14821.  
Resolutions: GA: <sup>(15)</sup>36/226 A, para. 8, 17 Dec. (p. 262); <sup>(16)</sup>36/226 B, 17 Dec., text following. <sup>(17)</sup>SC: 497(1981), 17 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA. A/36/PV.95-97, 99, 103 (11-17 Dec.); SC, S/PV.2316-2319 (16, 17 Dec.).

#### Security Council resolution 497(1981)

Adopted unanimously Meeting 2319 17 December 1981

Draft prepared in consultations among Council members (S/14798).

The Security Council,

Having considered the letter of 14 December 1981 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic contained in document S/14791,

Reaffirming that the acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of international law and relevant Security Council resolutions,

1. Decides that the Israeli decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights is null and void and without international legal effect;

2. Demands that Israel, the occupying Power, should rescind forthwith its decision;

3. Determines that all the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, continue to apply to the Syrian territory occupied by Israel since June 1967;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Securi-

ty Council on the implementation of the present resolution within two weeks and decides that, in the event of non-compliance by Israel, the Council would meet urgently, and not later than 5 January 1982, to consider taking appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

General Assembly resolution 36/226 B

121-2-20 (recorded vote) Meeting 103 17 December 1981  
13-nation draft (A/36/L.60 and Add.1); agenda item 33.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Chad, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Pakistan, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

The General Assembly,

Gravely alarmed by Israel's decision of 14 December 1981 to apply Israeli law to the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights,

Reaffirming that acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible under the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of international law and relevant United Nations resolutions,

Reaffirming once more the applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, to the occupied Syrian territory,

Recalling its resolutions 35/122 A to F of 11 December 1980,

1. Declares that Israel's decision to apply Israeli law to the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights is null and void and has no legal validity whatsoever;

2. Determines that the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, continue to apply to the Syrian territory occupied by Israel since 1967;

3. Strongly deplores the persistence of the Israeli policy of annexation, which escalates tension in the region;

4. Demands that Israel, the occupying Power, rescind forthwith its decision and all administrative and other measures relating to it, which constitute a flagrant violation of all relevant principles of International law;

5. Calls upon all States, specialized agencies and other international institutions not to recognize that decision;

6. Requests the Security Council, in the event of Israel's failure to implement the present resolution, to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution not later than 21 December 1981.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom.

Expulsion of the Mayors of Hebron and Halhul and the Islamic Judge of Hebron

By a resolution of 16 December 1981,<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly demanded that Israel rescind the illegal measures of expelling and imprisoning the Mayors of Hebron and Halhul and expelling the Sharia (Islamic) Judge of Hebron, and facilitate their immediate return. It requested the Secretary-General to report as soon as possible on implementation of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 143 to 1, with 2 abstentions, following approval by the Special Political Committee (SPC) on 30 November by a recorded vote of 118 to 1, with 1 abstention. The 24-nation draft was introduced in Committee by Bangladesh.

Israel had deported the three West Bank officials—Fahd Kawasmeh, Mayor of Hebron; Mohamed Milhem, Mayor of Halhul; and Rajab Tamimi, Kadi of Hebron—in May 1980, on the ground that they had systematically engaged in inciting the local Arab population to acts of violence and subversion, abusing their public offices.<sup>(8)</sup>

Israel voted against the resolution, saying its situation required that it attach the utmost importance to its duty to safeguard public order and security. The three leaders had had recourse to the Israeli judicial system; the Supreme Court had upheld the orders against them and, since their expulsion, their declarations and conduct had only added support to Israel's position.

Explaining its abstention, the United States said that, though it believed the deportation of the Mayors to be contrary to the 1949 Convention on protection of civilians, the resolution contained excessively harsh language and omitted reference to the violence in Hebron which had preceded the deportations.

In the SPC debate on the situation in the occupied territories, Egypt expressed concern at the imposition of restrictions on the movement of mayors and the prevention of their travel abroad.

The Secretary-General reported on 30 January 1981<sup>(4)</sup> on the implementation of two December 1980 resolutions, by which the General Assembly had called on Israel to rescind the illegal measures against the three Palestinian leaders<sup>(5)</sup> and the Security Council had declared it imperative that the Mayors be enabled to return home and resume their responsibilities.<sup>(7)</sup> He informed the Assembly of his appeals of 17 December 1980 and 14 January 1981, addressed to Israel, to heed those calls and release the Palestinian leaders. In its reply of 23 January, set out in the report, Israel reiterated its position that the Mayors had abused their offices in order to incite the Arab population to acts of violence and subversion. Since their expulsion, it added,

there had been a marked reduction in tension and an improvement in public order in Hebron and Halhul.

In February and March, the Secretary-General received three letters in connection with the subsequent arrest of other Moslem religious leaders by Israeli occupation authorities. Jordan, by a letter of 2 February,<sup>(2)</sup> conveyed a message from the General Islamic Congress for Beitul-Maqdis (Jerusalem), meeting at Amman, Jordan, stating that there had been 23 such arrests throughout the West Bank, including the members of the Islamic Higher Council in Jerusalem, and urging the Secretary-General to take steps to ensure their immediate release. Israel, on 18 February,<sup>(1)</sup> rejecting the allegations in the Jordanian letter, said that only three Moslem religious functionaries had been arrested in December 1980 on suspicion of involvement in terrorist activities and they had since been released. Replying on 11 March,<sup>(3)</sup> Jordan gave the names of five Islamic religious dignitaries whom it said the occupation authorities had detained.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Israel: 18 Feb., A/36/105-S/14376. Jordan: <sup>(2)</sup>2 Feb., A/36/89-S/14356; <sup>(3)</sup>11 Mar., A/36/128-S/14404. Report: <sup>(4)</sup>S-G, A/36/85-S/14350. Resolutions: GA: <sup>(5)</sup>35/122 D, 11 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 433); <sup>(6)</sup>36/147 D, 16 Dec. 1981, text following. <sup>(7)</sup>SC: 484(1980), 19 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 436). Yearbook reference: <sup>(8)</sup>1980, p. 411. Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.33-38, 39, 46 (17-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/147 D

143-1-2 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981  
Approved by SPC (A/36/632/Add.1) by recorded vote (118-1-1), 30 November (meeting 46); 24-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.21); agenda item 64.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

The General Assembly,  
Recalling Security Council resolutions 468(1980) of 8 May 1980, 469(1980) of 20 May 1980 and 484(1980) of 19 December 1980,

Deeply concerned at the expulsion by the Israeli military occupation authorities of the Mayors of Hebron and Halhul and of the Sharia Judge of Hebron,

Recalling the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, in particular article 1 and the first paragraph of article 49, which read as follows:

#### "Article 1

"The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect and to ensure respect for the present Convention in all circumstances."

#### "Article 49

"Individual or mass forcible transfers, as well as deportations of protected persons from occupied territory to the territory of the occupying Power or to that of any other country, occupied or not, are prohibited, regardless of their motive..."

Reaffirming the applicability of the Geneva Convention to the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem,

1. Demands that the Government of Israel, the occupying Power, rescind the illegal measures taken by the Israeli military occupation authorities in expelling and imprisoning the Mayors of Hebron and Halhul and in expelling the Sharia Judge of Hebron and that it facilitate the immediate return of the expelled Palestinian leaders so that they can resume the functions for which they were elected and appointed;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly as soon as possible on the implementation of the present resolution.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Guatemala, United States.

#### Attempted assassinations of the Mayor of Nablus and others

By a resolution of 16 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly expressed deep concern that Israel had failed so far to apprehend and prosecute the perpetrators of the June 1980 assassination attempts against Basam Al-Shaka, Mayor of Nablus; Karim Khalaf, Mayor of Ramallah; and Ibrahim Al-Taweel, Mayor of Al Bireh. It demanded that Israel inform the Secretary-General of the results of the investigations, and requested him to submit by 31 December a report on implementation of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 140 to 1, with 2 abstentions, following approval by SPC on 30 November by a recorded vote of 119 to 1, with 1 abstention. The draft was introduced by Pakistan on behalf of 25 countries.

Israel, which voted against, said the text raised serious questions of morality and double standards. Since 1966, terrorism by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) had claimed the lives of some 400 Arabs and wounded 2,000 others. Investigation of the 1980 incident would continue until the criminals had been brought to justice.

The United States said it had abstained be-

cause the text failed to consider all elements and implied, without justification, a lack of effort by Israel to apprehend and prosecute the perpetrators of the assassination attempts.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community (EC) members, noted that the matter had already been considered by the Security Council and repeated their appeal to all parties to refrain from acts of violence which could only make the search for peace more difficult.

As requested by the assembly, the Secretary General submitted a report on 30 December.<sup>(1)</sup> It reproduced a reply from Israel of the same date stating that it had nothing to add to what it had said in SPC and that Israeli authorities were carrying on the investigation.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/854.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/147 G, 16 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.33-38, 39, 46 (17-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/147 G

140-1-2 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/632/Add.1) by recorded vote (119-1-1), 30 November (meeting 46); 25-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.24 and Corr.1); agenda item 64.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

The General Assembly,

Recalling Security Council resolution 471(1980) of 5 June 1980, in which the Council condemned the assassination attempts against the Mayors of Nablus, Ramallah and Al Birah and called for the immediate apprehension and prosecution of the perpetrators of these crimes,

Recalling once again the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, in particular article 27, which states, *inter alia*:

"Protected persons are entitled, in all circumstances, to respect for their persons... They shall at all times be humanely treated, and shall be protected especially against all acts of violence or threats thereof..."

Reaffirming the applicability of the Geneva Convention to the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem,

1. Expresses deep concern that Israel, the occupying Power, has failed so far to apprehend and prosecute the perpetrators of the assassination attempts;

2. Demands that Israel, the occupying Power, inform the Secretary-General of the results of the investigations relevant to the assassination attempts;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly, not later than 31 December 1981, a report on the implementation of the present resolution.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya,

Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Guatemala, United States.

#### Educational institutions

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 16 December 1981,<sup>(6)</sup> condemned Israel's policies and practices against Palestinian students and faculty, and its repression against and closing of universities in the occupied Palestinian territories, and demanded that it rescind immediately orders of closure of the universities of Bir Zeit, Bethlehem and Al-Najah. The Assembly requested a report from the Secretary-General by the end of 1981 on implementation of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 114 to 2, with 30 abstentions, on the recommendation of SPC, which approved it on 30 November by a recorded vote of 94 to 2, with 25 abstentions. The text was introduced by Bangladesh, also on behalf of Cuba, India, Indonesia and Pakistan.

In connection with its consideration of Palestine refugees, the Assembly, on 16 December, appealed to States, United Nations specialized agencies and the United Nations University to contribute to the Palestinian universities in the occupied territories,<sup>(5)</sup> and called on Israel to remove obstacles to the establishment at Jerusalem of a university for Palestine refugees.<sup>(4)</sup>

Israel voted against the resolution on educational institutions in the occupied territories, calling it another example of distortion of fact and wild accusations. The Israeli authorities had had to close Bir Zeit University for two months in the face of violence since November 1980 in which a number of students and faculty members had been involved in hostile activities on behalf of PLO. There was no truth in the assertion that orders existed for closing the universities of Bethlehem and Al-Najah.

The United States said it had voted against the text because of its biased and polemical tone.

The United Kingdom, explaining the abstentions of the EC members, said they had the same reservations as on the Assembly's 1980 resolution on the subject,<sup>(3)</sup> though the wording had been improved in the 1981 text. New Zealand also abstained for the same reasons as in 1980.

Prior to the Assembly action, Jordan, by a



letter of 19 August,<sup>(1)</sup> complained of an assault on and closure of the Hebron Technical Engineering College by Israeli military authorities; details of the 21 and 22 July incident were provided in an enclosed note of 27 July to the Jordan Government from the League of University Graduates in the Governorate of Hebron, Amman branch.

Reporting to the Assembly on 29 December<sup>(2)</sup> in accordance with its request, the Secretary-General conveyed the text of a reply from Israel on the previous day, stating that no orders had been issued to close the universities of Bethlehem and Al-Najah and that both were open and functioning. As to Bir Zeit University, Israel said it had nothing to add to what it had told SPC.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Jordan, 19 Aug., A/36/443-S/14633.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/853.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/122 F, 11 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 434); <sup>(4)</sup>36/146 G, 16 Dec. 1981 (p. 339); <sup>(5)</sup>36/146 H, para. 5, 16 Dec. (p. 338); <sup>(6)</sup>36/147 F, 16 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.33-38, 39, 46 (17-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/147 F

114-2-30 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981  
Approved by SPC (A/36/632/Add.1) by recorded vote (94-2-25), 30 November (meeting 46); 5-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.23 and Corr.1); agenda item 64.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Pakistan.

The General Assembly,

Bearing in mind the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,

Deeply shocked by the most recent atrocities committed by Israel, the occupying Power, against educational institutions in the occupied Palestinian territories,

1. Reaffirms the applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, to the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem;

2. Condemns Israeli policies and practices against Palestinian students and faculty in schools, universities and other educational institutions in the occupied Palestinian territories, especially the policy of opening fire on defenceless students, causing many casualties;

3. Condemns the systematic Israeli campaign of repression against and closing of universities in the occupied Palestinian territories, restricting and impeding academic activities of Palestinian universities by subjecting the selection of courses, textbooks and educational programmes, the admission of students and the appointment of faculty members to the control and supervision of the military occupation authorities, in clear contravention of the Geneva Convention;

4. Demands that Israel, the occupying Power, comply with the provisions of the Geneva Convention and rescind all actions and measures against all educational institutions and ensure the freedom of these institutions, and that it rescind immediately orders for the closure of the universities of Bir Zeit, Bethlehem and Al-Najah and facilitate the resumption of education in the above-mentioned institutions;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly, before the end of 1981, a report on the implementation of the present resolution.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelo-

ruссия" SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chins, Congo, Cube, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Saint Lucia, Sweden, United Kingdom, Upper Volta, Uruguay.

#### Jerusalem

##### Protection of cultural property

Excavations by Israel at cultural and historical sites in Jerusalem, notably Al Aqsa Mosque, were the subject of communications from States during 1981 and of a General Assembly resolution in October.

COMMUNICATIONS. By a letter of 8 September to the Secretary-General,<sup>(3)</sup> Jordan reserved the right to bring before the Security Council the case of the latest Israeli excavations beneath Al Aqsa Mosque, which it said threatened the total collapse of that focal point of the Islamic faith. Attached to the letter were a map of the excavations and letters from the Jordanian Minister for Foreign Affairs alleging that Israel had the avowed aim of building a Temple of Solomon on the ruins of the Mosque; from the Mosque's resident engineer reporting on a tunnel beneath the site; and from Ruhi Al-Khatib, who signed as Mayor of Jerusalem, saying the excavations violated the sanctity of the holy Islamic sites and threatened to bring them down. The Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, by a letter dated 17 September,<sup>(1)</sup> conveyed the Committee's deep concern at Israel's continuing excavation of the tunnel under the Mosque, stating that it endangered historic Islamic buildings and had been the cause of clashes between Arabs and Jews in Jerusalem.

Israel, by a letter of 24 September,<sup>(2)</sup> rejected the Jordanian charges as a groundless attempt at religious incitement against Israel; it said recent work to clear an ancient underground passage had been carried out with the full co-operation of Moslem authorities.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 28 October the General Assembly adopted a resolution.

demanding that Israel desist from all excavations and transformations of the historical, cultural and religious sites of Jerusalem. It determined that such acts violated international law and the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, and were a serious obstruction to a comprehensive and just peace in the Middle East as well as a threat to international peace and security. The Assembly requested the Security Council to consider the situation in case Israel failed to comply, and requested the Secretary-General to report on implementation to the Assembly and the Council by 23 November.

The resolution was adopted, by a roll-call vote of 114 to 2, with 27 abstentions, on the recommendation of SPC, which approved it on 26 October, also by roll call, by 101 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions.

Morocco, introducing the draft on behalf of its 49 Arab, Moslem and other sponsors, stated that the Israeli excavations around the Holy Places of Islam in Jerusalem were being conducted on the false pretext that they were archaeological excavations. The Moslem world had always accorded to the Wailing Wall the respect due to that Jewish monument, but Israel's leaders were attacking the Holy Places in the hope that their disappearance would lead to the disappearance from the area of all civilizations other than the Jewish.

Israel, which voted against the text, said it did not reflect the facts. No structure on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem was in danger of collapse as a result of excavations, and the Geneva Convention contained no provision on archaeological excavations.

Also voting against, the United States said it strongly objected to the resolution and deplored its inflammatory charges; a report by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) had found no damage to the holy sites and recent repair work had been carried out in full co-operation with the Moslem authorities.

Among States which abstained in the vote, Canada, Greece, Sweden and the United Kingdom, the last speaking for the EC members, questioned the paragraph characterizing the excavations as a threat to peace and security; Sweden commented that that provision prejudged Security Council consideration. Canada, Finland and Sweden added that they were not sure the facts warranted the statements in the text, and Japan said the resolution contained unacceptable concepts. However, these States reaffirmed the need to protect cultural property and respect the Geneva Convention.

Spain, though supporting the resolution, would have preferred wording which did not

refer to questions within the competence of the Security Council.

Several speakers in the Committee, including Cuba, speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, as well as Iraq, Jordan, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, expressed the opinion that Israel was trying to destroy the Moslem cultural heritage. Jordan and Senegal believed that the international community should act to put an end to any practices endangering the religious sites in Jerusalem, which were part of the common heritage of mankind. In Cuba's view, the draft resolution would help to remedy the situation without requiring recourse to the Security Council, though the Council would have to examine the situation if Israeli violations persisted.

Pakistan appealed to the United States not to wash its hands of the situation and its possible consequences, and noted that UNESCO had placed the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls on the World Heritage List. Senegal said the excavations could serve only to aggravate tension in the Middle East.

On 20 November, the Secretary-General reported<sup>(4)</sup> that, in reply to a note by which he had brought the Assembly resolution to Israel's attention, Israel had reiterated that the mosques on the Temple Mount were not in danger of collapse and that it regarded the conclusions and demands of the resolution as groundless.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Palestinian rights Chairman, 17 Sep., A/36/519-S/14695; <sup>(2)</sup>Israel, 24 Sep., A/36/555-S/14708; <sup>(3)</sup>Jordan, 8 Sep., A/36/489-S/14684.

Report: <sup>(4)</sup>S-G, A/36/706-S/14762.

Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>GA, 36/15, 28 Oct., text following.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR. 11-13, 33-39 (22 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.42 (28 Oct.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/15

114-2-27 (roll-call vote) Meeting 42 28 October 1981  
Approved by SPC (A/36/632) by roll-call vote (101-2-23), 26 October (meeting 13); 49-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.3); agenda item 64.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Chad, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, Upper Volta, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

#### Recent developments in connection with excavations in eastern Jerusalem

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, is applicable to Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem,

Recalling its resolutions 2253(ES-V) of 4 July 1967, 2254(ES-V) of 14 July 1967, 3092(XXVIII) of 7 December 1973, 3240 B (XXIX) of 29 November 1974, 3525 B (XXX) of 15 December 1975, 31/106 B of 16 December 1976, 32/91 A of 13 December 1977, 33/113 A of 18 December 1978, 34/90 B of 12 December 1979 and 35/122 of 11 December 1980.

Recalling Security Council resolutions 252(1968) of 21 May 1968, 267(1969) of 3 July 1969, 271(1969) of 15 September 1969, 465(1980) of 1 March 1980, 476(1980) of 30 June 1980 and 478(1980) of 20 August 1980,

Bearing in mind the need to protect and preserve the unique spiritual and religious character and dimensions of the Holy City of Jerusalem,

Expressing its very grave concern that Israel, as the occupying Power, persists in excavating and transforming the historical, cultural and religious sites of Jerusalem,

Noting with alarm that the excavations and transformations in progress seriously endanger the historical, cultural and religious sites of Jerusalem as well as its overall configuration and that these sites have never been as endangered as they are today,

Noting with satisfaction and approval the decision of the World Heritage Committee of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to include the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls on the World Heritage List,

Noting with appreciation the recommendation of the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization during its one hundred and thirteenth session that the World Heritage Committee should speed up the procedure for including the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls in the List of World Heritage in Danger,

1. Determines that the excavations and transformations of the landscape and of the historical, cultural and religious sites of Jerusalem constitute a flagrant violation of the principles of international law and the relevant provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949;

2. Decides that such violations by Israel constitute a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive and just peace in the Middle East as well as a threat to international peace and security;

3. Demands that Israel desist forthwith from all excavations and transformations of the historical, cultural and religious sites of Jerusalem, particularly beneath and around the Moslem Holy Sanctuary of Al-Haram Al-Sharif (Al Masjid Al Aqsa and the Sacred Dome of the Rock), the structures of which are in danger of collapse;

4. Requests the Security Council to consider this situation in case Israel fails to comply immediately with the present resolution;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council, not later than 23 November 1981, on the implementation of the present resolution.

Roll-call vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom.

Other aspects

On 10 December 1981, the General Assembly reaffirmed its non-recognition of Israel's 1980 decision to proclaim Jerusalem as its capital, and other Israeli actions to alter the city's status.<sup>(7)</sup>

Several communications were sent during 1981 on other developments relating to Jerusalem.

By a letter of 10 March,<sup>(2)</sup> Jordan transmitted a letter of 8 March from Rabbi Moshe Hirsch on behalf of the Neturei Karta (Guardians of the Holy City) of Jerusalem, who charged that, on 7 March, Israeli security forces had committed an unprovoked assault against hundreds of defenceless Orthodox Jews in their synagogue, breaking windows and furniture and trampling religious texts. In a reply dated 23 March,<sup>(1)</sup> Israel charged that Jordan was promoting a distorted version of measures undertaken by Israeli authorities against law-breakers. In a letter of 1 April,<sup>(3)</sup> Jordan maintained that Israel's reply was designed to divert attention from charges of brutal police action against unarmed Orthodox Jews, as part of a pattern of political suppression inflicted by Israel on indigenous Palestinians of all faiths.

On 11 September,<sup>(5)</sup> Jordan transmitted a letter from the Neturei Karta of the United States, dated 4 September, protesting the desecration of graves and beatings and imprisonment of Orthodox Jews in Jerusalem.

On 7 April,<sup>(4)</sup> Jordan transmitted a memorandum from its Minister of Labour to the Director-General of the International Labour Organisation, stating that Israeli occupation authorities had violated international law and the Geneva Convention on protection of civilians by their take-over of the Jordanian Electricity Corporation of the Governorate of Jerusalem, whose concession they had transferred to the Israeli Regional Electricity Company. Morocco, on 10 July,<sup>(6)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General recommendations on political, information, cultural, economic and military matters adopted by the Al-Quds (Jerusalem) Committee of the Organization of the Islamic Conference at its fifth session, held at Fez, Morocco, on 23 and 24 April.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Israel: 23 Mar., A/36/137-S/14416. Jordan:

<sup>(2)</sup>10 Mar., A/36/125-S/14400; <sup>(3)</sup>1 Apr., A/36/158-S/14424; <sup>(4)</sup>7 Apr., A/36/178-S/14431; <sup>(5)</sup>11 1 Sep., A/36/505-S/14690. <sup>(6)</sup>Morocco: 10 July, A/36/379-S/14590.

Resolution: <sup>(7)</sup>GA, 36/120 E, 10 Dec. (p. 270).

Mediterranean-Dead Sea canal project

On 29 March 1981, Israel approved a plan for the construction of a 67-mile hydraulic structure to channel water from the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea for electric power generation.

Under the project, part of the conduit would pass through the Gaza Strip, occupied by Israel since 1967.

The General Assembly and the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy adopted resolutions calling for a halt to Israel's canal project, and the Secretary-General received a number of communications regarding it.

**COMMUNICATIONS.** By a letter of 7 April,<sup>(1)</sup> the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People stated that Israel's announced intention of building a canal across the Gaza Strip would violate United Nations resolutions. Jordan, by a letter dated 9 April,<sup>(5)</sup> conveyed its profound concern over the project and cited a 23 March statement by the Council of the League of Arab States to the effect that the aim was to bring about fundamental geographical, demographic, environmental, economic and particularly ecological transformations, affecting the Palestinian Arabs and Jordan. By a letter of 13 April,<sup>(3)</sup> Egypt expressed strong objection to the project as creating a *de facto* permanent Israeli presence in the occupied territories and violating Security Council resolutions and the Geneva Convention on protection of civilians.

Israel, in a letter dated 2 October,<sup>(4)</sup> enumerated the benefits which the region, in its view, would derive from the power generated by the project, and expressed willingness to co-operate with Jordan in the scheme.

**ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON NEW AND RENEWABLE SOURCES OF ENERGY.** On 21 August, the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy adopted a resolution<sup>(6)</sup> denouncing Israel for the canal project, describing it as aggression against the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people and their occupied land, and calling on Israel to stop implementing the project. The resolution was adopted by a roll-call vote of 63 to 1, with 33 abstentions.

Israel, which voted against, said the project would be of great advantage to the area by supplying pollution-free energy, and would not raise the level of the Dead Sea above the crest levels of existing dikes. Several of the States which abstained in the vote—Canada, Colombia, Denmark (speaking for the five Nordic countries) and Uruguay—said they had done so because the resolution went beyond the Conference's mandate.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 16 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(7)</sup> by which it demanded that Israel cease implementing the canal project and requested the Security Council to consider measures to halt it. The Assembly called on States not to assist the

project and requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Assembly and the Council, by 30 June 1982, a study on the canal and its effects on Jordan and the Palestinian territories.

The resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 139 to 2, with 4 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee (SPC), which approved the text on 7 December by 114 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions. The draft resolution, revised by its sponsors, was introduced by Jordan, on behalf of 20 members of the League of Arab States. The same States, by a letter of 20 October,<sup>(2)</sup> had requested the inclusion of the subject as an additional item on the agenda of the 1981 regular Assembly session.

Explaining its negative vote, the United States said the resolution bore virtually no relation to reality; the canal project was in the earliest stages of planning and it was wholly inappropriate to call on the Security Council to consider the issue.

Among those voting in favour, Canada emphasized that the project must be undertaken only with the mutual consent of all parties and stated that it would not assist the project. The USSR believed that the study called for in the resolution could be carried out by United Nations staff members and should not entail additional expenditures.

Israel, which voted against, rejected the factual and legal premises of the text as well as the assertion that the project would violate international law. The project would produce a renewable energy source independent of petroleum. It was designed as a water conduit, largely an underground pipeline, and not a canal for shipping. The 400-metre drop from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea would be used to generate electric power. The inflow of water would restore the Dead Sea to its 1955 level and would have only inconsequential effects on the composition and chemical balance of the water in the Sea.

Jordan said the project, for which nearly \$1 billion was being raised, would cause incalculable damage to the vital interests of Jordan and the Palestinians. The overflow from the Dead Sea that would be caused by the canal would inundate areas of the Jordan valley and southern Jordan. Replying to Israel's invitation to co-operate in the project, Jordan stated that it did not enter into negotiations with Israel because it did not recognize Israel. Referring to Israel's mention of a Jordanian project to link the Dead Sea and the Red Sea, Jordan declared that it would not put such a project into effect unless the world community failed to halt the construction of the canal planned by Israel.

A number of States, among them Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Pakistan,

Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Emirates, stressed that Israel was violating international instruments and the rights and interests of the countries of the whole region, particularly Jordan and the Palestinians. Saudi Arabia said the fact that the canal would pass through Palestinian territories under Israeli occupation was proof of Israel's determination to perpetuate its occupation.

Algeria expressed a similar opinion, adding that control of water supplies, the first stage of which was the appropriation of all the Jordan waters, would give Israel a hold over the economy of the entire Middle East. Iraq charged that the project was designed to meet purely strategic and military objectives and would in no way contribute to the development of the region. Kuwait appealed to all nations not only to condemn the Israeli project but also to withhold any kind of economic, political and technical help. The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community (EC) members, reiterated their opposition to the project on the grounds that it would not only be illegal but would also create a serious obstacle to a just and lasting peace settlement; they called on Israel to reconsider the project.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Palestinian rights Acting Chairman, 7 Apr., A/36/177-S/14430; <sup>(2)</sup>Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, 20 Oct., A/36/243; <sup>(3)</sup>Egypt, 13 Apr., A/36/187-S/14439; <sup>(4)</sup>Israel, 2 Oct., A/36/575-S/14715 (& Add.1, 1 Dec.); <sup>(5)</sup>Jordan, 9 Apr., A/36/180-S/14432.

Resolutions: <sup>(6)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (report, A/CONF.100/11, Sales No. E.81.I.24), 3, 21 Aug.; <sup>(7)</sup>GA, 36/150, 16 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/826; S-G statements, A/SPC/36/L.34, A/C.5/36/97.

Meeting records: GA: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.4 (3 Nov.); SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.49-51 (4, 7 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.73 (14 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.46, 100 (4 Nov., 16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/150

139-2-4 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/814) by vote (114-2-3), 7 December (meeting 51); 20-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.32/Rev.1); agenda item 136.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

#### Israel's decision to build a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea

The General Assembly,

Recalling the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,

Reaffirming the applicability of the Geneva Convention to all Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem,

Taking into account that the Israeli project to build a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea and the Dead Sea is in violation of the rules of international law, in particular those relating to the fundamental rights and duties of States,

Also taking into account that this project, if completed, will cause direct and irreparable damage to the rights and the legitimate vital interests of Jordan and of the Palestinian people,

Expressing concern that the proposed canal, to be constructed partly through the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, will violate the principles of international law,

1. Demands that Israel cease forthwith the implementation of its project of a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea and the Dead Sea;

2. Requests the Security Council to consider initiating measures to halt the execution of this project;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare and submit to the General Assembly and the Security Council, by 30 June 1982, a study on the Israeli canal and its effects on Jordan and the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967;

4. Calls upon all States not to assist, either directly or indirectly, in the preparation for and the execution of this project and to urge the compliance of national and international corporations to this effect;

5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Israel's decision to build a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Malawi.

#### Living conditions of the Palestinians

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. On 29 May 1981, the Secretary-General submitted a report (with later addenda) on the living conditions of the Palestinians.<sup>(1)</sup> It set out the replies of 13 Governments on action taken in response to a December 1980 resolution by which the General Assembly condemned Israel's policy resulting in the deterioration of the living conditions of the Palestinians and called on States to co-operate with United Nations organizations and local Palestinian authorities to alleviate those conditions.<sup>(2)</sup>

Israel's reply, dated 25 March, stated that the negative approach towards Israel taken in United Nations resolutions on the living conditions of the Palestinians made it impossible for Israel to associate itself with the ventures undertaken, in accordance with those resolutions, by

the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat). The resolutions presupposed consultations and co-operation with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), which Israel neither recognized nor accepted. Israel was doing its best to co-operate with those United Nations bodies whose aim was to assist in the improvement of the living conditions of the inhabitants of the territories under its control, among others the International Labour Organisation, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and the World Health Organization.

Reporting on social and economic progress in the occupied territories in the years 1967-1980, Israel stated that the gross national product had increased at an average annual rate of about 13 per cent, unemployment had been virtually eliminated, agricultural output and exports had increased significantly, the number of school classrooms had risen by 80 per cent and the public health system had been improved. The inhabitants enjoyed absolute freedom of religion and had been visiting Arab States in growing numbers. Freedom of speech and the press was restricted only by military censorship for security reasons. Municipal elections had been held in 1976, during which women in those areas had been allowed to vote for the first time.

The Economic and Social Council, on 24 July, took note of the Secretary-General's report. The decision<sup>(4)</sup> was adopted without vote, following similar approval on 21 July by the Council's First (Economic) Committee on an oral proposal by the Chairman.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 4 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(5)</sup> by which it condemned Israel for the deteriorating living conditions of the Palestinians in the occupied Palestinian territories, affirmed that the elimination of the Israeli occupation was a prerequisite for the social and economic development of the Palestinians, and requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Assembly in 1982, through the Economic and Social Council, a report on their deteriorating living conditions, to be prepared in co-operation with PLO.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 109 to 2, with 25 abstentions, following approval by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 11 November by a recorded vote of 98 to 2, with 26 abstentions.

The draft was revised by its sponsors to delete the phrase "with satisfaction" from a paragraph by which the Assembly took note of the Secretary-General's report on the subject. Jordan, in orally proposing this change, observed that much of the report contained data supplied by Israel that were

inconsistent with the conclusions of the report on this subject prepared for the Assembly in 1980.<sup>(6)</sup>

Introducing the 43-nation draft, the Syrian Arab Republic stated that Palestinians who refused to abandon the land of their ancestors were being exposed to psychological and economic pressure by Israeli authorities which, after having built settlements on the outskirts of Arab villages in occupied Palestine, were taking all sorts of economic and social measures to force them to leave.

Israel rejected the resolution on the ground that it included false allegations, despite the fact that substantial progress had been made in improving the living conditions of the Palestinian Arabs in the administered territories. Israel's administration policy was in accordance with its obligation under international law to guarantee the security of the territories and the safety of their inhabitants, and Israel had gone even further in promoting economic and social development. Israel objected to one-sided resolutions that presupposed consultation with PLO.

The United States, which also voted against, said it could not support the use of political rhetoric in regard to humanitarian questions, believed the text was unbalanced in its attacks against Israel and maintained that PLO should not be recognized as the representative of the Palestinian people.

Among those abstaining in the vote, Japan said the substance of some paragraphs was not appropriate for consideration under the economic item before the Committee. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, said they took the view that Israel should withdraw from the territories occupied since 1967 and believed that the occupation inevitably had an impact on the region's economic and social development.

Uruguay said it supported the resolution on the understanding it had expressed in 1980<sup>(5)</sup> (that Israel's right to existence was recognized as irreversible).

In the Second Committee debate, Jordan regarded Israel's statements about the living conditions of the Palestinians as completely misleading and observed that Israel had refused to allow neutral observers into the occupied territories.

The PLO observer made the following points about the Palestinians living conditions: Israeli authorities had closed Arab banks in the occupied territories, blocking the financing of Palestinian projects; they had prevented the population of the Gaza Strip from receiving assistance from other Arab countries, thus prohibiting them from controlling their economy; the average wage of Arab workers was half that paid to Israelis for the same kind of work, and the Arabs were the first to be fired; the Israelis

had destroyed the industrial infrastructure, so that the Palestinians were wholly dependent on the Israeli economy; and the occupation authorities had seized more than a third of the land in the occupied territories, particularly to establish settlements, and were obstructing agricultural development by inciting Palestinians to destroy their farms and attempting to prevent irrigation and the provision of drinking water.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/260 & Add.1-3.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/75, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 435); <sup>(3)</sup>36/73, 4 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC: 1981/190, 24 July, text following.

Yearbook references: 1980, <sup>(5)</sup>p. 385, <sup>(6)</sup>p. 422.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/713; S-G statements, A/C.2/36/L.41, A/C.5/36/43.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.I/SR.7-9, 17 (7-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-30, 31, 32, 35 (24 Sep.-11 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.52 (24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.84 (4 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/190

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/107) without vote, 21 July (meeting 17); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 9.

#### Report of the Secretary-General on the living conditions of the Palestinian people

At its 41st plenary meeting, on 24 July 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Secretary-General on the living conditions of the Palestinian people.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/73

109-2-25 (recorded vote) Meeting 84 4 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.10) by recorded vote (98-2-26), 11 November (meeting 35); 43-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.31/Rev.1), orally revised on proposal by Jordan: agenda item 69 (k).

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia,

#### Living conditions of the Palestinian people

The General Assembly,

Recalling the Vancouver Declaration on Human Settlements, 1976, and the relevant recommendations for national action adopted by Habitat: United Nations Conference on Human Settlements,

Recalling also resolution 3, entitled "Living conditions of the Palestinians in occupied territories", contained in the recommendations for international co-operation adopted by Habitat: United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, and Economic and Social Council resolutions 2026(LXI) of 4 August 1976 and 2100(LXIII) of 3 August 1977,

Recalling further its resolutions 3236(XXIX) and 3237(XXIX) of 22 November 1974, 31/110 of 16 December 1976, 32/171 of 19 December 1977, 33/110 of 18 December 1978, 34/113 of 14 December 1979 and 35/75 of 5 December 1980,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the living conditions of the Palestinian people:

2. Denounces Israel for refusing to allow the Group of Experts on the Social and Economic impact of the Israeli Occu-

pation on the Living Conditions of the Palestinian People in the Occupied Arab Territories to visit the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel;

3. Condemns Israel for the deteriorating living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories;

4. Affirms that the elimination of the Israeli occupation is a prerequisite for the social and economic development of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories;

5. Recognizes the need for a comprehensive report on the deterioration of the social and economic conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare a comprehensive and analytical report on the deteriorating living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories and to submit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, through the Economic and Social Council;

7. Also requests the Secretary-General, in preparing the above-mentioned report, to consult and co-operate with the Palestine Liberation Organization, the representative of the Palestinian people.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom.

#### Economic situation of the Palestinians

By a resolution of 9 October 1981<sup>(4)</sup> the Trade and Development Board of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to prepare a comprehensive and in-depth survey of the state of the economy of the Palestinians in the territories occupied by Israel, as well as an analysis of the potentials for its development, and to formulate proposals for alternative development strategies in collaboration with PLO. The Board also requested him to submit to it periodic progress reports on the preparation of the survey and invited UNDP to make additional resources available to UNCTAD for the purpose.

The General Assembly took note of that resolution on 16 December, in its resolution on the work of UNCTAD.<sup>(3)</sup> An earlier draft,<sup>(1)</sup> submitted to the Second Committee by Algeria for the Group of 77, by which the Assembly would have

endorsed the Board's decision rather than taken note of it, was withdrawn in favour of the text adopted.

In a report circulated in August,<sup>(2)</sup> prepared at the request of the UNCTAD secretariat in response to a 1979 request by the Conference,<sup>(5)</sup> M. W. Khouja, Economic Adviser to the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development, and P. G. Sadler, Director of the Institute for the Study of Sparsely Populated Areas, University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom, reviewed the economic conditions of the Palestinians in the occupied territories. The authors, who were not given access to Israeli officials and were unable to visit or conduct interviews in the occupied territories, based their study on data available in Jordan and other Arab countries, official Israeli statistics and other publicly available sources of information in Israel, interviews with Palestinians outside the occupied territories and information gathered by PLO.

In order to stabilize and strengthen the local economies in the occupied territories and prevent their further deterioration, the study recommended that special attention be paid to measures to counter any further subjugation of those economies to that of Israel, and to make alternative employment and income opportunities possible. Such measures should have the effect of stemming emigration, allowing more residents of the occupied territories to find work at home instead of in Israel and strengthening the base of the local economies. The study recommended specific measures in areas such as agriculture, labour, finance, housing and infrastructure, and trade. It suggested that a monitoring body be set up to improve information on the deterioration of conditions in the occupied territories and the continued subjugation of their economies to Israel.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.65.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNCTAD consultants, TD/B/870.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/145, para. 3, 16 Dec. (p. 533);

<sup>(4)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15), 239(XXIII), 9 Oct.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1979, p. 572.

#### Permanent sovereignty over national resources

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. On 10 November 1981, the Secretary-General submitted a report,<sup>(1)</sup> requested by the General Assembly in 1979<sup>(2)</sup> and 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> on the effects of Israeli occupation on the national resources in the occupied territories. He stated that in August a mission had been sent to Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic to gather information from the Governments concerned and from PLO, as well as from United Nations and specialized agency offices. Israel refused to permit the mission to visit the occupied territories on the grounds that the resolutions calling for the study

were motivated by political hostility and that the mission included staff members of the Economic Commission for Western Asia, of which PLO was a member while Israel was excluded.

The report, prepared by two consultants, stated that there had been a significant reduction in the amount of land under cultivation in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip since 1967, and more than 25 per cent of the total land area had been requisitioned, confiscated or otherwise appropriated by the occupying authorities. Israeli water use was dangerously close to the maximum sustainable capacity, increasing the pressure on water resources available to the Arab inhabitants.

The report noted a significant loss of human resources in the occupied territories, due to displacement following armed conflicts and emigration by Palestinians of working age in search of employment. Of the employed persons, 35 per cent worked in Israel, indicating a potential loss of manpower for the development of the occupied territories.

Regarding economic resources, the report cited Israeli data showing an aggregate increase in agricultural output, including output of the Israeli settlements, apparently due to new technologies introduced by the occupying authorities. There was considerable change in the mix of agricultural products, directed towards eliminating items competing with Israeli products and introducing new items which would provide raw material for Israeli industries.

The report found no evidence of any significant structural changes during the occupation that would have made industry a dynamic contributor to development. The establishment of factories in the Israeli settlements could have adverse consequences for the industrial sector, making Arab industries less competitive.

According to the report, there had been a dramatic change in the pattern and direction of trade, with Israel having become the main trading partner. All foreign exchange accrued to the Israeli economy and much of the wages earned were returned to the Israeli economy through the purchase of goods and services originating in Israel. Under those conditions, the people of the occupied territories had no choice but to rely on what could be provided through Israeli sources.

The report found that social, cultural and sports activities among the Arab residents were being discouraged and that books and publications were censored.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly emphasized the right of the Arab States and peoples whose territories were under Israeli occupation to full and effective permanent sovereignty and



control over their natural and all other resources, wealth and economic activities. It reaffirmed that all Israeli measures to exploit those resources were illegal and called on Israel to desist immediately and on States, international organizations, corporations and other institutions not to co-operate or assist in such measures. The Assembly reaffirmed the right of the Arab States and peoples concerned to full compensation for the exploitation, depletion, loss of and damages to their resources. The Secretary-General was requested to submit two reports to the Assembly: in 1982, a comprehensive report on permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied territories, with proposals for follow-up and implementation; and in 1983, a report on the implications, under international law, of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

The resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 115 to 2, with 24 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, which approved the 24-nation draft on 7 December by a recorded vote, requested by Iraq, of 105 to 2, with 23 abstentions.

Kuwait, introducing the text in the Committee, said the resolution had been made necessary by Israel's continued exploitation of the national resources of the occupied territories in contravention of international law and accepted norms.

Israel, voting against the text, stated that it could not associate itself with the actions called for since the resolutions on the subject were motivated by political hostility and ignored many productive activities in the administered territories. The Secretary-General's report was based on misinterpreted facts and inaccurate information which had been manipulated to support a predetermined and biased conclusion. It should have included a survey of the achievements in the administered territories, where the situation was far better than it had been prior to 1967. Although Israel had been a victim of continuous Arab aggression since its establishment in 1948, every United Nations report had ignored the circumstances behind Israel's presence in those territories, for whose security Israel was responsible.

The United States explained that it had voted against the resolution because it dealt with political matters outside the Committee's competence and because blanket and repetitive condemnations of Israel's administration diverted attention from the fundamental issue of making progress in the peace process.

Explaining the abstentions of the European Community members, the United Kingdom said their position remained unchanged.

Among those voting in favour, Burma ex-

pressed reservations to a paragraph by which the Assembly condemned Israel's refusal to allow the consultants who prepared the United Nations report access to the occupied territories, and Portugal reserved its position on the paragraph by which the Assembly reaffirmed the right of the States and peoples under Israeli occupation to compensation for exploitation of their natural resources.

Japan stated that it fully sympathized with the Arab States' position on resources in the occupied territories and hoped the problem would be expeditiously solved in conformity with international law; but Japan's position on permanent sovereignty over natural resources remained unchanged.

Jordan said international law did not allow Israel to confiscate land in the occupied territories for building settlements, to allocate most of the water resources to Israeli settlers and to blow up 19,000 houses on the West Bank.

The USSR, also supporting the resolution, said the measures it called for should be undertaken within the existing United Nations budget.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G and consultants, A/36/648.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>34/136, 14 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 406); <sup>(3)</sup>35/110, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 436); <sup>(4)</sup>36/173, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/834; S-G statements, A/C.2/36/L.135, A/C.5/36/103.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.4, 7-10, 45, 46 (25 Sep.-9 Oct. & 1, 7 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.76 (15 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/173

115-2-24 (recorded vote) Meeting 103 17 December 1981  
Approved by Second Committee (A/36/691/Add.2 and Add.2/Corr.1) by recorded vote (105-2-23), 7 December (meeting 46): 24-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.124), orally revised: agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Gambia, India, Iran, Kuwait, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 34/136 of 14 December 1979,

Bearing in mind the relevant principles of International law and the provisions of the international conventions and regulations, in particular Convention IV of The Hague of 1907, and the fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949, concerning the obligations and responsibilities of the occupying Power,

Recalling its previous resolutions on permanent sovereignty over natural resources, particularly their provisions supporting resolutely the efforts of the developing countries and the peoples of territories under colonial and racial domination and foreign occupation in their struggle to regain effective control over their natural and all other resources, wealth and economic activities,

Bearing in mind the pertinent provisions of its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, and 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States,

Recalling further its resolutions 3175(XXVIII) of 17 December 1973, 3336(XXIX) of 17 December 1974, 3516(XXX) of 15 December 1975, 31/186 of 21 December 1976, 32/161 of 19 December 1977 and 35/110 of 5 December 1980 on permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Arab territories,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Arab territories, requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/110, and noting with satisfaction the mission undertaken in preparation of that report,

1. Condemns Israel for its refusal to allow the United Nations consultants on national resources access to the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories,

2. Emphasizes the right of the Arab States and peoples whose territories are under Israeli occupation to full and effective permanent sovereignty and control over their natural and all other resources, wealth and economic activities;

3. Reaffirms that all measures undertaken by Israel to exploit the human, natural and all other resources, wealth and economic activities in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories are illegal and calls upon Israel to desist immediately from such measures;

4. Further reaffirms the right of the Arab States and peoples subjected to Israeli aggression and occupation to the restitution of, and full compensation for the exploitation, depletion and loss of and damages to, their natural, human and all other resources, wealth and economic activities, and calls upon Israel to meet their just claims;

5. Calls upon all States to support the Arab States and peoples in the exercise of those rights;

6. Calls upon all States, international organizations, specialized agencies, business corporations and all other institutions not to recognize, or co-operate with or assist in any manner in, any measures undertaken by Israel to exploit the national resources of the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories or to effect any changes in the demographic composition, the character and form of use of their natural resources or the institutional structure of those territories;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare and submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a comprehensive report on permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and to make proposals for follow-up and implementation;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare and submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session a report on the implications, under international law, of the United Nations resolutions on permanent sovereignty over natural resources, on the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories and on the obligations of Israel concerning its conduct in these territories.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of

Greece,<sup>a</sup> Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to vote in favour.

## Palestine refugees

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) continued to provide assistance to 1.5 million Palestine refugees in Arab States and in territories occupied by Israel (see below). By the end of 1981, it had spent about \$2 billion on such aid in the three decades since it began operations in 1950. However, it did not receive enough voluntary contributions during the year to meet all budgeted expenditures: income for 1981 was just over \$190 million, against a projected budget of \$239 million (p. 327).

The General Assembly, on 16 December 1981, adopted eight resolutions on Palestine refugees, as recommended by the Special Political Committee (SPC). They included a call for the return of displaced inhabitants of the occupied territories (p. 333), an endorsement of continued assistance to other displaced persons in the area (p. 334), a demand that Israel desist from removing and resettling refugees in the Gaza Strip (p. 335), and a request for United Nations protection and administration of Arab property rights in Israel (p. 336). States and organizations were asked to augment allocations for scholarships and grants to Palestine refugees (p. 337), and Israel was called on to remove obstacles to the establishment of a university for such refugees at Jerusalem (p. 338). Governments were called on to help meet the Agency's needs in the light of its projected budget deficit, and the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA was requested to continue its efforts for another year (p. 328).

## UN Agency for Palestine refugees

### Activities of UNRWA

In 1981, UNRWA provided education, health and relief services to Palestine refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and the Israeli-occupied territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. It maintained its own schools, training establishments, clinics and health centres, and it procured and distributed food rations to needy refugees.

Early in 1981, it appeared that the only way of maintaining the Agency's solvency would be a full or partial curtailment of the education programme, but later, the receipt of additional

pledges and cut-backs in both recurrent and non-recurrent expenditure enabled UNRWA to continue these activities until the end of the year.

Military activity and civil strife again interrupted services and disturbed the livelihood of refugees in several areas. Agency services were subject to frequent interruptions, particularly in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and Lebanon. Local disturbances and Israeli military operations in southern Lebanon caused considerable damage to refugee shelters and some Agency installations. In the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, the occupation authorities continued to demolish refugee shelters, but they also started housing projects for refugees (p. 335).

The number of refugees registered with UNRWA rose through natural increase by 39,681 since 31 December 1980, to 1,902,843 at 31 December 1981. Of these, about 824,000 were eligible to receive food rations and approximately 1.5 million were eligible for health and education services.

The Agency also distributed rations to about 230,000 displaced persons and displaced refugee children (registered for services only) in Jordan, at the expense of the Jordanian Government. By the end of the year, extra rations were being provided to some 39,000 "special hardship cases" in Jordan, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and also in Lebanon, beginning in 1981, where widows and divorced women with young children were aided.

About 669,000 of the registered refugees, some 35 per cent of the total, were living in 61 camps as at 31 December.

In co-operation with the World Health Organization, the Agency continued its work in health education and integrated family health care, with emphasis on preventive medicine, including supplementary feeding for nutritionally vulnerable groups. Health services were provided at 100 UNRWA units and some associated clinics. Training in medicine and paramedicine was assisted through the Agency's medical and nursing scholarship programmes and by vocational training courses. Some \$31.4 million was spent on health services in 1981.

The year's expenditure on relief services was \$36.4 million, which represented mainly the value of food commodities donated in kind, the provision of shelter and hardship assistance.

The Agency spent \$104.5 million on education during 1981, accounting for 57.8 per cent of its total expenditure. The education programme, operated with the technical assistance of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), covered the first nine years of general education (10 years in Lebanon), some assistance for refugee pupils in

government and private secondary schools, and vocational and teacher training in eight centres. Also, 365 university scholarships were awarded for the 1980/1981 academic year (p. 337). The majority of the Agency's 16,722 employees, almost all Palestine refugees themselves, were working in the educational field, most as teachers. In the 1980/1981 school year, some 200 additional teachers were appointed.

Over 321,000 children—7,000 more than in 1979/1980—received elementary and preparatory (lower secondary) education in 635 UNRWA schools during the 1980/1981 school year. Nearly 90,000 refugee pupils were enrolled in government or private schools, 8,901 of which received UNRWA assistance. Demand for places necessitated double shifts in about 74 per cent of Agency schools. During 1981, some \$750,000 was allocated to construct 40 additional classrooms and specialized units to avoid triple-shifting.

There was a small increase in persons attending the Agency's vocational and technical courses, an increase facilitated by double-shifting in some locations. Female students were encouraged to follow vocational studies. Four vocational training centres were enlarged. About 70 per cent of 1981's 600 graduates found employment, mainly with UNRWA. The UNESCO/UNRWA Institute of Education continued to provide courses in educational techniques to meet special needs and new curricula developments.

Also during the 1980/1981 school year, professional aspects of the UNRWA education system were strengthened by setting up Education Development Units in Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic and an Education Development Centre in the West Bank. The Agency took over the pre-school centres in the Gaza Strip previously run for it by the American Friends Service Committee.<sup>(2)</sup>

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER-GENERAL. In a report covering the period 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, after detailing the Agency's activities, indicated that the year under review had been a very difficult one. Because of the Agency's unprecedented financial crisis, it had not been possible to maintain services at their customary level. The Commissioner-General suggested that Governments consult informally on an apportioning of UNRWA expenses among themselves (p. 328).

Referring to other factors affecting the Agency's work, the Commissioner-General stated that hostilities in Beirut and southern Lebanon had seriously disrupted UNRWA operations.

COMMUNICATION. By a letter of 19 May,<sup>(1)</sup> Jordan transmitted to the Secretary-General a

resolution adopted in Amman on 20 April by its National Consultative Assembly, rejecting plans by UNRWA to reduce services to refugees and requesting the United Nations Secretariat to do all in its power to ensure that the States responsible for the dispersal of the Palestinians shouldered their financial responsibilities towards the Agency.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** In December, the General Assembly adopted eight resolutions on Palestine refugees, each pertaining to a special aspect of the question (p. 325). This action followed a debate in SPC on various aspects of the problem.

During the debate, many countries, among them Austria, Finland, Jordan and Sri Lanka, shared the Commissioner-General's opinion that UNRWA had a stabilizing influence on the situation in the Middle East.

Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Guyana, Iraq, Malaysia, the Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Sri Lanka, the USSR and Yugoslavia, among others, pointed out that the Palestine refugee problem was not merely a humanitarian issue, but rather a major political problem whose solution resided in a just and lasting Middle East settlement. India, in addition to several Arab and Eastern European States, believed that UNRWA services could at best be only temporary; the ultimate solution lay in Israeli withdrawal from the territories occupied in 1967 and recognition of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinians. A final solution to the Palestine refugee problem, said the United States, could be achieved only in the context of a just and comprehensive peace, to be achieved through negotiations.

Speaking on behalf of the European Community (EC) members, the United Kingdom said they were disturbed to learn that the Agency's activities in Lebanon had again been seriously affected by the hostilities there, and were concerned at the difficulties encountered by UNRWA and its staff in other areas, including arbitrary arrest and detention without charge or trial, demolition of refugee shelters and the failure to secure certain privileges and tax exemptions. Austria and the Philippines were concerned about harassment and restrictions of Agency staff and refugees. Sri Lanka, Sweden and Turkey also voiced concern about detentions and travel restrictions affecting UNRWA staff members, while China noted that they had been subjected to Israeli bombing and shelling:

Egypt and others condemned all measures taken against UNRWA staff and refugee camps as well as the collective punishment of the refugees by the occupation authorities; Egypt demanded that the demolition of Palestinian family shelters

by Israeli authorities be ended and expressed the opinion that the Palestinians had the right to fair compensation.

Israel, on the other hand, felt that UNRWA could not continue to serve camps under the control of terrorist organizations, nor could the United Nations give assistance to persons engaged in warfare against a Member State.

Japan and the Philippines were among those supporting the Commissioner-General's decision to give priority to educational services over other assistance. Lebanon maintained that the countries receiving Palestinian refugees could not support the political and human consequences resulting from any suspension of UNRWA operations or reduction of services. Guyana felt that any curtailment of UNRWA services would not only result in hardship for the refugees but would also entail serious political consequences.

Letter: <sup>(2)</sup>Jordan, 19 May, A/36/258.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/37/214; <sup>(3)</sup>UNRWA Commissioner-General, A/36/13 & Corr.1.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.21-28 (2-10 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

#### UNRWA finances

A shortfall of the voluntary contributions from which UNRWA received its financial support caused the Agency to cut back its educational and other programmes in 1981. The General Assembly decided to keep its 1981 session open to await proposals on how to meet a projected deficit of \$80 million in 1982.

**REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON FINANCING.** The Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA, in a report to the General Assembly dated 22 October 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> noted that the Agency's financial position, which had been precarious for a number of years, had deteriorated even further during 1981. The Group stated that in spring 1981 the Agency had come close to collapse because of insufficient funds and that it might enter 1982 without enough money to finance its pay-roll beyond January. The health care programme was already at a minimum and the relief assistance programme consisted mainly of distribution of donated food. The Agency would be in a better position to give highest priority to the education programme if Governments making contributions in kind would consider converting some of them into cash. The Group feared that the reduction of the education programme and the closing of schools would have serious social and political consequences.

The Group believed that there was an urgent need to place the Agency's financing on a more stable basis. Its financial position could not be improved unless more countries contributed and

those able to do so increased their contributions. The Group supported the suggestion in the Commissioner-General's annual report (p. 326) that informal consultations should take place on apportioning the Agency's expenses among contributors as one possible way of consolidating its financial basis.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Assembly called on all Governments as a matter of urgency to make the most generous efforts possible to meet the Agency's anticipated needs, particularly in the light of its projected budget deficit. It urged non-contributing Governments to contribute regularly and contributing Governments to consider increasing their contributions. Directing attention to the continuing seriousness of the UNRWA financial position, the Assembly noted with concern that, despite the Commissioner-General's successful efforts to collect additional contributions, the Agency's increased income was still insufficient to cover essential budget requirements. Other provisions of the resolution dealt with proposed repatriation of refugees (p. 333) and the location of UNRWA headquarters (p. 332).

The resolution, sponsored by the United States, was adopted by a recorded vote of 144 to none, with 1 abstention, after approval by SPC on 10 November by a recorded vote of 125 to none, with 1 abstention.

By another resolution of the same date,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly appealed for contributions to assist persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 hostilities.

The Assembly, also on 16 December,<sup>(6)</sup> noted with approval the report of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA and requested the Group to continue its efforts for the financing of the Agency for another year. This action was taken by a resolution adopted without vote, following its approval in like manner by SPC on 10 November, where the 20-nation draft was introduced by the Netherlands.

The Assembly decided on 16 December<sup>(8)</sup> to keep open its 1981 session until the Working Group had submitted proposals, by the end of January 1982, on ways to meet the Agency's 1982 budget deficit. The decision was taken without vote, following its approval by SPC on 7 December, also without vote. On 18 December,<sup>(9)</sup> the Assembly decided to resume its 1981 session, at a date to be announced, to consider among other items the situation of UNRWA.

The proposal to keep the session open was made orally by the SPC Chairman at the suggestion of Kuwait on behalf of the Arab Group, after that Group had requested that there be no vote by the Committee on a draft resolution sub-

mitted by 20 Arab States, and on amendments proposed by the United States, concerning the future financing of UNRWA. The draft resolution<sup>(2)</sup> would have had the Assembly decide to cover the Agency's estimated deficit for 1982 from the United Nations regular budget. The Secretary-General would have been requested to submit in 1982 a detailed study of the inclusion of the UNRWA budget into the United Nations budget as of 1983. Qatar, introducing this draft, said the Group had decided that the expected voluntary contributions would not be sufficient and they held it particularly important to protect the rights of tens of thousands of young people to education.

According to the United States amendments,<sup>(1)</sup> the Assembly, instead of deciding to cover the Agency's deficit from the United Nations budget, would have taken note of the various proposals to improve its financial position and would have urged the Working Group and other interested and concerned parties to continue consultations on ways to ameliorate the Agency's critical financial situation, reporting their suggestions to the Secretary-General by 1 February 1982. The Secretary-General would have been requested to submit a detailed study of all the proposals advanced to enhance the Agency's long-term financial stability, including a comprehensive management audit.

Israel abstained in the vote on the United States-sponsored resolution because of its reference to a 1948 Assembly resolution on repatriation or compensation for refugees (p. 333).

The Commissioner-General of UNRWA, introducing in SPC the Agency's annual report,<sup>(3)</sup> stated that UNRWA had experienced serious financial problems in 1981. Total expenditure in 1982 was estimated at \$265 million, of which \$151 million was for education, \$42 million for health and \$61 million for relief. Estimated income was \$185 million, leaving a projected deficit of \$80 million, or \$10 million more than in 1981.

To maintain all its programmes, he said, the Agency needed an additional \$80 million, of which \$34 million was the minimum required to avoid collapse of the education programme. Income from voluntary contributions 7 forecast at \$132 million for 1982) had proved less and less adequate. Unless UNRWA was assured of regular and adequate contributions, it would continue to move from one crisis to another until it collapsed.

General concern was voiced in the debate that the Agency's continued financial crisis might lead to the curtailment of essential services. Jordan, in particular, said it was already spending more than \$35.5 million in the current fiscal

year for direct assistance to refugees and could not accept any attempt to transfer to the host countries the burden of services provided by UNRWA.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, said they did not believe that the voluntary system of financing was inappropriate, but rather that the international response had been inadequate; a number of countries with the means to contribute had not done so, despite their expressions of concern for the Palestinians. Similarly, Spain urged that contributions to UNRWA continue on a voluntary basis, but be increased in number and amount. The United States, while hoping to increase its contribution, believed that other nations must assume more of the burden, especially those in the Middle East with the means to do so.

Lebanon appealed to all States capable of assuming greater financial burdens to do so. Zambia ascribed the problem to the fact that the financial burden was borne by only a handful of countries and said all States had the responsibility to contribute.

Canada said it would increase its contribution to UNRWA but expressed concern about the increased costs of its operations. Sweden stated that, as one of the largest contributors, it would continue to give substantial support and would also support fully any arrangement to put the Agency's financing on a more stable footing, including a more equitable burden-sharing.

Norway said it was prepared to participate in any arrangement to broaden participation in the financing of UNRWA and to place it on a sounder basis, including a more reasonable apportioning of its expenses. Reconsideration or even a structural change of the Agency's financial basis was also advocated by others, among them Austria, Chile, Egypt, Finland and Turkey. These countries supported the Commissioner-General's proposal that Governments consult on his idea of sharing the Agency's expenses among Member States on an agreed basis. Mauritania, Portugal and others felt that the costs for UNRWA should be apportioned equitably among all Governments. Senegal urged that exceptional measures be taken to place the Agency's finances on a sound footing.

In Bangladesh's view, UNRWA needed clear guidance regarding its future course, particularly for dealing with the financial emergency. Pakistan held it essential that the Assembly should secure an adequate amount of income for UNRWA and explore ways of raising that amount.

The United Arab Emirates suggested that the Agency's budgetary deficit should be met by: charging the deficit to the United Nations regular budget; requesting the Secretary-General to

study the feasibility of incorporating the Agency's budget into the United Nations budget and establishing new scales of assessment that would take account of the special responsibility of certain States because of their unconditional support for Israel; and enabling Palestine refugees to enjoy income from their property, which would suffice to cover their needs and make it possible to dispense with international assistance. The suggestion to include UNRWA expenditures in the United Nations budget or at least meet its deficit from that source was endorsed by other Arab States, such as Bahrain, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and Yemen. Yemen added that the continued dependence of UNRWA on voluntary contributions would create confusion in its programmes and even threaten its existence. Chile believed that the idea of including the Agency's expenditures in the United Nations budget should be considered.

Qatar suggested that contributions to UNRWA should be a fixed percentage and not a set amount, so as to offset inflation.

Australia, on the other hand, expressed doubts about the feasibility of meeting the Agency's expenses or deficit from the United Nations budget; it thought the answer to the immediate crisis lay in a more generous and speedy response from Member States. Japan argued that reliance on the United Nations budget could set an undesirable precedent for other bodies. The United States said that, if the proposal by the Arab Group was adopted, it would have to reconsider its pledge and its overall relationship with UNRWA; the estimated budget deficit amounted to approximately 10 per cent of the total United Nations budget, and meeting it by assessments levied on Member States would call into question the entire funding pattern of the major donor nations.

The Byelorussian SSR felt that a change of the existing financing system would be tantamount to accepting the exile of millions of Palestinians and would place those countries which were impeding a just solution to the Palestine problem on the same footing as those which consistently upheld the just cause of the Palestinians. Yugoslavia thought the Agency should be supported regardless of who was primarily responsible for the situation; to refrain from financing UNRWA would be tantamount to ignoring the Palestinians and the injustice done to them.

Kuwait suggested that a mechanism be devised to secure the revenues from the Palestinian properties in Israel under the guardianship of the United Nations, and then use them as partial funding for UNRWA.

The USSR said that, like other States which did not contribute directly to UNRWA, it nevertheless participated in the financing of similar programmes carried out by other agencies, contributed to the maintenance of the Agency's international staff and granted considerable bilateral assistance to Palestinians. Czechoslovakia said it was assisting the Palestinians through the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Israel held it essential that the Agency's records be updated in view of its permanent financial difficulties; the refugees' substantial absorption was not immediately apparent because it was the Agency's rule to keep them and their descendants on its registers indefinitely, even when they became self-supporting.

In the Syrian Arab Republic's opinion, the Agency's financial crisis was in essence a political struggle between those working sincerely for the return of the refugees and those who were doing all in their power to deprive them of their rights in order to support Israel.

Amendment: <sup>(1)</sup>United States, A/SPC/36/L.33 (to 20-nation draft A/SPC/36/L.14).

Draft resolution not pressed: <sup>(2)</sup>Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, A/SPC/36/L.14.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>UNRWA Commissioner-General, A/36/13 & Corr.1; <sup>(4)</sup>Working Group, A/36/615.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(5)</sup>36/146 D, para. 3, 16 Dec. (p. 335); <sup>(6)</sup>36/146 E, 16 Dec., text following; <sup>(7)</sup>36/146 F, 16 Dec., text following.

Decisions: GA: <sup>(8)</sup>36/431, 16 Dec., text following; <sup>(9)</sup>36/461, item 60, 18 Dec. (p. 350).

Financial implications: S-G statements, A/SPC/36/L.15 & L.31.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.21-25, 26-28, 48, 51 (2 Nov.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/146 E

Adopted without vote Meeting 100 16 December 1981  
Approved by SPC (A/36/818) without vote, 10 November (meeting 28); 20-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.10); agenda item 60.

Sponsors: Austria, Bangladesh, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Mali, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees In the Near East  
The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2656(XXV) of 7 December 1970, 2728(XXV) of 15 December 1970, 2791 (XXVI) of 6 December 1971, 2964(XXVII) of 13 December 1972, 3090(XXVIII) of 7 December 1973, 3330(XXIX) of 17 December 1974, 3419 D (XXX) of 8 December 1975, 31/15 C of 23 November 1976, 32/90 D of 13 December 1977, 33/112 D of 18 December 1978, 34/52 D of 23 November 1979 and 35/13 D of 3 November 1980,

Having considered the report of the Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees In the Near East,

Taking into account the report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for

Palestine Refugees in the the Near East, covering the period from 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981,

Gravely concerned at the critical financial situation of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, which has already reduced the essential minimum services being provided to the Palestine refugees and which threatens even greater reductions in the future.

Emphasizing the urgent need for extraordinary efforts in order to maintain, at least at their present minimum level, the activities of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East,

1. Commends the Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East for its efforts to assist in ensuring the Agency's financial security;

2. Takes note with approval of the report of the Working Group;

3. Requests the Working Group to continue its efforts, in co-operation with the Secretary-General and the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, for the financing of the Agency for a further period of one year;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the necessary services and assistance to the Working Group for the conduct of its work.

General Assembly resolution 36/146 F

144-0-1 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/818) by recorded vote (125-0-1), 10 November (meeting 26); draft by United States (A/SPC/36/L.11); agenda item 60.

Assistance to Palestine refugees

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/13 A of 3 November 1980 and all previous resolutions on the question, including resolution 194(III) of 11 December 1948,

Taking note of the report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, covering the period from 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981,

1. Notes with regret that repatriation or compensation of the refugees as provided for in paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194(III) has not been effected, that no substantial progress has been made in the programme endorsed by the Assembly in paragraph 2 of its resolution 513(VI) of 26 January 1952 for the reintegration of refugees either by repatriation or resettlement and that, therefore, the situation of the refugees continues to be a matter of serious concern;

2. Expresses its thanks to the Commissioner-General and to all the staff of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, recognizing that the Agency is doing all it can within the limits of available resources, and also expresses its thanks to the specialized agencies and private organizations for their valuable work in assisting the refugees;

3. Reiterates its request that the headquarters of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East should be relocated within the area of its operations as soon as practicable;

4. Notes with regret that the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine has been unable to find a means of achieving progress in the implementation of paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194(III) and requests the Commission to exert continued efforts towards the implementation of that paragraph and to report to the Assembly as appropriate, but not later than 1 October 1982;

5. Directs attention to the continuing seriousness of the financial position of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, as outlined in the report of the Commissioner-General;

6. Notes with concern that, despite the commendable and successful efforts of the Commissioner-General to collect

additional contributions, this increased level of income to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East is still insufficient to cover essential budget requirements in the present year and that, at currently foreseen levels of giving, deficits will recur each year;

7. Calls upon all Governments as a matter of urgency to make the most generous efforts possible to meet the anticipated needs of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, particularly in the light of the budgetary deficit projected in the report of the Commissioner-General, and therefore urges non-contributing Governments to contribute regularly and contributing Governments to consider increasing their regular contributions.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

#### General Assembly decision 36/431

Adopted without vote

Approved by SPC (A/36/818) without vote, 7 December (meeting 51); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 60.

Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

At its 100th plenary meeting, on 16 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, decided to keep open its thirty-sixth session until the Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East had submitted its proposals, by the end of January 1982, on ways of meeting the deficit of the Agency's budget for 1982.

#### Contributions

For 1981, a total of 64 Governments and the European Economic Community paid the equivalent of \$146,459,961 in contributions to UNRWA as at 31 December 1981. In addition, contributions in the amount of \$8,513,336 were received from the United Nations, specialized agencies, non-governmental organizations, private individuals and corporations. Counting \$6,240,334 in bank interest and other miscellaneous income, total income for 1981 from all sources was \$161,213,631 (see table on next page).

On 16 November, the Ad Hoc Committee of

the General Assembly for the Announcement of Voluntary Contributions to UNRWA met at United Nations Headquarters. A total of 53 States pledged contributions for 1982 in cash or kind. Pledges announced were estimated at approximately \$107 million.

Meeting record: Committee on contributions to UNRWA, A/AC.211/SR.1 (16 Nov.).

#### Accounts for 1980

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 30 November 1981 on the accounts of various United Nations programmes,<sup>(3)</sup> accepted the financial report and accounts and the audit opinion of the Board of Auditors with respect to UNRWA finances for the year ended 31 December 1980.<sup>(2)</sup> It concurred with comments by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ)<sup>(1)</sup> and requested the Agency head to take remedial action as required by the Board's observations.

The Board of Auditors recommended that the UNRWA Financial Regulations be revised to accommodate the Agency's current requirements, according to which its original budget estimates for the following year were revised without prior consultation with its Advisory Commission before being submitted to the Assembly. In its September report on United Nations accounts, ACABQ trusted that this recommendation would be brought to the Advisory Commission's attention, but noted that the Commissioner-General had kept the Commission's members informed about major changes in the estimates.

In the discussion of these reports in the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, Jordan expressed concern at the Agency's financial difficulties and supported a recommendation by the auditors that UNRWA should intensify its efforts to collect unpaid pledges by Governments, which had amounted to \$26 million as at the end of 1980. Concern on this score was also expressed by Morocco and the Philippines. The Philippines and the United States hoped controls would be strengthened so as to prevent losses of commodities such as those reported by the Board.

An UNRWA representative responded that: steps had been taken to amend the Financial Regulations to meet the special circumstances that had given rise to frequent amendments to the original budget estimates; the amount of unpaid pledges had been reduced to \$9 million; and strict controls were maintained over commodities and medical supplies, and losses were minimal.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ A/36/480; <sup>(2)</sup>Board of Auditors and financial statements, A/36/5/Add.3.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/65, 30 Nov. (p. 1302).



## CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNRWA FOR THE YEAR ENDING 31 DECEMBER 1981

(in US dollar equivalent)

Contributor	Payments in kind	Payments In cash	Total	Contributor	Payments In kind	Payments In cash	Total
Argentina	-	8,818	8,818	New Zealand	-	96,681	96,681
Australia	-	571,691	571,691	Nigeria	-	20,000	20,000
Austria	-	196,500	196,500	Norway	-	4,680,836	4,680,836
Bahrain	-	15,000	15,000	Oman	-	35,000	35,000
Belgium	947,205*	182,609	1,129,814	Pakistan	-	18,665	18,665
Brazil	-	10,000	10,000	Panama	-	500	500
Canada	3,750,000**	2,396,694	6,146,694	Philippines	-	5,000	5,000
Chile	-	3,500	3,500	Portugal	-	10,000	10,000
China	-	50,000	50,000	Qatar	-	500,000	500,000
Denmark	-	3,287,432	3,287,432	San Marino	-	4,195	4,195
Egypt	-	8,580	8,580	Saudi Arabia	-	5,000,000	5,000,000
European Economic Community	11,568,835**	-	11,568,635	Singapore	-	1,500	1,500
Finland	-	377,870	377,870	Sri Lanka	1,000	-	1,000
France	882,705	655,680	1,538,385	Suriname	-	1,000	1,000
Gaza authorities	103,241	-	103,241	Sweden	-	10,176,848	10,176,848
Germany, Federal	-	-	-	Switzerland	3,192,096**	842,124	4,034,220
Republic of	1,438,485**	4,308,290	5,746,775	Syrian Arab Republic	163,339	-	163,339
Ghana	-	5,200	5,200	Thailand	-	17,390	17,390
Greece	-	35,000	35,000	Trinidad and Tobago	-	4,975	4,975
Holy See	-	12,500	12,500	Tunisia	-	9,815	9,815
Iceland	-	17,500	17,500	Turkey	-	20,000	20,000
Indonesia	-	7,500	7,500	United Kingdom	-	10,026,938	10,026,938
Iran	-	30,000	30,000	United States	-	62,000,000	62,000,000
Ireland	-	130,875	130,875	Venezuela	-	10,000	10,000
Israel	468,691	-	468,691	Yemen	-	2,000	2,000
Italy	-	843,995	843,995	Subtotal	26,516,325	119,943,636	146,459,961
Jamaica	-	3,000	3,000	United Nations and specialized agencies:			
Japan	3,211,009**	7,651,376	10,862,385	United Nations			5,300,000
Jordan	740,003	-	740,003	UNESCO			715,960
Kuwait	-	2,100,000	2,100,000	WHO			305,400
Lebanon	49,916	12,944	62,860	Subtotal			6,321,360
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	-	1,250,000	1,250,000	Non-governmental sources			2,191,976***
Luxembourg	-	10,712	10,712	Miscellaneous Income and exchange adjustments			6,240,334
Malaysia	-	5,000	5,000	Total			161,213,631
Maldives	-	1,500	1,500				
Malta	-	1,012	1,012				
Mauritius	-	2,000	2,000				
Mexico	-	4,941	4,941				
Monaco	-	1,010	1,010				
Morocco	-	59,221	59,221				
Netherlands	-	2,202,219	2,202,219				

\*At Agency's 1981 price

\*\*At donor's valuation.

\*\*\*Includes \$229,069 for 1981, paid in 1982.

NOTE: Contributions include only amounts for 1981 paid as at 31 December 1981, except as indicated.

## Location of UNRWA headquarters

The main headquarters of UNRWA remained in 1981 at Vienna, Austria, where it had been moved from Beirut, Lebanon, in 1978.<sup>(2)</sup> Operational departments occupied rented premises at Amman, Jordan. The Lebanese Government reiterated its view that the Agency should return to Beirut as soon as circumstances in Lebanon permitted.

The General Assembly, in a resolution of 16 December on assistance to Palestine refugees,<sup>(1)</sup> reiterated its request that the Agency's headquarters, the major part of which remained outside its area of operations, be relocated within the area as soon as practicable.

During the debate on Palestine refugees in the Special Political Committee (SPC), the United Kingdom, speaking for the European Communi-

ty members, said they were gratified that the Commissioner-General intended to reunify UNRWA headquarters in the Middle East as soon as practicable. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Turkey also supported such relocation.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/146 F, para. 3, 16 Dec. (p. 330).  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1978, p. 358.

## Other aspects

## Proposed repatriation of refugees

The United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine was unable to report progress in 1981 towards the implementation of a 1948 General Assembly resolution providing for the repatriation of Palestine refugees and compensation for those who chose not to return.<sup>(2)</sup> In its thirty-fifth report, covering the period from

1 October 1980 to 30 September 1981 and transmitted to the Assembly by a note of the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission stated that events in the area had further complicated an already complex situation and that the circumstances which limited its possibilities of action had remained essentially unchanged. Nevertheless, it continued to hope that the situation would improve towards the achievement of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace, thus enabling it to carry forward its work.

The Assembly, by its resolution of 16 December on assistance to Palestine refugees,<sup>(4)</sup> noted with regret that the Commission had been unable to find a means of achieving progress in implementing the 1948 resolution, and requested it to exert continued efforts in that regard and to report to the Assembly by 1 October 1982. The Assembly also noted with regret that there had been no repatriation or compensation of refugees, or progress towards their reintegration by repatriation or resettlement.

In a resolution on the Palestine question adopted on 10 December, the Assembly reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and property in Palestine, from which they had been displaced and uprooted, and called for their early return.<sup>(3)</sup>

Israel, explaining its abstention on the resolution, said it had a different interpretation of the 1948 resolution mentioned therein; since its adoption, there had been a population exchange in the area, the Security Council had called for a solution on the basis of negotiation and a further step had been taken through the 1978 Camp David agreements with Egypt.

During the debate on Palestine refugees in SPC, a number of Arab States made the point that the Palestine question could not be solved until the refugees were able to return to their homes. Iraq stated that, in denying them the right to return, Israel was in breach of its obligations as a Member of the United Nations. Morocco said that, despite repeated demands by the Assembly for the refugees' return, Israel had continued to defy world public opinion.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Conciliation Commission for Palestine, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/529.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>194(III), para. 11, 11 Dec. 1948 (YUN 1948-49, p. 175); <sup>(3)</sup>36/120 D, para. 1, 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 268); <sup>(4)</sup>36/146 F, paras. 1 & 4, 16 Dec. (p. 330).

#### Return of displaced persons

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. The Secretary-General, on 30 September, submitted a report<sup>(1)</sup> on implementation of a 1980 resolution by which the General Assembly called on Israel to take immediate steps for the return of all displaced inhabitants in territories it had

occupied since 1967 and to desist from measures that obstructed their return.<sup>(2)</sup> The report reproduced information from the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) and from Israel.

The Secretary-General reported that UNRWA was not involved in arrangements for the return of refugees or displaced persons and could not estimate the total number of displaced inhabitants who had returned. However, it knew of about 9,800 UNRWA-registered refugees who had returned to the occupied territories since 1967, including 212 in the year ended 30 June 1981.

Israel, responding to the Secretary-General's request for information, stated that, in spite of security risks which inevitably resulted in some constraints on the return of persons displaced in 1967, it followed a policy of facilitating the reunification of families. Between 1967 and the end of June 1981, it had admitted 55,993 persons for that purpose to the territories it administered.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly reaffirmed the inalienable right of all displaced inhabitants to return to their homes or former places of residence in the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, and considered any agreements embodying any restriction on or condition for their return as null and void. Deploring Israel's continued refusal to take steps for the return of displaced inhabitants, it again called on Israel to take such steps and to desist from all measures obstructing their return, and requested the Secretary-General to report by the opening of its 1982 session on Israel's compliance.

The resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 121 to 3, with 21 abstentions, on the recommendation of SPC, which approved the 12-nation text, introduced by Pakistan, on 10 November, by a recorded vote of 105 to 3, with 18 abstentions.

Speaking after the vote in Committee, Israel rejected the resolution on the ground that it disregarded the facts. In Israel's view, the destructive intent behind the text was particularly evident in the paragraph referring to agreements, which was aimed directly against the Middle East peace process.

Also voting against, Canada stated that the resolution was critical of the peace process, which provided ways of dealing with the subject. The United States said that, while repatriation seemed applicable at the earliest practicable date in the context of an agreement among the parties, the outcome should not be prejudiced by the Assembly; the actions called for were premature, unworkable and one-sided.

Sweden and the United Kingdom, the latter speaking for the European Community mem-

bers, abstained on the ground that the text appeared to preclude the possibility of a negotiated settlement.

In the Committee's debate, Cyprus said it was fully committed to the right of displaced persons to return, wherever they were located.

Israel stated that to permit persons displaced by the 1967 hostilities to return systematically would open Israel's frontiers to saboteurs and agents of terrorist organizations.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/558.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/13 E, paras. 4 & 5, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 445); <sup>(3)</sup>36/146 B, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.21-25, 26, 27, 28 (2-10 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/146 B

121-3-21 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/818) by recorded vote (105-3-18), 10 November (meeting 28); 12-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.7); agenda item 60.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cuba, Cyprus, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Pakistan, Senegal, Yugoslavia.

Population and refugees displaced since 1967

The General Assembly,

Recalling Security Council resolution 237(1967) of 14 June 1967,

Recalling also its resolutions 2252(ES-V) of 4 July 1967, 2452 A (XXIII) of 19 December 1968, 2535 B (XXIV) of 10 December 1969, 2672 D (XXV) of 8 December 1970, 2792 E (XXVI) of 6 December 1971, 2963 C and D (XXVII) of 13 December 1972, 3089 C (XXVIII) of 7 December 1973, 3331 D (XXIX) of 17 December 1974, 3419 C (XXX) of 8 December 1975, 31/15 D of 23 November 1976, 32/90 E of 13 December 1977, 33/112 F of 18 December 1978, 34/52 E of 23 November 1979, ES-7/2 of 29 July 1980 and 35/13 E of 3 November 1980,

Having considered the report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, covering the period from 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981, and the report of the Secretary-General of 30 September 1981,

1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of all displaced inhabitants to return to their homes or former places of residence in the territories occupied by Israel since 1967 and declares once more that any attempt to restrict, or to attach conditions to, the free exercise of the right of return by any displaced person is inconsistent with that inalienable right and inadmissible;

2. Considers any and all agreements embodying any restriction on or condition for the return of the displaced inhabitants as null and void;

3. Deplores the continued refusal of the Israeli authorities to take steps for the return of the displaced inhabitants;

4. Calls once more upon Israel:

(a) To take immediate steps for the return of all displaced inhabitants;

(b) To desist from all measures that obstruct the return of the displaced inhabitants, including measures affecting the physical and demographic structure of the occupied territories;

5. Requests the Secretary-General, after consulting with the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, to report to the General Assembly by the opening of its thirty-seventh session on Israel's compliance with paragraph 4 above.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain,

Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom.

#### Assistance to displaced persons

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 16 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> again endorsed the efforts of UNRWA to continue to provide humanitarian assistance, on an emergency basis and as a temporary measure, also to persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 hostilities and in need of continued assistance. Governments, organizations and individuals were asked to contribute for that purpose to UNRWA and other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of SPC, which approved the 22-nation text in like manner on 10 November. It was introduced by Sweden, which noted that the same text had been adopted every year since 1967.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/146 D, 16 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.21-24, 25, 26, 27, 28 (2-10 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/146 D

Adopted without vote Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/818) without vote, 10 November (meeting 28); 22-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.9); agenda item 60.

Sponsors: Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mali, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden.

Assistance to persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 hostilities

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/13 C of 3 November 1980 and all previous resolutions on the question,

Taking note of the report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, covering the period from 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981,

Concerned about the continued human suffering resulting from the June 1967 hostilities in the Middle East,

1. Reaffirms its resolution 35/13 C and all previous resolutions on the question;

2. Endorses, bearing in mind the objectives of those resolutions, the efforts of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in

the Near East to continue to provide humanitarian assistance as far as practicable, on an emergency basis and as a temporary measure, to other persons in the area who are at present displaced and in serious need of continued assistance as a result of the June 1967 hostilities;

3. Strongly appeals to all Governments and to organizations and individuals to contribute generously for the above purposes to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and to the other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations concerned.

#### Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip

REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL AND UNRWA. On 30 September 1981, the Secretary-General submitted a report,<sup>(1)</sup> requested by the General Assembly in 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> on compliance with its call that Israel desist from removal and resettlement of Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip and destruction of their shelters.

According to Israel's response to the Secretary-General's request for information, included in this report, the positive trend of assisting refugee families to leave camps and find new dwellings had continued. As of July 1981, 5,846 families had been assisted in the framework of refugee rehabilitation projects; families which had received plots and built their own homes with Israeli aid had increased to 2,356, and 2,690 other refugee families had taken possession of new homes in Israeli housing projects. Israel added that it was patently incongruous to censure the promotion of housing projects designed to improve the condition of refugees.

The Secretary-General's report also provided information from UNRWA indicating that, in the year under review, Israeli occupying authorities had demolished, on punitive grounds, shelters occupied by 13 refugee families, leaving them to live in the open. The Agency had lodged compensation claims, but to no avail; nor had it been compensated for refugee shelters demolished in previous years. Despite the housing shortage, Israeli authorities continued to require refugee families moving into Israeli housing projects to demolish their shelters in the camps. During the reporting period, that requirement had been applied in all cases and a total of 272 shelter rooms had been demolished.

The UNRWA Commissioner-General, in his annual report to the Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> noted that special contributions had been received to improve the living conditions of refugees in the Gaza Strip, where the proportion of refugees living in camps and the density of population was higher than elsewhere. By the end of June 1981, 59 refugee families had received new shelter rooms in individual family units; one of the new shelters had been among seven demolished by Israeli authorities in May and June.

To reduce overcrowding in the Gaza Strip,

the Commissioner-General held it essential that the total complement of housing should increase substantially.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly demanded that Israel desist from removing and resettling Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip and from destroying their shelters, and requested the Secretary-General to report before its 1982 session on Israel's compliance.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 141 to 2, with 2 abstentions, following approval by SPC on 10 November by a recorded vote of 119 to 2, with 2 abstentions. The draft was introduced by Pakistan on behalf of 12 sponsors.

Israel stated that it had voted against because the resolution took a cynical approach towards the refugees in calling on Israel to stop providing them with housing. The United States said it opposed the text because it addressed Israel in a harsh and unfair manner.

Canada said it had voted in favour out of concern at the practice of demolishing refugee shelters on punitive grounds. The United Kingdom explained that, although the members of the European Community (EC) had voted in favour, they considered that nothing in the resolution should be held to interfere with the freedom of the refugees to choose where they wished to live.

In the Committee's debate, Sri Lanka referred to Israel's practice of demolishing shelters as a form of collective punishment, and expressed hope that it would be discontinued as contrary to international law and civilized conduct.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/559; <sup>(2)</sup>UNRWA Commissioner-General, A/36/13.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/13 F, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 446); <sup>(4)</sup>36/146 A, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.21-25, 26 27, 28 (2-10 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/146 A

141-2-2 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981 Approved by SPC (A/36/818) by recorded vote (119-2-2), 10 November (meeting 28); 12-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.6); agenda item 60.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cuba, Cyprus, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Pakistan, Senegal, Yugoslavia.

#### Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip

The General Assembly,

Recalling Security Council resolution 237(1967) of 14 June 1967,

Recalling also its resolutions 2792 C (XXVI) of 6 December 1971, 2963 C (XXVII) of 13 December 1972, 3089 C (XXVIII) of 7 December 1973, 3331 D (XXIX) of 17 December 1974, 3419 C (XXX) of 8 December 1975, 31/15 E of 23 November 1976, 32/90 C of 13 December 1977, 33/112 E of 18 December 1978, 34/52 F of 23 November 1979 and 35/13 F of 3 November 1980,

Having considered the report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, covering the period from 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981, and the report of the Secretary-General of 30 September 1981,

Recalling the provisions of paragraph 11 of its resolution 194(III) of 11 December 1948 and considering that measures to resettle Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip away from the homes and property from which they were displaced constitute a violation of their inalienable right of return,

Alarmed by the reports received from the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East that the Israeli occupying authorities persist in their policy of demolishing, on punitive grounds, shelters occupied by refugee families,

1. Demands that Israel desist from the removal and resettlement of Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip and from the destruction of their shelters;

2. Requests the Secretary-General, after consulting with the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, to report to the General Assembly before the opening of its thirty-seventh session on Israel's compliance with paragraph 1 above.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Guatemala, Malawi.

### Property rights

The General Assembly, on 16 December 1981, requested the Secretary-General to take all appropriate steps for the protection and administration of Arab property and assets in Israel, to establish a fund for the receipt of income derived therefrom and to report to it in 1982.<sup>(1)</sup>

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 117 to 2, with 26 abstentions, following approval by SPC on 10 November by a roll-call vote of 101 to 2, with 24 abstentions. The 10-nation draft was introduced by Bangladesh, which said the establishment of such a fund would enable UNRWA to solve its financial difficulties.

Israel, which voted against the resolution, said the right of a State to regulate and dispose of property within its territory was beyond question, and the United Nations had no competence to intervene. Israel had spent vast sums of money rehabilitating and developing derelict lands and property. Moreover, approximately 800,000 Jewish refugees from Arab countries

who had resettled in Israel had left property which had been confiscated by the Governments of those countries.

Also voting against, the United States said that, while compensation could be applicable in the context of an agreement among the parties, the outcome should not be prejudiced by the Assembly; the actions called for in the text were premature, unworkable and one-sided.

Among those which abstained, New Zealand said the resolution was as unlikely to advance Palestinian rights in the occupied territories or to further peace as was their continued illegal occupation by Israel. Austria, Canada, Sweden and the United Kingdom, the last speaking for the EC members, considered that a solution to the problems of Palestinian property rights and the return of the refugees must be sought in the framework of a comprehensive Middle East settlement.

Jordan, which voted for the draft, observed that it referred to land and property left behind by persons who had lived in Palestine for centuries before the arrival of the Jewish immigrants; it was only fair that the Palestine refugees, who were living at the subsistence level, should receive income accruing from that property, from which the Israeli Government was currently profiting.

During the debate on Palestine refugees, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya urged the international community to demand that Israel repay the profits extracted from exploitation of Palestinian property. Saudi Arabia suggested that a board be set up to collect revenues from the refugees' property and distribute those sums to the owners, who would then not be a burden on the international community. A similar suggestion was made by Kuwait (p. 329).

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/146 C, 16 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.21-25, 26-28 (2-10 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

### General Assembly resolution 36/146 C

117-2-26 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/818) by roll-call vote (101-2-24), 10 November (meeting 28); 10-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.8); agenda item 60.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mali, Pakistan, Senegal, Yugoslavia.

Revenues derived from Palestine refugee properties

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 35/13 A to F of 3 November 1980 and all its previous resolutions on the question, including resolution 194(III) of 11 December 1948,

Taking note of the report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, covering the period from 1 October 1980 to 30 September 1981,

Recalling that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of international law uphold the principle that no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of private property,

Considering that the Palestinian Arab refugees are entitled to their property and to the income derived from their property, in conformity with the principles of justice and equity,

Recalling, In particular, its resolution 394(V) of 14 December 1950, in which it directed the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, in consultation with the parties concerned, to prescribe measures for the protection of the rights, property and interests of the Palestinian Arab refugees,

Taking note of the completion of the programme of identification and evaluation of Arab property, as announced by the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine in its twenty-second progress report, of 11 May 1964, and of the fact that the Land Office has a schedule of Arab owners and file of documents defining the location, area and other particulars of Arab property,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to take all appropriate steps, in consultation with the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, for the protection and administration of Arab property, assets and property rights in Israel, and to establish a fund for the receipt of income derived therefrom, on behalf of their rightful owners;

2. Calls upon the Governments concerned to render all facilities and assistance to the Secretary-General on the implementation of the present resolution;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom.

## Education

REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL AND UNRWA. The Secretary-General submitted a report to the General Assembly in August 1981 (with later addenda)<sup>(1)</sup> on the responses of Member States and United Nations agencies to a 1980 Assembly appeal for special allocations, scholarships and grants for the higher education of Palestine refugees.<sup>(3)</sup>

Among the countries responding, Australia had indicated that it had offered six awards to Palestine refugees for tertiary studies in Australia; one of these had been granted and the rest were being finalized. The Federal Republic of Germany had offered 10 scholarships for vocational instructor training for graduates of UNRWA vocational training centres, and France had offered two scholarships to such graduates. Egypt advised that some 20,000 Palestinian stu-

dents had attended Egyptian schools and universities in the 1980/1981 academic year, most of them free of charge, and that 450 had been admitted to Egyptian universities in 1980/1981.

Several specialized agencies—the International Labour Organisation, the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Universal Postal Union, the World Intellectual Property Organization and the World Meteorological Organization—informed the Secretary-General of the assistance they were providing to Palestinians, including provision of training facilities and fellowships for higher studies.

The UNRWA Commissioner-General, in his annual report,<sup>(2)</sup> described the education and training services which accounted for more than half of the Agency's total expenditures (p. 326). The report also indicated that UNRWA had awarded 365 scholarships to Palestine refugees for study at Arab universities, of which 285 were continuing scholarships and 80 were new awards.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. The General Assembly, on 16 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> strongly appealed to States, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations to augment the special allocations for grants and scholarships to Palestine refugees in addition to their contributions to the regular budget of UNRWA, and invited United Nations agencies to expand their assistance for higher education of Palestine refugee students. It appealed to States, specialized agencies and other international bodies to contribute to Palestinian universities in the territories occupied by Israel and towards the establishment of vocational training centres for Palestine refugees. The Assembly requested UNRWA to act as recipient and trustee for special allocations and scholarships and requested the Secretary-General to report to it in 1982.

The resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 145 to none, with 1 abstention, on the recommendation of SPC, where the draft, introduced by Jordan also on behalf of Bangladesh and Pakistan, was approved on 10 November by a recorded vote, requested by Israel, of 125 to none, with 2 abstentions.

Also on 16 December, in connection with its consideration of the situation in the territories occupied by Israel, the Assembly condemned Israeli practices against Palestinian students and faculty and demanded that Israel rescind measures against educational institutions.<sup>(5)</sup>

With regard to the resolution on educational assistance to Palestine refugees, Israel explained that it had abstained in the vote because of certain political formulations that betrayed the true purpose of the resolution, which was not to promote education but to further Jordan's unrelenting propaganda campaign.

During the SPC debate, Jordan urged other Governments to follow the lead of those who had granted scholarships to Palestine refugees.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/385 & Add.1,2; <sup>(2)</sup>UNRWA Commissioner-General, A/36/13.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/13 B, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 443); <sup>(4)</sup>36/146 H, 16 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/147 F, 16 Dec. (p. 316).

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.21-26, 27, 28 (2-10 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/146 H

145-0-1 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SP (A/36/818) by recorded vote (125-0-2), 10 November (meeting 28); 3-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.13); agenda item 60.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Jordan, Pakistan.

Offers by Member States of grants and scholarships for higher education, including vocational training, for the Palestine refugees

The General Assembly.

Recalling its resolution 212(III) of 19 November 1948 on assistance to Palestine refugees,

Recalling also its resolution 35/13 B of 3 November 1980,

Cognizant of the fact that the Palestine refugees have, for the last three decades, lost their lands and means of livelihood,

Having examined with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General on offers of grants and scholarships for higher education for Palestine refugees and the scope of the implementation of resolution 35/13 B,

Having also examined with appreciation the report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, covering the period from 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981, dealing with this subject,

Noting that fewer than one per thousand of the Palestine refugee students have the chance to continue higher education, including vocational training,

Noting also that over the past several years the number of scholarships offered by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East has dwindled to half of what it was because of the Agency's recurring budgetary difficulties.

1. Urges all States to respond to the appeal contained in General Assembly resolution 32/90 F of 13 December 1977 in a manner commensurate with the needs of the Palestine refugees for higher education and vocational training;

2. Strongly appeals to all States, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations to augment the special allocations for grants and scholarships to Palestine refugees in addition to their contributions to the regular budget of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East;

3. Expresses its appreciation to all Governments, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations that responded favourably to General Assembly resolution 33/112 C of 18 December 1978;

4. Invites the relevant United Nations agencies to continue to expand the inclusion within their respective spheres of competence of assistance for higher education for the Palestine refugee students;

5. Appeals to all States, specialized agencies and the United Nations University to contribute generously to the Palestinian universities in the territories occupied by Israel since 1967;

6. Also appeals to all States, specialized agencies and other international bodies to contribute towards the establishment of vocational training centres for Palestine refugees;

7. Requests the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East to act as recipient and trustee for such special allocations and scholarships and to award them to qualified Palestine refugee candidates:

8. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

#### Proposed university

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. The Secretary-General, on 30 October 1981, submitted a report,<sup>(1)</sup> requested by the General Assembly in November 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> on ways of establishing a university of arts and sciences at Jerusalem to serve Palestine refugees.

According to 1980 estimates by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization cited in the report, three fourths of the 40,000 Palestinian Arab students who completed secondary education each year did not go on to university, mainly because of the lack of facilities. Of the 60,000 Palestinian Arab students in institutions of higher learning in 1977, only about 5,000 (9 per cent) attended universities on the West Bank and in Israel. Jordanian and Palestinian experts consulted for the report believed it essential to increase the number of Palestinians at the professional, managerial, scientific and technical levels, and to train them in the territories occupied by Israel, including Jerusalem.

As to the proposed university, those experts expressed the opinion that, while it should admit Palestinian Arabs regardless of their place of residence, it might initially have to restrict admission to those living in the occupied territories. The United Nations should provide its charter, select its board of trustees, assist in the appointment of academic staff and, if possible, arrange for financing. The persons consulted indicated that, if necessary, voluntary funds, primarily from Arab sources, could be made available on a regular basis.

It was evident, the Secretary-General concluded, that the establishment of the university would be possible only with the agreement and co-operation of the Israeli authorities, which had not been obtained.

Annexed to the report were exchanges of correspondence between the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs and Israel, Jordan and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). In reply to the Under-Secretary-General's request for co-operation with the study and access to the area by United Nations experts, Israel expressed concern that the sponsors were attempting to use the field of higher education for dubious political ends and said it was unable to help in taking the matter further. Jordan invited United Nations representatives to visit two of its universities. PLO expressed full support for the university project and suggested that a feasibility study be prepared.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly recognized the urgent necessity of establishing an arts and sciences university at Jerusalem for Palestine refugees and called on Israel to remove the obstacles it had put in the way. It requested the Secretary-General to take all necessary measures, including a feasibility study, for establishing the university and to report in 1982 on the progress made.

The Assembly adopted the resolution by a recorded vote, requested by Israel, of 119 to 2, with 20 abstentions, following its approval by SPC on 30 November by a recorded vote of 87 to 2, with 17 abstentions. The draft was introduced by Jordan, also on behalf of Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Senegal, and was revised by its sponsors before approval.

Israel, voting against, said the resolution did not respond to the refugees' educational needs. In Judea and Samaria there were already several universities established and developed by Israel. The new initiative might lead to discrimination between Moslems, Jews and Christians. Furthermore, it had no precedent in the history of refugees, most of whom found it difficult to satisfy their most elementary needs for education. The United States also voted against, explaining that it considered the initiative unrealistic.

Among those which abstained in the vote, Canada thought it was ill-timed to advocate the establishment of a university even though UNRWA was not receiving enough contributions for its pressing needs; moreover, Canada was not convinced that a university was urgently needed. Sweden, although it favoured the general aim of establishing a university, wanted a feasibility study before any commitment was undertaken. The United Kingdom said the European Community members had difficulty with some

of the text's formulations and considered that any resulting expenditure must be covered through voluntary contributions outside the UNRWA budget.

Austria, though voting affirmatively, also favoured voluntary contributions and added that it might be better to use or enlarge existing institutions in view of the costs.

In the Committee's debate, Egypt expressed regret that Israel had not co-operated on the project.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/593.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/13 B, paras. 5 & 6, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 444); <sup>(3)</sup>36/146 G, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/825; S-G statements, A/SPC/36/L.17, A/C.5/36/96.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.21-26, 27, 28, 46 (2-30 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.73 (14 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/146 G

119-2-20 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/818) by recorded vote (87-2-17), 30 November (meeting 46); 5-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.12/Rev.1); agenda item 60.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, India, Jordan, Pakistan, Senegal.

University of Jerusalem for Palestine refugees

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/13 B of 3 November 1980,

Having examined with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General concerning the establishment of the university of Jerusalem in pursuance of paragraphs 5 and 6 of resolution 35/13 B,

Having also examined with appreciation the report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, covering the period from 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981,

1. Commends the constructive efforts made by the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, the Council of the United Nations University and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in exploring ways and means of establishing at Jerusalem a university of arts and sciences to cater to the needs of Palestine refugees in the area, under the aegis of the United Nations;

2. Further commends the close co-operation of the competent educational authorities in the host countries as well as those of the Palestine Liberation Organization;

3. Recognizes the urgent necessity of establishing the proposed university;

4. Calls upon Israel as the occupying Power to desist from obstructing the implementation of the resolution of the General Assembly and to remove the obstacles which it has put in the way of establishing the university at Jerusalem;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to take all necessary measures, including a functional feasibility study, for establishing the university at Jerusalem;

6. Further requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the progress made in the implementation of the present resolution.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India,



Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago,

Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom.

## Chapter IX

### Cyprus question

Talks between representatives of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities in Cyprus continued throughout 1981, focusing on constitutional and territorial issues. The two sides met at Nicosia, Cyprus, under the auspices of the Secretary-General's Special Representative in Cyprus, Hugo J. Gobbi, who presented in November, on the Secretary-General's behalf, an evaluation paper suggesting ideas or working hypotheses with regard to some aspects of the Cyprus problem.

The United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) continued to supervise cease-fire lines drawn in 1974<sup>(7)</sup> between the Cyprus National Guard in the south and the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot forces in the north (p. 344). Twice during 1981, in June<sup>(5)</sup> and December,<sup>(6)</sup> the Security Council extended the Force's mandate for six-month periods, expiring on 15 December 1981 and 15 June 1982, respectively.

Prior to each extension, the Secretary-General reported to the Council, in May<sup>(2)</sup> and December,<sup>(3)</sup> on the United Nations operation in Cyprus. He also submitted a report on the Cyprus question to the General Assembly in November.<sup>(1)</sup>

Agreement between the two sides was announced in April on terms of reference for the establishment of a Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus. The Committee began work in July but procedural difficulties prevented it from starting its substantive work. The General Assembly in December urged that the Committee proceed without further delay aided by the Secretary-General's good offices.<sup>(4)</sup>

A \$14 million United Nations programme of humanitarian assistance to Cyprus was under way during the year (p. 346).

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/702, <sup>(2)</sup>S/14490 & Add.1, <sup>(3)</sup>S/14778 & Corr.1,2 & Add.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>GA: 36/164, 16 Dec. (p. 346). SC: <sup>(5)</sup>486(1981), 4 June (p. 343); <sup>(6)</sup>495(1981), 14 Dec. (p. 344).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1974, p. 275.

### General aspects

COMMUNICATIONS (FEBRUARY-MAY). A number of communications concerning the situation in Cyprus were received by the Secretary-General from Cyprus and Turkey, the latter transmitting letters from representatives of the Turkish Cypriot community. The letters transmitted by Turkey were signed by Rauf R. Denktas as "President of the Turkish Federated State of Kibris" (Kibris being the Turkish-language name for Cyprus) or by Nail Atalay as "representative of the Turkish Federated State of Kibris".

Turkey, by a letter dated 23 February,<sup>(11)</sup> transmitted a letter of the same date from Mr. Atalay attaching a 19 February letter from Mr. Denktas, stating that the final communique (New Delhi Declaration) of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries<sup>(10)</sup> (New Delhi, India, 9-13 February) contained misleading elements, including a reference to the Greek Cypriot administration as the Government of Cyprus; Mr. Denktas added that the Turkish people of Cyprus did not consider itself bound by any decisions on Cyprus taken in its absence at any international forum at which it was not represented. Cyprus, in a letter of 6 March,<sup>(1)</sup> rejected the views expressed in the Turkish letter and cited the paragraph on Cyprus in the New Delhi Declaration, in which the Ministers of non-aligned countries reaffirmed their support for the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus and reiterated their solidarity with its Government and people.

Cyprus, by a letter of 9 March,<sup>(2)</sup> protested the Turkish Foreign Ministry's inclusion of the Mission of the Turkish Federated State of Kibris in its 1981 list of foreign diplomatic missions at Ankara, Turkey. Replying by a letter of 14

April,<sup>(12)</sup> Turkey stated that it had no choice but to recognize the Turkish Federated State of Cyprus until new structures were agreed upon by the two communities. By another letter of 14 April,<sup>(13)</sup> Turkey transmitted a letter of the same date from Mr. Atalay stating that the Turkish Federated State of Kibris had maintained an office at Ankara since 1975.

Cyprus, by a letter of 10 April,<sup>(3)</sup> protested a report that the Turkish Cypriot leadership had taken steps to issue title deeds to Turkish Cypriots for properties in the occupied area of Cyprus owned by Greek Cypriot refugees.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (MAY). Before the mandate of UNFICYP was due to expire, the Secretary-General, on 27 May, submitted a report to the Security Council on the United Nations operation in Cyprus covering the period from 1 December 1980 to 27 May 1981.<sup>(21)</sup> The report dealt with the activities of the Force, including its civilian police element and its financing (p. 344), as well as with developments in the intercommunal talks, held in the framework of the good offices mission entrusted to the Secretary-General by the Security Council since 1975.<sup>(23)</sup> The humanitarian assistance programme was also reviewed (p. 346).

The Secretary-General reported that the intercommunal talks had continued in a constructive atmosphere, although with limited practical results. Meetings had been held almost weekly at Nicosia, under the auspices of his Special Representative, with a reduced schedule to take effect in May and June in view of elections in both parts of Cyprus. The interlocutors for each side had taken up in succession the four agenda items agreed upon when the current round of talks began in August 1980.<sup>(29)</sup>

The Secretary-General had continued direct personal contact with the parties with a view to facilitating the negotiations. During the first months of 1981, his representatives, in consultation with the parties, had sought to devise the basis and content of a partial interim agreement that would take into account the matters assigned priority or special importance by the 10-point accord of 1979 for resumption of the talks.<sup>(28)</sup> However, there were still difficulties with regard to the possible impact of that approach on the political and legal positions of the parties, on the geographical scope and the nature of a new régime for Varosha (a community near the port of Famagusta, just inside the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot forces' cease-fire line), and on the method and extent of the easing of economic restrictions in connection with the reopening of Nicosia International Airport.

On 22 April, agreement had been announced on the establishment and terms of reference of a Committee on Missing Persons (p. 345).

The Secretary-General recommended to the Council a six-month extension of the UNFICYP mandate. On 4 June, in an addendum to the report, he added that both parties had concurred in the proposed extension.

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION (JUNE). The Security Council, by a resolution of 4 June<sup>(24)</sup> prepared on the basis of consultations carried out by its President, took note of the Secretary-General's report and extended the stationing of UNFICYP in Cyprus for a further six months, to 15 December. It urged the parties to pursue the intercommunal talks, and requested the Secretary-General to continue his good offices mission and to report to the Council by 30 November. This resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with China not participating in the vote.

Before adopting the resolution, the Council invited Cyprus, Greece and Turkey, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion of the Cyprus situation. Mr. Atalay was also invited to participate under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.<sup>a</sup>

The Secretary-General, in a statement to the Council, said the intercommunal negotiations were to enter a more active phase at the beginning of July, and the parties had given him reason to believe that they were prepared to make a serious effort towards a comprehensive settlement. That would involve the interconnected consideration of territorial and constitutional aspects.

Cyprus stated that progress in the negotiations could be achieved only through the implementation of agreements already reached and by taking further steps in the right direction. Proposals by the other side should not reiterate old positions or undermine the legal order in the Republic, but should be pragmatic and reasonable.

Greece believed that the party responsible for the Cypriot tragedy had the duty to make a serious effort to arrive at a settlement; the situation could have been resolved if the two Cypriot communities had been allowed to seek a satisfactory settlement without the interference of outside elements more interested in promoting their own aims than in the welfare of the Cypriots.

Turkey stated that the intercommunal negotiations were the only valid means for a just and lasting solution; progress could be achieved only by mutual concessions, not by taking unrealistic positions and going back on previous agreements.

<sup>a</sup> Rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure states: "The Security Council may invite members of the Secretariat or other persons, whom it considers competent for the purpose, to supply it with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence."

Mr. Atalay, stressing the need to address the two communities as equals, stated that the only way to guarantee a lasting peace in Cyprus was to create a bicomunal, bizonal federation in which each community could manage its internal affairs without interference from the other side; there could be no federation without equality of the units forming it.

FURTHER COMMUNICATIONS (JUNE-DECEMBER). On 3 June,<sup>(4)</sup> 13 August,<sup>(6)</sup> 9 November<sup>(7)</sup> and 17 November,<sup>(8)</sup> Cyprus protested violations of its airspace by jet fighters of the Turkish air force on 1 and 2 June, 11 August and 5, 12 and 13 November. On 19 November<sup>(17)</sup> and 27 November,<sup>(18)</sup> Turkey transmitted letters of the same dates from Mr. Atalay stating that the aircraft mentioned in the Cyprus letters sent in November had remained within the airspace of the Turkish Federated State.

By a letter dated 10 June,<sup>(14)</sup> Turkey transmitted a letter of the same date from Mr. Atalay protesting remarks by Archbishop Chrisostomos of the Greek Orthodox Church, published in the Greek Cypriot daily *Agon* on 17 May, calling for the break-up of the intercommunal talks and urging Greece to create an armed front against Turkey and Turkish Cypriots. On 13 June,<sup>(5)</sup> Cyprus cited a statement by its President objecting to what he called provocative remarks by Mr. Denktas about the existence of borders in Cyprus and stating that the future of the intercommunal talks would become gloomy if the intransigent attitude of the Turkish side did not change radically.

By a letter of 16 June,<sup>(15)</sup> Turkey transmitted a letter of the same date from Mr. Atalay charging that Greek Cypriot leaders had publicly denied the existence of the population exchange agreement reached in 1975 at Vienna, Austria, under the auspices of the Secretary-General.<sup>(27)</sup>

By a letter of 27 November,<sup>(9)</sup> Cyprus stated that the Turkish Cypriot leaders had decided to confer citizenship status in the so-called Turkish Federated State of Cyprus to settlers from Turkey; annexed to the letter was the text of an amendment to that effect dated 28 October. On 15 December,<sup>(19)</sup> Turkey transmitted a letter of the same date from Mr. Atalay, replying that the Federated State had the right and responsibility to pass, execute and apply laws deemed necessary and suitable for the task of governing northern Cyprus, just as the Greek Cypriot administration did regarding the area under its own jurisdiction.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (DECEMBER). In a report to the Security Council dated 1 December on the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the period 28 May to 30 November,<sup>(22)</sup> the Secretary-General expressed the view

that the search for a solution to the Cyprus problem had undergone a rapid evolution. For the first time, the parties had proposed concrete territorial, in addition to constitutional, arrangements. Shortly after the talks had resumed on 5 August, following a short recess while elections were held in the island, the Turkish Cypriot interlocutor had submitted his community's proposals, and on 9 September the Greek Cypriot interlocutor had done likewise.

The Secretary-General's Special Representative had submitted an evaluation paper, initially on 22 October as an informal draft and officially on 18 November. This paper dealt with some aspects of the problem, analysing the parties' positions, seeking to identify major points of coincidence and equidistance, and suggesting ideas or working hypotheses, derived mainly from the parties' positions and conceived as parameters for negotiations. The paper did not purport to introduce proposals as a basis for negotiations to solve the Cyprus problem.

The report also covered the other topics dealt with in the Secretary-General's May report on the Cyprus operation (p. 341).

In the light of the situation on the ground and of political developments, the Secretary-General again concluded that the continued presence of UNFICYP remained necessary, both in helping to maintain calm and in creating conditions for a peaceful settlement. He therefore recommended a further six-month extension of the Force's mandate and, in an addendum of 14 December, he stated that the parties had signified their concurrence.

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION (DECEMBER). By a resolution of 14 December,<sup>(25)</sup> adopted unanimously on the basis of a draft prepared during consultations among Council members, the Security Council took note of the Secretary-General's latest report, extended the stationing of UNFICYP for a further six months to 15 June 1982, and requested the Secretary-General to continue his good offices mission and to report by 31 May 1982.

Before adopting the resolution, the Council invited Cyprus, Greece and Turkey, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion. Mr. Atalay was also invited to participate under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.<sup>b</sup>

Addressing the Council after adoption of the resolution, the Secretary-General said the parties had agreed to use the evaluation presented by his Special Representative as a method of negotiation, thus embarking on the path designed to lead eventually to a comprehensive settlement.

<sup>b</sup> see footnote a on p. 341.

There had been gradual movement in the negotiating process instead of confrontation, and the pace of that movement had accelerated over the previous few months. However, the parties should not lose sight of the great distance to be travelled.

Cyprus stated that the basis for the intercommunal dialogue remained the United Nations resolutions and the past high-level agreements, not the Secretary-General's evaluation paper, though it was helpful to the negotiations. Cyprus had accepted an understanding not to have the Cyprus question discussed at the current General Assembly session (see below), but it would request a full-fledged debate and a resolution if the talks in Cyprus did not register progress within a reasonable time.

Greece stated that the Turkish Cypriots, in their August proposal, had offered to return about 3 per cent of the territory occupied by foreign troops in return for the virtual partition of the island through the creation of two federated entities, each of which would be an independent State in all but name.

Turkey denied that the Turkish Cypriot side had asked for partition and said the other side should give up the hope of prevailing on the Turkish Cypriots to place themselves under Greek Cypriot administration; the Greek Cypriots should negotiate on the basis of the Secretary-General's evaluation before seeking to go before the General Assembly in the hope of obtaining doubtful satisfaction and poisoning relations between the two communities.

Mr. Atalay stated that the Turkish Cypriot side had accepted the evaluation paper as the framework and basis of the intercommunal talks; its August proposals had helped the talks to reach a constructive stage and it was determined to do all it could to keep the talks alive, despite the unconstructive attitude of the other side.

China, explaining its position on United Nations peace-keeping operations, said that henceforth it would support those operations that were conducive to the maintenance of peace and security and the preservation of the sovereignty and independence of the States concerned.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** The Secretary-General submitted a report on the Cyprus question to the General Assembly on 20 November,<sup>(20)</sup> reviewing developments in the intercommunal talks and other matters (covered in his reports to the Security Council). He observed that there had been a rapid evolution during the year in the search for a solution, with the submission of new or revised proposals by both sides and of his evaluation paper. While the talks represented the best method of pursuing the negotiations, the evaluation paper constituted a deter-

mined effort to lend structure and substance to the process.

The Assembly did not discuss the Cyprus question in 1981, though the item remained on its agenda. When suspending the session on 18 December,<sup>(26)</sup> it listed this item among those to be considered when the session resumed.

By a letter of 8 September,<sup>(16)</sup> Turkey transmitted a letter of the same date from Mr. Atalay forwarding a letter dated 4 September from Mr. Denktas, on the representation of Cyprus in the Assembly; Mr. Denktas stated that the Greek Cypriot administration's continued attempts to represent the Republic as a whole at international forums were null and void, and that the Turkish Cypriot community would not be bound by anything said or done by such a delegation.

Letters: Cyprus: <sup>(1)</sup>6 Mar., A/36/120-S/14396; <sup>(2)</sup>9 Mar., A/36/123-S/14399; <sup>(3)</sup>10 Apr. A/36/185-S/14437; <sup>(4)</sup>3 June, A/36/306-S/14504; <sup>(5)</sup>13 June, A/36/324-S/14539; <sup>(6)</sup>13 Aug., A/36/436-S/14630; <sup>(7)</sup>9 Nov., A/36/668-S/14751; <sup>(8)</sup>17 Nov., A/36/699-S/14758; <sup>(9)</sup>27 Nov., A/36/729-S/14773. <sup>(10)</sup>India: 2 Mar., transmitting Conference of non-aligned countries documents, A/36/116 & Corr.1. Turkey: <sup>(11)</sup>23 Feb., A/36/108-S/14382; <sup>(12)</sup>14 Apr., A/36/204-S/14445; <sup>(13)</sup>14 Apr. A/36/205-S/14446; <sup>(14)</sup>10 June, A/36/321-S/14538; <sup>(15)</sup>16 June, A/36/336-S/14561; <sup>(16)</sup>8 Sep., A/36/486-S/14681; <sup>(17)</sup>19 Nov., A/36/707-S/14763; <sup>(18)</sup>27 Nov., A/36/728-S/14772; <sup>(19)</sup>15 Dec., A/36/852-S/14812.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(20)</sup>A/36/702, <sup>(21)</sup>S/14490 & Add.1, <sup>(22)</sup>S/14778 & Corr.1,2 & Add.1.

#### Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: SC: <sup>(23)</sup>367(1975), paras. 6-8, 12 Mar. 1975 (YUN 1975, p. 298); <sup>(24)</sup>486(1981), 4 June 1981, text following; <sup>(25)</sup>495(1981), 14 Dec., text following.

Decision: <sup>(26)</sup>GA: 36/461, item 35, 18 Dec. (p. 350). Yearbook references: <sup>(27)</sup>1975, p. 286; <sup>(28)</sup>1979, p. 421; <sup>(29)</sup>1980, p. 454.

Meeting records: SC, S/PV.2279, 2313 (4 June, 14 Dec.).

#### Security Council resolution 486(1981)

14-0 Meeting 2279 4 June 1981  
Draft prepared in consultations carried out by President (S/14500).

#### The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 27 May 1981,

Noting the concurrence of the parties concerned in the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 June 1981,

Reaffirming the provisions of Its resolution 186(1964) and other relevant resolutions,

Reiterating its support of the ten-point agreement for the resumption of the intercommunal talks which was worked out at the high-level meeting on 18 and 19 May 1979 at Nicosia under the auspices of the Secretary-General.

1. Extends once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under resolution 186(1964) for a further period ending on 15 December 1981;

2. Notes with satisfaction that the parties have resumed the intercommunal talks within the framework of the ten-point

agreement and urges them to pursue these talks in a continuing, sustained and result-oriented manner, avoiding any delay;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 30 November 1981.

vote in Council as follows:

In favour: France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United States,  
Against: None.

China did not participate in the vote.

#### Security Council resolution 495(1981)

Adopted unanimously Meeting 2313 14 December 1981

Draft prepared in consultations among Council members (S/14790).

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 1 December 1981,

Noting the concurrence of the parties concerned in the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 December 1981,

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 186(1964) and other relevant resolutions,

Reiterating its support of the ten-point agreement for the resumption of the intercommunal talks which was worked out at the high-level meeting on 18 and 19 May 1979 at Nicosia under the auspices of the Secretary-General,

1. Extends once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under resolution 186(1964) for a further period, ending on 15 June 1982;

2. Notes with satisfaction that the parties have resumed the intercommunal talks within the framework of the ten-point agreement and urges them to pursue these talks in a continuing, sustained and result-oriented manner, avoiding any delay;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 31 May 1982.

## UN Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus

#### Activities of UNFICYP

The United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) continued during 1981, for the seventeenth year, to supervise the cease-fire lines of the Cyprus National Guard and the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot forces, and to provide security for civilians in the buffer zone between those lines. To help maintain the cease-fire, UNFICYP exercised surveillance over the area between the lines—a zone 180 kilometres long and from 20 metres to 7 kilometres wide—based on a system of 133 observation posts, 64 of which were permanently manned (as

at 30 November). United Nations civilian police (UNCIVPOL), deployed in support of the Force, contributed to the maintenance of law and order in that area and to the protection of civilians, particularly where intercommunal problems existed.

In discharge of its humanitarian responsibilities, UNFICYP assisted in the transfer from north to south, at their request, of 90 Greek Cypriots during the first 10 months of 1981. As of 31 October, 1,086 Greek Cypriots were residing in the north and some 187 Turkish Cypriots remained in the south. It also helped implement the humanitarian assistance programme for Cyprus (p. 346).

The Security Council extended the Force's mandate twice during 1981, for six months on each occasion (16 June-15 December 1981 and 16 December 1981-15 June 1982). The activities of the Force were described in two reports by the Secretary-General to the Council, covering the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the periods 1 December 1980 to 27 May 1981<sup>(1)</sup> and 28 May to 30 November.<sup>(2)</sup>

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>S/14490 & Add.1, <sup>(2)</sup>S/14778 & Corr.1,2 & Add.1.

#### Composition of UNFICYP

As at 30 November 1981, UNFICYP had a strength of 2,374, including civilian police.<sup>(1)</sup> Contingents came from eight States (see table below). The number of military personnel was 117 below the level of 30 November 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> in pursuance of a 1980 recommendation by a Secretariat Survey Team.<sup>(2)</sup>

#### CONTINGENTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCE IN CYPRUS

(by country of origin, as at 30 November 1981)

Military personnel	
Austria	291
Canada	515
Denmark	341
Finland	11
Ireland	6
Sweden	381
United Kingdom	795
Total	2,340
Civilian police	
Australia	20
Sweden	14
Total	34
Grand total	2,374

Between 1 January and 30 November, three members of the Force died, which brought the total number of fatal casualties to 121 since the inception of UNFICYP in 1964.

Major-General Guenther G. Greindl of Austria took command of the Force on 1 March 1981

from Major-General James Joseph Quinn of Ireland.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, S/14778 & Corr.1,2.  
Yearbook references: 1980, <sup>(2)</sup>p. 455, <sup>(3)</sup>p. 456.

#### UNFICYP financing

The expenditures of UNFICYP totalled \$20,987,635 in 1981. The Force continued to be financed by voluntary contributions and by troop-contributing Governments. A total of \$16,506,781 was received in contributions from 22 States during 1981 (see table below).

The accumulated deficit of the Force stood at \$91.5 million as at 15 December 1981. Because of the deficit, it was impossible to reimburse troop-contributing Governments for the whole of their extra costs in providing contingents. The Secretary-General reported to the Security Council in December<sup>(3)</sup> that the last payment to those Governments in respect of their claims, which represented in some cases only a fraction of their actual costs in maintaining their contingents, had been made in April 1981, and met those claims only up to July 1976.

The Secretary-General made appeals for contributions in letters of 5 June<sup>(1)</sup> and 29 December,<sup>(2)</sup> sent following each renewal of the UNFICYP mandate to all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies. Pointing out that contributions had consistently fallen short of needs, he said in the December letter that the rate of accumulation of the deficit had been growing, since voluntary contributions for the previous five years had averaged \$9 million every six months while expenses had increased from \$11 to \$14 million for a six-month period.

#### PAYMENTS RECEIVED IN 1981 FOR THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCE IN CYPRUS

(as at 31 December 1981; In US dollars)

Country	Amount
Australia	100,000
Bahamas	2,000
Barbados	1,000
Belgium	223,250
Germany, Federal Republic of	1,030,459
Greece	1,092,768
Iceland	7,500
India	10,000
Jamaica	1,000
Luxembourg	9,401
Norway	610,000
Pakistan	3,000
Philippines	300
Portugal	4,000
Singapore	1,500
Switzerland	415,761
Thailand	1,000
United Arab Emirates	10,000
United Kingdom	3,976,004
United Republic of Cameroon	5,338
United States	9,000,000
Uruguay	2,500
Total	16,506,781

Letters: S-G; <sup>(1)</sup>5 June, S/14554; <sup>(2)</sup>29 Dec., S/14834.  
Report: <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, S/14778 & Corr.1.

## Other aspects

#### Establishment of the Committee on Missing Persons

On 22 April 1981, the Secretary-General's Special Representative in Cyprus announced that an agreement had been reached by the two sides on terms of reference for the establishment of a Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus. In his report of 27 May to the Security Council,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that the announcement had been the result of efforts by himself and his representatives aimed at bridging the gap between the two communities with regard to the establishment of an investigatory body to trace and account for missing persons. The Committee consisted of three members: one humanitarian person representing each of the two communities and an official-Claude Pilon—selected by the International Committee of the Red Cross, with the agreement of both sides, and appointed by the Secretary-General.

The Committee began work on 14 July. However, the Secretary-General reported to the Council in his 1 December report<sup>(2)</sup> that it had immediately encountered procedural difficulties that had prevented it from embarking on substantive work. The Committee reconvened on 26 November and received from its third member a revised set of proposals intended to resolve those difficulties.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly, expressing regret at the lack of progress towards commencing the investigative work of the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus, urged that the Committee proceed with that work without further delay and called on the parties to assist it in a spirit of co-operation and goodwill. The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue to provide his good offices for the unhindered functioning of the Committee.

This resolution, sponsored and revised by Cyprus, was adopted by the Assembly without vote, following its approval by the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee on 4 December by a recorded vote of 89 to 7 (Bangladesh, El Salvador, Guatemala, Indonesia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Turkey), with 30 abstentions.

Cyprus stated, in introducing the resolution, that 2,000 persons were still missing in that country as a result of foreign aggression. However, the Turkish Cypriot party had used pretexts and stratagems to prevent the Committee on Missing Persons from starting its investigative work.

Turkey opposed the text, stating that the procedural matters could have been solved if the Greek Cypriots had not resorted to obstructive methods, including violation of the rule of secrecy that should govern the Committee's work; the Turkish Cypriot community, supported by Turkey, considered that the Assembly had no power to pronounce judgement on the Committee, whose establishment, terms of reference and procedure derived not from a United Nations decision but from intercommunity agreement.

Also voting against, Bangladesh said it sought to avoid supporting a text that might delay movement towards a mutually acceptable solution. Pakistan said the agreement establishing the Committee, and its work, were confidential, and any observations on that work might impede efforts to establish confidence between the parties.

Brazil abstained, explaining that it had no knowledge of the Committee's procedural difficulties or the provisions of the agreement mentioned in the text.

Among those voting for the resolution, Australia, Austria and Sweden said they had done so for purely humanitarian reasons, in the hope that the Committee could fulfil its mandate. Papua New Guinea also cited humanitarian concerns as the reason for its vote. Greece observed that some of the missing persons were of Greek nationality and added that the reluctance of the Turkish Cypriot side to co-operate had caused procedural difficulties.

New Zealand, which also voted in favour, regarded the text as procedural but expressed reservations to a reference in the preamble by which the Assembly welcomed an oral agreement of 26 March concerning attendance of the Committee of Relatives of Missing Persons (a non-governmental organization in Cyprus) at meetings of the three-member Committee. In regard to this reference, Turkey said that, following meetings with Father Christophorou (Chairman of the Committee of Relatives), Rauf R. Denktas had made a press statement on 29 March announcing a concordance of views on three points, including the participation of families of missing persons in the Committee's work as observers; but it could not be claimed that Mr. Denktas, as President, could have concluded an intercommunity agreement of public law with a private person or the association over which that person presided.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>S/14490, <sup>(2)</sup>S/14778 & Corr.1.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/164, 16 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-70, 72, 73 (19 Nov.-4 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/164

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) by recorded vote (89-7-30), 4 December (meeting 73); draft by Cyprus (A/C.3/36/L.72/Rev.1); agenda item 12.

#### Missing persons In Cyprus

The General Assembly,

Recalling its previous resolutions on the question of the missing persons In Cyprus,

Reaffirming the basic human need of families to be informed, without further delay, about the fate of their missing relatives,

Having in mind that agreement was reached, on 19 May 1979, during the high-level meeting held at Nicosia under the auspices of the Secretary-General,

Welcoming the agreement establishing the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus, referred to in the report of the Secretary-General of 27 May 1981, including the oral agreement of 26 March 1981 concerning the attendance of representatives of the Committee of Relatives of Missing Persons at the meetings of the Committee,

Regretting the fact that owing to procedural difficulties no progress has been achieved towards the commencement of the Committee's investigative work,

1. Urges that the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus proceed, without any further delay, with its investigative work for the tracing of and accounting for missing persons in Cyprus;

2. Calls upon the parties concerned to assist, in a spirit of co-operation and goodwill, the Committee in carrying out its investigative task;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide his good offices for the unhindered functioning of the Committee.

#### Humanitarian assistance

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) continued in 1981 to assist displaced and needy persons in Cyprus in his capacity as Co-ordinator of United Nations Humanitarian Assistance for Cyprus. According to the Secretary-General's December report to the Security Council on the United Nations operation in Cyprus,<sup>(1)</sup> the 1981 programme provided \$14 million for 18 projects to build temporary housing and a general hospital, procure health, education and agricultural equipment and supplies, and provide professional training. During the 12 months ended 30 November 1981, UNHCR distributed or delivered 1,299.2 tons of food, clothing, gas and diesel oil: 961 tons to Greek Cypriots and Maronite Christians in the north, and 338.2 tons to Turkish Cypriots in the north. The World Food Programme was a major contributor of food.

This programme was in addition to humanitarian functions performed by the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for Greek Cypriots remaining in the north, including good offices in regard to temporary visits to the south by Greek Cypriots residing in the north, and periodic visits by UNFICYP officials to Turkish Cypriots in the south.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, S/14778 & Corr.1.

## Chapter X

## Organizational questions

In December 1981, the United Nations selected a new Secretary-General, Javier Pérez de Cuéllar of Peru, for a five-year term beginning on 1 January 1982, to replace Kurt Waldheim of Austria. The appointment was made by the General Assembly<sup>(12)</sup> on the unanimous recommendation of the Security Council.<sup>(17)</sup>

Three States joined the United Nations, raising its membership to 157. Resolutions recommending the admission of Vanuatu,<sup>(14)</sup> Belize,<sup>(15)</sup> and Antigua and Barbuda<sup>(16)</sup> were adopted unanimously by the Security Council, after which the Assembly admitted them to the Organization—Vanuatu on 15 September,<sup>(4)</sup> Belize on 25 September,<sup>(7)</sup> and Antigua and Barbuda on 11 November.<sup>(11)</sup>

In October, the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States was granted observer status in the Assembly.<sup>(8)</sup> The Assembly also called for strengthened co-operation between the United Nations and intergovernmental organizations previously granted such status—the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation,<sup>(13)</sup> the League of Arab States<sup>(10)</sup> and the Organization of the Islamic Conference,<sup>(9)</sup> as well as the Organization of African Unity (OAU) (p. 228).

The Assembly resumed its thirty-fifth session in January,<sup>a</sup> March and May, and adjourned it on 14 September. It held its eighth emergency special session, on the Namibia question, from 3 to 14 September, and opened its thirty-sixth regular session on 15 September, suspending it on 18 December after having completed consideration of all but seven of the 138 agenda items. It elected Ismat T. Kittani (Iraq) as President for the thirty-sixth session (p. 350).

In March and September, the Assembly approved the decisions of its Credentials Committee to reject the credentials of South Africa for representatives to the thirty-fifth session<sup>(1)</sup> and the eighth emergency special session.<sup>(2)</sup> It approved all other credentials submitted by Member States for the emergency special session,<sup>(3)</sup> and at the start<sup>(5)</sup> and close<sup>(6)</sup> of its thirty-sixth session, rejecting a challenge to the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea.

In addition to these organizational questions affecting political organs, the United Nations dealt with a number of organizational issues related to economic and social matters, centred on co-ordination and restructuring within the system and relations with non-governmental organizations (p. 1074).

## Resolutions:

General Assembly: <sup>(1)</sup>35/4 C, 2 Mar. (p. 352); <sup>(2)</sup>ES-8/1 A, 4 Sep. (p. 352); <sup>(3)</sup>ES-8/1 B, 11 Sep. (p. 352); <sup>(4)</sup>36/1, 15 Sep. (p. 350); <sup>(5)</sup>36/2 A, 18 Sep. (p. 352); <sup>(6)</sup>36/2 B, 17 Dec. (p. 352); <sup>(7)</sup>36/3, 25 Sep. (p. 349); <sup>(8)</sup>36/4, 15 Oct. (p. 352); <sup>(9)</sup>36/23, 9 Nov., (p. 356); <sup>(10)</sup>36/24, 9 Nov. (p. 354); <sup>(11)</sup>36/26, 11 Nov. (p. 348); <sup>(12)</sup>36/137, 15 Dec. (p. 348); <sup>(13)</sup>36/174, 17 Dec. (p. 354).

Security Council: <sup>(14)</sup>489(1981), 8 July (p. 350); <sup>(15)</sup>491(1981), 23 Sep. (p. 349); <sup>(16)</sup>492(1981), 10 Nov. (p. 348); <sup>(17)</sup>494(1981), 11 Dec. (p. 348).

Publication: Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly (embodying amendments and additions adopted by the General Assembly up to 31 December 1981) (A/520/Rev.14), Sales No. E.82.I.9.

## Appointment of the Secretary-General

By a resolution adopted by acclamation on 15 December 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Security Council, appointed Javier Pérez de Cuéllar of Peru as Secretary-General of the United Nations for a term of office from 1 January 1982 to 31 December 1986. Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar had served as Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Cyprus (1975-1977), Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs (1979-1981) and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General on the situation in Afghanistan (1981). He had previously been a Peruvian Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the United Nations.

The Council recommended the appointment by a resolution adopted unanimously on 11 December,<sup>(6)</sup> transmitted to the Assembly on the same date by a letter from the Council President.<sup>(1)</sup> The Assembly resolution was sponsored by all 15 members of the Council.

The Council devoted four meetings to the matter, on 27 and 28 October and 4 and 17 November, before adopting its recommendation on 11 December. All these meetings were held in private, in accordance with the Council's practice when considering the appointment of the Secretary-General.

Prior to the Council's consideration, the candidature of Salim Ahmed Salim, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania, was supported unanimously by the Assem-

<sup>a</sup> See YUN 1980 for coverage of issues considered by the General Assembly at its resumed thirty-fifth session in January 1981.



bly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, at its eighteenth ordinary session (Nairobi, Kenya, 24-27 June), and was supported by acclamation at the meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and heads of delegation of non-aligned countries (New York, 25 and 28 September). The OAU decision was communicated in letters dated 28 September to the Council and the Assembly by the Chairman of the African Group;<sup>(2)</sup> the decision by the non-aligned countries was communicated to the Council in a letter of 30 September from Cuba.<sup>(4)</sup> However, in a statement of 8 December transmitted to the Council by a 10 December letter from Botswana, Chairman of the African Group,<sup>(3)</sup> Mr. Salim said he had asked that his name be set aside from subsequent ballots, as the position of a permanent member of the Council had made it impossible for the Council to recommend him.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>SC President, 11 Dec., A/36/820; <sup>(2)</sup>Algeria, for African Group, 28 Sep., A/36/557 (S/14711);

<sup>(3)</sup>Botswana, 10 Dec., S/14788; <sup>(4)</sup>Cuba, for non-aligned countries, 30 Sep., S/14712.

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>GA, 36/137, 15 Dec., text following; <sup>(6)</sup>SC, 494(1981), 11 Dec., text following.

Communiqués: SC, S/PV.2303-2305, 2310, 2312 (27 Oct.-11 Dec.).

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.98 (15 Dec.).

Security Council resolution 494(1981)

Adopted unanimously Meeting 2312 11 December 1981

The Security Council,

Having considered the question of the recommendation for the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations,

Recommends to the General Assembly that Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar should be appointed Secretary-General of the United Nations for a term of office from 1 January 1982 to 31 December 1986.

General Assembly resolution 36/137

Adopted by acclamation Meeting 98 15 December 1981

15-nation draft (A/36/L.56); agenda item 16.

Sponsors: China, France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations  
The General Assembly,

Acting in accordance with the recommendation contained in Security Council resolution 494(1981) of 11 December 1981,

Appoints Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar as Secretary-General of the United Nations for a term of office beginning on 1 January 1982 and ending on 31 December 1986.

## Admission of Members to the United Nations

During 1981, the number of Member States of the United Nations rose to 157. Three States—Antigua and Barbuda, Belize and

Vanuatu—were admitted to membership by the General Assembly on the Security Council's recommendation. In each case, the Council acted unanimously on the basis of unanimous recommendations by its Committee on the Admission of New Members. The Assembly's resolutions were adopted by acclamation except in the case of Belize, on which Guatemala voted against.

### Admission of Antigua and Barbuda

Antigua and Barbuda, a Caribbean island country formerly administered by the United Kingdom, attained independence on 1 November 1981 and applied for membership by a telegram of the same date.<sup>(2)</sup> Its admission to the United Nations was unanimously recommended by the Security Council on 10 November.<sup>(3)</sup> Acting on the Council's recommendation as transmitted by its President in a letter of the same date,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly admitted Antigua and Barbuda on 11 November by adopting by acclamation a resolution sponsored by 59 States.<sup>(4)</sup>

Congratulations to the Government and people of Antigua—as it was known prior to independence—were extended on 21 August by the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (p. 1181).

Letter and telegram (1): <sup>(1)</sup>SC President, 10 Nov., A/36/666; <sup>(2)</sup>Antigua and Barbuda (1), 1 Nov., transmitted by S-G note, A/36/642-S/14742.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>SC, 492(1981), 10 Nov., text following; <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/26, 11 Nov., text following.

Meeting records: SC, S/PV.2307, 2309 (10 Nov.); GA, A/36/PV.53 (11 Nov.).

Security Council resolution 492(1981)

Adopted unanimously Meeting 2309 10 November 1981

Unanimously recommended by Committee on Admission of New Members (S/14748), 10 November (meeting 69).

The Security Council,

Having examined the application of Antigua and Barbuda for admission to the United Nations,

Recommends to the General Assembly that Antigua and Barbuda should be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

General Assembly resolution 36/26

Adopted by acclamation Meeting 53 11 November 1981

59-nation draft (A/36/L.13 and Add.1); agenda item 20.

Sponsors: Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Canada, China, Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Admission of Antigua and Barbuda to membership in the United Nations

The General Assembly,

Having received the recommendation of the Security Council of 10 November 1981 that Antigua and Barbuda should be admitted to membership in the United Nations,

Having considered the application for membership of Antigua and Barbuda,

Decides to admit Antigua and Barbuda to membership in the United Nations.

Admission of Belize

Belize, a Central American country formerly administered by the United Kingdom, attained independence on 21 September 1981 and applied for membership by a telegram of the same date.<sup>(2)</sup> Its admission to the United Nations was unanimously recommended by the Security Council on 23 September.<sup>(3)</sup> Acting on the Council's recommendation as transmitted by its President in a letter of the same date,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly admitted Belize on 25 September by adopting a 75-nation resolution<sup>(4)</sup> by a recorded vote of 144 to 1.

Guatemala, which voted against the admission of Belize, maintained in the Council and the Assembly that Belize was part of its territory and that it would continue to struggle by peaceful means in support of its claim, regarding the United Kingdom as primarily responsible for the origin and solution of the dispute. The United Kingdom said its guiding principle had always been the right of self-determination; it had never accepted the Guatemalan claim and hoped that negotiations could be resumed promptly, though its role would be different now that Belize was an independent State. Following the admission of his country, the Prime Minister of Belize, George C. Price, told the Assembly that his Government was ready to pursue the formula agreed upon by Belize, Guatemala and the United Kingdom on 11 March.

The dispute between Guatemala and the United Kingdom over Belize was the subject earlier in the year of several letters to the Council and the Assembly (p. 1181).

Letter and telegram (1): <sup>(1)</sup>SC President, 23 Sep., A/36/551;  
<sup>(2)</sup>Belize (t), 21 Sep., transmitted by S-G note, A/36/533-S/14701.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>SC, 491(1981), 23 Sep., text following;  
<sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/3, 25 Sep., text following.

Meeting records: SC, S/PV.2301, 2302 (23 Sep.); GA, A/36/PV.13 (25 Sep.).

Security Council resolution 491(1981)

Adopted unanimously Meeting 2302 23 September 1981  
Unanimously recommended by Committee on Admission of New Members (S/14703), 23 September (meeting 68).

The Security Council.

Having examined the application of Belize for admission to the United Nations,

Recommends to the General Assembly that Belize should be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

General Assembly resolution 36/3

144-1-0 (recorded vote) Meeting 13 25 September 1981  
75-nation draft (A/36/L.4 and Add.1); agenda item 20.

Sponsors: Algeria, Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Comoros, Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Admission of Belize to membership in the United Nations

The General Assembly,

Having received the recommendation of the Security Council of 23 September 1981 that Belize should be admitted to membership in the United Nations,

Having considered the application for membership of Belize,

Decides to admit Belize to membership in the United Nations.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Guatemala.

Abstaining: None.

Admission of Vanuatu

Vanuatu, a South Pacific island country which had been the condominium of the New Hebrides under the joint administration of France and the United Kingdom, attained independence on 30 July 1980 and applied for United Nations membership by a letter dated 22 May 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> Its admission to the United Nations was unanimously recommended by the Security Council on 8 July,<sup>(3)</sup> on the basis of a draft resolution sponsored in the Committee on the Admission of New Members by all 15 Council members. Acting on the Council's recommendation as transmitted by its President in a letter of the same date,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly admitted Vanuatu on 15 September by adopting by acclamation a resolution sponsored by 57 States.<sup>(4)</sup>

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>SC President, 8 July, A/36/368; <sup>(2)</sup>Vanuatu, 22 May, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/308-S/14506.  
 Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>SC, 489(1981), 8 July, text following;  
<sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/1, 15 Sep., text following.  
 Meeting record: SC, S/PV.2290, 2291 (8 July); GA, A/36/PV.1 (15 Sep.).

#### Security Council resolution 489(1981)

Adopted unanimously Meeting 2291 8 July 1981  
 Unanimously recommended by Committee on Admission of New Members (S/14580). 8 July (meeting 67): 15-nation draft.

Sponsors: China, France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

The Security Council,

Having examined the application of the Republic of Vanuatu for admission to the United Nations.

Recommends to the General Assembly that the Republic of Vanuatu should be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/1

Adopted by acclamation Meeting 1 15 September 1981  
 57-nation draft (A/36/L.1 and Add.1): agenda item 20.

Sponsors: Algeria, Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Canada, Central African Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Admission of the Republic of Vanuatu  
 to membership in the United Nations

The General Assembly,

Having received the recommendation of the Security Council of 8 July 1981 that the Republic of Vanuatu should be admitted to membership in the United Nations,

Having considered the application for membership of the Republic of Vanuatu,

Decides to admit the Republic of Vanuatu to membership in the United Nations.

## Organizational questions concerning the General Assembly

#### Dates of sessions

The thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, which had opened on 16 September 1980 and been suspended on 17 December, was resumed on 15 January 1981. Additional meetings of the resumed session took place on 16 January, 2 to 6 March, 11 May and 14 September.

The eighth emergency special session of the Assembly was held from 3 to 14 September to consider the question of Namibia (p. 1140).

The Assembly opened its thirty-sixth session on 15 September. The session continued through 18 December, when the Assembly, on an oral proposal of its President, decided to

resume the session in 1982 in order to complete consideration of the seven items remaining on its agenda.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/461, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly decision 36/461

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 8.

#### Suspension of the thirty-sixth session

At its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1981, the General Assembly decided to resume its thirty-sixth session, at a date to be announced, for the sole purpose of considering the following agenda items:

- Item 12: Report of the Economic and Social Council (consideration of the question of human rights relating to the case of Mr. Ziad Abu Eain);
- Item 15 (c): Election of a member of the International Court of Justice;
- Item 18 (i): Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia;
- Item 35: Question of Cyprus;
- Item 37: Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development;
- Item 60: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East;
- Item 100: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983 (question of the formulation, presentation, review and approval of programme budgets).

#### Election of the President

On 15 September 1981, the General Assembly elected Ismat T. Kittani, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, as President of its thirty-sixth session.<sup>(1)</sup> In accordance with the pattern of rotation among regions established in 1978,<sup>(4)</sup> only representatives of Asian States were eligible for the presidency. The election was by secret ballot. Of the 150 votes cast on the first ballot, Mr. Kittani received 64, Khwaja Mohammed Kaiser (Bangladesh) 46 and Tommy T.B. Koh (Singapore) 40; there was 1 abstention and 1 invalid ballot. Since the required majority (76) was not obtained, a second ballot was held, restricted to Mr. Kaiser and Mr. Kittani, in which each candidate received 73 of the 146 votes cast; there were six invalid ballots. Mr. Kittani's name was then drawn by lot, in accordance with rule 93 of the Assembly's rules of procedure.<sup>b</sup>

In a letter of 18 September to the Secretary-General, Iran enclosed a communiqué dated 17 September from its Ministry of Foreign Affairs stating that Iraq had launched a war of aggression against Iran and that the accession of such a State to the Assembly presidency would have grave moral and political implications for the United Nations.<sup>(2)</sup> In a letter to the Secretary-General dated 25 September, Iraq responded

<sup>b</sup> Rule 93 states: "If in the second ballot the votes are equally divided, and a majority is required, the President shall decide between the candidates by drawing lots."

that Mr. Kittani had been elected in compliance with the rules of procedure and that Iran had begun and continued to wage a war of aggression against Iraq.<sup>(3)</sup> (For information on the Iran-Iraq situation, see p. 238.)

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/302, 15 Sep.

Letters: <sup>(2)</sup>Iran, 18 Sep., A/36/526; <sup>(3)</sup>Iraq, 25 Sep., A/36/556.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 33/138 annex, 19 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 401).

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.1 (15 Sep.).

#### Agenda

The General Assembly adopted without vote on 4 September 1981<sup>(1)</sup> a five-item agenda<sup>(3)</sup> for its eighth emergency special session, including one substantive item: Question of Namibia.

A 134-item agenda for the Assembly's thirty-sixth session was adopted initially on 18 September, and four additional items were included on 6 October and 4 November<sup>(2)</sup>. In addition to adopting the agenda,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly allocated each of the 138 items for consideration by one of its Main Committees or directly in plenary meetings.<sup>(5)</sup> These actions were taken on the recommendation of the General Committee,<sup>(9)</sup> which acted on the basis of a provisional agenda of 126 items<sup>(7)</sup> and a supplementary list of 8 items<sup>(8)</sup> proposed for inclusion prior to the session (annotated by the Secretariat<sup>(6)</sup>, as well as proposals for additional items submitted during the session.

The Assembly's actions on inclusion and allocation of items were taken without a vote. In the General Committee, inclusion of two items was recommended by vote on 16 September, the others having been recommended without vote: item 38, Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council (24 votes to 4) (p. 353), and item 42 (b), Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Secretary-General (a proposal by the USSR to delete the sub-item was rejected by 18 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions) (p. 73).

(For lists of agenda items, see APPENDIX IV.)

Decisions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>ES-8/21, 4 Sep., text following; <sup>(2)</sup>36/402, 18 Sep., 6 Oct. & 4 Nov., text following.

Documents: 8th emergency special session: <sup>(3)</sup>agenda, A/ES-8/10. 36th session: <sup>(4)</sup>agenda, A/36/251 & Add.1, 2; <sup>(5)</sup>allocation, A/36/252; <sup>(6)</sup>annotated preliminary list and agenda, A/36/100 & Add.1; <sup>(7)</sup>provisional agenda, A/36/150; <sup>(8)</sup>supplementary list, A/36/200/Rev.1.

Report: <sup>(9)</sup>General Committee, A/36/250 & Add.1, 2. Meeting records: GA: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.1-4 (16 Sep.-3 Nov.); plenary, A/ES-8/PV.2 (4 Sep.), A/36/PV.4, 28, 46 (18 Sep.-4 Nov.).

General Assembly decision ES-8/21

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 4.

#### Adoption of the agenda

At its 2nd plenary meeting, on 4 September 1981, the General Assembly adopted the agenda for its eighth emergency special session.

General Assembly decision 36/402

Adopted without vote

Approved by General Committee (A/36/250 and Add.1, 2). 16 September, 6 October and 3 November; agenda item 8.

#### Adoption of the agenda and allocation of agenda items

At its 4th, 28th and 46th plenary meetings, on 18 September, 6 October and 4 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendations of the General Committee as set forth in its first, second and third reports, adopted the agenda and the allocation of agenda items for the thirty-sixth session.

#### Credentials of representatives

At its eighth emergency special session and its thirty-sixth regular session, the General Assembly approved reports of its Credentials Committee accepting the credentials submitted by Member States for representatives attending those sessions, except for those submitted by South Africa at the emergency special session. In each case, the Committee adopted resolutions orally proposed by its Chairman by which it accepted the credentials concerned, and the Assembly then adopted resolutions submitted by the Committee to approve its reports.

The Assembly resolution at the emergency special session<sup>(3)</sup> was adopted without vote on 11 September 1981, on the basis of a draft similarly approved by the Committee the previous day. At its regular session, the Assembly adopted similar resolutions without vote on 18 September<sup>(4)</sup> and 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> as recommended by the Committee, also without vote, on 15 September and 9 December, respectively. The Assembly rejected on 18 September an amendment that would have added the phrase "except with regard to the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea" to the resolution approving the report (p. 248).

The Assembly twice approved reports stating that the Committee had decided to reject the credentials submitted by South Africa (p. 163). This occurred first on 2 March by a resolution<sup>(1)</sup> which the Assembly adopted by 112 votes to 22, with 6 abstentions, following a Committee vote the same day to reject the credentials submitted by South Africa for the thirty-fifth session. The Assembly adopted a similar resolution on 4 September<sup>(2)</sup> by a recorded vote of 117 to 22, with 6 abstentions, after the Committee, on the previous day, decided to reject the credentials submitted by South Africa for the eighth emergency special session. In both instances, the vote in Committee to reject the credentials was 6 to 1, with 2 abstentions. South Africa did not submit credentials at the thirty-sixth session later in 1981.

During the discussions on credentials at the Assembly's emergency special and thirty-sixth sessions, individual delegations also opposed approval of the credentials of Afghanistan (p. 237)

and Chile (p. 951), and reservations were expressed on the credentials of Israel (p. 263).

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>35/4 C, 2 Mar., text following; <sup>(2)</sup>ES-8/1 A, 4 Sep., text following; <sup>(3)</sup>ES-8/1 B, 11 Sep., text following; <sup>(4)</sup>36/2A, 18 Sep., text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/2 B, 17 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: A/35/PV.102, 103 (2 Mar.); A/ES-8/PV.2, 11 (4, 11 Sep.); A/36/PV.3, 4, 103 (18 Sep., 17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 35/4 C

112-22-6 Meeting 103 2 March 1981

Approved by Credentials Committee (A/35/484/Add.2 and Add.2/Corr.1) without vote. 2 March (meeting 3): draft orally proposed by Acting Chairman; agenda item 3.

Credentials of representatives to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly

The General Assembly

Approves the third report of the Credentials Committee.

#### General Assembly resolutions ES-8/1 A and B

A: 117-22-6 (recorded vote) Meeting 2 4 September 1981

B: Adopted without vote Meeting 11 11 September 1981

Approved by Credentials Committee (A/ES-8/6 and Add.1) without vote. 3 end 10 September (meetings 1 end 2); drafts orally proposed by Chairman: agenda item 3.

Credentials of representatives to the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly

A

The General Assembly

Approves the first report of the Credentials Committee.

B

The General Assembly

Approves the second report of the Credentials Committee.

Recorded vote in Assembly on resolution ES-8/1 A as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian, SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe,

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Costa Rica, Guatemala, Japan, Malawi, Spain, Uruguay.

#### General Assembly resolutions 36/2 A and B

A: Adopted without vote Meeting 3 18 September 1981

B: Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Credentials Committee (A/36/517 and Add.1) without vote. 15 September and 9 December (meetings 1 and 2); drafts orally proposed by Chairman: agenda item 3.

Credentials of representatives to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly

A

The General Assembly

Approves the first report of the Credentials Committee.

B

The General Assembly

Approves the second report of the Credentials Committee.

Observer status for the African,

Caribbean and Pacific Group of States

By a resolution of 15 October 1981, sponsored by 53 States and adopted without vote, the General Assembly invited the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States to participate as observer in the Assembly's sessions and work.<sup>(2)</sup> The resolution was introduced by Samoa.

The matter was raised by a letter dated 14 August from 27 States,<sup>(1)</sup> requesting inclusion in the Assembly's agenda of an item on observer status for the ACP Group. An explanatory memorandum annexed to the letter noted that the 61-member Group, established pursuant to the Georgetown (Guyana) Agreement of 6 June 1975 as an intergovernmental organization with headquarters at Brussels, Belgium, had two main objectives: to help develop closer trade, economic and cultural relations among ACP States and among developing countries in general, and to promote regional and interregional co-operation and the establishment of a new international economic order.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Bahamas, Botswana, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Congo, Fiji, Ghana, Guyana, Ivory Coast, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritania, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire, Zimbabwe, 14 Aug., A/36/198 & Add.1-3.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/4, 15 Oct., text following.

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.35 (15 Oct.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/4

Adopted without vote Meeting 35 15 October 1981

53-nation draft (A/36/L.5 and Add.1): agenda item 134.

Sponsors: Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Denmark, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Ireland, Italy, Kenya, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Observer status for the African, Caribbean and Pacific

Group of States in the General Assembly

The General Assembly,

Noting the desire of the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States for co-operation between the United Nations and that organization,

1. Decides to invite the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States to participate in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly in the capacity of observer;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to take the necessary action to implement the present resolution.

## Organizational questions concerning the Security Council

### Agenda

The Security Council held 60 meetings during 1981 at which it considered a total of 15 items. It continued to follow the practice of adopting at each meeting the agenda for that meeting. (For list of agenda items, see APPENDIX IV.)

On 17 December,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly, on an oral proposal of its President, took note of a note by the Secretary-General dated 15 September. In his note,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General notified the Assembly, in accordance with Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations, of nine matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security which the Security Council had discussed since his previous annual notification. In addition, he listed 87 matters of which the Council remained seized but which it had not discussed during the period.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA. 36/436, 17 Dec., text following.

Notification: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G note, A/36/503.

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

### General Assembly decision 36/436

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President: agenda Item 7.

Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly took note of the note by the Secretary-General dated 15 September 1981.

### Report

On 10 November 1981 the Security Council unanimously adopted its report to the General Assembly for the period 16 June 1980 to 15 June 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> The General Assembly took note of this report on 17 December, acting without vote on an oral proposal by its President.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Council's activities during the remainder of 1981 were covered in its report to the Assembly for the period 16 June 1981 to 15 June 1982.<sup>(3)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA. 36/438, 17 December, text following.

Reports: SC, <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/2 & Corr. 1, <sup>(3)</sup>A/37/2.

Communiqué: SC, S/PV.2308 (10 Nov.).

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

### General Assembly decision 36/438

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President: agenda item 11.

#### Report of the Security Council

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly took note of the report of the Security Council.

### Proposed increase in membership

In 1981, the General Assembly again postponed consideration of the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council. Draft resolutions on this item, proposing an increase in membership from 15 to 21, had been introduced and discussed at both the 1979<sup>(3)</sup> and 1980<sup>(4)</sup> sessions, but no action had been taken.

On 14 September 1981, at its resumed thirty-fifth session, the Assembly decided to include the item in the draft agenda of its 1981 regular session.<sup>(1)</sup> The decision was orally proposed by the Assembly President at the request of the 19 sponsors of the 1980 draft resolution and was adopted without vote. Following consultations at the Assembly's thirty-sixth session, the President proposed that the question be included in the provisional agenda of the 1982 regular session since there had been no request to consider the item at the 1981 session. This decision was adopted by the Assembly without vote on 18 December.<sup>(2)</sup>

Decisions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>35/453, 14 Sep., text following;

<sup>(2)</sup>36/460, 18 Dec. text following

Yearbook references: <sup>(3)</sup>1979, p. 435; <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 461.

Meeting records: GA, A/35/PV.114, A/36/PV.105 (14 Sep., 18 Dec.).

### General Assembly decision 35/453

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President at request of Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Cuba, Ghana, Grenada, Guyana, India, Iraq, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, Nigeria, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, United Republic of Cameroon, Zambia: agenda item 30.

#### Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council

At its 114th plenary meeting, on 14 September 1981, the General Assembly decided to include in the draft agenda of its thirty-sixth session the item entitled "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council" and to transmit to that session all relevant documentation from the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly.

### General Assembly decision 36/460

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President: agenda item 38.

#### Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council

At its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1981, the General Assembly decided to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council".

## Relations between the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations

In 1981, the General Assembly adopted, without vote, four resolutions concerned with

strengthening co-operation between the United Nations and the following intergovernmental organizations: the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation, the League of Arab States, the Organization of African Unity (p. 229) and the Organization of the Islamic Conference. By each resolution, the Secretary-General was requested to report to the Assembly in 1982 on measures taken to further co-operation between the United Nations and the organization concerned.

#### Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation

By a resolution of 17 December 1981, the Assembly welcomed the participation of the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation in United Nations work and requested the Secretary-General, in collaboration with the Agency, to examine Agency proposals aimed at reinforcing co-operation.<sup>(2)</sup>

The draft of the resolution, as orally amended by the USSR in Committee to specify that the Secretary-General's report be submitted through the Economic and Social Council, had been approved by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, also without vote, on 11 November. An earlier draft, sponsored by 36 States and introduced by Zaire,<sup>(1)</sup> was withdrawn by its sponsors following the informal consultations that resulted in the submission of the final draft by a Vice-Chairman of the Committee. Under the first draft, the Assembly would have decided to strengthen co-operation, rather than recognized the necessity of doing so, and the Secretary-General would have considered ways of strengthening co-operation, rather than examined the Agency's proposals on reinforcing it.

Draft resolution withdrawn; <sup>(1)</sup>Angola, Belgium, Benin, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, France, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Niger, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, Togo, Tunisia, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Zaire, A/C.2/36/L.17.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/174, 17 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10, 11, 12-25, 26, 28-32, 35 (24 Sep.-11 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/174

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.1) without vote. 11 November (meeting 35); draft by Committee Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.40), based on informal consultations on 36-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.17) and orally amended by USSR; agenda item 69.

Co-operation between the United Nations and the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 33/18 of 10 November 1978, by which it accorded observer status to the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation,

Recalling also Economic and Social Council decision 190(LXI) of 5 August 1976, by which the Council had designated the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation to participate on an ad hoc basis in the deliberations of the Council on questions within the scope of its activities.

Noting with satisfaction the desire expressed by the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation to establish close co-operation with the United Nations in all fields of common interest, in particular training, desertification control, science and technology for development, new and renewable sources of energy and technical co-operation among developing countries,

Recognizing the importance of those sectors,

1. Welcomes the participation of the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation in the work of the United Nations in fields of common interest;

2. Recognizes the necessity of strengthening co-operation between the United Nations and the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation;

3. Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in collaboration with the Secretary-General of the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation, to examine proposals by the Agency aimed at reinforcing co-operation with the United Nations and to submit a report thereon through the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### League of Arab States

In a letter to the Secretary-General dated 14 August 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> Algeria, as Chairman of the Arab Group for August, requested that the General Assembly include an item on co-operation between the United Nations and the League of Arab States in its agenda for the 1981 regular session. An attached explanatory memorandum stated that the objective of the request was for closer co-operation between the United Nations and the League — which was granted observer status by the Assembly in 1950<sup>(2)</sup>—and for joint efforts in seeking solutions to international problems.

By a resolution of 9 November, sponsored by 20 States belonging to the League and introduced by Qatar, the Assembly noted with appreciation the League's constructive contribution to the work of the United Nations system, recognized its continued efforts to promote co-operation among Arab States and to seek solutions to Arab problems, reaffirmed the determination to work with the League towards the establishment of the new international economic order, and requested the Secretary-General to continue to strengthen political, economic, cultural and administrative co-operation with the League.<sup>(3)</sup>

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Arab Group, 14 Aug., A/36/196.

Resolutions: GA, <sup>(2)</sup>477(V), 1 Nov. 1950 (YUN 1950, p. 873); <sup>(3)</sup>36/24, 9 Nov. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.2 (16 Sep.); plenary, A/36/PV.49 (9 Nov.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/24

Adopted without vote Meeting 49 9 November 1981

20-nation draft (A/36/L.9); agenda item 132.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco,

Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Co-operation between the United Nations  
and the League of Arab States

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 477(V) of 1 November 1950, in which it requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to invite the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States to attend sessions of the General Assembly as an observer,

Recalling also the pertinent articles of the Charter of the United Nations which encourage activities through regional arrangements for the promotion of the purposes and principles of the United Nations,

Recognizing the efforts made by the League of Arab States for the promotion of these purposes and principles.

Noting that the Charter of the League of Arab States has envisioned co-operation with international bodies in order to guarantee peace and security and to promote economic and social relations,

Noting with satisfaction the co-operation that has developed for more than thirty years between the United Nations and the League of Arab States in areas of common endeavour,

Taking note of the effective participation of the League of Arab States in the work of the United Nations system,

1. Reaffirms its resolution 477(V) and decides to invite the League of Arab States to participate in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly and of its subsidiary organs as an observer;

2. Notes with deep appreciation the increasing participation of the League of Arab States in the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and its constructive contribution to that work;

3. Recognizes the continued efforts of the League of Arab States to promote co-operation among Arab States and to seek solutions to Arab problems of vital importance to the International community and takes note with satisfaction of the increased collaboration of various organizations of the United Nations system in support of these efforts;

4. Recognizes the importance of continued close association by the United Nations and the specialized agencies, where appropriate, with the efforts of the League of Arab States in order to promote social and economic development and to advance intra-Arab as well as international co-operation in this vital field;

5. Reaffirms the determination of the United Nations to work closely with the League of Arab States towards the establishment of the new international economic order in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

6. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his efforts to maintain contacts with the League of Arab States and requests him further to strengthen these contacts;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to take the necessary measures to strengthen co-operation at the political, economic, cultural and administrative levels between the United Nations and the League of Arab States in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report on the implementation of the present resolution and on the development of co-operation between the League of Arab States and the organizations concerned within the United Nations system.

Organization of the Islamic Conference

In a report issued in November 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> the Secretary-General described measures taken to implement the General Assembly's 1980 resolution on promoting co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference.<sup>(6)</sup> The report described ac-

tivities in which the two organizations had co-operated. Among them were: investments by the Islamic Development Bank in projects in Indonesia and Somalia supported by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); consultations on investment monitoring between the Bank and UNDP; preparation of a joint programme with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization for establishing an industrial training and development centre; joint activities with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to celebrate the fifteenth century of Hegira, including an international symposium on Islam (Paris, July 1981); and joint programmes between the Bank and the World Health Organization to improve the health of refugees in Somalia and southern Sudan. In the political field, the two organizations had consulted and exchanged information on the Palestine question, the Afghanistan situation, disarmament, apartheid and the situation between Iran and Iraq.

The report suggested that the Islamic Conference be granted observer status with the Economic Commission for Western Asia, the Economic Commission for Africa and the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.

Resolutions on these and other political, economic, social and cultural issues were adopted at the Third Islamic Summit Conference, held at Taif, Saudi Arabia, from 25 to 28 January, at which the Secretary-General delivered an address on 26 January emphasizing the necessity of finding just solutions to the political and economic problems of concern to both organizations. The texts of the Conference's resolutions and communique were circulated as an Assembly document, at the request of Saudi Arabia.<sup>(4)</sup> Circulated as documents at the request of Iraq were the resolutions and communiqué of the Twelfth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, held at Baghdad, Iraq, from 1 to 5 June,<sup>(1)</sup> and the communique of a meeting held by the Foreign Ministers at United Nations Headquarters on 3 October.<sup>(2)</sup> A special representative of the Secretary-General attended the June meeting.

On 9 November, the Assembly adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(7)</sup> by which it noted the Secretary General's report and the participation of the Islamic Conference in the financing of development projects, and urged the United Nations and the Islamic Conference to intensify co-operation on such questions as international peace and security, disarmament, self-determination, decolonization, human rights and the establishment of a new international economic order. It invited bodies of the United Nations system to send studies and experts to the Islamic Conference.



The draft of this resolution was introduced in the Assembly by Iraq, on behalf of the members of the Islamic Conference. After its adoption, Ethiopia stated that it would have voted against if the resolution been put to a vote; it did not believe the United Nations should be a party to decisions of an organization based on a particular religion. India said it would have abstained in a vote; while it had no objection to maintaining co-operation with the Islamic Conference on equal terms with other observer organizations, it felt that the object of some elements in the resolution was unclear. Israel also said it would have abstained, since the Islamic Conference endeavoured to promote aims that were sometimes in contrast to the Charter of the United Nations; it also had reservations about attempts to institutionalize further differentiation among Member States on the basis of religion. The Philippines, voicing support of the Islamic Conference, observed that some delegations could not approve all of the Conference's decisions without reservation since they were not necessarily bound by them. The USSR said it would not have supported the resolution, as it placed the Islamic Conference in a privileged position with the aim of creating in the United Nations a special machinery for consolidating an abnormal situation.

Israel, in a letter to the Secretary-General dated 25 November<sup>(3)</sup> referring to resolutions of the January and June meetings of the Islamic Conference, said it was difficult to see how a call for a "Holy War" against Israel could be reconciled with the United Nations Charter (p. 258).

Letter: Iraq: <sup>(1)</sup>5 Aug., annexing resolutions and communique of Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, A/36/421-S/14626 & Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>14 & 23 Oct., annexing communique of Foreign Ministers meeting, A/36/603 & Add.1. <sup>(3)</sup>Israel: 25 Nov., A/36/722. <sup>(4)</sup>Saudi Arabia: 25 Mar., annexing resolutions and communique of Islamic Summit Conference, A/36/138.

Report: <sup>(5)</sup>S-G, A/36/384.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(6)</sup>35/36, 14 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 467); <sup>(7)</sup>36/23, 9 Nov. 1981, text following.

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.49 (9 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/23

Adopted without vote Meeting 49 9 November 1981

Draft by Iraq (A/36/L.8); agenda item 25.

Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the state of co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference,

Recalling its resolutions 3369(XXX) of 10 October 1975 and 35/36 of 14 November 1980,

Noting with satisfaction the development of co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference,

Noting further the establishment of relations of co-operation between the specialized agencies and other bodies of the United Nations system and the Organization of the Islamic Conference,

Taking into account the desire of both organizations to contribute to the search for solutions to global problems, such as questions relating to international peace and security, disarmament, self-determination, decolonization, fundamental human rights and the establishment of a new international economic order,

Noting the participation of the Secretary-General in the work of the Third Islamic Summit Conference of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, held at Mecca-Taif from 25 to 28 January 1981,

Noting the effective participation of the Organization of the Islamic Conference in the work of the United Nations,

Convinced of the need to strengthen the co-operation between the United Nations, the specialized agencies and other bodies of the United Nations system and the Organization of the Islamic Conference,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the Secretary-General on the state of co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference;

2. Urges the two organizations to intensify co-operation in their common search for solutions to global problems, such as questions relating to international peace and security, disarmament, self-determination, decolonization, fundamental human rights and the establishment of a new international economic order;

3. Notes with satisfaction the establishment of relations of co-operation between the specialized agencies and other bodies of the United Nations system and the Organization of the Islamic Conference;

4. Invites the specialized agencies and other bodies of the United Nations system to send to the Organization of the Islamic Conference studies and experts in their areas of specialization, including the combating of desertification and the elimination of poverty, hunger, illness and ignorance;

5. Notes the effective participation of the Organization of the Islamic Conference in the financing of a number of development projects in co-operation with the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the United Nations Environment Programme;

6. Considers it necessary to strengthen co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference for the achievement of the goals set forth in the Charter of the United Nations;

7. Takes note of the appointment by the Secretary-General of a special representative to participate in the work of the Twelfth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, held at Baghdad from 1 to 5 June 1981, and to study the best way of establishing machinery for co-ordinating the activities of the various units of the secretariats of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and other bodies of the United Nations system which co-operate or may co-operate with the Organization of the Islamic Conference;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report on the state of co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference;

9. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference".

Twentieth anniversary of the  
Conference of Non-Aligned Countries

On 12 October 1981, the General Assembly met for a solemn observance of the twentieth anniversary of the first Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, from 1 to 6 September 1961.

The proposal for the observance was made in a letter of 14 August 1981 by Cuba, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries,<sup>(1)</sup> requesting that the matter be included in the agenda of the Assembly's 1981 session. An attached explanatory memorandum noted that membership in the Movement had increased from 25 countries to virtually two thirds of United Nations Members, attesting to the increasing validity of its principles and its positive role in international relations.

At the observance, the Assembly President emphasized the close parallel between the principles and objectives of the Movement and those of the United Nations, as well as its consistent support for the United Nations. The Secretary-General described the Movement as one of the great forces directing the world's political evolution and said its achievements had confirmed its founders' belief that medium and small Powers could, by joining together, initiate positive international action. Tributes to the work of the Movement were also paid by Yugoslavia, the host country for the first Conference; Cuba, Chairman of the Movement for 1981; and by representatives of regional groups and national liberation movements.

The documents of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi, India, from 9 to 13 February, were circulated as an Assembly document at the request of India.<sup>(3)</sup> In accordance with a request by Cuba, the same was done for the communiqué of the meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and heads of delegation of non-aligned countries to the 1981 regular session of the Assembly, held at United Nations Headquarters on 25 and 28 September.<sup>(2)</sup>

Letters: Cuba: <sup>(1)</sup>14 Aug., for non-aligned countries, A/36/195; <sup>(2)</sup>30 Sep., annexing communiqué of non-aligned countries, A/36/566-S/14713. <sup>(3)</sup>India: 2 Mar., annexing documents of Conference of Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries, A/36/116 & Corr. 1. Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.34 (12 Oct.).

#### Other intergovernmental organizations

At the request of Cuba, the resolutions adopted at the sixth-eighth Inter-Parliamentary Con-

ference, held at Havana, Cuba, from 15 to 23 September 1981, were circulated at the Assembly's 1981 regular session.<sup>(2)</sup> The communiqué and the declaration of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, held at Melbourne, Australia, from 30 September to 7 October, were also circulated as an Assembly document at the request of Australia.<sup>(1)</sup>

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Australia, 9 Oct., annexing communiqué and declaration of Commonwealth Heads of Government, A/36/587; <sup>(2)</sup>Cuba, 5 Oct., annexing resolutions of Inter-Parliamentary Conference, A/36/584.

## Other organizational questions

#### Composition of UN organs

On 16 December 1981, the General Assembly deferred consideration of the question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations. On the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, it decided without objection to include the item in its 1982 agenda.<sup>(3)</sup> The Chairman proposed this action orally in Committee, noting that no member had asked to speak on the question, which had been deferred by the Assembly at its 1979<sup>(1)</sup> and 1980<sup>(2)</sup> sessions. The Committee agreed to the proposal without objection on 2 December.

Decisions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>34/420, 5 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 438); <sup>(2)</sup>35/404, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 463); <sup>(3)</sup>36/433, 16 Dec. 1981, text following. Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.47 (2 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly decision 36/433

Adopted without vote

Approved by SPC (A/36/765) without objection. 2 December (meeting 47); Oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 68.

#### Question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations

At its 100th plenary meeting, on 16 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, decided to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations".

## Chapter XI

## Other political questions

Aspects of a dispute between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Malta over delimitation of the continental shelf between them were considered by the Security Council during 1981, and

a Special Representative of the Secretary-General sought to help the parties resolve their differences over submission of the matter to the International Court of Justice (p. 358).

An aerial incident on 19 August between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the United States, and other aspects of relations between the two countries, were the subject of letters by both sides to the United Nations (p. 360).

In October, the General Assembly endorsed the continuing work of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation,<sup>(2)</sup> which examined a number of scientific papers in preparation for a substantive report it was to issue in 1982.

Various aspects of information were considered by the Assembly and its Committee on Information.<sup>(1)</sup> In December, the Assembly made a number of recommendations to strengthen the United Nations public information programme,<sup>(4)</sup> and called for governmental and private support to expand the International Programme for the Development of Communication—a project of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.<sup>(3)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Information, A/36/21.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/14, 28 Oct. (p. 362); <sup>(3)</sup>36/149 A, 16 Dec. (p. 374); <sup>(4)</sup>36/149 B, 16 Dec. (p. 363).

## Questions concerning the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

### Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Malta

During 1981, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Malta were unable to agree on whether either party had the right to conduct offshore drilling operations in a disputed area of the Mediterranean Sea pending a decision by the International Court of Justice on delimitation of the continental shelf between the two States. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya sought an interim ban on drilling pending a Court decision, but Malta regarded this as an unacceptable precondition. As a consequence, by year's end the parties had not completed the formalities required to submit the delimitation dispute to the Court under a special agreement, signed by them in 1976, that provided for such adjudication as a means of resolving the dispute.

A Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Diego Cordóvez, continued a mission aimed at assisting the parties to complete the formalities of submission to the Court. The positions of both sides were presented in letters to the Secretary-General (January-June) and the Security Council President (September-November), and at a meeting of the Council in July. In December, the Special Representative suggested that the parties consider submitting the issue of interim drilling to the Court in conjunction with the delimitation case.

COMMUNICATIONS (JANUARY-JUNE). In a letter dated 14 January,<sup>(1)</sup> the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya informed the Secretary-General that the Libyan Basic People's Congresses had decided to ratify the 1976 agreement with Malta on submission of the dispute over the continental shelf to the International Court of Justice, provided that no drilling was allowed until the Court concluded consideration of the matter.

In a reply of 15 January,<sup>(6)</sup> Malta said the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had delayed ratification by almost one month and had laid down a new condition on drilling which Malta viewed as failure to comply with the unconditional Libyan undertaking—given to the Secretary-General's Special Representative during consultations in October/November 1980<sup>(20)</sup>—to submit the original text of the agreement for ratification by the Libyan Congresses.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya responded on 21 January<sup>(2)</sup> that it had stated at the outset and during negotiations that it would not accept commencement of drilling in the disputed area until the dispute was settled; it cited the Special Representative's November 1980 report to the effect that Malta had accepted an implicit understanding in 1976 that it would not begin drilling until the Court had reached a decision and a delimitation agreement had been concluded.

Malta stated on 23 January<sup>(7)</sup> that it was depositing on that date a further declaration accepting, unconditionally and without reservations, the Court's jurisdiction on disputes over delimitation of its continental shelf; Malta would have spontaneously refrained from drilling if the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had ratified the 1976 agreement at once, but it was no longer equitable to impose such a condition in 1981. On 27 January,<sup>(8)</sup> Malta transmitted notes verbales by which the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, on 26 January, announced that it was ready to exchange documents ratifying the 1976 agreement, and Malta, on 27 January, invited the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to exchange the instruments of ratification at Valletta, Malta, and sign a joint document notifying the Court of the agreement; Malta said in its letter of transmittal to the Secretary-General that it had no objection to that course because the Libyan ratification had not been made conditional, and asked him to indicate a day for finalization of the formalities.

In a letter of 2 February,<sup>(9)</sup> Malta reproduced a Libyan note verbale of 29 January stating that it was ready to ratify the agreement provided no drilling was allowed in the disputed area until the Court had completed its review—a proviso which Malta said was not acceptable. On 17 February,<sup>(10)</sup> Malta said it had been notified on

15 February that a Libyan delegation was about to visit for the exchange of ratification instruments, but Malta had also been informed by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya that formal submission of the case to the Court had yet to be negotiated and finalized; unless the Security Council acted, the dispute would again threaten the region's security.

On 3 June,<sup>(11)</sup> Malta said the Council should meet to ask the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to comply with its 1980 commitment to ratify the agreement without conditions. Reiterating on 18 June its request for a Council meeting,<sup>(12)</sup> Malta said it was willing to exchange the instruments of ratification if it received a Libyan assurance that its Congresses' decisions placed no condition.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, on 11 June,<sup>(3)</sup> said the nature of the dispute was such that neither party should foster the intention of exploiting the disputed area; it was prepared to exchange instruments of ratification but not to have dictated to it a different formula for those instruments.

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION. By a letter of 21 July to the Security Council President,<sup>(13)</sup> Malta said it was clear that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya did not wish to submit the agreed terms to the Court and insisted on inserting extraneous conditions; Malta therefore requested that the Council meet to condemn the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for its show of force in August 1980<sup>(19)</sup> and for going back on its undertaking to place the matter before the Court.

The Council met on 30 July in accordance with Malta's request, and invited the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Malta to participate in the discussion without vote.

The Secretary-General gave the Council an account of contacts he and his Special Representative had had with both parties with a view to assisting them in finalizing the exchange of instruments of ratification and the joint notification to the Court, as provided in the 1976 agreement. In late March, a Libyan delegation had visited Malta to conclude the formalities, but the discussions had been inconclusive. The Secretary-General had conveyed to the Libyan side a 2 July statement by Malta that it considered the question of interim drilling operations in the disputed area as a separate legal issue on which the parties were entitled to have different views. In a letter of 17 July, Malta had accepted a Libyan offer to send a special envoy to discuss the matter. However, meetings between the parties on 27 and 28 July had failed to resolve pending issues.

Malta told the Council that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would continue to find excuses not

to ratify the 1976 agreement. By failing to do so for five years, it had lost its claim to the area where Malta had carried out exploration activities. Although the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had drilled 30 offshore wells of its own, it had forcibly prevented Malta, which was completely dependent on imported petroleum, from carrying out the only activity it had legitimately authorized. Malta, while continuing to exercise self-restraint, believed that a Council pronouncement safeguarding Malta's right to exploit its offshore resources and enjoining the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to desist from threats was essential.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reaffirmed its commitment to conclude the exchange of instruments of ratification and submit the dispute to the Court. As evidence of that commitment, it cited the dispatch of two delegations to Malta, in March and July. However, it could not accept Malta's demand that the Libyan instrument be replaced by a text presented by the Maltese Foreign Ministry. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya believed that to continue bilateral negotiations would be better than to delay them by creating unnecessary obstacles. It hoped those negotiations would put the 1976 agreement into effect and lead to submission of the dispute to the Court.

FURTHER COMMUNICATIONS (SEPTEMBER-NOVEMBER). In a letter dated 15 September,<sup>(4)</sup> the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya transmitted a telegram to the Security Council President from the Secretary of the People's Committee of the Libyan People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison, stating that, on 4 January 1981, it had ratified the 1976 agreement by a resolution stating the Libyan Congresses' view that drilling in the disputed area would cease pending the Court's decision; the telegram added that Malta was solely responsible for making conditions that would delay the exchange of ratification instruments. Malta replied on 24 September<sup>(14)</sup> that the view of the Libyan Congresses had no place in the instrument of ratification.

On 2 November,<sup>(15)</sup> Malta stated that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had not provided a comprehensive reply to the Maltese position as stated to the Secretary-General's Special Representative on 24 September. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya responded on 11 November<sup>(5)</sup> that the issue was legal and procedural and should not have been submitted to the Security Council, since there was no threat to Malta or to regional security; it reiterated its desire to have recourse to the Court and said it had no aggressive intentions against Malta. Replying on 17 November,<sup>(16)</sup> Malta stated that it was still threatened with the use of force should it drill in its part of the continental shelf.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE. In a letter of 8 December,<sup>(17)</sup> Malta said the report by the Secretary-General's Special Representative, submitted to the Security Council on 1 December, was a vindication of Malta's warning that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would turn the mediation efforts into a means for procrastination; those efforts had failed because the Council's insistence on an agreed settlement had been interpreted by the Libyan side as unwillingness of the Council to act against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

In a note of 9 December,<sup>(18)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that, since Malta had referred to the Special Representative's report, he was making it available as a Council document.

In the report, annexed to the Secretary-General's note, the Special Representative said the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had expressed readiness to meet with Malta at Valletta but Malta's position was that such a meeting should be held only if the Libyan Government notified its intention of modifying its ratification instrument. After summarizing the parties' positions, he concluded that the crux of the problem preventing them from concluding the formalities for submission of the matter to the Court was lack of agreement on the right of either party to drill in the disputed area pending a Court decision. It was no longer possible to overcome that specific problem on the basis of procedural arrangements, on which his latest efforts had focused.

The Special Representative therefore suggested that the parties, in order to settle the question of interim drilling, might consider requesting the Court, in conjunction with the submission of the delimitation case, to indicate, as a matter of priority, what Article 41 of the Court's Statute described as "any provisional measures which ought to be taken to preserve the respective rights of either party". By so doing, they would ensure that their legal positions would be consistently safeguarded until the dispute was resolved.

Letters: Libyan Arab Jamahiriya: <sup>(1)</sup>14 Jan., S/14331; <sup>(2)</sup>21 Jan., S/14344; <sup>(3)</sup>11 June, S/14519; <sup>(4)</sup>15 Sep., S/14697; <sup>(5)</sup>11 Nov., S/14752. Malta: <sup>(6)</sup>15 Jan., S/14332; <sup>(7)</sup>23 Jan., S/14343; <sup>(8)</sup>27 Jan., S/14348; <sup>(9)</sup>2 Feb., S/14357; <sup>(10)</sup>17 Feb., S/14375; <sup>(11)</sup>3 June, S/14498; <sup>(12)</sup>18 June, S/14558; <sup>(13)</sup>21 July, S/14595; <sup>(14)</sup>24 Sep., S/14707; <sup>(15)</sup>2 Nov., S/14743; <sup>(16)</sup>17 Nov., S/14756; <sup>(17)</sup>8 Dec., S/14782.

Note: <sup>(18)</sup>S-G, annexing report of Special Representative, S/14786.

Yearbook references: 1980, <sup>(19)</sup>p. 465, <sup>(20)</sup>p. 466.

Meeting record: SC, S/PV.2294 & Corr.1,2 (30 July).

#### Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the United States

An incident on 19 August 1981 involving the shooting down of Libyan aircraft by the United States over the Gulf of Sidra (Surt) in the Medi-

terranean Sea, and other matters concerning relations between the two countries, were the subject of letters to the Presidents of the General Assembly and the Security Council and to the Secretary-General.

Prior to that incident, by a letter to the Secretary-General dated 27 April,<sup>(3)</sup> the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya transmitted a letter from its head of State asserting that the establishment by the United States of so-called rapid deployment forces in the Middle East constituted a threat to international and regional peace and security. By a letter of 3 August to the Security Council President,<sup>(4)</sup> the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya transmitted a letter from the Secretary of the People's Committee of the Libyan People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison, charging the United States with a campaign aimed at aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya through such means as a declaration of readiness to pay for military aid to its neighbours, escalation of military manoeuvres and of a media campaign to pave the way for aggression, and a reported plan to liquidate the Libyan leader.

The United States, -in a letter to the Council President dated 19 August,<sup>(9)</sup> said that United States aircraft participating in a routine peaceful naval exercise over international waters in the Mediterranean Sea had on that date been subjected to an unprovoked attack by Libyan aircraft and had shot down two of them. In a protest note to the Libyan Government, cited in the letter, the United States said the exercise had been announced in accordance with international practice; it expressed grave concern at the attack and declared that any further attacks would also be resisted with force if necessary.

In a letter to the Council President transmitted by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on 20 August,<sup>(5)</sup> the Libyan Secretary for Foreign Liaison said eight aircraft attached to the United States Sixth Fleet, participating in military manoeuvres in the Gulf of Surt (Sidra) within Libyan territorial waters, had intercepted two Libyan Air Force aircraft and shot down one of them while they were engaged in reconnaissance over Libyan territorial waters. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reserved the right to take all necessary measures to protect its rights to its territorial waters and airspace.

In a further letter transmitted on 25 August,<sup>(6)</sup> the Libyan Secretary said that a statement by the United States President on 20 August, admitting that he had ordered the Sixth Fleet to carry out provocative manoeuvres in Libyan waters and to fire on the Libyan aircraft, revealed that the aggression had been premeditated. On 6 October,<sup>(7)</sup> the Libyan Secretary sent a letter to the General Assembly President mentioning

statements about the incident by groups of Arab, Islamic and non-aligned countries.

Also regarding the incident, Algeria, as Chairman of the Group of Arab States, transmitted to the Security Council President on 21 August<sup>(1)</sup> a declaration by which the Group condemned what it termed United States aggression and called on all international groups to stand fast against a challenge by a major Power which, as a permanent member of the Security Council, bore special responsibility to maintain international peace and security.

On 23 November,<sup>(8)</sup> the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya transmitted a letter in which its Secretary for Foreign Liaison denied news reports that it had equipped assassination squads to kill the United States President and other officials; he affirmed that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya did not believe in such terrorist measures, asserted that the allegations made it clear that the United States was plotting to invade his country, and offered to welcome a Security Council fact-finding mission to investigate the allegations.

On 7 December,<sup>(2)</sup> Ethiopia transmitted to the Secretary-General a letter of 25 November from its Minister for Foreign Affairs, in his capacity as Chairman of an extraordinary session of the Political Committee under the Tripartite Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation between Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 15-17 November), annexing a joint statement in which the Committee condemned military manoeuvres and acts of intimidation by the United States and its collaborators in the region.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Arab Group: 21 Aug., S/14638/Rev.1. <sup>(2)</sup>Ethiopia: 7 Dec., A/36/788. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya: <sup>(3)</sup>27 Apr., A/36/228-S/14468; <sup>(4)</sup>3 Aug., S/14625; <sup>(5)</sup>20 Aug., S/14636; <sup>(6)</sup>25 Aug., S/14642; <sup>(7)</sup>6 Oct., A/C.1/36/3; <sup>(8)</sup>23 Nov., S/14766. <sup>(9)</sup>United States: 19 Aug., S/14632.

## Radiation effects

**UNSCEAR ACTIVITIES.** The United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR) held its thirtieth session at Vienna, Austria, from 6 to 10 July 1981. It discussed a number of scientific documents prepared by the United Nations Secretariat, containing supporting evidence for its next substantive report to the General Assembly, scheduled for 1982.

According to its 1981 report,<sup>(1)</sup> these documents reviewed information on physics and biology provided by United Nations Members and international organizations or published in scientific literature. In the field of physics, the

discussions dealt with models for the assessment of radiation doses to humans, exposures resulting from peaceful nuclear-power production, exposures received through diagnostic or therapeutic radiology, exposures to radon and thoron and their decay products, and occupational exposures. Among biological topics considered were: models for tumour induction by radiation in man and experimental animals; short- and long-term non-tumorous consequences of partial-body exposure; the biological effects of radiation administered in combination with other physical, chemical or biological agents; and fatality rates of radiation-induced tumours. The Committee also reviewed and approved a document on the environmental behaviour and dosimetry of radionuclides, prepared by the Secretariat in response to a request by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 28 October,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly commended UNSCEAR for its 26-year contribution to an understanding of radiation effects, and requested it to continue its work, including co-ordination activities, to increase knowledge of the doses, effects and risks of ionizing radiation from all sources. The Assembly endorsed the Committee's intention to continue its scientific review and assessment activity, requested UNEP to continue supporting the Committee's work and disseminating its findings, and endorsed its renewed request that Member States and organizations provide further data about doses, effects and risks from various radiation sources.

The resolution was approved by the Special Political Committee (SPC) on 14 October, also without vote, on the basis of a 29-nation draft. Introducing it, Poland remarked that international co-operation on atomic radiation could not progress without measures to limit and halt the arms race.

In the SPC discussion, Chile, Czechoslovakia, India, Poland, the USSR and Venezuela called for a halt to nuclear-weapon testing, particularly in the atmosphere. Australia, Fiji and New Zealand mentioned a resolution adopted by the heads of Governments participating in the South Pacific Forum (Vanuatu, 10 and 11 August) condemning such testing and the dumping or storage of nuclear wastes in the Pacific. New Zealand added that it was awaiting information requested from France on nuclear tests it had carried out on Mururoa Atoll (in the Tuamotu Archipelago, French Polynesia) and on their effects. France responded that the tests were carried out underground, far from population centres, and it published a safety report on each explosion and an annual report on the monitoring of radioactivity.

Argentina expressed concern that some countries benefiting from nuclear energy did not attach due importance to UNSCEAR studies. Austria and Greece favoured the establishment of world-wide standards for radiation protection. Greece also suggested that UNSCEAR study population exposure from natural radiation sources and from radio-isotopes arising from the nuclear fuel cycle. Sierra Leone would have liked the resolution to include a provision calling on interested parties to reduce the levels of radiation to which mankind was exposed.

Those delegations and others, including Japan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, the United States and Uruguay, stressed the importance of the Scientific Committee's work and the need for States to co-operate with it, and said they looked forward to the substantive report it was to submit in 1982.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNSCEAR, A/36/439.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/14, 28 Oct., text following.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.4, 5 (13, 14 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.42 (28 Oct.).

General Assembly resolution 36/14

Adopted without vote Meeting 42 28 October 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/629) without vote, 14 October (meeting 5): 29-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.2); agenda Item 59.

Sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, USSR, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

#### Effects of atomic radiation

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 913(X) of 3 December 1955, by which it established the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, and its subsequent resolutions on the subject, including resolution 35/12 of 3 November 1980, by which it, inter alia, requested the Scientific Committee to continue its work,

Taking note with appreciation of the report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation,

Concerned about the potentially harmful effects on present and future generations, resulting from the levels of radiation to which man is exposed,

Conscious of the continued need to examine and compile information about atomic and ionizing radiation and to analyse its effects on man and his environment,

We/coming the decision of the Scientific Committee to submit its report with scientific annexes to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session,

1. Commends the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation for the valuable contribution it has been making in the course of the past twenty-six years, since its inception, to wider knowledge and understanding of the levels, effects and risks of atomic radiation, and for fulfilling its original mandate with scientific authority and independence of judgement;

2. Notes with satisfaction the continued and growing scientific co-operation between the Scientific Committee and the United Nations Environment Programme;

3. Requests the Scientific Committee to continue its work, including its important co-ordinating activities, to increase knowledge of the doses, effects and risks of ionizing radiation from all sources;

4. Endorses the Scientific Committee's Intention to continue its activity of scientific review and assessment on behalf of the General Assembly;

5. Requests the United Nations Environment Programme to continue providing support for the effective conduct of the Scientific Committee's work and for the dissemination of its findings to the General Assembly, the scientific community and the public;

6. Expresses its appreciation for the assistance rendered to the Scientific Committee by Member States, the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency and non-governmental organizations and invites them to increase their co-operation in this field;

7. Endorses the Scientific Committee's renewed request that Member States and the United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations concerned should provide further relevant data about doses, effects and risks from various sources of radiation, which would greatly help the Committee in the preparation of its next major report to the General Assembly.

## Information

By two resolutions adopted on 16 December 1981 under the title "Questions relating to information", the General Assembly made a number of recommendations to strengthen the United Nations public information programme,<sup>(5)</sup> and called for governmental and private support to expand the International Programme for the Development of Communication—a project of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).<sup>(4)</sup> Both resolutions, prepared in a Working Group on information questions established on 19 October by SPC and open to all its members, were approved by SPC without vote on 3 December.

Most of the recommendations were based on proposals by the Assembly's Committee on Information. Following an organizational session on 3 and 4 March, the Committee held its third session at United Nations Headquarters from 27 April to 15 May, resuming on 30 May to adopt part of its report and on 26 August to consider 33 recommendations which it adopted by consensus.<sup>(1)</sup> In October, the Secretary-General reported<sup>(2)</sup> on action taken by the Department of Public Information to implement recommendations made by the Assembly in 1980.<sup>(3)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on information, A/36/21; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/504.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/201, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 481); <sup>(4)</sup>36/149 A, 16 Dec. 1981 (p. 374); <sup>(5)</sup>36/149 B, 16 Dec. (p. 363).

## UN public information

The General Assembly's 1981 resolution on the public information programme of the United Nations<sup>(3)</sup> contained several recommendations about specific activities (p. 365), as well as an affirmation of support for the efforts of UNESCO to

promote the establishment of a new world information and communication order (p. 371). By this resolution, the Assembly approved the recommendations of the Committee on Information,<sup>(1)</sup> reaffirmed the mandate it had given the Committee in 1979 with regard to public information and establishment of a new information and communication order,<sup>(2)</sup> and requested the Committee to avoid overlap with the activities of UNESCO and to seek the co-operation of United Nations organizations. It reiterated its appeal for wider dissemination of information about United Nations activities.

This resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 147 to 2, on the recommendation of SPC (p. 362).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Information, A/36/21.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>34/182, sect. 1, 18 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 458); <sup>(3)</sup>36/149 B, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: ACABQ report, A/36/7/Add.20; 5th Committee report, A/36/824; S-G statements, A/SPC/36/L.30, A/C.5/36/86.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.6-12, 14, 48 (15-26 Oct. & 3 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.73 (14 Dec.); plenary. A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/149 B

147-2 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/819) without vote. 3 December (meeting 48); draft by Vice-Chairman, based on deliberations of Working Group on Information (A/SPC/36/L.25, part 9): agenda item 67.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3535(XXX) of 17 December 1975, 31/139 of 16 December 1976, 33/115 A to C of 18 December 1970, 34/181 and 34/182 of 18 December 1979 and 35/201 of 16 December 1980 on questions relating to information,

Recalling article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which provides that everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression and that this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers, and article 29, which stipulates that these rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations,

Recalling also articles 19 and 20 of the international Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,

Recalling Its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling the Final Declaration of the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Havana from 3 to 9 September 1979, which stressed that co-operation in the field of information is an integral part of the struggle for the creation of new international relations in general and of a new world information order in particular, and also recalling the Declaration of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981, which re-emphasized the importance of the interrelationship between information and communication systems and the developmental processes in the developing countries,

Recalling the Declaration on Fundamental Principles concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and International Understanding, to the Promotion of

Human Rights and to Countering Racism, Apartheid and Incitement to War, adopted on 28 November 1978 by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, as well as the relevant resolutions on information and mass communications adopted by the General Conference at its nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first sessions,

Recalling the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975,

Recalling also the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace,

Conscious of the need for all to collaborate in the establishment of a new world information and communication order based, inter alia, on the free circulation and wider and better balanced dissemination of Information, guaranteeing the diversity of the sources of information and free access to information, and, in particular, the urgent need to change the dependent status of the developing countries in the field of information and communications, and intended also to strengthen peace and international understanding,

Reaffirming the primary role which the General Assembly is to play in elaborating, co-ordinating and harmonizing United Nations policies and activities in the field of information and recognizing the central and important role of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the field of information and communications,

Reaffirming that the establishment of a new world information and communication order is linked to the new international economic order and is an integral part of the international development process,

Emphasizing the complementarity of the activities in the field of information and communication and the need to strengthen co-operation and co-ordination between the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system that deal with different aspects of information and communication,

Emphasizing that the establishment of the International Programme for the Development of Communication within the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization constitutes an important step in the development of the infrastructures of communications in the developing countries,

Expressing its satisfaction with the work of the Committee on information as reflected in its report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session,

Expressing its appreciation to the Joint United Nations information Committee for its efforts towards improving co-ordination of the public information activities of the various organizations of the United Nations system,

Taking note with satisfaction of the report of the Secretary-General on questions relating to information,

Also taking note with satisfaction of the report of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

1. Approves the report of the Committee on information and its recommendations:

2. Reaffirms the mandate given to the Committee on Information by the General Assembly in its resolution 34/182, namely:

(a) To continue to examine United Nations public information policies and activities, in the light of the evolution of international relations, particularly during the past two decades, and of the imperatives of the establishment of the new international economic order and of a new world information and communication order;

(b) To evaluate and follow up the efforts made and the progress achieved by the United Nations system in the field of information and communications;

(c) To promote the establishment of a new, more just and more effective world information and communication order, intended to strengthen peace and international understanding and based on the free circulation and wider and better balanced dissemination of information, and to make recommendations thereon to the General Assembly;



3. Requests the Committee on Information, keeping in mind its mandate, the essential tasks of which are to continue to examine the policies and activities of the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat and to promote the establishment of a new, more just and more effective world information and communication order, to avoid any overlapping of its activities on this subject with those of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, while stressing at the same time the ever-growing significance of the close working co-operation between that organization and the United Nations;

4. Requests the Committee on Information to seek the co-operation and active participation of all organizations of the United Nations system, particularly the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in the fulfilment of its mandate;

5. Affirms its strong support for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and for its efforts to promote the establishment of a new world information and communication order;

6. Reiterates its appeal to Member States, to the information and communication media, both public and private, as well as to non-governmental organizations, to disseminate more widely information about the activities of the United Nations and, *inter alia*, about the efforts of the developing countries towards their economic, social and cultural progress and about the efforts of the international community to achieve international social justice and economic development, international peace and security and the progressive elimination of international inequities and tensions;

7. Requests that the Joint United Nations Information Committee, as the essential instrument for inter-agency co-ordination and co-operation in the field of public information and for the development of a common public information approach covering all aspects of the activities of the organizations within the United Nations system, should continue with its task and that it should be strengthened and made more effective;

8. Reaffirms the importance of the rapidly increasing role of United Nations public information programmes in fostering public understanding and support of United Nations activities and requests the Secretary-General to continue to review the current activities of the Department of Public Information with a view to ensuring a better and more efficient use of its available resources;

9. Reiterates the recommendation contained in its resolution 35/201 that additional resources for the Department of Public Information should be commensurate with the increase in the activities of the United Nations which the Department is called upon to cover for the purpose of public information, and that the Secretary-General should provide such resources to the Department to this end where needed;

10. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the activities of the Department of Public Information, as the focal point for the co-ordination and implementation of the public information tasks of the United Nations, should be strengthened along the lines established in the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly and recommendations of the Committee on Information, to ensure a more coherent coverage of, and a better knowledge about, the United Nations and its work, especially in its priority areas, such as international peace and security, disarmament, peace-keeping and peace-making operations, decolonization, the promotion of human rights, the struggle against racial discrimination, the integration of women in the struggle for peace and development, the establishment of the new international economic order and the establishment of a new world information and communication order, activities against apartheid, the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the continuation of broadcast media programmes on women, due regard being given at the same time to economic and social issues;

11. Requests the Secretary-General to take measures to ensure that the existing imbalance in the staff of the Department of Public Information should be rectified and, until

equitable geographical distribution is achieved, to take urgent steps to increase the representation of the group of developing countries, particularly at senior and policy-making levels, by a policy of recruiting among their nationals, taking into account also the interests of other under-represented groups of countries, in accordance with Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolutions 33/143 of 20 December 1978 and 35/210 of 17 December 1980, and to submit a progress report to the Committee on Information at its next session;

12. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To ensure that the Department of Public Information makes a more strenuous effort to ensure balance in the use of official languages in the publications and programmes of the Department;

(b) To strengthen the competent unit in the Department of Public Information for the production of United Nations information material in Spanish with a view to dissemination through United Nations information centres and United Nations Development Programme offices located in Spanish-speaking countries;

(c) To report on the above to the Committee on Information at its next session;

13. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To submit to the Committee on Information for decision at its next substantive session a plan for the regionalization of the Radio and Visual Services Division of the Department of Public Information, keeping in mind General Assembly resolution 35/201 and following the views expressed and suggestions made in the course of the debate on this subject;

(b) Without prejudice to the above plan for regionalization of the Radio and Visual Services Division, to take necessary action for the establishment of a separate Caribbean Unit in the Radio Service and the expansion of its African Unit, to consider the enlargement of the Arabic Unit in the Radio Service as far as possible through redeployment of existing resources and to maintain and enhance its functions as the producer of radio and television programmes to the Arabic-speaking countries;

(c) To make specific proposals to the Committee on Information at its next session for the purpose of enabling the Asian Unit to undertake programming at a meaningful level in other major languages of the region;

(d) To submit to the Committee on Information at its next substantive session a comprehensive report on the implementation of subparagraphs (b) and (c) above;

14. Further requests the Secretary-General to implement fully his proposals, presented to and endorsed by the Committee on Information, for the expansion of United Nations short-wave broadcasts;

15. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the Department of Public Information continues to develop active links with a broad spectrum of international and regional news organizations to encourage more media coverage of United Nations activities;

16. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the Department of Public Information continues and further strengthens its co-operation with the non-aligned countries in the field of information, particularly with the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies as well as with regional news agencies of developing countries, and in this regard requests that the Department should be adequately equipped to supply the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies, as well as regional news agencies of the developing countries, with information on the activities of the United Nations system which they are disseminating;

17. Requests the Secretary-General to consider the possibility that the Department of Public Information should receive the daily dispatches of the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies and regional news agencies of developing countries in the interest of more balance in the sources of information used by the Department;

18. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the Department of Public Information extends and strengthens

its co-operation with the national news agencies of developing countries;

19. Notes the important role of the United Nations information centres and their unique position to co-operate directly with national media and disseminators of information in their areas;

20. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To take appropriate steps to strengthen the capacity of the information centres where needed;

(b) To present, on the basis of consultations between the Department of Public Information and other United Nations bodies concerned, drawing on the findings of the Joint Inspection Unit in its report, the Secretary-General's comments thereon and the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on co-ordination in the field of public information activities, a study on ways and means to enhance the role of the information centres, along policy guidelines set by the General Assembly, focusing on measures to increase the functional flexibility of the centres, enable them to adjust their work to the needs and wishes of the countries concerned, enhance the effectiveness of their work and improve the co-ordination of their activities as the decentralized part of the structure of the Department of Public Information;

21. Reaffirms the importance of the role played by Development Forum and its decision that the continued publication of that periodical as an inter-agency project is essential and requests the Secretary-General to conclude his review of its financial status, to continue to seek to ensure long-term financial support for that publication from the organizations of the United Nations system and to report on this subject to the Committee on Information at its next session;

22. Stresses the importance of the presentation in United Nations publications of various points of view and experiences, in particular information about the efforts of the developing countries towards their economic, social and cultural progress;

23. Requests the Secretary-General as far as possible within existing resources to implement fully the recommendations of the Committee on Information as well as to continue implementation of the recommendations set out in section III of General Assembly resolution 35/201 and of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Committee on Information as approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/201;

24. Requests the Secretary-General to report on the progress made in implementing the recommendations mentioned in paragraph 23 above to the Committee on Information at its next substantive session;

25. Requests the Committee on Information to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

26. Requests the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of the present resolution to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

27. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of the thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Questions relating to information".

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome

and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen. Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

#### UN public information programme

The General Assembly, by its December 1981 resolution on United Nations public information,<sup>(5)</sup> reiterated a 1980 recommendation<sup>(4)</sup> that additional resources for the Department of Public Information (DPI) should be commensurate with the increase in United Nations activities. It listed a number of priority areas for public information in the political, economic and social spheres, requested urgent steps to recruit more nationals from developing countries and asked for reports in 1982 from the Committee on Information and the Secretary-General.

Other recommendations in the resolution dealt with strengthening DPI language adaptation services (p. 366), regional units in its Radio and Visual Services Division (p. 367), United Nations radio and television programmes (p. 367), co-operation with news agencies (p. 368), United Nations information centres (p. 370) and the publication of Development Forum (p. 370).

The provisions on public information priority areas and geographical distribution of DPI staff, as well as on a number of other specific matters, were based on recommendations of the Committee on Information, contained in its 1981 report to the Assembly.<sup>(1)</sup> The Committee said the Assembly should welcome assurances that no additional appropriations would be sought to implement past recommendations on this subject. It suggested that DPI determine methodologies for evaluating the prevailing image of the United Nations as well as the effectiveness of the Department's channels for reaching public opinion.

In a report to the Assembly dated 2 October 1981<sup>(2)</sup> on implementation of its 1980 resolution on public information,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that there had been progress, though uneven, towards improved geographical balance in DPI. As at 30 June 1980, the proportion of Professional-level staff in DPI from the Group of 77 developing countries had risen from 21.2 per cent in 1976 to 28.1 per cent of the total, while among higher-level posts (P-5 and above) it had risen from 20.4 to 32.1 per cent.

During discussion of this topic in SPC, Bangladesh favoured the allocation of increased resources to DPI and the public information programme, Cyprus and Turkey said sufficient funds should be provided to cope with growing tasks, and the Congo. said the Department

should receive priority in fund allocation. Liberia believed DPI would need additional resources to provide the services demanded of it, including technical co-operation with the third world. Venezuela expressed concern that those favouring zero budget growth were attempting to curtail public information activities.

In Czechoslovakia's view, the only way to achieve improvements within existing financial constraints was to use available resources more effectively and concentrate on key issues. Japan believed DPI must make the best use of the limited resources available. The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community (EC) members, said that, in view of budget limitations, new activities implied a contraction of other work. The United States favoured reorganizing the Department by reallocating resources in the interests of greater efficiency and higher quality products.

Concern about the projected cost of implementing the 1981 resolution—estimated by the Secretary-General at \$912,600 for 1982-1983—was voiced by Canada, New Zealand and the United States when SPC was given the cost estimates in December. The United States explained its vote against the resolution in the Assembly by stating that the consensus achieved earlier on the provisions of the resolution had been dissipated by the decision of the Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee on 14 December to approve the addition of this amount to the 1982-1983 budget.

With regard to geographical distribution of nationalities represented in DPI, the Byelorussian SSR said the Department's most serious shortcoming was the low proportion of staff members from developing countries and socialist States. Calls for better representation from their areas were also made by a large number of speakers from Africa, Asia and other socialist countries. However, the United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, felt that personnel matters should be considered in the Fifth Committee.

Canada endorsed the resolution's provision on geographical balance in DPI on the understanding that the requirement for qualified personnel would be borne in mind. Sweden said the principle of equitable geographical distribution applied to the Secretariat as a whole, not merely to individual departments.

As to information priorities, the Byelorussian SSR felt that efforts to avert nuclear war, curtail the arms race and promote détente should be publicized more widely. Poland said DPI should better reflect United Nations priorities. Romania considered that United Nations information activities could make an important contribution to mobilizing the political will of States. Benin and

Ireland stressed the importance of presenting a balanced picture of the United Nations. Ireland added that this should include both its achievements and its debates on unresolved issues.

Jordan suggested that an expert group of the Committee on Information draw up an action programme in line with the goals of the new world information and communication order, defining a few well-studied projects that could be carried out with the help of a special voluntary fund.

The Philippines saw a need to refine the guidelines for measuring the success of information programmes. Brazil thought that information centres could help in the evaluation of DPI products by distributing questionnaires and gathering data on the type of material most requested by the public.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Information, A/36/21; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/504.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/201, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 481); <sup>(4)</sup>ibid., sect. II (p. 482); <sup>(5)</sup>36/149 B, 16 Dec. 1981 (p. 363).

#### Strengthening language adaptation services

The General Assembly, by its December 1981 resolution on public information,<sup>(3)</sup> requested a more strenuous effort to ensure balance in the use of official languages in DPI publications and programmes and a strengthening of the unit which produced information material in Spanish for United Nations information centres. It asked for a report in 1982 to the Committee on Information.

In response to a 1980 request by the Assembly for better balance in the use of languages,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General stated in his October report on public information<sup>(1)</sup> that continuing efforts had been made to that end. The report mentioned a number of publications that had been or would be issued in up to 24 languages and the addition of a Russian-language writer/adaptor to the Adaptation Unit of the Press and Publications Division.

In the SPC discussion of information in October, Benin said the Adaptation Unit should not simply translate articles conceived and written in English but should be a real working unit in which the official United Nations languages had complete equality. Portugal hoped the Portuguese language would be used more widely in United Nations information. Spain, supported by Argentina and Cuba, urged the establishment of a unit to produce Spanish-language materials for information centres.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/504.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/201, sect. III, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980 482); <sup>(3)</sup>36/149 B, para. 12, 16 Dec. 1981 (p. 364).

#### Regional units in the Radio and Visual Services Division

The General Assembly, by its December 1981 resolution on public information,<sup>(5)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to submit a plan for regionalizing the Radio and Visual Services Division of DPI. In regard to the Radio Service, which already had a regional structure, the Secretary-General was asked to establish a Caribbean Unit, expand the African Unit, consider enlarging the Arabic Unit and make proposals to enable the Asian Unit to undertake programming in additional languages. The Assembly also requested that a report be submitted in 1982 to the Committee on Information.

A report on regionalizing the Division, drafted by a consultant, was presented to the Committee on Information in April,<sup>(1)</sup> in response to a 1980 request by the Assembly.<sup>(4)</sup> It envisaged the establishment of Visual Service units covering films and television for Africa, Asia, Latin America/Iberia, the Middle East/Arabic and the Caribbean, and eventually for North America and Europe. However, it noted that each such unit would cost not less than \$200,000-\$250,000 a year. In his covering note, the Secretary-General said that in the Organization's difficult financial condition it would not be easy to justify treating DPI differently from other Secretariat departments subject to budgetary restraint.

Responding to another 1980 Assembly request, the Secretary-General estimated, in a note to the Committee,<sup>(2)</sup> that 14 new posts would be needed to strengthen the regional structure of the Radio Service, mainly by establishing a Caribbean Unit and expanding the African Unit. However, he reaffirmed his intention not to seek additional resources.

After considering these documents, the Committee on Information recommended in August<sup>(3)</sup> that a plan for regionalizing the Division should be set in motion urgently, through a redistribution of existing posts and the creation of a limited number of new ones when necessary. It also urged faster progress towards a more balanced linguistic output of the Division.

During the October debate on information in SPC, regionalization of the Radio and Visual Services Division was endorsed by Algeria, Benin, Cuba, Egypt, Jamaica, Liberia, Mongolia, Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda and Venezuela, though Venezuela stressed the need to maintain a global perspective. Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago specifically urged the creation of a Caribbean Unit in the Radio Service. Bangladesh and Nepal asked that the Radio Service's Asian Unit produce programmes in their national languages, while Chile stressed the need for television programmes in Spanish. Sierra Leone

urged expansion of the African Unit and said Portuguese language services should be strengthened. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania and the Syrian Arab Republic favoured a single unit for Arabic-language radio and television programmes, while the Sudan asked that more resources be provided to the Middle East Unit to bring it to the same level as other regional units. Singapore stressed that regionalization must be accompanied by recruitment of qualified persons from the regions to be served.

Brazil said a decision had to be taken on how best to reconcile the functions assigned to regional units with central planning and co-ordination. Japan regretted demands for further decentralization of DPI activities, stating that this would reduce the effectiveness and volume of its work. Yemen viewed the plan submitted to the Committee on Information as cumbersome and not likely to achieve regionalization.

Notes: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>A/AC.198/34, <sup>(2)</sup>A/AC.198/35.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>Committee on Information, A/36/21.

Resolution: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/201, sect. III, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 482); <sup>(5)</sup>36/149 B, para. 13, 16 Dec. 1981 (p. 364).

#### UN radio and television programmes

Two means of improving the dissemination of United Nations radio and television programmes were under consideration in 1981—satellite transmission and short-wave broadcasting.

A consultant's report submitted to the Committee on Information in April<sup>(2)</sup> proposed that a daily 10-minute news programme produced by DPI be transmitted to developing countries by communication satellite during General Assembly sessions, as the first stage in a move to modernize the United Nations telecommunication system. A covering note reaffirmed the Secretary-General's intention not to seek additional appropriations.

The Committee asked in August for reports in 1982 on the cost-effectiveness of various means of transmission and on the possibility of the United Nations acquiring its own communication satellite.<sup>(3)</sup> It also suggested that, after surveying potential recipients' interest, DPI should prepare a weekly 10-minute newscast for satellite transmission during the 1982 regular session of the Assembly, to be followed in a second stage by a weekly broadcast in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish for transmission to all Member States throughout the year.

The General Assembly did not deal with satellite broadcasting in its December 1981 resolution on public information; however, it authorized implementation of proposals presented to the Committee and endorsed by it for the expansion of United Nations short-wave broadcasts.<sup>(6)</sup> These proposals, as described in a note by the

Secretary-General in April,<sup>(1)</sup> provided for a total of nine hours of daily broadcasts, five days a week, to various regions in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Greek, Hebrew, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, Swahili and Turkish. No funds were appropriated for this purpose for 1982, pending a study of the full costs.

In his October report to the Assembly on public information,<sup>(4)</sup> the Secretary-General said that 22 radio stations all over the world made use of United Nations programmes produced for broadcast to southern Africa. Production of weekly television magazines in Spanish was to begin with the 1981 regular session of the Assembly. Studies on short-wave broadcasts over United Nations facilities and on United Nations frequency modulation broadcasts in the Headquarters area, called for by the Assembly in 1980,<sup>(5)</sup> would be submitted in 1982.

In the SPC discussion of information in October, Jordan suggested that Member States be asked to allocate on their radio and television stations half an hour every two weeks during Assembly sessions for material supplied by DPI. Increased short-wave broadcasting was endorsed by Algeria, Jamaica and Tunisia. Colombia suggested that existing communication satellites be used by the United Nations as the first step towards creating its own satellite system. The Congo and Zaire supported the idea of a United Nations communication satellite. Sri Lanka thought the Organization should make greater use of satellites and that its officials should appear on more radio and television programmes.

On the other hand, Austria felt that such major steps as the creation of a United Nations communication satellite system must not be undertaken lightly, while New Zealand said the Committee on Information should concentrate on co-ordination of information activities.

Notes: S-C, <sup>(1)</sup>A/AC.198/36, <sup>(2)</sup>A/AC.198/39.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>Committee on Information, A/36/21; <sup>(4)</sup>S-G, A/36/504.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(5)</sup>35/201, sect. III, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 482); <sup>(6)</sup>36/149 B, para. 14, 16 Dec. 1981

#### Co-operation with news agencies

Requesting that DPI continue to develop active links with a broad spectrum of international and regional news organisations so as to encourage more media coverage of the United Nations, the General Assembly, by its December 1981 resolution on public information,<sup>(5)</sup> asked that such co-operation be strengthened, in particular with the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies as well as with regional and national news agencies of developing countries. DPI, it said, should be adequately equipped to supply

information on the United Nations to those agencies, and should consider the possibility of receiving their dispatches.

This action had been recommended by the Committee on Information in its 1981 report to the Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup> An April note by the Secretary-General<sup>(1)</sup> described co-operative arrangements with the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies, Inter Press Service, the Pan African News Agency, broadcasting unions, other regional news agencies, and national news agencies and broadcasting organisations. Also, in his October report to the Assembly on public information,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that, in keeping with the Assembly's 1980 request,<sup>(4)</sup> whenever working space had been available to journalists at United Nations Headquarters, preference had been given to media representatives from developing countries.

During the October debate on information in SPC, Yugoslavia urged closer co-operation between the United Nations and the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies, including United Nations use of the Pool's dispatches. Support for closer co-operation between DPI and news organizations was also expressed by Bangladesh, Egypt, India, Iraq, Trinidad and Tobago, and Turkey. The United States said it understood the provision in the resolution for co-operation with news agencies to encompass private as well as public organizations.

Pakistan urged greater efforts to provide adequate office space for journalists at Headquarters, particularly those representing smaller countries.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/AC.198/38.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on Information, A/36/21; <sup>(3)</sup>S-C, A/36/504.

Resolution: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/201, sect. III, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, 482); <sup>(5)</sup>36/149 B, paras. 15-18, 16 Dec. 1981 (p. 364).

#### UN information centres

Noting the unique position of United Nations information centres because of their ability to co-operate directly with national news media in their areas, the General Assembly, in its December 1981 resolution on public information,<sup>(4)</sup> requested that steps be taken to strengthen the centres where needed. The Secretary-General was asked to present a study on ways of enhancing their role and increasing their functional flexibility. These provisions had been recommended by the Committee on Information in August.<sup>(1)</sup>

In a report to the Committee dated 2 April,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General presented a plan to enhance the effectiveness of the network of centres. This would be done through such means as improved guidance and support from United

Nations Headquarters in languages other than English, better geographical balance in staffing, improved career prospects for locally recruited information assistants, and the provision of more funds and modern communication technology. In his October report to the Assembly on public information,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General announced the establishment in August of the sixty-first centre, at Dacca, Bangladesh, and said preparations for a centre at Salisbury, Zimbabwe, were in their final stages. Negotiations had begun for establishing a centre in Panama.

In SPC in October, Algeria, Bangladesh, Cuba, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Philippines urged a strengthening of the information centres, while Iraq called for better co-ordination of their activities. Czechoslovakia considered that the centres played a significant role but said the key to improving the United Nations image lay in the approach taken by mass media and Governments. Denmark, speaking for the Nordic States, said the study of the centres proposed by the Committee on Information should aim at measures to give them more independence and flexibility. Ireland thought it more important to expand the capabilities of existing centres than to create new ones. Endorsing the proposed study, Jamaica said more such studies were needed before the Committee could develop specific guidelines for DPI. Romania made the point that the centres should be better adapted to specific national and regional conditions.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Information, A/36/21; S-G, <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/504, <sup>(3)</sup>A/AC.198/33 & Corr.1.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/149 B, paras. 19 & 20, 16 Dec. (p. 365).

#### Programme for journalists and broadcasters

Nineteen persons took part in the 1981 Programme for Journalists and Broadcasters from Developing Countries, held at United Nations Headquarters for eight weeks beginning 8 September. As part of the Programme, participants undertook in-service work assignments with the Secretariat, attended briefings on United Nations issues and covered events for their own media organizations. This was the first such programme held in response to a 1980 request by the General Assembly.<sup>(3)</sup> Information about it was communicated by the Secretary-General in a note dated 2 April to the Committee on Information<sup>(1)</sup> and in his October report on public information.<sup>(2)</sup>

Support for this programme was voiced in SPC in October by Algeria, Austria, Bangladesh, Egypt, Jamaica, Kenya, Singapore and Yugoslavia. Benin said more resources should be found for such training.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/AC.198/40.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/504.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/201, sect. III, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 482).

#### Other aspects of the public information work programme

The Committee on Information, in its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended a strengthening of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the DPI External Relations Division, additional support for the World Newspaper Supplement on development and economic matters, and publicity for the 1981 observance of the twentieth anniversary of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (p. 356).

The Committee also examined a draft medium-term plan projecting the activities of DPI for 1984-1989. Following its discussion, the United Nations Secretariat was to redraft the text to reflect members' views and use it as a basis for proposing budgets during the period covered by the plan.

The World Newspaper Supplement was endorsed in the SPC discussion in October by Algeria, Bangladesh and Yugoslavia. The United States criticized it for having displayed partisanship on critical issues of the new international economic order, but Uganda defended its balance and impartiality.

Pakistan asked that DPI bear in mind the contributions of the mass media to development. Trinidad and Tobago urged that a special information effort be addressed to youth.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Information, A/36/21.

#### Co-ordination in the UN system

The General Assembly, by its December 1981 resolution on United Nations public information, recommended a strengthening of the Joint United Nations Information Committee (JUNIC), the inter-agency body responsible for co-ordinating the public information activities of organizations in the United Nations system (p. 370). It also asked that long-term financial support by United Nations organizations continue to be sought for Development Forum, a periodical in newspaper format jointly financed by a number of them (p. 370).

#### JUNIC activities

JUNIC held its eighth regular session in Tokyo from 3 to 6 February 1981 and a special session at Geneva from 8 to 10 July.

According to the Secretary-General's October report to the General Assembly on United Nations public information,<sup>(3)</sup> as well as its own report submitted in April to the Committee on Information,<sup>(2)</sup> JUNIC was strengthening its role by moving from co-operative planning to joint action. It was completing a report for its parent

body, the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, on the image of the United Nations and the erosion of public support. It had prepared a study on communication in support of development and a plan of action for 1982-1983 setting out the information activities planned by United Nations organizations, including those pegged to special events.

One joint activity, the non-governmental liaison services at New York and Geneva, whose function was to advise non-governmental organizations interested in international economic issues, was described in an annex to the JUNC report. In August, the Committee on Information recommended that JUNC encourage that activity.<sup>(1)</sup>

JUNC also worked on plans for continued joint support for the publication of Development Forum and drew conclusions about the need to strengthen inter-agency co-ordination of public information activities (see below).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Information, A/36/21;  
<sup>(2)</sup>JUNC, A/AC.198/37 & Corr.1 & Add.1, 2; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G,  
 A/36/504.

#### Proposed strengthening of JUNC

By its December 1981 resolution on United Nations public information,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly requested that JUNC, as the essential instrument for inter-agency co-ordination and co-operation in public information, should be strengthened and made more effective. Such strengthening had been recommended by the Committee on Information in August.<sup>(1)</sup>

A stronger and more responsible JUNC was also one of the main recommendations in a February report by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) on co-ordination of public information activities in the United Nations system.<sup>(2)</sup> Prepared by Sreten Ilic, a member of JIU in 1980, the report concluded that the effectiveness of JUNC had been weakened by a lack of sufficient authority and that its funds and manpower were not being used rationally. The Inspector recommended that members be given authority to commit their organizations, that the JUNC programme and plan be submitted to the Economic and Social Council through the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, that the heads of information services be required to attend its sessions and that its staff and budget be increased.

In the report on its eighth session,<sup>(3)</sup> JUNC pointed to the danger of duplication and overlapping of effort when different United Nations organizations aimed at the same audiences. It considered that its activities, particularly joint projects, should continue to strengthen co-operation and co-ordination.

Reports: (1) Committee on Information, A/36/21; <sup>(2)</sup>JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/218; <sup>(3)</sup>JUNC, A/AC.198/37.  
 Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/149 B, para. 7, 16 Dec. (p. 364).

#### Publication of Development Forum

In its December 1981 resolution on public information,<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly reaffirmed that the continued publication of the periodical Development Forum<sup>(1)</sup> as an inter-agency project was essential. It requested the Secretary-General to continue seeking financial support for the publication from United Nations organizations and to report to the Committee on Information in 1982.

In its February report on co-ordination of public information activities in the United Nations system,<sup>(3)</sup> JIU recommended that this publication, founded in 1973, should be the only system-wide periodical in the field of economic and social development and should be financed from obligatory contributions by participating organizations. A table in the report indicated that Development Forum expected income of \$1,691,800 in 1981, of which \$900,000 would be derived from subscriptions and the rest from 14 different sources within the United Nations system, including \$200,000 from the United Nations, as well as the African and Asian Development Banks.

In a note to the Committee on Information issued in April as an addendum to its report,<sup>(4)</sup> JUNC said that a renewed expression by the Committee of long-term financial support was essential. The Committee, in its 1981 report to the Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> recommended that the Secretary-General secure the financial basis for continuation of Development Forum through the United Nations regular budget, that other United Nations organizations should contribute on a long-term basis and that efforts to secure voluntary contributions should continue. It suggested that the feasibility of locating the editorial offices in a developing country should be investigated.

In October, the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), noting the support given to Development Forum by the Committee on Information, requested that the heads of United Nations organizations in a position to support the publication should reiterate their intention to continue their support beyond 1983.<sup>(7)</sup>

A \$400,000 subvention to Development Forum, proposed by the Secretary-General,<sup>(5)</sup> was included in the United Nations budget for 1982-1983 as the result of a decision, taken without vote, by the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee on 1 December 1981. The United States said it would have opposed the addition on budgetary grounds, if there had been a vote.

United Nations budgetary support for Development Forum was endorsed in the Special Political Committee in October by Bangladesh, Denmark (speaking for the Nordic countries) and Zaire. The Lao People's Democratic Republic hoped the publication would present more information about the least developed countries. The USSR said publications such as Development Forum tended to omit mention of the development achievements of socialist countries and those newly independent States that had opted for the non-capitalist road.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup> Development Forum, vol. IX, Nos. 1-10 (regular edition), Nos. 70-93 (business edition).

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup> Committee on Information, A/36/21; <sup>(3)</sup> JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/218; <sup>(4)</sup> JINIC, A/AC.198/37/Add.2; <sup>(5)</sup> S-G, A/C.5/36/52.

Resolution and decision: Res. <sup>(6)</sup> GA, 36/149 B, para. 21, 16 Dec. (P. 365). Dec.: <sup>(7)</sup> ACC, 1981/18, Oct.

Meeting record: GA, 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.58 (1 Dec.).

#### Costs of public information

The 1981 JIU report on co-ordination of public information<sup>(1)</sup> cited figures prepared by the Secretary-General showing that some \$52 million had been spent by the United Nations system for public information in 1979, \$37 million of it by the United Nations. JIU recommended that, to give States a full picture, a standardized form be worked out for presenting such expenditures, that the Secretary-General regularly submit estimates of expenditures to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC), that ACC explore ways of pooling resources, and that public information programmes and budgets of a joint character be submitted to CPC for its guidance.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup> JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/218.

#### Establishment of a new information and communication order

By its December 1981 resolution on United Nations public information,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly affirmed strong support for the efforts of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to promote the establishment of a new world information and communication order. In the preamble, the Assembly said such an order should be based on free circulation and wider and better balanced dissemination of information, guaranteeing the diversity of information sources and free access to information, and the urgent need to change the dependent status of the developing countries in the information and communication fields.

The Assembly's Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States,<sup>(4)</sup> adopted on 9 December,

included among the rights comprising non-intervention the right of States and peoples to free access to information and to develop fully, without interference, their system of information and mass media and to use their information media to promote their interests and aspirations. Also encompassed by the non-intervention principle, according to the Declaration, was the right and duty of States to combat, within their constitutional prerogatives, the dissemination of false or distorted news which could be interpreted as interference in the internal affairs of other States or as harmful to the promotion of peace, co-operation and friendly relations among nations.

Speaking in the First Committee when it approved this Declaration, the United States objected that this provision contradicted the article in the Assembly's 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights<sup>(3)</sup> affirming the right to receive and impart information across frontiers. Greece said it could not subscribe to a paragraph that appeared to limit the right to information and Finland said it would have voted against the paragraph if it had been voted on separately.

The need for everyone to collaborate in the establishment of a new world information and communication order was cited by the Committee on Information in its 1981 report.<sup>(1)</sup> The Committee recommended that the Joint United Nations Information Committee take into account several practical steps to that end which the inter-agency body had listed in its report on its February session:<sup>(2)</sup> strengthening the information and communication capabilities of developing countries and their capacity to communicate among themselves; improving the dissemination of information on development issues between developed and developing countries; and promoting improved understanding of the developing countries and a global perception of common world problems on the part of the public in industrialized countries.

Much of the October debate on information in the Special Political Committee (SPC) centred on the concept of a new world order and on the importance of freedom of information under that order. Benin expressed the view that those who urged respect for such freedom without first seeking to identify and correct the serious injustices and inequalities in the existing system were putting the cart before the horse. The Congo saw the concentration of the media in the hands of a minority as a threat to freedom of information. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said freedom of information entailed the obligation to respect the sovereignty and independence of States without tampering with their social and cultural heritage.

The Niger and the Philippines disagreed with the perception that a new order would threaten



freedom of information. Tunisia saw no contradiction between this freedom and the need for wider and better balanced dissemination.

Canada considered that the role of Governments in eliminating the imbalance in information must be confined to developing the means to promote a free flow of information; it must not extend to the content of information. Denmark, speaking for the Nordic States, recognized the need for a new order aimed at redressing imbalances in communication while safeguarding freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and the freedom to gather, receive and impart information. Ireland said the choice by information media of what to publish would be enhanced if they had a variety of independent sources. Portugal advocated a system that would enable more individuals to obtain a maximum of information from different independent sources. Turkey said the process of creating a new order should be based on consensus rather than confrontation.

New Zealand said it could not support any move that would limit the freedom of the media to report on events in their own country and the world. Speaking for the European Community (EC) members, the United Kingdom said the imbalance in communication resources should be corrected without diminishing basic human rights, which could best be defended by ensuring a well-informed and critical audience. The United States said the way to resolve the concerns of developing countries over imbalances in the flow of information was not to silence voices or restrict access to the means of communication but to encourage diversity of opinion; it understood the resolution as in no way limiting the freedom of information media to report events or imposing inappropriate codes of conduct on journalists. Spain favoured a liberal information system whereby the individual could choose for himself. Austria, Chile and Japan were also among those which stressed the need to maintain freedom of information.

A number of speakers were critical of the type of information being disseminated about developing countries. Democratic Yemen said the monopoly of Western news agencies, which transmitted false news about the life and future of nations, must be eliminated. Ethiopia charged transnational news agencies with giving distorted images of developing countries, ignoring their development efforts and over-emphasizing negative news; a similar point was made by Guyana, Liberia, Nepal, Qatar and Uganda. Madagascar thought it strange that attempts were made to reduce the problem of a new order to freedom of information, since the dissatisfaction with the present order was caused by bias and insufficient coverage of third-world problems and aspira-

tions. The Lao People's Democratic Republic and the Syrian Arab Republic also complained of domination by the West in the flow of information and of the distorted news supplied.

Sri Lanka warned that the distortions and malice which sometimes characterized the flow of information between North and South might provoke Governments to take actions which they would not have taken if the information had been more balanced. Yugoslavia saw a need to "decolonize" information so that developing countries would not have to depend on prejudiced news.

Several speakers emphasized the need for information to respect the political and cultural independence of audiences in developing countries. Argentina said the establishment of a balanced flow of information, adapted to freedom of expression and respectful of the sovereignty and cultural independence of peoples, should be a mandatory international norm. Everyone favoured freedom of information, said Guinea, provided that it did not dull the awareness of peoples seeking cultural, social and political identity. Mauritania favoured the dissemination of information relevant to the majority in developing countries rather than that which expressed the needs of minority groups in urban areas who had often assimilated alien values.

Peru considered that, rather than imposing censorship on the pretext that the existing system was based on an information monopoly and failed to reflect third-world aspirations, countries should strengthen their infrastructures and formulate their own information policies.

Brazil, Cyprus and Venezuela were among a number of countries which observed that a new information and communication order was inseparable from the establishment of a new international economic order. Mexico viewed the right to information as an aspect of the principle of self-determination of peoples. Trinidad and Tobago criticized the view of information as merchandise, which deliberately ignored the fact that "inform" meant "educate" in the sense of intellectual and moral training.

Several speakers commented on the responsibility of information media. Observing that terrorist acts throughout the world had increased as publicity about them intensified, Colombia said the future of free information depended on how clearly the line could be drawn between the informative and the sensational. Egypt said information media had a vital role to play, not only in analysing international situations but also in reducing tension and checking the deterioration in international relations. Romania said the media should help arrest the deterioration in the international political climate, highlight the

dangers of the arms race, illustrate the abnormal gap between developed and developing countries and bear in mind the need to eliminate colonialism and racial discrimination.

In Bulgaria's view, information should neither impinge on the sovereign rights of countries nor violate approved principles of international relations; the concept of the free flow of information without qualification was unacceptable. The German Democratic Republic favoured the establishment of international legal norms to eliminate the risk of misusing information against peoples and to point to possibilities of exploiting information for international peace and understanding. The USSR thought the United Nations should urge the communication media and States to ensure that information was used to further peace and security, combat colonialism and apartheid, contribute to mutual assistance and encourage confidence.

Other countries also spoke of the role of information in international relations. In the view of Bangladesh, the international climate depended in large part on the content of information disseminated. Qatar urged States to emulate the machinery set up by the Gulf Arab countries to co-ordinate information policies and promote friendly relations. Zaire said it was time to broaden and diversify the information flow from South to North, so as to strengthen peace and understanding.

The technological gap in communications between developed and developing countries was a recurrent theme in many statements. Pakistan wondered how developing countries could discharge their obligation to disseminate knowledge with no broadcast transmitters, ill-equipped studios and obsolete printing presses. Algeria called on developed countries to provide sustained assistance to help developing countries install comprehensive national communication systems, while China saw the developed countries as duty-bound to help developing countries with capital, technology and equipment; but both added that developing countries should rely mainly on one another. Senegal saw technology as heightening differences between States in such a way that those with the most advanced media controlled the flow of information. Observing that most developing countries shared the West's belief in freedom of information, Singapore said it was in the interest of Western countries to help the developing countries which upheld that principle to develop their communication structures and train media personnel. Yemen felt that the establishment of the new order was necessary to eliminate the dependence of developing countries in the field of communication.

Austria considered that the share of developing countries in the production and transmission of news could be adjusted through increased co-operation, technology transfer and training of personnel. Japan argued that the disparity between developed and developing countries must be redressed not by imposing controls on the flow of information but by gradually enhancing the capacity of developing countries to disseminate information. The EC nations, said the United Kingdom, were ready to consider practical steps to correct the imbalance. The USSR said it had long been assisting developing countries in the installation and maintenance of communication facilities and by training some 1,000 specialists; such aid was not tied to political conditions. Australia, Malaysia and New Zealand also cited assistance they had given to develop communications in the Pacific and elsewhere.

Iraq said the great Powers used the media in their spheres of influence; such information was not objective and there was imbalance between developing and developed countries. Czechoslovakia saw the information imbalance as caused by the fact that the major Western news agencies supplied 80 per cent of the information circulated daily in the non-socialist world; until the developing countries created their own information networks, free circulation of information would be a myth. Poland said it agreed with the criticism that some Western news agencies were trying to impose their political beliefs and thought patterns on developing countries.

Criticism of certain national information activities was voiced in the debate. The Byelorussian SSR said the United States-financed radio broadcasts by the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty aimed at interfering in the affairs of other States and slandering the socialist countries and national liberation movements. A similar point was made by Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and Mongolia. The Ukrainian SSR condemned the use of information media to increase international tension. Viet Nam criticized the Voice of Free Asia for broadcasting slander against the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Viet Nam and the legitimate Government of Kampuchea. Cuba said it was only to be expected that a country such as the United States would resort to measures such as the imminent installation of a radio transmitter for the ideological penetration and destabilization of Cuba.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Information, A/36/21; <sup>(2)</sup>JUNIC, A/AC.198/37.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>217 A (III), art. 19, 10 Dec. 1948 (YUN 1948-49, p. 536); <sup>(4)</sup>36/103, annex, para. 2, 9 Dec. 1981 (p. 148); <sup>(5)</sup>36/149 B, para. 5, 16 Dec. (p. 364).

### Implementation of the UNESCO Programme for communication

By a resolution adopted without vote on 16 December 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly called on United Nations Member States, organizations and enterprises to support an expansion of resources of the International Programme for the Development of Communication, established by UNESCO in 1980.<sup>(4)</sup> It invited 1 Member States to work within organizations to which they belonged to secure satisfactory implementation of the Programme by allocating additional resources. It also invited the Director-General of UNESCO to report in 1982 on the Programme and on efforts to establish a new world information and communication order.

The initial stages of the Programme were described in a progress report by the Director-General, transmitted to the Assembly by the Secretary-General in a note of 28 September.<sup>(2)</sup> The report noted that the Programme had been established with the approval of the UNESCO General Conference in 1980 and that its 35-member Intergovernmental Council, elected by the Conference, had held its first session in Paris from 15 to 22 June 1981. By a resolution of 22 June, the Council had decided to launch the Programme in 1982 with a few well-studied projects, to be examined at a subsequent session. During the first phase, priority would be given to regional and subregional communication development. In addition, the Council had defined main areas for research, beginning with a questionnaire to identify the needs of States.

Initial resources would be provided by financial contributions to the Programme. India, Iraq, Mexico and the Netherlands had announced the amounts of their contributions, while France, Nigeria, Norway, Venezuela and Yugoslavia had declared their intention of contributing later. The Council had decided that the appropriate financing system would be established in the light of studies.

In his October report to the Assembly on United Nations public information,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General said he would continue to support and encourage UNESCO and the Programme. He noted that the United Nations had been represented at the Intergovernmental Council's June session and would be at its following session (Acapulco, Mexico, January 1982).

A UNESCO representative told SPC in October that his organization was continuing its regular activities in the field of communication, helping countries to plan, set priorities and train personnel (p. 1414).

In the SPC debate, most speakers supported the new Programme as a means of enabling developing countries to set up their own communi-

cation facilities and helping establish a new information order. Canada said the Programme's success would depend on whether it avoided ideological confrontation. Denmark stated that the Nordic countries would consider supporting feasible communication projects under the Programme. Indonesia was among several countries which expressed hope that the Programme would be adequately funded. The Philippines favoured a fellowship programme for journalists from developing countries.

Many representatives stressed the need to promote co-operation and avoid duplication between the work of the United Nations and that of UNESCO.

The Byelorussian SSR said UNESCO was under attack by those who sought to preserve a policy of information imperialism, pursued under the slogan of "free information". Benin viewed the criticism of UNESCO as part of a conspiracy by transnational press agencies, while Cuba saw it as blackmail and sabotage by the United States and its allies. The Ukrainian SSR said the United States had threatened to cut off its contribution to the UNESCO budget and the Syrian Arab Republic regretted that certain industrialized Western countries were withdrawing their support for efforts to establish a new information and communication order. Yugoslavia cited a decision by the Intergovernmental Council of Ministers of Information of Non-Aligned Countries to defend UNESCO from incorrect and sometimes malicious interpretations of its activities.

The United States said its House of Representatives had adopted in July a provision that would restrict United States payments to UNESCO should that body adopt any resolution to restrict journalists or inhibit the free flow of information.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/504; <sup>(2)</sup>UNESCO, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/530.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/149 A, 16 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 1275.

Financial implications: ACABQ report, A/36/7/Add.20; 5th Committee report, A/36/824; S-G statements; A/SPC/36/L.30. A/C.5/36/86.

Meeting records: GA: SPC. A/SPC/36/SR.6-12, 14, 48 (15-26 Oct. & 3 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.73 (14 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/149 A

Adopted without vote Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/819) without vote, 3 December (meeting 48); draft by Vice-Chairman, based on deliberations of Working Group on information (A/SPC/36/L.26, part A); agenda item 67.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 34/181 and 34/182 of 18 December 1979 and 35/201 of 16 December 1980.

Recalling the relevant provisions of the Final Declaration of the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana from 3 to 9 September

1979, of the Declaration of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981, and of the Fifth Meeting of the Intergovernmental Council of Ministers of Information of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Georgetown in May 1981,

Recalling the relevant resolutions adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981,

Recalling the relevant provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975,

Recalling the relevant provisions of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace,

Recalling the Intergovernmental Conferences on Communication Policies, held respectively at San José in July 1976, Kuala Lumpur in February 1979 and Yaoundé in July 1980, the preparatory meeting of experts for the intergovernmental planning conference to develop institutional arrangements and systematic collaborative consultation on communication development activities, needs and plans, held at Washington in November 1979, and the Intergovernmental Conference for Co-operation on Activities, Needs and Programmes for Communications Development, held in Paris from 14 to 21 April 1980, as well as the International seminar on the development of communication held under the auspices of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, such as that which took place at Tashkent in September 1979,

Recalling resolution 4/21 adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at its twenty-first session, in which it resolved to establish, within the framework of the organization, the International Programme for the Development of Communication and to elect the Intergovernmental Council of the Programme,

Recalling also that the implementation of the objectives of the International Programme for the Development of Communication requires the co-operation of all those interested and concerned,

Considering that communication plays a fundamental role as a vehicle of information and an instrument for acquiring knowledge and know-how and, consequently, represents an important dimension in the life of societies,

Conscious of the important contribution which the mass information and communication media and the free circulation and wider and better balanced dissemination of information can make to co-operation between all countries, the strength-

ening of international peace and security, the promotion of human rights, international understanding, progress of education and science, the preservation of their cultural identities and the promotion of their socio-cultural values,

Recognizing the central role of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the field of communications and information, within its mandate, as well as the progress accomplished by the organization in that field,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on the implementation of the International Programme for the Development of Communication;

2. Considers that resolution No. 1 adopted by the Intergovernmental Council of the International Programme for the Development of Communication of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at its first session, held in Paris from 15 to 22 June 1981, constitutes an important step in the implementation of the Programme;

3. Expresses its appreciation to all Member States that announced their contributions to the Programme, in the form of financial means, manpower, materials, technology and training for the development of communication, especially taking note of the contributions in this regard from developing countries;

4. Calls upon Member States-developed and developing alike-and organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, as well as other intergovernmental organizations and concerned public and private enterprises, to lend their support to the expansion of the Programme's resources;

5. Invites Member States to take the necessary steps, within the organizations and bodies of the United Nations system and other organizations of which they are members, to secure satisfactory implementation of the Programme through the allocation of additional resources;

6. Endorses the appeal of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization addressed to Member States, International organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, as well as other Intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, professional groups or other available sources, to make contributions to the Programme as soon as possible;

7. Invites the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a progress report on the implementation of the Programme as well as on the efforts of that organization for the establishment of a new world information and communication order.

# Economic and social questions

## Chapter I

### Development and international economic and social policy

The discouraging world economic situation—sluggish growth, accelerating inflation, world trade slow-down, worsening current-account balances and higher energy prices—continued to occupy a major part of the attention of United Nations bodies during 1981.

Little progress was recorded towards the launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development, originally scheduled to commence in 1980 (p. 378). Accordingly, the General Assembly decided to leave the item open to allow informal consultations to continue on the form the negotiations should take. Technical work was under way to promote greater economic co-operation among developing countries, including preliminary consideration of a global system of trade preferences among them (p. 382).

The special concern the Organization had shown for more than two decades for the poorest of the world's poor was further demonstrated at the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (Paris, 1-14 September 1981).<sup>(3)</sup> The Conference adopted the second phase—the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s—of the Comprehensive New Programme of Action for these countries, inaugurated in 1979 by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The Substantial New Programme was designed to transform the economies of these countries and enable them to achieve internationally accepted minimum standards of nutrition, health, housing and education as well as job opportunities for all, particularly the rural and urban poor. In December, the General Assembly endorsed the Programme, called for its implementation and arranged for its mid-term review in 1985.<sup>(15)</sup> Earlier, the Economic and Social Council appealed for substantial aid to these countries,<sup>(8)</sup> added Guinea-Bissau to the United Nations list of the least developed countries<sup>(6)</sup> and decided to review Togo's economic situation for its possible inclusion in the list.<sup>(9)</sup>

The Assembly also appealed again to donor nations to assist the land-locked developing countries build their transport and transit facilities<sup>(13)</sup>

and made a further request for contributions to the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries, managed by the United Nations Development Programme.<sup>(16)</sup>

Reiterating the need to strengthen economic co-operation for development within the United Nations system, the Economic and Social Council called for the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, adopted by the Assembly in 1980,<sup>(12)</sup> to be applied in the work programmes of United Nations organizations.<sup>(11)</sup>

The first of a new series of annual reports on the world economic situation—the Trade and Development Report, 1981—was issued by UNCTAD.<sup>(2)</sup> Another report, the World Economic Survey 1980-1981,<sup>(1)</sup> was a background document for the annual discussion in the Economic and Social Council on international economic and social policy, with special emphasis on current trends (p. 384). A third assessment of current trends and prospects for the 1980s was prepared by the Committee for Development Planning, a standing body of experts appointed by the Council.<sup>(4)</sup> The Council also considered a preliminary draft of a report on long-term trends, offering a socio-economic perspective of the world economy to the year 2000 (p. 388).

Several broad areas of economic and social development were the object of special United Nations studies. Following preliminary action by the Council in July<sup>(10)</sup> the General Assembly called in December<sup>(14)</sup> for implementation of a new United Nations work programme to study the interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development. The Council also requested high priority for United Nations studies on the role of the public sector in economic development.<sup>(7)</sup> Reports were submitted on a unified approach to development analysis and planning, combining economic and social elements (p. 395). The Council called on Governments to give special attention to increasing the social impact of rural development policies,<sup>(5)</sup> and arranged for the continued submission, every four years, of reports on agrarian reform and rural development (p. 399). The As-

sembly decided to continue a computerized Development Information System operated by the Information Systems Unit of the United Nations Secretariat's Department of International Economic and Social Affairs.<sup>(17)</sup>

The improvement of development planning (p. 396) and public administration (p. 398) in developing countries continued to be a focus of technical co-operation activities.

Among other broad aspects of development under consideration in 1981 were development finance (p. 558), social development (p. 761), and the relationships between disarmament and development (p. 96) and development and human rights (p. 973).

Publications: <sup>(1)</sup> World Economic Survey 1980-1981 (E/1981/42), Sales No. E.81.II.C.2; 1981-1982 (E/1982/46), Sales No. E.82.II.C.1. <sup>(2)</sup> Trade and Development Report, 1981 (TD/B/863/Rev.1), Sales No. E.81.II.D.9. <sup>(3)</sup> Report of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (A/CONE.104/22/Rev.1), Sales No. E.82.I.8.

Report: <sup>(4)</sup> CDP, E/1981/27.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(5)</sup>1981/15, 6 May (p. 399); <sup>(6)</sup>1981/34, 8 May (p. 412); <sup>(7)</sup>1981/45, 20 July (p. 394); <sup>(8)</sup>1981/46, 20 July (p. 405); <sup>(9)</sup>1981/47, 20 July (p. 413); <sup>(10)</sup>1981/51 22 July (p. 392); <sup>(11)</sup>1981/64, 23 July (p. 381). GA: <sup>(12)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503); <sup>(13)</sup>36/175, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 414); <sup>(14)</sup>36/179 (p. 393), <sup>(15)</sup>36/194 (p. 410), <sup>(16)</sup>36/195 (p. 416), 17 Dec.; <sup>(17)</sup>36/237, 18 Dec. (p. 398).

Other publication: Towards the New International Economic Order, Sales No. E.82.II.A.7.

## Economic co-operation

### Proposed global negotiations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION. As it had decided in 1980,<sup>(11)</sup> the General Assembly resumed its thirty-fifth session on 15 January 1981 to consider four agenda items, among them the launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development. On the same day, the Assembly agreed to an oral proposal by its President that he pursue consultations on the subject and report on their outcome at a later date.

At the final meeting of the thirty-fifth session, on 14 September 1981, the President outlined work done since October 1980, when an informal consultative group had been established under his chairmanship to seek general agreement on launching the negotiations.<sup>(14)</sup> That group had achieved substantial progress by December 1980, the President said, and he felt that it had been close to agreement. He had set out the results in an informal text of 14 December that dealt with both procedures and agenda for the negotiations.

A wide measure of agreement had been reached, the President stated, on a four-stage general framework for the negotiations: (1) the central conference would establish objectives and provide guidance with respect to the agenda items; (2) the items would be sent to an existing specialized forum in the United Nations system—commodities to UNCTAD, for example—or to an ad hoc group when no such forum existed, as in the case of energy questions; (3) the outcome of the second phase would be considered by the central conference, which would be responsible for assembling a package for approval by all Member States; and (4) the agreements would be implemented. However, there was disagreement in regard to the third stage, and specifically as to whether the conference should be able to change conclusions reached in a specialized forum such as the International Monetary Fund, whose procedures and voting structures were more restricted than those of the General Assembly.

Regarding the agenda, the President said that there were still differences over two areas—energy, and money and finance. The major issue concerning energy was whether predictability of supplies and petroleum pricing should be listed as distinct sub-items. Concerning money and finance, the major question was how to set out the functioning and reform of the international monetary and financial system in all its aspects.

He informed the Assembly that, following an economic summit meeting of Western industrial nations (Ottawa, Canada, 19-21 July), the United States had told him that the matter of global negotiations should not be pursued until the Assembly's regular 1981 session. In the conviction that full participation in efforts to launch the negotiations was vital, the President proposed—and the Assembly decided without vote on 14 September—to include the item in the draft agenda of its thirty-sixth (1981) session.<sup>(12)</sup>

Speaking after the decision, Canada and China expressed regret that no agreement had been reached on procedures and agenda. However, these States—together with the United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community (EC) members—generally felt that there had been a narrowing of differences. Japan urged all countries to recognize the serious economic and political impact that might result from failure to engage in constructive North-South dialogue and to adopt a more positive and constructive attitude towards the negotiations. Norway, on behalf of the Nordic countries, said they were ready to accept the texts as they stood and hoped all States would join in a consensus. The

United States reiterated its view that consideration of the negotiations should be deferred until after the International Meeting on Co-operation and Development—a conference of 22 heads of State or Government at Cancún, Mexico, on 22 and 23 October, focusing on North-South relationships.

Venezuela expressed the disappointment of the Group of 77 developing countries that negotiations had not formally commenced. Jordan, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, termed the progress meagre.

The readiness of the industrialized States members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) to conduct international consultations and co-operation with developing countries was affirmed in a communiqué issued by an OECD ministerial meeting on 16 and 17 June; the communiqué, forwarded by a 13 July letter from Belgium,<sup>(3)</sup> also reviewed member countries' economic prospects and policies, trade problems, the energy situation and trade relations with developing countries.

A 30 September letter from Venezuela<sup>(5)</sup> attached the Declaration of the fifth annual meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Group of 77 (New York, 28 and 29 September), in which the Group expressed regret that a few developed countries lacked the political will to undertake without delay measures to achieve equitable solutions to the world economic crisis and voiced concern that the launching of the negotiations continued to be jeopardized mainly by one country.

The outcome of the Cancun summit conference was conveyed in a summary by its co-Chairmen, transmitted by a 26 October letter from Canada and Mexico.<sup>(4)</sup> With regard to global negotiations, the summary said the participants had confirmed the desirability of supporting a consensus to launch them on a basis to be mutually agreed and in circumstances offering the prospect of meaningful progress; some countries had insisted that the competence of the specialized agencies should not be affected.

The General Assembly resumed consideration of the subject on 4 and 5 November, hearing delegations reiterate their views on the substance and format of the projected negotiations.

Several States pointed to recent international high-level meetings, particularly the Cancún conference and a meeting of Commonwealth heads of Government (Melbourne, Australia, 30 September-7 October),<sup>(2)</sup> as reason for optimism for the launching of the negotiations, although it was recognized that there had been differences of approach.

For Japan, a highlight of Cancún was that agreement had been reached to continue pre-

paratory negotiations for the global round in New York. Australia suggested that progress in the preparatory process might be made through a contact group open to all countries, meeting concurrently with the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, that might capture the spirit of the Cancún and Melbourne meetings—a free-flowing exchange of views between developed and developing countries. The United Kingdom said EC members felt that concentration on substance could help in the search for practical solutions; the General Assembly had a central role to play but the competence of the specialized agencies should be respected. Regarding the respective roles of specialized bodies and the overview mechanism, Finland and Sweden thought it over-zealous to try to establish, before the substantive negotiations began, what to do with their results.

Norway said it was important that further efforts at agreement be based on common positions already established and that preparations be finalized so the negotiations could start at the beginning of 1982. Austria felt it essential to arrive at a consensus on basic elements and not become bogged down in a futile search for detailed and specific guidelines for every stage of the negotiations. Canada urged States to consider the damage that would be done to the credibility of the United Nations if the projected undertaking could not be successfully concluded.

The United States cited its leading role in assistance to and trade with developing countries, and stressed five objectives for development: feeding hungry people, enabling all countries to strengthen and diversify their economies through an open world trading system, integrating developing countries more fully into that system, achieving economic growth through trade and commercial capital flows that responded to market-place incentives, and solving the energy problem through higher production and more efficient use.

Algeria, on behalf of the Group of 77, restated the Group's view that: there was a fundamental need for a world dialogue open to all countries, based on democratic decisions and institutions; the General Assembly was the central body for decision-making, direction, the provision of impetus and co-ordination at all stages of negotiation; essential questions of reconstructing the world economy and reshaping international economic institutions could not be removed from the agenda; and the major issues identified by the Assembly when it decided in 1979 to launch the negotiations<sup>(8)</sup> should be considered with equal care and with regard for their inter-relationship.

China said that an orderly restructuring of international economic relations through dialogue was in the common interest of most nations and would contribute to peace and security. The Philippines remarked that no one was calling for the overthrow of the current system or the destruction of existing economic and financial institutions; the task was to make adjustments in the existing order to meet urgent needs of the times.

Poland, on behalf of the Eastern European States and Mongolia, reiterated their support in principle for the negotiations and the broad outline of the agenda and said they had been willing to participate in the consensus on procedure, but remarked that the unwillingness of certain imperialist circles to give up their positions and their desire to keep the developing countries in a state of dependence hardly gave reason for optimism.

On 9 December, in a resolution on the strengthening of international security<sup>(9)</sup> the Assembly urged States to proceed without delay to a global consideration of ways and means to revive the world economy and restructure international economic relations within the framework of global negotiations.

Following several weeks of inconclusive informal consultations, the Assembly agreed on 18 December, on an oral proposal by its President, that the item should be left open in order to allow the consultations to continue, on the understanding that the Assembly would reconvene at short notice to consider any agreement that might emerge. Accordingly, the topic was included in the list of seven items which the Assembly decided to consider when it resumed its thirty-sixth session in 1982.<sup>(13)</sup>

Algeria (for the Group of 77), China and the USSR, the last named on behalf of the Eastern European States and Mongolia, expressed regret that, because of one delegation, agreement had not been reached. The United Kingdom restated the EC members' aim to launch the negotiations on a basis acceptable to all and promising genuine progress.

**OTHER ACTION.** The first regular 1981 session of the inter-agency Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) (Geneva, 13 and 14 April) was attended by the General Assembly President, who informed it of efforts to launch the global negotiations. The Committee expressed appreciation to the President for his efforts<sup>(10)</sup> and, in its annual overview report,<sup>(6)</sup> issued in May, stated its concern that there had been no agreement on the matter.

The Joint Meetings of ACC and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) (Geneva, 29 June-1 July)<sup>(7)</sup> reaffirmed the contribution that adequately prepared global negotiations

could make to implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade (see below) and the need to launch them as soon as possible.

The Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), meeting at Rome, Italy, from 7 to 25 November, offered that organization's assistance in the global negotiations with regard to food production, food aid, food security and related matters; the Conference's position was conveyed in a letter of 8 December from the FAO Director-General, annexed to a 16 December note by the Secretary-General.<sup>(1)</sup>

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>FAO Director-General, 8 Dec., transmitted by S-G note, A/36/836; <sup>(2)</sup>Australia, 9 Oct., annexing Commonwealth communiqué and declaration, A/36/587; <sup>(3)</sup>Belgium, 13 July, annexing OECD communiqué, A/36/380; <sup>(4)</sup>Canada and Mexico, 26 Oct., annexing summary of International Meeting on Co-operation and Development, A/36/631 & Corr.1; <sup>(5)</sup>Venezuela, 30 Sep., annexing Group of 77 declaration, A/36/573.

Reports: <sup>(6)</sup>ACC, E/1981/37; <sup>(7)</sup>ACC and CPC chairmen, E/1981/86.

#### Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(8)</sup>34/138, 14 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 468); <sup>(9)</sup>36/102, para. 5 (e), 9 Dec. 1981 (p. 145).

Decisions: <sup>(10)</sup>ACC: 1981/1., para. (a), 14 Apr. GA: <sup>(11)</sup>35/450, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 526); <sup>(12)</sup>35/454, 14 Sep. 1981, text following; <sup>(13)</sup>36/461, item 37, 18 Dec. (p. 350).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(14)</sup>1980, p. 525.

Meeting records: GA: A/35/PV.100, 114 (15 Jan., 14 Sep.); A/36/PV.46, 47, 104, 105 (4 Nov.-18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly decision 35/454

##### Adopted without vote

##### Oral proposal by President; agenda item 123,

##### Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development

At its 114th plenary meeting, on 14 September 1981, the General Assembly decided to include in the draft agenda of its thirty-sixth session the item entitled "Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development" and to transmit to that session all relevant documentation from the eleventh special session and the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly.

#### Implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade

During the year following the adoption by the General Assembly in December 1980 of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,<sup>(6)</sup> which began on 1 January 1981, the Economic and Social Council and other United Nations bodies took steps to ensure that the goals and objectives of the Strategy were incorporated into their work plans.

On 20 March 1981, the Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD decided to inscribe on the agenda for its September/October session an



item on arrangements for review and appraisal of the Strategy's implementation.<sup>(7)</sup> On 7 October, the Board decided, after informal consultations, to defer consideration to a future session.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Committee for Development Planning (CDP), in the report on its 1981 session (New York, 23 March-1 April),<sup>(3)</sup> stated that in future it would study particular aspects of the world economic situation and prospects as well as critical development problems hampering implementation of the Strategy.

In their 1981 report to the Council,<sup>(2)</sup> the CPC/ACC Joint Meetings (Geneva, 29 June-1 July) viewed the Strategy as the policy framework for planning and programming in the United Nations system, reaffirmed the international community's commitment to its implementation and stressed the need to mobilize resources. The report also summarized the Meetings' discussion on five issues suggested by ACC relating to implementation of the Strategy:<sup>(1)</sup> growth, employment, protectionism and structural adjustment; energy, money and finance; food; development of infrastructures; and social development. After acknowledging a divergence of opinion on some questions, the report said there was broad understanding and consensus on most fundamentals.

On 23 July, the Economic and Social Council adopted a resolution<sup>(5)</sup> calling on the United Nations system to apply the International Development Strategy as a policy framework in formulating and implementing work programmes and medium-term plans. The Council reiterated the need to strengthen international economic co-operation for development within the system, with the General Assembly in the central role. It urged ACC to continue to assess the world economic situation and prospects, and requested the Secretary-General to continue bringing to the Council's and the Assembly's attention the results of those assessments. In addition, CDP was requested to carry out future work related to the Strategy's implementation, as envisaged by CDP in its 1981 report.

The draft, introduced by Venezuela on behalf of the Group of 77, was adopted without vote as revised by the sponsors after informal consultations. Following its adoption, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States said the reservations they had expressed at the time the Strategy was adopted<sup>(8)</sup> still stood. The USSR said any action taken by United Nations bodies in implementing the Strategy should not be limited to reorganization of their work nor imply extra expenditure; it added that other Assembly decisions for the restructuring of economic relations should be taken together with the Strategy as a guide for United Nations bodies.

Prospects for attaining the Strategy's targets were also addressed in a preliminary draft perspective of the development of the world economy to the year 2000, prepared by the Secretary-General (p. 389).

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>ACC, E/1981/91.

Reports <sup>(2)</sup>ACC and CPC chairmen, E/1981/86; <sup>(3)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27; <sup>(4)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/64, 23 July, text following; <sup>(6)</sup>GA, 35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503). Dec.: <sup>(7)</sup>TDB, 234(XXII), 20 Mar.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(8)</sup>1980, p. 500.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.20-34, 39, 40 (1-23 July).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/64

Adopted without vote Meeting 40 23 July 1981

Draft by Venezuela, for Group of 77 (E/1981/L.54/Rev.1); agenda item 5.

#### Implementation by the United Nations system of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation and 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States,

Recalling also the goals, objectives and policy measures set out in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Taking note with appreciation of the statements made by the President of the Economic and Social Council and the Secretary-General at the opening of the second regular session of 1981 of the Council, the concluding statement of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation and other statements made during the general discussion of international economic and social policy, including regional and sectoral developments, at that session,

Taking note also of the World Economic Survey 1980-1981, the report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination Task Force on Long-Term Development Objectives on its eighth session, the conclusions of the Joint Meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination on the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade and the report of the Committee for Development Planning on its seventeenth session,

1. Reiterates the need to strengthen international economic co-operation for development within the multilateral framework of the United Nations system, in which the General Assembly has the central role;

2. Calls upon all organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to apply the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade as a policy framework in the formulation and implementation of their programmes of work and medium-term plans;

3. Urges the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination to continue its efforts to assess on a system-wide basis the world economic situation and prospects in the perspective of long-term development objectives and in the overall context of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade and the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, and requests the Secretary-General to continue to bring to the attention of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly the results of those system-wide assessments;

4. Requests the Committee for Development Planning to carry out future work in relation to the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, as envisaged in chapter V of its report on its seventeenth session;

5. Recommends that the General Assembly should keep under review the implementation of the present resolution.

#### ACC Task Force on

#### Long-Term Development Objectives

The ACC Task Force on Long-Term Development Objectives met at Geneva from 16 to 18 March 1981 and reported to ACC<sup>(1)</sup> that it had made a collective review of the world economic situation and prospects and reviewed critical international policy issues in the context of the International Development Strategy<sup>(2)</sup> (p. 388). After receiving this report, ACC expressed the view on 14 April that it should receive wide publicity.<sup>(3)</sup>

On the same date ACC adopted new terms of reference for the Task Force<sup>(4)</sup> which include a Cuba focus on implementation and review and appraisal of the Strategy, as well as assisting and advising ACC to provide technical support and analytical contributions for intergovernmental bodies on development objectives and targets. It was also to serve as an inter-agency mechanism for considering emerging development issues and questions arising from General Assembly resolutions.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Task Force, E/1981/71.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution <sup>(2)</sup>GA: 35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503).

Decisions: ACC, 14 Apr.: <sup>(3)</sup>1981/1, paras. (b) & (c); <sup>(4)</sup>1981/6.

#### Implementation of the 1974 Charter

#### of Economic Rights and Duties of States

During debate in the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on development and international economic co-operation at the 1981 regular session of the General Assembly, several delegations referred to the need to implement the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, adopted by the Assembly in 1974.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Byelorussian SSR said that achievement of the goals of the Charter and the International Development Strategy<sup>(2)</sup> depended largely on how consistently and firmly the developing countries struggled against neo-colonialism, defended their sovereignty over their natural resources and controlled the transnational corporations operating in their territory. The German Democratic Republic, warning against attempts by imperialist forces to oppose implementation of the Charter, said that advocacy of the so-called free market system should be seen as a device to replace a democratic restructuring of international economic relations by the unbridled ac-

tivities of private capital. Hungary urged compliance with the Charter and Mongolia expressed the view that the conditions for attaining the goals of the Strategy could be created only through application of the Charter.

Poland and the USSR said they observed the Charter in their relations with other States, including developing countries; the USSR added that the deterioration of the international situation was due to the proliferation of acts of aggression by imperialists, running counter to the Charter. The Ukrainian SSR stated that implementation of the Charter had been delayed by the obstinacy of some Western States which sought to maintain their privileged economic positions and to use economic relations for blackmail and discrimination.

The Congo described the Charter as an important document in the strategy to establish a new international economic and political order. Cuba and Viet Nam urged periodic evaluation of progress in implementing it, while Zaire said the Secretary-General should report regularly on the matter.

On 17 December the General Assembly, on the Second Committee's recommendation, decided without vote<sup>(3)</sup> to include a sub-item on the Charter in the provisional agenda of its 1982 regular session, under the item on development and international economic co-operation. This decision, orally proposed by the Second Committee Chairman, was similarly approved by the Committee on 10 December after he announced that several delegations had requested that the topic be resubmitted in 1982.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>3281(XXIX), 12 Dec. 1974 (YUN 1974, p. 403); <sup>(2)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1981 (YUN 1980, p.503)

Decision: <sup>(3)</sup>GA: 36/441, 17 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 47 (24 Sep.-10 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly decision 36/441

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.1) without vote. 10 December (meeting 47); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 69 (b).

#### Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, decided to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session, under the item entitled "Development and international economic co-operation", a sub-item entitled "Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States".

#### Economic co-operation

#### among developing countries

During 1981, several United Nations bodies, especially the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), continued

to promote measures of economic co-operation among developing countries (ECDC). These activities complemented programmes of technical co-operation among developing countries pursued by the United Nations Development Programme and others (p. 462).

The Committee for Development Planning (CDP), at its 1981 session (New York, 23 March-1 April), devoted a chapter of its report<sup>(3)</sup> to South-South economic co-operation. It noted the slow growth and increasingly inward-looking policies of many developed countries, and urged that ECDC be vigorously initiated. The Committee felt that short- and medium-term progress could be achieved by co-operation in finance, energy, food and rural development, technology, trade, industrial development and infrastructure. It favoured such measures as the establishment of a third world development bank, soft loans by oil-exporting countries that would enable oil importers to meet higher petroleum prices, investment by capital-surplus developing countries in rural development programmes of other third world countries, and promotion of South-South trade through tariff and other preferences.

A High Level Conference on Economic Co-operation among Developing Countries, convened by the Group of 77 at Caracas, Venezuela, from 13 to 19 May, adopted a programme of action specifying co-operative activities in trade, technology, food and agriculture, energy, raw materials, finance, industrialization and technical co-operation, and proposing mechanisms for co-ordination, monitoring, follow-up actions and evaluation; the report of the Conference was transmitted to the Secretary-General on 5 June by Venezuela as Chairman of the Group of 77.<sup>(2)</sup>

UNCTAD ACTIVITIES. The Meeting of Governmental Experts of Developing Countries on Economic Co-operation among Developing Countries, convened by UNCTAD, held its second session at Geneva from 27 July to 7 August. The Meeting adopted recommendations aimed at facilitating the early negotiation of a global system of trade preferences (GSTP) among developing countries.

On 6 November, the UNCTAD Trade and Development Board decided, by a roll-call vote of 54 to 20 (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States), with 7 abstentions (Eastern European States), to include a third session of the Meeting on ECDC in the 1982 UNCTAD calendar.<sup>(4)</sup> Group B States (developed market-economy countries) acknowledged the importance of ECDC but objected to activities which they felt were not in

keeping with the principle that all UNCTAD members should be associated with its decision-making. Group D States (centrally planned economies) also reiterated their reservations about universality and equality of States. To resolve this issue, the Board authorized its President to undertake consultations, between its current and 1982 sessions, with a view to arriving at a generally acceptable solution to the problems underlying UNCTAD activities on ECDC.<sup>(8)</sup>

An International Workshop on the Promotion of Economic and Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries with Particular Reference to Developing Countries' Joint Investments and their Financing, organized by UNCTAD and the Research Centre for Co-operation with Developing Countries (Ljubljana, Yugoslavia), was held at Bled, Yugoslavia, from 2 to 7 November.<sup>(6)</sup> The Workshop made general policy recommendations as well as specific suggestions to support this form of co-operation through improved information and communications, to stimulate joint ventures and multinational enterprises and to increase financial flows to such undertakings.

Technical co-operation activities of UNCTAD relating to ECDC<sup>(5)</sup> continued to concentrate on assistance to regional and subregional organizations and integration secretariats responsible for trade liberalization schemes, common external tariffs, and financial and monetary co-operation. Regional projects assisted the Economic Community of West African States, the West African Economic Community, the Customs and Economic Union of Central Africa, the Mano River Union and the Niger Basin Authority; the Trade Negotiations Group, the Bangkok Agreement and the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN); and the Central American Common Market and the Andean Group. Inter-regional and regional advisers aided other regional and subregional organizations as well as some commodity associations. The interregional programme included projects promoting co-operation between state trading organizations and the initiation of a Trade Information System, involving collection and dissemination of data on trade barriers.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 16 December, the General Assembly, in a resolution on UNCTAD,<sup>(7)</sup> requested that body to intensify and complete its work in the priority areas indicated in a 1977 resolution of the UNCTAD Committee on Economic Co-operation among Developing Countries, especially in the areas of trade information systems regarding the foreign trade of those countries, their state trading organizations, multinational production and marketing enterprises, GSTP and monetary and financial co-operation among them.

The original draft of this resolution,<sup>(1)</sup> submitted to the Second Committee by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 and later withdrawn in favour of a text submitted by a Committee Vice-Chairman after informal consultations, contained an additional paragraph by which the Assembly would have welcomed the 1980 and 1981 Meetings of Governmental Experts of Developing Countries on ECDC and a proposed 1982 meeting of senior officials which was to finalize and approve rules for launching negotiations to establish GSTP.

In the Committee's general debate, Bhutan, Democratic Yemen, Mexico, Thailand, Tunisia and Zimbabwe made the point that ECDC was meant to complement and not replace North-South co-operation. Turkey considered that it would be natural for developing countries to start by establishing preferential tariffs among themselves, but the aim should be to use them as a means of eventually integrating their economies with that of the world. The United Republic of Cameroon stated that ECDC must not be regarded as a stage on the way to autarky or as obviating the need for fundamental adjustments or structural changes in North-South relations.

Afghanistan said that ECDC was a means of strengthening the solidarity of developing countries but could be developed only in the context of a radical restructuring of the international economic system. India viewed ECDC as essential to the promotion of individual self-sufficiency and collective self-reliance, allowing the developing countries to make the best possible use of the complementary features of their economies. Uganda saw this form of co-operation as essential to the new international economic order.

The importance of the Caracas Conference on ECDC as a stimulus to closer co-operation was stressed by a number of developing countries, including Algeria, China, Kenya, Madagascar, the Niger, Pakistan, the Sudan, Venezuela and Zambia. Guyana said the action programme approved by that Conference reflected the developing countries' new awareness of the fact that interdependence must be based on mutually beneficial relationships. Nepal saw the results as proof that third world countries had the will to increase co-operation among themselves and thus contribute to their economic development and emancipation. Liberia and Sierra Leone hoped the action programme would be endorsed by the international community. The United Arab Emirates thought a timetable should have been fixed for implementation. Among the developed countries, Canada said it was ready to assist efforts to implement the Caracas plan.

Several States cited examples of ECDC in which they were participating, especially with

countries in the same region. Barbados mentioned joint ventures between itself and Trinidad and Tobago in such areas as cement production and air cargo facilities, and said it had offered assistance to certain Caribbean and African countries in respect of sugar cane technology. Mexico had begun participating in the Caribbean Development Fund and, with Venezuela, had extended for a year an energy co-operation programme for Central America and the Caribbean. Botswana noted that 14 countries of eastern and southern Africa were negotiating the establishment of a preferential trade area for that subregion. Singapore mentioned preferential trade arrangements and other economic co-operation among ASEAN members.

The Syrian Arab Republic called on developing countries, especially those with the means to do so, to provide financing and investment assistance by granting long-term low-interest loans.

Referring to UNCTAD and other United Nations activities in this area, the USSR said they must not violate the principle of universality, must be kept within the limits of competence of the sponsoring organs and must not jeopardize work on other trade and economic problems of interest to all States.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.65.

Letter: <sup>(2)</sup>Venezuela, for Group of 77, 5 June, A/36/333 & Corr.1.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27; <sup>(4)</sup>TDB, A/36/15; <sup>(5)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/WP/16 & Corr.1 & Corr.1/Rev.1; <sup>(6)</sup>Workshop on economic and technical co-operation among developing countries, UNCTAD/ECDC/TA/14.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(7)</sup>GA, 36/145, para. 15, 16 Dec. (p. 534). Dec.: <sup>(8)</sup>TDB.246(XXIII), para. (c), 6 Nov.

Publication: Co-operation Amidst Uncertainty: Priorities for International and South-South Action (extracts of CDP report), Sales No. E.82.II.A.2.

## Economic and social conditions and trends

The current world economic situation was the subject of three major United Nations reports issued in mid-1981 as a background to discussion in the Economic and Social Council and the Trade and Development Board.

One of these reports, the World Economic Survey 1980-1981,<sup>(2)</sup> prepared annually by the United Nations Secretariat's Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, concluded that the world economy was in a major recession, its deepest since that of 1975. Growth in world output had declined from 4.6 per cent in 1978 to 2.2 per cent in 1980, and in the developed market economies the growth rate had fallen to 1.5 per cent, compared to 3.1 per

cent in the centrally planned economies. Among energy-importing developing countries the growth rate had slipped to 3.9 per cent; when adjusted for the decline in the purchasing power of their exports, the rate was below that of population growth, resulting in lower per capita incomes.

The deterioration in economic growth had been accompanied by accelerated inflation, a marked slow-down in the expansion of world trade and worsened current-account imbalances, associated with higher interest rates and import prices, including a 64 per cent rise in petroleum prices compared to 1979. For the remainder of 1981, the Survey forecast a hesitant recovery and high inflation levels.

According to the Survey, much of the sharp deceleration in the economic growth of energy-importing developing countries was due to pressures from abroad, including the developed market economies, where recessionary tendencies had been reinforced by policy measures directed increasingly to fighting inflation. While the recession in the major industrial centres had weakened demand for the exports of developing countries, monetary restraint had led to sharply higher interest charges for developing country borrowers. In addition, higher prices for imports, and particularly for energy, put pressure on their external accounts. Such adverse external developments had led to a sharp decline in the purchasing power of the exports of energy-importing developing countries and to widening current account deficits, from \$48 billion in 1979 to \$72 billion in 1980.

The Survey concluded that the revival of the world economy was attendant on finding a successful approach to inflation in the market economies. Policies depending solely or primarily on demand restraint were unlikely to succeed in combining greater price stability with vigorous growth. A combination of measures was required, including monetary and fiscal restraints, encouragement of savings, consensus on how real income losses should be distributed, and incentives for rapid changes in productive structures imposed by changes in relative prices and comparative advantage. Better international co-ordination was needed to minimize the negative impact of national anti-inflationary policies. Improved mechanisms were also needed to channel financing to developing countries.

The second major economic study was the Trade and Development Report, 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the first in a series of annual reports published by the UNCTAD secretariat. The Report pointed out that the divergence between targets and actual growth rates had reached major proportions at the beginning of the Third United Nations De-

velopment Decade. Decelerating growth necessitated severe cuts in developing countries' investment programmes, reducing the capacity of many to achieve even the minimal structural change required to sustain current development levels. The worsening economic situation was unequally distributed, with the poor shouldering a disproportionately large part of the burden.

Assessing economic prospects for 1981-1982, the Report stated that the continued world recession would make it difficult for any group of developing countries to improve its growth performance in 1981, but that a moderate upturn of world output and trade in 1982 would permit a slightly improved performance in that year. The developed market-economy countries were likely to experience mixed growth in 1981—higher in the United States and lower in several major European countries—followed by a cyclical upturn expected to result in a higher growth rate for the group as a whole in 1982, accompanied by lower inflation. Planned growth rates for the socialist countries of Eastern Europe averaged 3.2 per cent for 1981, and China's rate might be 4 to 5 per cent.

Looking to the medium term, the Report pointed to an apparent decline in the secular growth of developed market-economy countries, with the consequence that current counter-cyclical policies were unlikely to move those economies back to the growth paths of the 1950s and 1960s. In the case of the Eastern European socialist countries, prospects for growth of the labour supply were less favourable, resulting in a possible slow-down of economic growth in the 1980s; nevertheless, the outlook for expansion of trade between those countries and others—especially developing countries—was good. China's economy continued to be relatively closed, so that growth prospects would be largely determined by internal dynamics, which pointed to possible fast development.

Given the trends in major industrial economies, and assuming no major changes in trade and capital flows, the Report projected an annual growth rate for developing countries of the order of 4.5 per cent during the 1980s, compared to the 7 per cent target of the International Development Strategy.<sup>(6)</sup> This implied that international discussion of development objectives would need to consider viable alternatives, possibly including far-reaching reforms in the organization of international economic relations. Such measures would require intensified international economic co-operation and concerted governmental effort, since market forces alone could not bring about the required transformations and structural reforms.

A third assessment of the current world

economic situation and prospects for the 1980s was prepared by CDP at its 1981 session (New York, 23 March-1 April).<sup>(4)</sup> The Committee concluded that, unless the international community found ways to break with stalemate and stagflation, any pretence of achieving the goals of the International Development Strategy must be abandoned. In addition to lagging growth in all groups of countries, the developed market economies were likely to resort increasingly to protectionist policies in the absence of a renewed effort to resolve the problems hampering world trade. The only solution lay in globally co-ordinated action to restore openness and dynamism in the world economy.

Six areas were identified by CDP as requiring urgent action to assist the developing countries, particularly the poorest: support to enable international financial institutions to enlarge the flow of quickly disbursable funds; substantial increases in bilateral development assistance; greater co-operation between oil-exporting and oil-importing countries; cessation of protectionism; additional investment in agriculture; and a system of food security. It also urged the developed centrally planned economies to expand co-operation with developing countries in six basic areas: natural resources development, industrial and energy-producing capacities, preferential export promotion, favourable credit and loan repayment conditions, training of personnel, and the formulation of national social and economic development plans. Finally, CDP called for action by all countries towards disarmament, in view of the serious economic burden caused by the arms race (p. 99).

Other 1981 reports on the economic situation included surveys of individual regions (p. 608) and of long-term trends in economic development (p. 389).

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL CONSIDERATION.** In an address to the Economic and Social Council on 1 July, prior to its annual discussion of international economic and social policy, the Secretary-General stated that more countries were resorting to unilateral measures that tended to shift the burden of economic adjustment to others; if the others retaliated, all might eventually be in a worse state. The economies of the major industrial countries had lost their dynamism, many special interests were competing for resources and Governments found it increasingly difficult to allocate enough resources to meet pressing social and economic needs. Tendencies towards fragmentation and dispersal had to be reversed and the temptations of unilateral solutions resisted. He called for strengthened co-operation, particularly in the areas of food, energy, finance and trade.

The Council debate focused on the disquieting trends in the world economy, and different views were expressed with regard to both their cause and remedy. Most speakers, however, recognized that the developing countries were worst affected by the global crisis.

The developed market-economy countries generally shared the view of the United Kingdom, speaking for the European Economic Community (EEC), that it was necessary to combat inflation, bring down interest rates and pursue structural adjustment in order to regain world economic stability and growth. The United States spoke similarly and said it intended to give direct aid, help the developing world by restoring the health of its own economy, stimulate trade by avoiding protectionism, encourage the private sector in the development process and strengthen international financial institutions.

Australia was among those which recognized that protectionism by developed countries had caused balance-of-payments deficits, high debts, increased interest rates and uncertain access to markets for developing countries. Ireland also urged resistance to protectionism but said that, in the erratic and unpredictable conditions of the previous few years, such protective measures were almost inevitable. For Spain, protectionism was dangerous because it affected chiefly the economically weaker countries and threatened the liberal, multilateral approach to economic affairs.

Denmark, on behalf also of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, said the Nordic States had a long tradition of support for the developing countries and believed that such support would also benefit industrialized countries and contribute to world stability.

Belgium cited the increase in petroleum prices as a cause of inflation, restrictive economic policies and their accompanying hardships. Canada advocated increased agricultural development and farmers' incentives to stimulate food production and the establishment of a World Bank affiliate to promote energy development in developing countries; it also favoured a greater voice for developing countries in international financial institutions, in keeping with their increasing economic weight. Italy called on oil-producing countries to recognize the important impact of energy prices on other factors of the world economy.

The developing countries generally felt that counter-inflationary policies by some developed countries had adversely affected the rest of the world. Growth had slackened, resulting in a decline in developing countries' imports and in global demand for commodities. High interest rates in certain developed countries had raised

the debt-servicing costs of borrowers. Disappointment was expressed at the failure to launch global negotiations towards a new international economic order (p. 378). Several States stressed the benefits to be derived from expanded economic co-operation among developing countries and pledged support for the action programme adopted at the High Level Conference on this subject held at Caracas in May (p. 383).

Argentina warned that the doubling of indebtedness of the developing countries within two years could have explosive consequences for individual countries and the world economy; the indefinite accumulation of massive deficits could not add up to a development strategy. Unlike temporary crises of the past when growth rates fell and inflation rose, said Brazil, the rich countries currently had predictable growth levels while the poor countries had no growth prospects at all. Chile said it knew from experience the importance of combating inflation, but the policies adopted by some countries to that end had caused a drop in demand for the products of developing countries and a sharp decline in commodity prices. Venezuela observed that the industrialized countries' monetary and fiscal policies, adopted to regulate demand, had not produced any significant reduction in inflationary pressures.

Burundi noted that a number of African nations had based their currencies on those of former metropolitan Powers, which had in turn been subordinate to the United States dollar; successive fluctuations in the central currency had weighed heavily on the new States' balances of payments and developing countries had had to bear the full weight of inflation. Ethiopia pointed to a widening gap between developing countries: the per capita gross domestic product of the least developed had grown by an annual average of only 1 per cent over the past two decades, compared to 2.9 per cent for developing countries as a whole. The Sudan stated that the purchasing power and export earnings of the least developed countries were less than they had been 20 years previously. Although it was true that the crisis affected all countries, said Senegal, it was felt much more keenly by the developing ones and notably by the majority which imported petroleum.

Algeria thought it inadmissible to argue that world economic recovery must stem from recovery in the developed countries; action designed merely to re-establish the former balance between developed and developing countries would be politically unacceptable and economically ineffective. Barbados said that fundamental and acute economic problems would not disap-

pear by general declarations of intent. Indonesia pointed out that, while interdependence was becoming increasingly recognized, some developed countries were still reluctant to acknowledge that reality by adopting corresponding policy measures. Yugoslavia called for a strengthening of international financial institutions and regretted that some States were using the current economic difficulties as a pretext for delay in implementing the International Development Strategy.

Bangladesh said a number of countries had embarked on planned development in the light of the Strategy but found themselves in difficulties when assumptions on trade growth, investment and resource flows had had to be discarded at the beginning of the decade. Nepal stated that, while all countries were affected by the declining economy, developing countries were less able to defend themselves because of deteriorating terms of trade, increasing energy costs, protectionism and tighter monetary policies in the industrialized countries, restricted access to private capital markets and a decline in real terms of official development assistance (ODA). Nigeria ascribed the plight of developing countries not to lack of effort on their part but to deteriorating access to export markets, technology and finance.

Morocco stated that the increased protectionist policies of industrialized nations had left developing countries no alternative to continued indebtedness as the price of survival. Also referring to the effects of protectionism, Iraq noted that the annual growth rate in the volume of developing country exports to the industrial economies had declined to virtually nil in 1980.

With regard to ODA, EEC felt that the burden should be balanced more fairly among all countries able to contribute; it welcomed aid given by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries and urged a similar commitment from the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA). France also said mobilization of financial resources was not a matter for Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development countries alone and added that it was committed to reaching over the coming years the ODA target set by the International Development Strategy—0.7 per cent of the developed countries' gross national product (GNP).<sup>(7)</sup> Japan pledged increases in both quality and quantity of its ODA, which it planned to more than double during the five years beginning in 1981. Italy reported the doubling of its contribution in 1980.

China said it was not right for certain countries to cite differences in economic systems as grounds for evading their assistance obligations. Turkey called for a substantial increase in ODA

by industrialized countries, whatever their economic system, and by countries with a surplus. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya remarked that it had provided substantial financial and development assistance through bilateral and multilateral programmes.

Fiji, Mexico and Zaire were among those which pointed out that an increase in ODA of only 5 per cent of the nearly \$500 billion spent each year on armaments would make it possible to reach the target set in the International Development Strategy. Ghana said ODA increases had been more noticeable at the bilateral level; donors tended to see their contributions in terms of self-interest rather than of meeting human needs. India pointed out that the current level of ODA, as a share of GNP, was below that reached five years previously. Pakistan called for targets to be set in order to reverse the trend; for example, the leading economic Powers might earmark for ODA 0.7 per cent of the increment in their GNP in each remaining year of the 1980s.

Cuba saw a need to improve the developing countries' terms of trade, give them a massive transfer of additional resources, reform the international monetary system and speed negotiations for disarmament and détente.

The developed centrally planned economy countries felt that international economic co-operation and developing countries' growth and progress depended on the easing of international tensions and on disarmament. They held that there were some stabilizing factors in the world economy such as the continuous and planned national economic development of the member countries of CMEA.

The USSR said Western ruling circles had attempted to overcome their economic crisis by protectionism and by draining funds and resources from developing countries through transnational corporations and the brain drain; it called for observance of a code of conduct to democratize international economic relations and reiterated its proposal that the major military Powers agree to reduce their military budgets and allocate part of the savings to meet the needs of developing countries. Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia and Viet Nam said that world economic problems could be solved only under conditions of détente and peaceful coexistence.

The Byelorussian SSR viewed the capitalist countries as the originators of inflation and protectionism, and said the flow of foreign private capital to developing countries was increasing their external debt. The German Democratic Republic urged the United Nations to control the import of highly qualified personnel from developing countries, remarking that some States

were profiting more from such plunder than they gave in development aid. Poland warned that, if various forms of protectionism were the only response to economic difficulties, the stagnation would become a prolonged economic crisis, with foreseeable political and social repercussions.

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD CONSIDERATION. The current world economic situation, with special reference to the Trade and Development Report, 1981, was discussed by the Trade and Development Board in September/October. Introducing the report, the Director of the Money, Finance and Development Division of the UNCTAD secretariat stressed the need to consider what would be required to secure faster growth in developing countries so that, before the end of the century, they could sustain autonomous development and growth largely independently from world economic conditions. Faster growth would generate more balanced and sustainable trade patterns than those currently prevailing.

On 9 October, after considering a note by the UNCTAD secretariat on the world economic outlook for 1981 and 1982<sup>(1)</sup> and another by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD on world inflation, the Board noted his intention to provide an in-depth study of the world inflationary phenomenon (p. 393) and decided to refer to its March 1982 session a draft decision on access by developing countries to international capital markets (p. 561).<sup>(5)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 16 December, the General Assembly, in a resolution on UNCTAD,<sup>(8)</sup> took note with appreciation of the initiative of the UNCTAD Secretary-General in preparing the Trade and Development Report.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/865.

Publications: <sup>(2)</sup>World Economic Survey 1980-1981 (E/1981/42), Sales No. E.81.II.C.2; 1981-1982 (E/1982/46), Sales No. E.82.II.C.1. <sup>(3)</sup>Trade and Development Report, 1981 (TD/B/863/Rev.1), Sales No. E.81.II.D.9.

Reports: <sup>(4)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27; <sup>(5)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(6)</sup>35/56, annex, para. 20, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 505); <sup>(7)</sup>ibid., para. 24; <sup>(8)</sup>36/145, para. 4, 16 Dec. 1981 (p.533).

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.20-34 (1-10 July).

#### Long-term trends in economic development

ACTIVITIES OF THE TASK FORCE. At its eighth session, held at Geneva from 16 to 18 March 1981, the Task Force on Long-Term Development Objectives, a subsidiary body of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), assessed the world economic situation and prospects and identified areas where action appeared particularly necessary to bring about progress in implementing the International Development Strategy.<sup>(5)</sup> In its report,<sup>(3)</sup> the Task Force discussed the interrelated problems of growth, em-



ployment, protectionism and structural adjustment. It also focused on two other areas of major concern for the 1980s: energy (p. 696) and food (p. 718).

With regard to the first item, the Task Force saw a need in the developed market economies for a mix of national anti-inflation policies to restrain demand and stimulate investment, coupled with international co-ordination to keep exchange and commodity markets stable. It warned against protectionist measures affecting international trade and suggested that international consultation to facilitate structural adjustment within national economies could help prevent short-term employment losses. For developing countries, it favoured a development-oriented process, combining national and international measures, to ensure sufficient long-term financing of payments deficits; emphasis on the domestic market instead of exports to industrialized countries, without neglecting regional trade; and expanded South-South co-operation. It emphasized that a global policy framework was essential, since no country had found a satisfactory answer through short-term national economic management.

Revised terms of reference for the Task Force were approved by ACC on 14 April (p. 382).

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. In accordance with a 1979 General Assembly request,<sup>(4)</sup> the Economic and Social Council considered in November 1981 a preliminary draft of an overall socio-economic perspective of the world economy to the year 2000, prepared by the Secretary-General in consultation with United Nations bodies.<sup>(2)</sup> Describing this project in a note to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General said full use had been made of technical work and studies by organizations within and outside the United Nations system.

In his note to the Council, the Secretary-General said the preliminary draft examined the possibilities for world economic development and focused on two interrelated aspects: a summary appraisal of the current world situation and the implied short-term outlook (1980-1982) and medium-term prospects (1980-1985); and a prospective assessment to the year 2000, developed according to different assumed policy approaches to the resolution of current issues. He pointed to critical problem areas requiring intensified international co-operation: population, resources and environment; food and agriculture; industrialization, trade and the international division of labour; energy; technological development, technology transfer and transnational corporations; the international monetary and financial system; and disarmament. The question of strengthening the findings of the

global perspectives was to be the subject of further inter-agency consultation through the ACC Task Force on Long-Term Development Objectives, while regional perspectives were being elaborated with the regional commissions.

The Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the United Nations Secretariat's Office for Development Research and Policy Analysis introduced the draft to the Council on 2 November. He said the report made it clear that a substantial acceleration of growth in the developing countries could be brought about only by a large increase in resources for capital formation, together with a substantial improvement in productivity, particularly in low-income and least developed countries. According to projections, national savings rates and productivity improvements would be insufficient to permit attainment of the International Development Strategy target of an annual growth rate of 7 per cent.<sup>(6)</sup> Even if that rate was attained, the poverty of millions could not be alleviated by the year 2000 without deliberate policies to reduce income inequities.

In the Council, the USSR criticized the draft for failing to focus on the issue of restructuring international economic relations, not indicating how growth rates could be improved, unduly stressing the role of foreign investment capital, omitting comments about the adverse consequences of transnational corporation activities and ignoring the multilateral co-operation between socialist and developing countries. The German Democratic Republic and the USSR pointed out that only the first chapter of the preliminary draft envisaged by the Assembly's 1979 resolution had been submitted. Poland and the United Kingdom, the latter on behalf of the EEC members, felt it preferable to postpone further consideration until 1982.

In a decision of 2 November,<sup>(7)</sup> adopted without vote on an oral proposal by its President, the Council invited the Secretary-General to take into account the views expressed and to prepare a revised preliminary draft perspective, incorporating the conclusions of interorganizational consultations under way, which would be considered at the Council's second regular session of 1982. The Council also recommended that the General Assembly defer for one year the review of progress made in implementation of its 1979 resolution.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 4 December, the General Assembly adopted without vote a decision<sup>(8)</sup> by which it took note of the Secretary-General's note and of the Council's action and deferred the review to its 1982 regular session. On 27 November, the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee had similarly approved this text as introduced by its Chairman.

In the Committee's discussion, the USSR said future work on this topic should take account of the importance of socio-economic changes such as land reform, strengthening of the public sector, industrialization, comprehensive planning and control over foreign capital, as well as the need to transfer resources from military to development purposes.

Notes: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/576, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1981/113.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>Task Force on Long-Term Development Objectives, E/1981/71.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>34/57, 29 Nov. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 743); <sup>(5)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503); <sup>(6)</sup>ibid., para. 20 (p. 505).

Decisions: <sup>(7)</sup>ESC: 1981/200, 2 Nov., text following.

<sup>(8)</sup>GA: 36/423, 4 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.44 (2 Nov.). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 44 (24 Sep.-27 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.84 (4 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/200

Adopted without vote

Draft orally proposed by President; agenda item 26.

##### Examination of long-term trends in economic development

At its 44th plenary meeting, on 2 November 1981, the Council decided:

(a) To take note of the note by the Secretary-General containing the preliminary draft of an overall socio-economic perspective of the world economy to the year 2000 and of the indication therein that consultations with the regional commissions and organizations of the United Nations concerned, as called for in General Assembly resolution 34/57 of 29 November 1979, were in progress;

(b) To invite the Secretary-General, taking into account the views expressed by delegations at the resumed second regular session of 1981, to proceed with the preparation of a revised report on the preliminary draft perspective, incorporating the conclusions of the interorganizational consultations under way, with a view to synthesizing the findings of other organizations of the United Nations system on long-term social and economic trends;

(c) To consider that report at its second regular session of 1982;

(d) To recommend to the General Assembly that it should defer for one year the review specified in paragraph 7 of Assembly resolution 34/57 relating to the progress made in the implementation of that resolution.

#### General Assembly decision 36/423

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.11) without vote. 27 November (meeting 44): draft by Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.118); agenda item 69 (m).

##### Long-term trends in economic development

At its 84th plenary meeting, on 4 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee:

(a) Took note of the note by the Secretary-General on the progress in the preparation of an overall socio-economic perspective of the development of the world economy;

(b) Took note also of Economic and Social Council decision 1981/200 of 2 November 1981 concerning the examination of long-term trends in economic development;

(c) Decided to defer to its thirty-seventh session the review specified in paragraph 7 of its resolution 34/57 of 29 November 1979 relating to the progress made in the implementation of that resolution.

Environment, natural resources,  
population and development

In December 1981, the General Assembly called for implementation of a new work programme to study the interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development. The programme was drawn up and revised by the Secretariat during the year, on the basis of proposals by an expert group convened by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

ACTIVITIES OF THE UNEP EXPERT GROUP. Pursuant to a 1980 decision of the UNEP Governing Council,<sup>(18)</sup> the UNEP Executive Director convened, in January 1981, a second session of a high-level group of experts to advise him on elements for inclusion in a system-wide work programme on interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development—a programme envisaged in 1980 resolutions by the General Assembly<sup>(13)</sup> and the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(8)</sup>

In its report, annexed to the UNEP Council's report to the Assembly,<sup>(6)</sup> the expert group pointed out that rapid modernization had produced important unintended dysfunctional consequences such as poverty, unemployment, explosive growth of urban slums, environmental degradation and irrational management of natural resources. It concluded that interrelationships should be mapped through regional and country case studies. Several studies and projects were proposed for inclusion in the programme.

In a decision of 26 May,<sup>(16)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council agreed with the expert group's proposals and invited the Economic and Social Council to consider them favourably. The Governing Council considered that further reports by the Secretary-General should contain advice to Governments on the results of studies and that emphasis in the immediate future should be placed on projects and case studies that would demonstrate the value of the interrelationships approach.

ACTION BY THE POPULATION COMMISSION (JANUARY/FEBRUARY) AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (MAY). The interrelationships between population, resources, environment and development were considered by the Population Commission at its January/February session (p. 778). The Commission stated in its report<sup>(4)</sup> that population policies and programmes could play an important role with regard not only to slowing population growth, density, age structure and spatial distribution, but also to accommodation, social and urban problems, congestion and pollution. It added that the qualitative dimension of population programmes was central to problems of development and rapid social change as well as to processes of self-reliance,

decentralization and participation in development.

The Economic and Social Council, in a resolution of 6 May<sup>(9)</sup> on implementation of the 1974 World Population Plan of Action,<sup>(17)</sup> urged those responsible for new development strategies, for international conferences or for drafting instruments on economic, social and technological progress to consider fully the interrelationships of population factors and social, economic, cultural and political development in dealing with population problems.

In another resolution of the same date, on a population work programme,<sup>(10)</sup> the Council requested the Secretary-General to continue work on interrelations of population and development, with a view to integrating demographic factors in development strategies and plans. He was also asked to expedite the preparation of manuals on methods of incorporating demographic factors in development planning.

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION (JULY).** In accordance with a 1979 Economic and Social Council request,<sup>(7)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted in May 1981 a report to the Council<sup>(5)</sup> which discussed the scope and nature of the issues and set out some conclusions on requirements for sustaining long-term development. It reviewed findings that had emerged from activities of the United Nations system in four areas: population pressure, resource systems and technological options; human capabilities, livelihood systems and environmental management; development processes, human settlements and population distribution; and national self-reliance, life-styles and patterns of development. The report also submitted findings relevant to national planning.

In a statement to the Council on 14 July, the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation outlined elements of a proposed system-wide work programme whose objectives would be: synthesis, integration and advancement of knowledge, based on co-ordinated multidisciplinary research; identification of issues emerging from ongoing or anticipated changes in the distribution of power and resources between and within societies, such as those implicit in Assembly documents relating to the new international economic order; and improvement of the capability for long-term global analyses of interrelationships so that they could be used to elaborate long-term strategies and policy decisions at local, national, regional and international levels.

Programme areas to be explored would include rational use of global resources, consumption patterns and life-styles, and improvement and expansion of carrying capacity. Within

these areas, projects would be identified for implementation by the United Nations system and other institutions. Programme components would include: system-wide cataloguing and evaluation of work; data gathering and analysis, theoretical work, long-term perspectives and projections; assistance to developing countries trying to solve problems stemming from interrelationships; and national planning implications.

The Director-General added that a trust fund had been established to receive governmental contributions for these activities.

On 22 July, the Council adopted without vote a resolution,<sup>(11)</sup> sponsored by India, Kenya, Pakistan and Sweden, by which it welcomed establishment of the trust fund and urgently requested the Director-General to finalize the proposals for the work programme and to submit them to Governments at an early stage for consideration at the Assembly's 1981 regular session.

The Federal Republic of Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom expressed opposition to the fund, while the United States said it would not contribute. On the other hand, Sweden said it was prepared to make a contribution.

On 24 July, in a resolution on international co-operation on the environment,<sup>(12)</sup> the Council endorsed in principle the proposals of the expert group and the important role of UNEP on this topic, and invited the Assembly to request the Director-General to implement the proposals, taking into account the Council's resolution of 22 July. This provision incorporated two revisions made after informal consultations on the original draft, adding the words "in principle" and the phrase inviting the Assembly to take account of the Council resolution.

Brazil expressed reservations on the Secretary-General's report, saying it appeared to imply that reduction of development and modification of development objectives were justified to preserve the environment, and that some of its ideas prejudged the exercise of economic and social options by developing countries and invaded areas of exclusive national jurisdiction.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** Responding to the Economic and Social Council resolutions of 22 and 24 July, the Secretary-General submitted to the General Assembly in October a report of the Director-General containing proposals for the system-wide work programme on interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development.<sup>(3)</sup>

The programme would include surveys and monitoring, field projects, development of planning and policy tools, and research. Its objectives were to be the advancement of understanding, the promotion of multidisciplinary approaches and the stimulation of international efforts.

Components were to include: comparative geographic, sectoral and societal studies; action-oriented research studies urgently needed for developing countries; methodological studies; and review and synthesis of new knowledge. Three programme areas were specified: rational use of global resources, consumption patterns and life-styles, and improving and expanding carrying capacity.

An appendix listed eight study projects identified for inclusion, on the following topics: land resources for future populations (Indonesia, Kenya, Tunisia); deforestation of the Himalayan foothills; overgrazing in the Sudano-Sahelian region; peasant survival and environmental management in densely populated semi-arid highlands (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru); high-consumption regions; resource use; development and life-styles; and development of an extended Social Accounting Matrix for analysis of interrelationships.

The Director-General proposed that existing ACC machinery be used for inter-agency consultations and that an advisory body of four outside experts be constituted to review programme activities, assess orientation and achievements, recommend further development and advise on the trust fund, which would finance the advisory body's meetings.

On 17 December, the General Assembly adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(14)</sup> by which it requested the Director-General to initiate implementation of a work programme as outlined in his report and to consult Governments on the elements. The Assembly supported the proposed arrangements for inter-agency consultations and establishment of the advisory body, appealed to Governments to contribute to the trust fund and decided to review progress at its 1983 regular session. It expressed awareness that national policies and strategies in resources, environment, people and development were government prerogatives.

The resolution was approved by the Second Committee on 7 December, also without vote, as submitted by a Committee Vice-Chairman after informal consultations on an earlier draft introduced by Sweden, also sponsored by India and Pakistan and subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup>

In another resolution of 17 December, on international co-operation on the environment,<sup>(15)</sup> the Assembly welcomed the recommendations of the UNEP Governing Council and the Economic and Social Council on the work programme and the role of UNEP, and requested the Director-General to take steps for their implementation.

The three-nation text differed in several respects from the one adopted. It contained no reference to government prerogatives and, in addition

to drafting differences, would have had the Assembly: endorse the Director-General's proposals to initiate a work programme, taking into account the relevant provision in the other Assembly resolution of 17 December (see previous paragraph); welcome (rather than support) the Director-General's arrangements; and appeal for substantial contributions to the trust fund. Also, the initial draft did not provide that the advisory body should be financed from the trust fund.

Explaining their positions on this resolution, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom restated their opposition to the proliferation of funds. Canada, referring to the preambular clause on government prerogatives, supported the right of States to pursue national policies but said States also were responsible for ensuring that activities within their jurisdiction or control did not harm the environment of other States.

Speaking of the second resolution, the Federal Republic of Germany said it was premature to request implementation of the work programme; further consideration by the UNEP Council was needed.

COMMUNICATION. On 9 November, China transmitted to the Secretary-General<sup>(2)</sup> the Beijing Declaration on Population and Development, adopted by the Asian Conference of Parliamentarians on Population and Development (Beijing, China, 27-30 October). In this document, the participants recognized the inextricable relationships between population, resources and environment in efforts to manage poverty, employment and development, and resolved to stimulate interest and create awareness and understanding of those relationships among fellow parliamentarians and people.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>India, Pakistan, Sweden, A/C.2/36/L.75.

Letter: <sup>(2)</sup>China, 9 Nov., A/C.2/36/4.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>DIEC Director-General, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/571; <sup>(4)</sup>Population Commission, E/1981/13; <sup>(5)</sup>S-G, E/1981/65; <sup>(6)</sup>UNEP Council, A/36/25.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(7)</sup>1979/49, 1 Aug. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 793); <sup>(8)</sup>1980/49, para. 2, 23 July 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 723); <sup>(9)</sup>1981/28, para. 2, 6 May 1981 (p. 780); <sup>(10)</sup>1981/29, para. 2 (d) & (k), 6 May (p. 787); <sup>(11)</sup>1981/51, 22 July, text following; <sup>(12)</sup>1981/73, para. 5, 24 July (p. 815). GA: <sup>(13)</sup>35/74, para. 5, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 724); <sup>(14)</sup>36/179, 17 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(15)</sup>36/192, para. 5, 17 Dec. (p. 816).

Decision: <sup>(16)</sup>UNEP Council: 9/1, sect. II, 26 May.

Yearbook references: <sup>(17)</sup>1974, p. 552; <sup>(18)</sup>1980, p. 716.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.21-34, 35, 37, 39, 41 (2-24 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 41, 46 (24 Sep.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/51

Adopted without vote Meeting 39 22 July 1981

4-nation draft (E/1981/L.52); agenda item 3.

Sponsors: India, Kenya, Pakistan, Sweden.

Interrelationships between resources,  
environment, people and development

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/74 of 5 December 1980 on international co-operation in the field of the environment, in which the Secretary-General was requested to take the requisite steps for the Implementation of the recommendations of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the work of the United Nations system on interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development;

2. Welcomes the statement of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, in which he presented an outline of the elements of a system-wide programme of work on the interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development;

3. Urgently requests the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to finalize the proposals for the system-wide programme of work on interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development, bearing in mind the above-mentioned outline of the elements, and to submit the proposals to Governments at an early stage, so as to facilitate the full consideration of the programme of work by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session and to enable the Assembly to take the appropriate decisions for its implementation, also bearing in mind Council resolution 1981/73;

4. Welcomes the establishment of the general trust fund for the purpose of facilitating the implementation of the system-wide programme of work to be undertaken pursuant to General Assembly resolution 35/74.

General Assembly resolution 36/179

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.1) without vote, 7 December (meeting 46); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.133), based on informal consultations on 3-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.75); agenda item 69.

Interrelationships between resources,  
environment, people and development

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation on interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development,

Conscious of the Interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development, as noted in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recognizing that the application of existing knowledge concerning those interrelationships could lead to a more efficient use of available resources in the United Nations system,

Recalling its resolution 35/74 of 5 December 1980, in paragraph 5 of which it requested the Secretary-General to take the requisite steps for implementation of a system-wide programme of work on the interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development,

Recalling Economic and Social Council resolutions 1981/51 of 22 July 1981 and 1981/73 of 24 July 1981,

Aware that the formulation and implementation, at the national level, of policies and strategies in the fields of resources, environment, people and development fall within the prerogative of Governments,

1. Requests the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation:

(a) To initiate implementation of a co-ordinated multidisciplinary programme of work on interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development, as outlined in his report, and within this framework the recommendations

on this subject of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme and of the Economic and Social Council;

(b) Urgently to consult Governments on the elements contained in his report, as he proceeds in the implementation of the above-mentioned programme of work;

2. Supports the arrangements proposed by the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation for inter-agency consultations and programme support in the implementation of the programme of work, as well as the establishment of a small advisory body, to be financed through the trust fund which has been established for financing activities concerning interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development, to assist him in the overall guidance of the programme of work and to oversee the operation of the trust fund;

3. Appeals to Governments to contribute to the trust fund;

4. Decides to review at its thirty-eighth session the progress made in the implementation of the present resolution.

Inflation and development

In a note to the General Assembly, transmitted by the United Nations Secretary-General on 29 September 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) proposed to submit in 1982 rather than 1981 a report requested by the Assembly in 1979<sup>(4)</sup> on measures to combat world inflation with a view to accelerating developing countries' real growth and increasing their import capacity in a context of just and stable financial markets. He pointed out that there had been changes since 1979 in the underlying economic forces affecting inflation. Several Governments appeared to have different perceptions of the origins of that process and to attach different weights to the goals of reducing inflation and achieving full employment. Therefore, the UNCTAD secretariat felt that a comprehensive review was required and it proposed to submit such a report for the twenty-fifth session of the Trade and Development Board (September 1982) and the Assembly's 1982 regular session.

On 9 October, the Board noted this intention and agreed to consider the report in September 1982.<sup>(3)</sup>

On 16 December, in a resolution on UNCTAD,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly took note of the UNCTAD Secretary-General's intention and the Board's agreement. In an earlier version of this text, submitted by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77,<sup>(1)</sup> the Assembly would have welcomed the Board's decision and requested that the study and the Board's comments be transmitted to the Assembly in 1982.

In a related decision,<sup>(6)</sup> adopted without vote on 16 December, the Assembly took note of the UNCTAD Secretary-General's communication. This action was recommended by the Second Committee, which similarly approved it on 11 December on an oral proposal of its Chairman.

The effects of inflation and monetary instabili-

ty on the finances of the United Nations system were also examined by the Assembly during the year (p. 1300).

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.65.

Note: <sup>(2)</sup>UNCTAD S-G, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/536.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>34/197, paras. 3 & 4, 19 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 581); <sup>(5)</sup>36/145, para. 5, 16 Dec. 1981 (p. 533).

Decision: <sup>(6)</sup>GA: 36/430, 16 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 48 (24 Sep.-11 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/430

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.3) without vote, 11 December (meeting 48); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 69 (c).

#### World Inflationary phenomenon

At its 100th plenary meeting, on 16 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, took note of the note by the Secretary-General transmitting a note by the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development on the world inflationary phenomenon.

#### Public sector and economic development

Responding to a 1979 Economic and Social Council request,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted in May 1981 a progress report on the role of the public sector in promoting the economic development of developing countries,<sup>(1)</sup> in advance of a comprehensive report scheduled for 1983.

According to the report, new perceptions and priorities regarding development had led most developing countries to enlarge the role of the public sector and mobilize more resources for its use. The need to bring the fruits of development to the larger mass of people had caused the public sector to devise new organizations and redesign development policy to undertake wholly new tasks. The public sector had attempted to bring about changes in institutions such as agrarian relations, created new institutions such as public enterprises and joint ventures, and implemented policies designed to benefit selected groups.

Governments had expressed the need for research and analysis of public sector policies and programmes and the modalities to implement them, the report said. The larger and complex role of the public sector had called for more and diversified training of personnel and for policies to retain competent persons, and there was also a growing need to improve public management.

On 20 July, the Economic and Social Council recommended that the report be transmitted to the General Assembly, together with the Secretary-General's comprehensive report called

for by the Assembly in 1979.<sup>(4)</sup> The Council decided to discuss the latter at its second regular session of 1983, requested the Secretary-General to accord high priority to studies and reports on the role of the public sector in promoting developing countries' economic development, and recognized the important role of the International Centre for Public Enterprises in Developing Countries in promoting co-operation among developing countries in this field.

The Council took these actions by a resolution which it adopted without vote. The 11-nation draft, introduced by Mongolia, incorporated oral amendments proposed by Brazil and by the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Economic Community. Brazil's amendment had the Council recognize instead of emphasize the role of the International Centre. The United Kingdom amendment added a preambular paragraph saying that every State had the sovereign and inalienable right to choose its economic and social system in accordance with its people's will, without outside interference.

Canada stated that, had there been a vote, it would have been unable to support the request for high priority for studies and reports on this topic.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/66.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1979/48, 31 July 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 515); <sup>(3)</sup>1981/45, 20 July 1981, text following. <sup>(4)</sup>GA: 34/137, para. 5, 14 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 516).

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.21-34, 37, 38 (2-20 July).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/45

Adopted without vote Meeting 38 20 July 1981 11-nation draft (E/1981/L.47/Rev.1), orally amended by Brazil and by United Kingdom for EEC members; agenda item 3.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Cuba, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, India, Iraq, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Yugoslavia.

#### Role of the public sector in promoting the economic development of developing countries

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolutions 1978/60 of 3 August 1978, 1978/75 of 8 November 1978 and 1979/48 of 31 July 1979,

Further recalling General Assembly resolution 34/137 of 14 December 1979, in which the Assembly, inter alia, invited the Secretary-General to continue his detailed study of the role of the public sector and to submit, through the Economic and Social Council, a comprehensive report to the Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, paying special attention to several aspects of the question indicated in that resolution,

Noting the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, in which it is stressed that due account should be taken of the positive role of the public sector in mobilizing internal resources, formulating and implementing overall national development plans and establishing national priorities,

Bearing in mind that every State has the sovereign and inalienable right to choose its economic and social system, in accordance with the will of its people and without outside interference,

1. Takes note of the progress report of the Secretary-General on the role of the public sector in promoting the economic development of developing countries;

2. Recommends that the progress report should be transmitted to the General Assembly, together with the compre-

hensive report of the Secretary-General to be submitted in accordance with Assembly resolution 34/137;

3. Decides to discuss the comprehensive report of the Secretary-General at the second regular session of the Council in 1983;

4. Reaffirms Council resolution 1978/60, in which it, *inter alia*, invited the regional commissions and other appropriate organizations of the United Nations system to assist the Secretary-General regularly in his continuing study of the role of the public sector in promoting the economic development of developing countries;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to accord high priority to the studies and reports on the role of the public sector in the economic development of developing countries;

6. Recognizes, in this connection, the important role of the international Centre for Public Enterprises in Developing Countries in promoting co-operation among developing countries in this field.

## Development planning and information

The Committee for Development Planning (CDP) held its seventeenth session at United Nations Headquarters from 23 March to 1 April 1981.<sup>(2)</sup>

Composed of experts appointed by the Economic and Social Council, CDP examined the causes and costs of the world economic crisis and outlined priority areas of action to restore dynamism in the world economy, including action by the developed market and centrally planned economies (p. 386). It made recommendations regarding regional development strategies in Africa (p. 611), Asia and the Pacific (p. 636), Latin America (p. 661) and Western Asia (p. 669). It suggested activities for economic co-operation among developing countries (p. 383) and reviewed the United Nations list of least developed countries (p. 411). The world economic situation and development problems hampering implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade (p. 381) were to be the subjects of future study by CDP.

In connection with development planning, a 10 September letter from Israel to the Secretary-General<sup>(1)</sup> attached a government report outlining an alternative development strategy for developing countries; this approach called for a shift of resources from the modern to the traditional sector, where a transitional economy would be created that would produce food and non-agricultural goods primarily for its own consumption, using its predominantly agricultural surpluses to pay for its imports from the modern sector and from the world market.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Israel, 10 Sep., A/36/497.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27.

## Unified approach to development planning

Responding to the concern, spanning more than a decade, of both the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council to promote a unified approach to development analysis and planning for socio-economic development, the Secretary-General, in January 1981, submitted two related reports.

One of these reports,<sup>(1)</sup> submitted in response to a 1979 Assembly decision,<sup>(6)</sup> contained conclusions and recommendations based on information from Governments on their experience in applying a unified approach. Previous reports, in 1977<sup>(8)</sup> and 1979,<sup>(9)</sup> incorporated information from 25 Governments; for the 1981 report, new replies were received from Argentina, Cyprus, Iraq, Jordan, Malaysia, Pakistan and Suriname.

The report concluded that various countries had applied a unified approach in varying degrees and contexts. Their development objectives had become more comprehensive and explicit, to facilitate policy and programme formulation; the interrelationships of policies and programmes were being taken into account; attempts had been made to incorporate regional programmes into national plans; and review and appraisal had become part of decision-making. Arrangements had been made to widen the participation of local institutions, improve the co-ordination of central planning authorities, facilitate the application of a unified approach in regional and local plans, and make review and appraisal more effective. There had also been efforts to improve the availability of information.

The second report concerned world experience in integrated social and economic planning which could be recommended to interested Governments for their application.<sup>(2)</sup> This report, requested by the Economic and Social Council in 1979,<sup>(3)</sup> illustrated interactions among nutrition, health, educational and family planning programmes. The report sought to demonstrate that knowledge of the nature of such interactions was necessary for the design of integrated plans and programmes. It found that sectoral programmes were often designed in isolation from one another, due to compartmentalization of agencies and the rigidities arising from a functional allocation of responsibilities. To avoid this, many Governments would have to improve their organizational arrangements.

The Commission for Social Development took note of both reports on 17 February.<sup>(4)</sup>

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. On 4 May, the Economic and Social Council decided to continue to consider regularly a unified approach to development analysis and planning. It requested the Secretary-General, on the basis of government information, to submit in 1983 a

report on experience acquired in applying such an approach in socio-economic development at the national level, as well as in the activities of United Nations economic and social bodies.

The decision to this effect<sup>(5)</sup> was adopted without vote, following similar approval on 24 April by the Council's First (Economic) Committee of a text introduced by its Chairman and based on consultations.

In the Committee's discussion, the Byelorussian SSR and the USSR stressed the importance of integrated planning in socialist economies and called for more work by the United Nations on this topic, leading to practical recommendations. The United States said experience had demonstrated the need to avoid relying too heavily on Governments in promoting social development; individual and group initiatives should be encouraged instead. The German Democratic Republic and India thought that a unified approach should also be applied in international economic relations.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 19 November, the General Assembly confirmed the Council decision, also decided to continue consideration of the question regularly and requested that the report called for by the Council be submitted to the Assembly in 1983 through the Commission for Social Development and the Council.

The Assembly took these actions by adopting without vote a decision<sup>(7)</sup> recommended by its Second (Economic and Financial) Committee. The Committee had likewise approved the draft, submitted by its Chairman, on 11 November.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/69, <sup>(2)</sup>E/CN.5/586.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC: 1979/23, 9 May 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 760).

Decisions: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission for Social Development (report, E/1981/26): IV, 17 Feb. <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/107, 4 May, text following. GA: <sup>(6)</sup>34/419, para. (c), 29 Nov. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 760); <sup>(7)</sup>36/405, 19 Nov. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(8)</sup>1977, p. 647; <sup>(9)</sup>1979, p. 753.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.4, 5 (23, 24 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.13 (4 May). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.8, 11, 35 (7 Oct.-11 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.64 (19 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/107

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/59) without vote, 24 April (meeting 5); draft by Chairman (E/1981/C.1/L.4); agenda item 12.

Unified approach to development analysis and planning

At its 13th plenary meeting, on 4 May 1981, the Council decided:

(a) To take note of the report of the Secretary-General on a unified approach to development analysis and planning;

(b) To continue to consider on a regular basis the question of a unified approach to development analysis and planning, taking into account its importance for the process of development as stressed in the international Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

(c) To request the Secretary-General, on the basis of infor-

mation supplied by Governments, to prepare a report on the experience acquired in applying a unified approach in the process of socio-economic development at the national level, as well as in the activities of the United Nations economic and social organs and organizations, and to submit it to the Council at its first regular session of 1983 through the Commission for Social Development at its twenty-eighth session;

(d) To include in the provisional agenda for its first regular session of 1983 the item entitled "Unified approach to development analysis and planning".

General Assembly decision 36/405

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/693) without vote, 11 November (meeting 35); draft by Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.20); agenda item 71 (c).

Unified approach to development analysis and planning

At its 64th plenary meeting, on 19 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee:

(a) Took note of the report of the Secretary-General on a unified approach to development analysis and planning;

(b) Confirmed Economic and Social Council decision 1981/107 of 4 May 1981, entitled "Unified approach to development analysis and planning";

(c) Decided to continue consideration on a regular basis of the question of a unified approach, taking into account its importance for the process of development as stressed in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

(d) Requested the Secretary-General, on the basis of information supplied by Governments, to prepare a report on the experience acquired in applying a unified approach in the process of socio-economic development at the national level and in the activities of the United Nations economic and social organs and organizations and to submit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session through the Commission for Social Development at its twenty-eighth session and the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1983;

(e) Further decided to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-eighth session the item entitled "Unified approach to development analysis and planning".

Technical co-operation

During 1981, the United Nations Secretariat's Department of Technical Co-operation for Development (DTCD) implemented 90 technical co-operation projects in 70 developing countries designed to improve their technical and institutional capabilities for planning and to strengthen their infrastructure for development. According to a report by the Secretary-General to the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP),<sup>(1)</sup> advisory missions provided assistance in specific economic and social sectors and, in response to developing countries' needs for more skilled personnel, training formed an important aspect.

The main emphasis was on national and regional planning, formulation and evaluation of investment projects, planning for international technical co-operation, and projects devoted exclusively to training. Significant support was also given to preparations for the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (p. 404); to country programming for the third



UNDP programming cycle (1982-1986) (p. 444); and, in co-operation with the Office for Special Political Questions, to special economic assistance programmes mandated by the General Assembly (p. 495).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, DP/1982/22.

#### Development information

##### Information Systems Unit in DIESA

The General Assembly decided in December 1981 to continue the Information Systems Unit (ISU) in the United Nations Secretariat's Department of International Economic and Social Affairs (DIESA) and to finance it within the existing total of the United Nations budget. This Unit created and maintained a computerized Development Information System (DIS), providing access to unpublished reports and studies produced by or for DIESA, DTCD, the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs and the Centre for Human Settlements.

The Assembly acted on an October 1981 report of the Secretary-General,<sup>(3)</sup> submitted in response to a 1980 resolution,<sup>(4)</sup> describing the Unit's activities. He said there had been considerable demand for the Unit's services during 1981 and estimated that its continuation at the current operational level would cost \$447,200 in 1982-1983.

An evaluation of ISU was prepared by a consultant designated by the Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems (IOB). In his report,<sup>(2)</sup> the consultant concluded that, unless ISU could be provided with at least \$300,000 a year—the minimum needed to make it useful and comprehensive—the current limited operation should be discontinued. In transmitting this report to the Assembly, IOB stated that it could not express an opinion and felt that the Assembly must decide.

The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ), in a report to the Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> concluded that the reports of the Secretary-General and IOB had not convinced it that there was need for ISU and DIS as currently constituted.

On 18 December, the Assembly concluded that the loss of DIS could have a negative effect on international co-operation for development. Accordingly, it requested the Secretary-General to continue ISU by absorbing its cost through savings, economies and redeployment within the United Nations budget for 1982-1983. He was asked to report to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on institutional arrangements which would enable ISU to serve as a focal point for expansion, merging and distribution of the development-related data bases of the regional

commissions and for maintaining the Macrothesaurus for Information Processing in the Field of Economic and Social Development (a document-indexing tool used by several United Nations organizations). The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to improve the System's coverage and services and asked IOB to report in 1983 on the Unit's performance and utility.

The Assembly took these actions by adopting a resolution,<sup>(5)</sup> recommended by the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, by a recorded vote of 107 to 16, with 15 abstentions. On 15 December, the Committee had approved the draft, sponsored by Canada, Denmark and Pakistan, by 40 votes to 14, with 23 abstentions.

Canada, introducing the resolution, said the budgetary arguments against ISU were not relevant to the key issue of a long-term approach to the establishment of an integrated development information system in the United Nations. The sponsors had been advised that the modest sum needed to finance ISU could be found within the existing budget total.

A number of States explained their positions in the Fifth Committee. Those which voted against the resolution thought ISU should be discontinued. The USSR felt that money was being wasted on an unnecessary undertaking when so many problems required an urgent solution. The United States objected to expanding the Unit's mandate to cover co-ordination of United Nations development information systems and opposed the transfer of activities from voluntary funding to the regular budget.

Several States explained their abstentions. Brazil, Ghana and Greece said they hoped ISU might yet prove useful. India, noting that it had argued in 1980 against continuing ISU, abstained in view of the call for a review. Japan said that, although it had contributed to ISU, it could not support any proposal that might lead to a budget increase. Peru, which voted in favour in the Assembly, thought funding should be by voluntary contributions. The United Republic of Tanzania noted that both the consultant and ACABQ had concluded that DIS should be discontinued.

A number of delegations explained their positive votes. Algeria, Sierra Leone, Venezuela and Yugoslavia felt ISU could benefit developing countries. Australia agreed, adding that knowledge lost could never be regained. Guinea supported the dissemination of development information. Kenya noted that ISU had made an effort to co-operate with the Economic Commission for Africa. Mauritania wished to give ISU another chance to prove itself but had reservations on its usefulness. Morocco said it was too early to let DIS expire; if voluntary funds could not be found, financing from the United Nations

budget should continue. Pakistan thought it premature to terminate a unit which held promise but was not reaching its potential because insufficient resources had been devoted to it. Trinidad and Tobago and the United Republic of Cameroon also felt ISU had potential.

In the Fifth Committee's discussion, Denmark said a token increase in the ISU budget might suffice to expand DIS into a comprehensive system of access to development literature. Sweden stated that it continued to believe in the usefulness of ISU and DIS but would no longer make voluntary contributions, since the users and the Secretary-General had not shown a readiness to support it.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/7/Add.7; <sup>(2)</sup>IOB, A/C.5/36/7; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/6.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/217, sect. XIII, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1234); <sup>(5)</sup>36/237, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 47, 58, 76, 77 (12 Oct.-15 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/237

107-16-15 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) by vote (40-14-23). 15 December (meeting 77); 3-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.29/Rev.1); agenda item 100.

Sponsors: Canada, Denmark, Pakistan.

Establishment of an information Systems Unit in the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs The General Assembly,

Recalling section XIII of its resolution 35/217 of 17 December 1980, by which it decided that the staffing complement of the Development Information System of the Information Systems Unit would be funded temporarily by the regular budget for 1981 and that a report on the evaluation of the System should be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session,

Taking note of the report of the Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems containing an evaluation of the Development Information System of the Information Systems Unit, as well as the report of the Secretary-General and the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which provide information on the progress of the Unit since last year, and particularly the section which outlines the role that the Unit can play in the maintenance of compatibility and the exchange of development information among the regional commissions,

Mindful of the limited size of both the data base and user community of the Development Information System and of the need to improve its coverage and services,

Considering that the Development Information System, in providing access to the unpublished reports and studies produced by or for the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development and other parts of the Secretariat, will be providing a needed and valuable service to the Governments and Member States and other users of the System,

Further considering that the loss of the Development Information System could have a negative effect on international co-operation for development,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to continue the Information Systems Unit by absorbing the cost of the Unit from the resources proposed for the 1982-1983 programme budget through savings, economies and redeployment;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the potential and appropriate institutional arrangements in regard to the Information Systems Unit which would enable it to serve as a focal

point for the expansion, merging and distribution of the development-related data bases of the regional commissions and for the maintenance of the macrothesaurus;

3. Further requests the Secretary-General to undertake measures to improve the Development Information System in terms of its coverage and services;

4. Requests the Inter-Organization Board to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, through the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, on the performance and utility of the Information Systems Unit.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Portugal, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Ghana, Greece, India, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Romania, Rwanda, Spain, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania.

#### Other developments

During 1981 there were several other developments with regard to economic and social information systems. In July, the Economic and Social Council adopted two resolutions on the subject. The first dealt with preparations for the Second Intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for Informatics, scheduled for Havana, Cuba, in 1983 (p. 759). By the second, the Council recognized the importance of harmonizing United Nations information systems and made specific requests to the Secretary-General and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination on enhancing the effectiveness of such systems (p. 1385). In May, the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme acted to expand the International Referral System on the environment (INFOTERRA) (p. 826). The Industrial and Technological Information Bank, a project of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, continued to develop its data base and network of correspondents (p. 593).

#### Public administration

##### Technical co-operation

The United Nations Secretariat's Department of Technical Co-operation for Development

(DTCD) supported 86 projects in 1981, including 27 new ones, in the field of development administration, which encompassed public finance (p. 562) as well as public administration. A third of these focused on administrative reform and improvement of management practices and procedures, according to a report on United Nations technical co-operation activities prepared by the Secretary-General for the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme.<sup>(3)</sup> Emphasis was also given to programmes for alleviating shortages of skilled personnel.

Support was given to public enterprises in a number of countries to strengthen their role as effective instruments of economic development. DTCD co-operated with the Central American Institute for Public Administration, the Latin American Centre for Development Administration and the African Training and Research Centre in Administration for Development, as well as with the International Centre for Public Enterprises at Ljubljana, Yugoslavia.

An Expert Working Group on Network in Public Administration and Finance focused on the potential for global co-operation and joint activities in this field (Alcalá de Henares, Spain, 9-15 December).<sup>(2)</sup> Among seminars and workshops organized by DTCD during the year were those on: curricula design for management development (Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, 20-24 July);<sup>(1)</sup> decentralization for development (Khartoum, Sudan, 14-18 September); economic performance of public enterprises-jointly with the Government of Pakistan (Islamabad, Pakistan, 24-29 November); and strategies and measures for enhancing capabilities for development administration in developing countries Bangkok, Thailand, 9-14 December).

Publications: <sup>(1)</sup> Curricula Design for Management Development, Sales No. E.82.II.A.18; <sup>(2)</sup> Network for the United Nations Programme in Public Administration and Finance, Sales No. E.82.II.H.3.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup> S-G, DP/1982/22.

## Rural development

### Social aspects

By a resolution adopted on 6 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Economic and Social Council called on Governments to give special attention to increasing the social impact of basic rural development policies such as implementing agrarian reforms, promoting co-operative endeavours, introducing development planning, strengthening the role of national qualified personnel and encouraging popular participation in the development of rural areas. The Council requested the Secretary-General to devote special attention to social as-

pects of rural development in his 1982 report on the world social situation (p. 768). He was also invited to help increase dissemination of information on national experience and requested to report in 1983 to the Commission for Social Development on implementation of this resolution.

The resolution was adopted without vote after the Council's Second (Social) Committee had similarly approved the draft on 29 April, as recommended by the Commission for Social Development on 16 February.

The Commission on Human Settlements made several recommendations on 6 May to improve slums, squatter areas and rural settlements (p. 858).

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup> ESC, 1981/15, 6 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3.10, 11 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/15

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote, 29 April (meeting 11); draft by Commission for Social Development (E/1981/26); agenda item 10.

#### Social aspects of rural development

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling the Declaration on Social Progress and Development contained in General Assembly resolution 2542(XXIV) of 11 December 1969,

Recalling also the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, contained in the annex to General Assembly resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980.

Concerned at the distressing social conditions prevailing in rural areas of many countries.

Taking into account the need for implementing integrated rural development programmes to fight mass poverty, raise the levels of living of the rural population and achieve the goal of equitable distribution of national income,

1. Calls upon Governments, while implementing the relevant provisions of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade and national development programmes, to give special attention to increasing the social impact of basic rural development policies such as:

- (a) Implementing agrarian reforms;
- (b) Promoting co-operative endeavours;
- (c) Introducing development planning;

(d) Strengthening the role of national qualified personnel in rural development;

(e) Encouraging popular participation in the development process of rural areas:

2. Requests the Secretary-General to devote special attention in the forthcoming report on the world social situation to the social aspects of rural development, taking into account the provisions of the present resolution;

3. Invites the Secretary-General to facilitate increasing dissemination of information on national experience of countries with different socio-economic systems in rural development;

4. Further requests the Secretary-General to report to the Commission for Social Development at its twenty-eighth session on the implementation of the present resolution.

### Rural development and land reform

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), in a report to the

Economic and Social Council in June 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> described action it was taking to analyse and disseminate information on agrarian reform and rural development, as called for in the Programme of Action approved by the 1979 World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development.<sup>(9)</sup>

According to this report, review and analysis of national policies were being undertaken by high-level missions, whose reports could give guidance to developing countries in regard to policy options and to development organizations regarding assistance possibilities. United Nations agencies were conducting research, diagnostic and evaluation studies were to be undertaken and regional centres for rural development had been established in Africa and in Asia and the Pacific to analyse and disseminate information. Information furnished by Governments would be monitored by FAO, which would collaborate with other United Nations agencies to establish benchmarks and socio-economic indicators.

The FAO report was submitted following three decisions by the Council relating to the type of reports it wished to receive on this topic. It had decided in February 1980<sup>(5)</sup> that the submission of progress reports on land reform should be discontinued and that it would consider at its 1981 organizational session what type of report it would require. On 6 February 1981,<sup>(6)</sup> it requested FAO to suggest what the report might contain. The FAO suggestions, contained in a letter of 26 March,<sup>(1)</sup> were approved by the Council on 24 April<sup>(7)</sup> in a decision adopted, without vote, on an oral proposal by the President; the Council decided to consider the report in July. Addressing the Council on 14 April, the USSR stressed the importance of democratic land reform for radical socio-economic change and thought the Council should consider the topic regularly.

Taking note of the FAO report on 23 July, in a decision<sup>(8)</sup> adopted, without vote, as orally proposed by its President, the Council approved the organization's suggestion that it submit every four years, beginning in 1984, a review and analysis of agrarian reform and rural development. In making this suggestion, FAO pointed out that the 1979 Conference had stressed the need for analysis and dissemination of information on the subject.

In further action, both the Council and the General Assembly called on Governments to implement agrarian reform and rural development within the framework of their national plans and objectives and in accordance with the Conference's recommendations. The Council's action was contained in a 24 July resolution on food and agriculture,<sup>(3)</sup> and the Assembly's was incorporated in a 17 December resolution on the work of the World Food Council.<sup>(4)</sup>

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>FAO, 26 Mar., E/1981/38.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>FAO, E/1981/73.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC: 1981/71, para. 18, 24 July (p. 723). <sup>(4)</sup>GA: 36/185, para. 5, 17 Dec. (p. 723).

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(5)</sup>1980/100, para. 5, 6 Feb. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 566); <sup>(6)</sup>1981/105, 6 Feb. 1981 (p. 1091); <sup>(7)</sup>1981/106, 24 Apr., text following; <sup>(8)</sup>1981/185, 23 July, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(9)</sup>1979, p. 500.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.3, 4, 8 (6 Feb., 14 & 24 Apr.); E/1981/SR.21-34, 40 (2-23 July).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/106

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 1.

Report on land reform and rural development

At its 8th plenary meeting, on 24 April 1981, the Council approved the suggestions made by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations as to the type of report required on land reform and rural development and decided to consider that report at its second regular session of 1981 under the item entitled "General discussion of international economic and social policy, including regional and sectoral developments".

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/185

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 3.

Land reform and rural development

At its 40th plenary meeting, on 23 July 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations on land reform and rural development and decided to approve the suggestion contained in paragraph 29 thereof, concerning the submission to the Council every four years, beginning in 1984, of a report to be entitled "Review and analysis of agrarian reform and rural development".

Technical co-operation

The Department of Technical Co-operation for Development (DTCD) carried out several integrated rural development projects during 1981, according to a report by the Secretary-General on United Nations technical co-operation activities.<sup>(1)</sup>

Under the United Nations regular programme of technical co-operation, DTCD launched an interregional project to strengthen national capabilities for integrated rural development. Missions were sent to Bahrain, China, the Congo, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Guatemala, Guinea, Liberia, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, the Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand and the United Republic of Tanzania. Some supported government efforts to formulate regional and national social plans, policies and programmes, while others focused on popular participation and self-reliance or sought to enhance the participation of women in community development. In co-operation with the Economic Commission for Latin America, Panama was assisted to identify particularly disadvantaged areas and to try to improve living conditions.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, DP/1982/22.

## Co-ordination in the UN system

New priorities for rural development work by the United Nations system were agreed to in March 1981 by the Consultative Committee on Substantive Questions (Programme Matters) of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC). They called for a focus on joint action at the country level in support of national efforts, promoting popular participation in development and evaluation of rural development.

This revised orientation had been proposed by the ACC Task Force on Rural Development as the result of its own appraisal of its work, which took place at its ninth meeting (Rome, Italy, 5 and 6 February).<sup>(3)</sup> The Task Force, established in 1976 to co-ordinate assistance to States in their rural development programmes, concluded that the original objectives of its effort had not been completely achieved. It proposed a work programme realistically designed for implementation and conforming to an explicit time frame and clearly designed output. These conclusions, mentioned in the 1981 ACC overview report to the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(1)</sup> were endorsed by the Consultative Committee, which agreed that a further review and appraisal of inter-agency action in this area should take place by the end of 1983.

The results of the 1981 appraisal were considered in May/June by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC),<sup>(2)</sup> which generally agreed with the ACC assessment that the Task Force had not been as successful as desired. The Committee noted that the Programme of Action of the 1979 World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development<sup>(4)</sup> had set out inter-agency tasks and that the new work programme proposed by the Task Force was designed to produce outputs of direct use to Governments within a specified time period. It recommended that a new progress review be presented to the Economic and Social Council through CPC in 1984.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACC, E/1981/37; <sup>(2)</sup>CPC, A/36/38; <sup>(3)</sup>Task Force on Rural Development, ACC/1981/PG/4. Yearbook reference <sup>(4)</sup>1979, p. 500.

## Special measures for the least developed and other developing countries

### Least developed countries

Among the 122 developing Member States of the United Nations in 1981, 31 had been officially designated as least developed countries (LDCs), including one—Guinea-Bissau—added to the Organization's list in May by the Econom-

ic and Social Council (p. 412). Their special problems, and ways to alleviate them, were the focus of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, held in Paris in September (p. 406).

The table on p. 403 contains selected basic economic and social indicators for these countries as compared with all developing countries. The data, published by the secretariat of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD),<sup>(2)</sup> updates information furnished to the Conference on LDCs by its secretariat.<sup>(1)</sup>

Notes: (1)Conference secretariat, A/CONF.104/9 & Corr.1;

(2)UNCTAD secretariat, TD/276/Add.1.

Publications: The Least Developed Countries and Action in Their Favour by the International Community (A/CONF. 104/2/Rev.1), Sales No. E.83.I.6; United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (DPL/691).

### Comprehensive New Programme of Action

In 1979, UNCTAD had decided to launch a two-phase Comprehensive New Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries, comprising an Immediate Action Programme (1979-1981) and a Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s, aimed at transforming their economies towards self-sustained development.<sup>(1)</sup> While the initial phase was drawing to a close (see below), the Substantial New Programme of Action was adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, held in Paris from 1 to 14 September 1981 (p. 406).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(1)</sup>1979, p. 568.

### Implementation of the Immediate Action Programme (1979-1981)

After receiving preliminary information from the Secretary-General on the results of the Immediate Action Programme for the least developed countries (LDCs), the Economic and Social Council expressed deep concern in July 1981 that the Programme had not been fully implemented more than two years after its adoption and nearly at the end of the programme period (1979-1981). This provision was incorporated in a resolution of 20 July on preparations for the Conference on LDCs.<sup>(7)</sup> The phrase "nearly at the end of the programme period" was added to the original draft by its sponsor-Venezuela, on behalf of the Council members belonging to the Group of 77—after Australia remarked that a number of delegations thought it premature to declare the Programme a failure when data for the whole period were not available.

In another action on 20 July,<sup>(9)</sup> orally proposed by the Council President and adopted without vote, the Council took note of an initial report by the Secretary-General on the Programme's implementation.<sup>(4)</sup> The report, pre-

pared in response to a 1980 General Assembly request to monitor implementation of measures in favour of LDCs,<sup>(8)</sup> contained no substantive information. Rather, it drew attention to studies prepared for the Conference on LDCs and to the fact that the Preparatory Committee for the Conference had also been asked to monitor progress under the Programme.

The Committee undertook this review at its June/July session<sup>(2)</sup> but reached no conclusions, devoting most of its attention to Conference preparations (p. 404).

In further response to the Assembly request, the Secretary-General included, in his November report on the Conference,<sup>(3)</sup> a review of progress in the Programme's implementation. The report summarized information supplied by individual donor countries, the United Nations system and multilateral donor agencies. It concluded that sufficient financing had not been provided to meet one of the Programme's two main aims—an immediate boost to the economies of LDCs and alleviation of their most pressing social needs. Despite efforts by some donors, overall concessional financial resources to LDCs had declined in 1979 and, according to preliminary estimates, again in 1980, in both total and per capita real terms. As to the other main aim, the request by the Group of 77 for at least \$100 million to support preparations by LDCs for the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s remained unfulfilled.

Also included in the Secretary-General's report was information about activities by United Nations bodies in implementation of the Immediate Action Programme, including the following:

- Department of Technical Co-operation for Development. Twenty-two projects in 18 countries encompassing regional and national economic planning, strengthening and creating project formulation and evaluation units, and rural development; expert missions on mineral development.

- Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). Activities in agriculture, industry, environmental protection, regional trade expansion and co-operation, export promotion and other trade-related issues.

- Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA). Advisory services, training of personnel and research to assist Democratic Yemen and Yemen.

- World Food Council Assistance to 10 countries on food supply strategies to eradicate hunger and malnutrition.

- United Nations Industrial Development Organization. Technical assistance, training of personnel, industrial information services; solidarity meetings within the framework of economic and technical co-operation among developing countries.

- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Expenditures of \$139.3 million in 1979, \$158.3 mil-

lion in 1980 and an expected increase for 1981; in addition, \$9.8 million in 1979, \$14 million in 1980 and \$15 million in 1981 <sup>(6)</sup> from the Special Measures Fund for LDCs; special intercountry programmes in Africa, the Arab States and Asia.

- World Food Programme. Economic and social development projects and emergency operations to promote agriculture, food production and rural development, and to improve nutrition and warehouse management.

- International Labour Organisation. Technical assistance and advisory services to create employment opportunities, combat poverty and satisfy basic needs; assistance in negotiations with financial institutions for cash, equipment and materials for public works programmes.

- World Health Organization. Allocation for African LDCs of \$17.3 million in 1980-1981 budget; \$5.8 million in voluntary contributions to the Voluntary Fund for Health Promotion in LDCs.

- World Bank. Total commitments to LDCs of \$858 million for 1979, \$980 million for 1980 and \$1,186 million (estimated) for 1981, with some 80 per cent of all International Development Association credits in fiscal 1980 (1 July 1979-30 June 1980) going to countries whose per capita gross national product did not exceed \$360 (in 1978 dollars).

- International Monetary Fund. A total of 2,776 million in special drawing rights made available to LDCs during 1979 and 1980 from various Fund facilities; \$71.8 million distributed to them from gold sales profits.

- Universal Postal Union. Provision of experts and fellowships to Botswana, Cape Verde, Chad, the Comoros, Lesotho and Uganda.

- International Telecommunication Union. Help in development planning and improvement of training schemes; efforts to enable African countries to attain some objectives of the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa (1978-1988) (p. 614).

- Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. Technical assistance to 13 countries in training of personnel, developing dry docks and other port facilities, and reorganization and equipping of shipyards.

- World Intellectual Property Organization. Award of 43 fellowships for training or study courses; assistance in drafting or revising national legislation concerning intellectual property rights; aid to two African bodies for the establishment of documentation and information centres concerned with patents.

- International Fund for Agricultural Development. Assistance to LDCs amounting to \$306 million—about 35 per cent of the Fund's total aid—between December 1977 and December 1980, through either development loans on highly concessional terms or grants for technical assistance and research.

- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Special and differential treatment and technical assistance provided under tariff and non-tariff measures agreed during the Tokyo Round of negotiations, in force from 1 January 1980.<sup>(10)</sup>

A report by the UNDP Administrator, describing the Programme's role in development co-  
(continued on p. 404)

# SELECTED BASIC INDICATORS FOR LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES AS COMPARED WITH ALL DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

COUNTRY	GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT							OTHER INDICATORS			
	Population (millions) 1981	Labour force in agriculture (percentage) 1981*	Annual average growth rates (percentage) 1970-1980	\$US per capita 1981*	Agricultural output (\$US per capita) 1981*	Manufacturing output (\$US per capita) 1981*	Exports (\$US per capita) 1981*	Concessional assistance (\$US per capita) 1981	Energy consumption per capita (kg oil/coal equivalent) 1981	Average life expectancy (years) at birth 1980	Secondary school enrolment ratio (percentage) 1980*
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Afghanistan	16.3	77	1.6	238	750	48	42.5	18.3	61	37	7
Bangladesh	90.7	84	3.8	118	56	9	8.7	12.2	46	46	25
Benin	3.6	46	1.8	242	109	13	11.0	22.6	51	47	13
Bhutan	1.3	93	—	109	50	12	12.8	7.4	—	44	7
Botswana	0.8	79	10.2	1,204	182	67	480.8	116.6	424	50	22
Burundi	4.3	83	2.8	225	143	23	16.3	28.2	13	42	3
Cape Verde	0.3	56	0.3	288	60	16	18.2	154.4	253	61	23
Central African Republic	2.3	87	0.8	261	94	35	54.5	43.3	44	44	12
Chad	4.5	83	0.4	173	77	14	13.2	13.9	23	41	4
Comoros	0.4	63	1.1	285	128	15	43.4	103.0	47	47	7
Democratic Yemen	1.9	58	—	347	45	49	225.6	60.1	529	45	31
Ethiopia	32.2	79	2.4	148	73	15	11.6	8.1	29	40	11
Gambia	0.6	78	1.8	388	115	10	43.6	99.8	128	42	13
Guinea	5.1	80	3.1	360	164	11	95.2	18.6	84	45	16
Guinea-Bissau	0.8	82	0.9	268	136	5	17.5	84.1	55	42	10
Haiti	5.1	66	4.3	312	100	56	31.3	20.9	52	53	15
Lao People's Democratic Republic	3.8	73	1.0	98	6?	4	5.0	36.7	62	43	76
Lesotho	1.4	83	7.0	281	76	13	37.1	73.4	—	51	21
Malawi	6.4	83	7.0	265	108	40	44.6	21.6	48	44	4
Maldives	0.2	77	6.8	320	99	13	54.1	76.6	—	47	6
Mali	7.1	86	3.7	194	54	15	21.7	31.8	30	43	9
Nepal	14.6	92	2.0	157	98	6	9.3	12.7	11	44	79
Niger	5.5	87	4.4	354	170	19	93.1	37.5	51	43	4
Rwanda	5.0	89	7.0	251	115	32	14.1	31.0	19	45	2
Samoa	0.2	75	2.5	623	312	—	69.6	160.7	281	68	39
Somalia	4.9	80	3.9	386	191	24	40.9	78.9	63	44	8
Sudan	18.9	76	3.3	380	138	27	34.8	30.3	89	46	17
Uganda	13.6	80	0.0	356	277	15	22.8	10.5	27	54	8
United Republic of Tanzania	18.5	80	4.4	283	143	26	30.6	37.9	55	52	4
Upper Volta	7.1	81	1.7	150	55	21	10.6	30.6	29	39	3
Yemen	5.9	75	7.8	558	33	2.5	54.3	76	42	4	
All LDCs	290.6	81	3.2	220	102	19	25.0	22.1	52	45	15
All developing countries	2,280.4	58	6.0	970	765	175	725.8	16.5	459	55	32

\*Or latest year available.

## NOTES (for figures in italics)

Column 2—Maldives and Samoa=1980; Samoa=in subsistence agriculture.

Column 3—Samoa=national income 1975-1979.

Column 4—Afghanistan=tentative estimate of net material product per capita; Democratic Yemen, Samoa, Yemen and all developing countries=1980 estimate; Lao People's Democratic Republic=estimate of gross national product per capita; Maldives—at 1980 prices; Sudan and Uganda=preliminary World Bank estimate.

Column 5—Afghanistan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Sudan and Uganda=estimates; Democratic Yemen, Samoa, Yemen and all developing countries=1980 estimates.

Column 6—Democratic Yemen=1980 estimate; Yemen and all developing countries=1980; Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nepal, Sudan and Uganda=estimates.

Column 7—All developing countries=excluding major petroleum exporters.

Column 10—Maldives=1977.

Column 11—Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Democratic Yemen, Nepal and Yemen=1979; Comoros=1973; Haiti and Lao People's Democratic Republic=1978; Maldives=1977; Samoa=1970.

operation with LDCs, was submitted in March to the UNDP Governing Council.<sup>(5)</sup> It indicated that UNDP resources made available to those countries had doubled since 1970, accounting for more than 30 per cent of the Programme's total allocations, and that their share would grow during the 1982-1986 programming cycle.

Concessional assistance to LDCs in 1981 from the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the Eastern European socialist countries, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), various multilateral agencies and individual countries is detailed in the table below, based on data published by UNCTAD.<sup>(1)</sup>

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/276/Add.1.  
 Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Preparatory Committee for Conference on LDCs, A/36/45; S-G, <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/689, <sup>(4)</sup>E/1981/92; UNDP Administrator, <sup>(5)</sup>DP/554, <sup>(6)</sup>DP/1982/49.  
 Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(7)</sup>ESC, 1981/46, para. 1, 20 July (p. 406); <sup>(8)</sup>GA, S-11/4, para. 8, 15 Sep. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 553). Dec.: <sup>(9)</sup>ESC, 1981/170, 20 July 1981, text following.  
 Yearbook reference: <sup>(10)</sup>1979, p. 1328.  
 Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.35-37, 38(14-20 July).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/170

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 4.

#### Implementation of special measures in favour of the least developed countries

At its, 38th plenary meeting, on 20 July 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Review of progress in the implementation of special measures in favour of the least developed among the developing countries, including those of the immediate Action Programme for 1979-1981".

#### UN Conference on LDCs

Conference preparations. Plans for the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries were completed at the third session of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference, held at Geneva from 29 June to 10 July 1981.

The Committee considered a "non-paper" by the Conference secretariat suggesting a working draft of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s. This was considered by a Contact Group, along with several informal texts and amendments submitted by different groups. The Committee decided to transmit to the Conference, annexed to its report,<sup>(6)</sup> all these texts together with the Chairman's statement on the discussion, outlining areas of the draft on which differing views remained. The Committee further agreed that, to aid government preparations, the Chairman should prepare a synoptic paper to reflect the various proposals.

The Committee decided to bring to the attention of the pre-Conference Consultation among Senior Officials (Paris, 27 and 28 August) the Chairman's proposals for the provisional agenda and organization of work of the Conference. The Committee also approved the Conference's provisional rules of procedure.

Also prior to the Conference, each LDC prepared a presentation describing its economic situation, prospects and needs. These were reviewed by each country with its aid partners at a series of clustered meetings between April and June. Each meeting considered development potentials, bottle-necks, development objectives and priorities, assistance requirements, and projects and programmes.

### CONCESSIONAL ASSISTANCE TO LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES BY SOURCE FOR 1981 (Net amounts in millions of constant 1980 US dollars)

DONOR	AMOUNT	DONOR	AMOUNT	DONOR	AMOUNT
DAC member countries		DAC member countries (cont.)		OPEC member countries (cont.)	
Bilateral		Multilateral		Bilateral (cont.)	
Australia	55.6	African Development Fund	76.2	Qatar	3.0
Austria	9.0	Asian Development Bank	64.6	Saudi Arabia	235.0
Belgium	85.5	European Communities	481.3		
Canada	168.4	World Bank	9.8	Subtotal	455.0
Denmark	74.7	IDA	573.0	Multilateral	
Finland	23.9	Inter-American Development Bank	10.0	Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa	13.0
France	478.3	IFAD	22.6	Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development	58.0
Germany, Federal Republic of	528.7	IMF trust fund	2.6	Islamic Development Bank	54.0
Italy	60.7	United Nations	737.8	OPEC Fund	122.0
Japan	293.9				
Netherlands	285.5				
New Zealand	4.8	Subtotal	1,977.9		
Norway	90.5	OPEC member countries		Subtotal	247.0
Sweden	180.9	Bilateral		Eastern European socialist countries	430.4
Switzerland	55.8	Algeria	20.0	China	79.6
United Kingdom	296.4	Iraq	4.0		
United States	529.6	Kuwait	180.0		
Subtotal	3,222.2	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13.0	Total	6,412.1



The review meetings, and the countries they examined, were as follows:

–Asia and the Pacific (Vienna, Austria, 30 March-10 April); Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Democratic Yemen, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Nepal, Samoa, Yemen.<sup>(7)</sup>

–Eastern Africa (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 4-14 May); Burundi, Comoros, Ethiopia, Rwanda, Sudan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania.<sup>(8)</sup>

–Western and central Africa and Somalia (The Hague, Netherlands, 25 May-5 June); Benin, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Gambia, Guinea, Mali, Niger, Somalia, Upper Volta.<sup>(9)</sup>

–Southern Africa, Guinea-Bissau and Haiti (Geneva, 22-26 June); Botswana, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Lesotho, Malawi.<sup>(10)</sup>

A memorandum by Chad on its emergency assistance needs was presented at a meeting during the Conference.

Additional regional preparations included the first meeting of the Conference of Ministers of African LDCs (Addis Ababa, 26-30 July)<sup>(4)</sup> and the Ministerial Meeting of LDCs of the ESCAP and ECWA Regions (Bangkok, Thailand, 10 and 11 August).<sup>(5)</sup> The Bangkok Meeting emphasized the need for follow-up to the Programme of Action and requested the Conference to consider establishing a calendar of meetings, including a mid-term review.

A report on the situation and prospects of LDCs, with emphasis on plans for the 1980s, was submitted to the Conference by its Secretary-General.<sup>(1)</sup> After a sector-by-sector review of their problems and possibilities, the report detailed the kinds of support the international community could render.

Inter-agency consultations on the Comprehensive New Programme of Action for LDCs, devoted mainly to preparations for the Conference, were held at Geneva on 12 and 13 January,<sup>(2)</sup> 28 and 29 April<sup>(3)</sup> and 13 and 14 July. At the April meetings, participants expressed their views on follow-up to the Conference (p. 408).

On 27 June, the UNDP Governing Council requested the Administrator to ensure the full participation of UNDP in the Conference and, within existing administrative resources, to prepare for any role which might be requested of it regarding implementation of the Programme of Action for the 1980s.<sup>(12)</sup>

On 20 July, the Economic and Social Council, after expressing concern that the Immediate Action Programme (1979-1981) had not been fully implemented (p. 401), urged donor Governments and other United Nations Member States to attend the Conference at the highest political level and make firm commitments to support and implement the measures agreed. The Coun-

cil also appealed to donors, Member States and United Nations bodies for substantial aid to LDCs, particularly during the 1980s.

These actions were incorporated into a resolution<sup>(11)</sup> adopted without vote. The text was submitted by Venezuela on behalf of the Group of 77 after informal consultations had been held to revise the Group's original draft.

Australia was concerned that the request for firm commitments came close to prejudging the issue, while Canada stated that it did not usually make firm advance commitments to measures that had not been defined or agreed. The USSR spoke similarly and said it would not take on additional financial obligations.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup> The Least Developed Countries and Action in Their Favour by the International Community (A/CONF.104/2/Rev.1), Sales No. E.83.1.6.

Reports: Inter-agency consultations: <sup>(2)</sup>3rd, ACC/1981/3; <sup>(3)</sup>4th, ACC/1981/18. Ministerial meetings: <sup>(4)</sup>Africa, E/ECA/CM.8/10; <sup>(5)</sup>ESCAP and ECWA regions, A/CONF.104/12. <sup>(6)</sup>Preparatory Committee: A/36/45. Review meetings for: <sup>(7)</sup>Asia and Pacific, A/CONF.104/3; <sup>(8)</sup>eastern Africa, A/CONF.104/4;

<sup>(9)</sup>western and central Africa and Somalia, A/CONF.104/5; <sup>(10)</sup>southern Africa, Guinea-Bissau and Haiti, A/CONF.104/6.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(11)</sup>ESC, 1981/46, 20 July, text following. Dec.: <sup>(12)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/35, 27 June.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.21-34, 37, 38(2-20 July).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/46

Adopted without vote Meeting 38 20 July 1981

Draft by Venezuela, for Group of 77 (E/1981/L.48/Rev.1); agenda item 3.

#### United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling resolution 122(V) of 3 June 1979 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, by which it endorsed, as one of its major priorities, a Comprehensive New Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries in two phases: an Immediate Action Programme (1979-1981) and a Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s,

Recalling also General Assembly resolutions 34/203 of 19 December 1979 and 35/205 of 16 December 1980, by which the Assembly decided to convene the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, with the objective of finalizing, adopting and supporting the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s.

Noting with great satisfaction that the Conference will be held in Paris in September 1981.

Recalling resolution 887(XXXVII), adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Nairobi in June 1981, on the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, by which all donors, States Members of the United Nations and international organizations were urged to make firm pledges during the Conference in order to launch effectively, immediately after the Conference, the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the least developed countries, to be finalized and adopted at the Conference,

Noting also General Assembly resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, by which the Assembly adopted the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, and in particular the subsection on the least developed countries, in which the Assembly stated,

inter alia, that, as an essential priority within the Strategy, the least developed countries—the economically weakest and poorest countries with the most formidable structural problems—required a special programme of sufficient size and intensity consistent with their national plans and priorities to make a decisive break from their past and present situation and their bleak prospects.

Deeply concerned about the serious and deteriorating economic and social conditions of the least developed countries,

Noting with appreciation that some developed countries have taken positive steps towards the implementation of resolution 122(V) of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development,

1. Expresses deep concern that the Immediate Action Programme (1979-1981) has not been fully implemented more than two years after its adoption and nearly at the end of the programme period;

2. Expresses its gratitude to those Governments which have provided assistance for the preparation of the forthcoming United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries;

3. Expresses its appreciation to the secretariat of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and other United Nations bodies for their efforts in the preparation of the Conference;

4. Takes note of the statements made during the Council's second regular session of 1981 on the forthcoming Conference;

5. Notes with appreciation that the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity decided, inter alia, in resolution 887(XXXVII), to call upon the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity to address the Conference on behalf of that organization;

6. Urges all donor Governments and States Members of the United Nations to attend the Conference at the highest possible political level and to make firm commitments to support and implement the measures agreed to at the Conference, in order to launch effectively, immediately after the Conference, the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the least developed countries, to be finalized and adopted at the Conference;

7. Appeals to all donor Governments, States Members of the United Nations and appropriate United Nations organizations and programmes to provide substantial financial and material assistance to the least developed countries to support their domestic efforts aimed at promoting rapid and self-sustained socio-economic development, in particular during the 1980s.

Programme of Action for the 1980s. The Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries—the second phase of the Comprehensive New Programme of Action for LDCs (p. 401)—was adopted by acclamation by the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, held in Paris from 1 to 14 September 1981.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Programme consisted of a preamble and three chapters. The chapters dealt with the general situation and national measures, international support measures, and arrangements for implementation, follow-up and monitoring. Highlights of the Programme follow.

General situation and national measures. The main objectives of the Programme were: to promote structural changes to overcome the extreme economic difficulties of LDCs; to provide internationally accepted minimum standards for the poor; to identify

and support major investment opportunities and priorities; and to mitigate the adverse effects of natural disasters. Efforts must be made to enable each country to increase its national income substantially, even double it by 1990 as compared to the late 1970s—requiring an annual growth rate of 7.2 per cent.

The countries would set themselves appropriate objectives. Agriculture should continue to receive the highest priority in national objectives, aiming towards, and if possible surpassing, the 4 per cent annual growth target set in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.<sup>(4)</sup> A first objective was to increase food production and food security in order to eliminate hunger and malnutrition rapidly, not later than 1990. Measures to develop forestry, fisheries and livestock were also set out. High priority was attached to comprehensive and integrated rural development.

The Programme called for LDCs to mobilize their human resources through education, training and provision of incentives, and stressed the indispensable role of women in development. Emphasis was placed on improving health, nutrition and human settlements, and on appropriate national measures for family planning and population control.

Substantial support was urged to enable LDCs to exploit and develop their natural resources, complete geological surveys, and map mineral and energy resources. Energy problems were viewed with concern and measures for priority action suggested.

In the manufacturing sector, the aim was to increase output to an overall annual rate of 9 per cent or more. Measures were specified to accelerate industrial development.

Attention was called to the need to strengthen and develop physical and institutional infrastructures, safeguard the environment and promote investments that would transform economies to a high level of operation. The additional problems of the 15 land-locked and 5 island countries among the 31 LDCs were mentioned. Foreign trade objectives to expand markets and thereby increase export earnings were listed, and measures were urged to improve response to disasters.

International support measures. Only a substantial increase in official development assistance (ODA) in real terms during the current decade would enable LDCs to achieve their objectives, the Programme declared. In this regard, all donor countries reaffirmed their commitment to the target of 0.7 per cent of gross national product (GNP) for overall ODA, as envisaged in the International Development Strategy.<sup>(3)</sup> Most donors would devote 0.15 per cent of their GNP to LDCs, while others would double ODA to that group. The result, by 1985, was likely to be a doubling of ODA to those countries compared to the previous five years. As LDCs were currently financing only half their imports from export earnings, assistance was called for to improve their balance of payments.

Multilateral assistance agencies were asked for substantial and increased concessional aid. New

mechanisms should be considered, such as international tax schemes for development, further International Monetary Fund (IMF) gold sales, a link between the creation of special drawing rights (SDRS) and development assistance, and interest subsidies.

To improve the quality and effectiveness of ODA, donors were called on to: provide grants or highly concessional loans, untied whenever possible; take into account the effects of inflation on project costs; and increasingly utilize national development agencies in recipient countries for programme implementation.

An immediate action component was included in the Programme to meet the most urgent needs in such areas as food and energy shortages, debt relief, disaster assistance, aid to overcome production bottle-necks, project identification and preparation, fertilizers and pumps to improve agricultural productivity, community-level job creation activities and assurances of predictable levels of assistance.

In regard to technical assistance, emphasis was placed on the prompt provision of experts and on the training of national personnel.

Suggested commercial policy measures included: improved access to markets; promotion of exports by diversification, an integrated vertical approach to expansion, long-term sales arrangements, regional and economic co-operation among developing countries (ECDC), trade support measures and technical assistance; and international co-operation on commodities through agreements and compensation for export earnings shortfalls. Other economic policy measures included: strengthening transport and communications; improving food and agriculture by assistance to build food stocks, conclusion of an international wheat agreement, establishment of an international emergency food reserve and other measures; accelerating technological transformation; and support for ECDC and multi-country investments.

Arrangements for implementation, follow-up and monitoring. The Programme provided for national, regional and global co-operation and review.

At the national level, Governments might establish aid consultative groups or other arrangements with their development partners, or strengthen and broaden them where they already existed. Country review meetings should be held periodically, preferably starting by 1983, to consider each country's economic situation and its progress in implementing the Programme of Action, and to review aid conditions and secure further assistance. The Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) would be invited to be represented at those meetings, which would take place at the initiative of the interested LDCs. In a separate resolution,<sup>(2)</sup> the Conference noted the reports on review meetings already held (p. 405) and recommended them for consideration in follow-up action on the Programme.

At the global level, UNCTAD would have the focal role in elaborating arrangements for implementation. The Conference recommended to the General Assembly that the Intergovernmental Group on the Least Developed Countries should meet at a high

level in 1985 for a mid-term progress review and consider an end-of-decade review, possibly in the form of a second United Nations Conference on LDCs.

For global monitoring, the UNCTAD secretariat, in collaboration with United Nations bodies, would prepare information and analyse progress and policy issues. To help countries with planning, feasibility studies and project preparation in the first half of the 1980s, donors should make special allocations to the UNDP Special Measures Fund for LDCs or through other channels.

The Secretary-General was requested to make recommendations to the Assembly's 1981 regular session on arrangements to enable the United Nations Secretariat to perform follow-up, monitoring and implementation services.

After adoption of the Programme, Conference participants expressed general satisfaction at the outcome.

The Group of 77 felt the Conference had been a positive, though not decisive, sign for resumption of North-South dialogue. China spoke in similar vein. Norway said it had hoped to see the Programme incorporate objectives and measures of a magnitude greater than those which had materialized; it regretted that certain concepts of the International Development Strategy had not been included.

Differing opinions were expressed on the modalities of development assistance.

The United Republic of Tanzania, speaking for the African Group, said it would have wanted a stronger and more unequivocal commitment on the flow of resources in real terms and within a specific time frame. Bangladesh remarked that, without giving up the goals of the International Development Strategy, the Conference had attempted to see how actual commitments and agreements could be reached.

The spokesman for the European Economic Community (EEC) said the donor countries among its members, in the context of efforts to reach the general ODA target of 0.7 per cent, would aim to allocate 0.15 per cent of their GNP as aid to LDCs; some had already surpassed that target. Finland reaffirmed its commitment to the 0.7 per cent target and said it would reach the 0.15 per cent level in the coming years. Japan stated that it would try to increase assistance to LDCs in the context of its new medium-term ODA target. Saudi Arabia pointed out that its annual average aid contributions represented 6 per cent of its GNP and that 22 LDCs were among the recipients.

Australia said it would maintain a flow of resources in the context of its regional priorities and its concern to assist those in greatest need; it had more than doubled its aid to LDCs between

1978 and 1981. New Zealand could not accept specific financial sub-targets, but in assisting South Pacific countries would pay special regard to the Programme, which was directly relevant to the needs of island developing countries. The United States said its position of not accepting specific ODA targets had not changed; it continued to oppose a link between SDRs and aid, and could not support the concept of international taxation.

China stated that, in terms of being able to provide aid, it could not be placed in the same category as those developed or donor countries mentioned in reference to ODA.

Bulgaria, on behalf of the Eastern European States and Mongolia, said it viewed recommendations on financial and other assistance as directed towards industrially developed capitalist States; those socialist States were determined to contribute significantly to the Programme's measures and targets which corresponded to the principles of the socialist system and of their system of economic relations with developing countries.

With regard to LDC exports, the EEC spokesman said EEC would examine ways of meeting the recommendation on export earnings stabilization and further improvements to the EEC scheme of generalized preferences. The United States considered IMF the best forum for dealing with financial difficulties caused by export earnings shortfalls, while Canada would have preferred the Programme to refer to the IMF balance-of-payments approach to export earnings compensation and Japan felt that studies on this subject should be continued in the international organizations already dealing with it.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup> Report of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (A/CONF.104/22/Rev.1), Sales No. E.82.I.8.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup> Conference on LDCs: 1, 14 Sep. GA: <sup>(3)</sup> 35/56, annex, para. 24, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 505); <sup>(4)</sup> *ibid.*, para. 28 (p. 506).

**Implementation of the Programme of Action.** Initial steps to follow up the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for LDCs were authorized by the General Assembly in December 1981 and United Nations organizations made plans for inter-agency co-ordination in implementing the Programme.

At the fourth inter-agency consultations on the Comprehensive New Programme of Action for LDCs, convened by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) at Geneva on 28 and 29 April,<sup>(2)</sup> participants expressed the view that follow-up for review and co-ordination of assistance to LDCs should not duplicate existing national, regional and international mechanisms, and that full consultations should take place with the agencies concerned.

On 30 October, ACC decided that implementation and follow-up by secretariats in the United Nations system would be carried out through inter-agency consultations to be convened by the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation within the ACC work programme.<sup>(9)</sup>

Responding to the request contained in the Programme (p. 407), the Secretary-General, in a report of 9 November to the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> made proposals for United Nations Secretariat services for follow-up, monitoring and implementation, to be provided by the Director-General, UNCTAD, and the regional commissions for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Western Asia.

Under these arrangements, at the national level the Secretariat would help organize country reviews if requested by the Governments concerned and resident co-ordinators for United Nations system development assistance in each LDC would ensure coherence in the contributions of participating organizations. Regional commissions would contribute to the follow-up within their areas and assist in organizing and synchronizing country reviews. At the global level, where the Conference had proposed that UNCTAD play the focal role, the UNCTAD secretariat would prepare information and submit progress reports, while other United Nations bodies would report periodically on their own contribution.

On 17 December, the Assembly adopted a resolution on the results of the Conference<sup>(7)</sup> by which it endorsed the Programme of Action, called, on Member States and international organizations to implement it immediately as part of international action for the establishment of a new international economic order, and urged donors to implement their commitments and to make adequate special allocation to the Special Measures Fund of UNDP or other suitable channels. After reaffirming that LDCs had primary responsibility for their development, the Assembly decided that review and monitoring of progress in implementation of the Programme should be undertaken as envisaged therein, that resources to be made available to UNCTAD and other United Nations bodies would be adequate for the purpose and that the mid-term review would be carried out by the UNCTAD Intergovernmental Group on LDCs at a high-level meeting in 1985. The Secretary-General was requested to report in 1982 on the resolution's implementation.

This resolution was adopted, without vote, as recommended by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, which approved it in like manner on 7 December. The draft was submitted

by a Committee Vice-Chairman following informal consultations on a text submitted by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77,<sup>(1)</sup> subsequently withdrawn.

In addition to drafting changes, the resolution differed from the Group's text in several respects. The paragraph by which the Assembly reaffirmed the responsibility of LDCs for their own development was not in the earlier version. By the Group's draft, the Assembly would have called on the developed countries in particular to implement the Programme and would have decided to ensure that additional resources were made available to the appropriate United Nations bodies for follow-up. Also, the Assembly would have decided to convene the Intergovernmental Group in order to carry out the mid-term review; by the compromise text it decided that the Group should carry out the review and that the results be made available to it for review and appraisal of the implementation of the International Development Strategy.<sup>(4)</sup> Further, the Group of 77 text would have had the Assembly urge that aid consultative groups or other review arrangements be established without delay; whereas by the adopted text, the Assembly called on States, the United Nations system and other relevant agencies to respond favourably to invitations to participate in such consultations.

Also on 17 December, the Assembly adopted without vote a decision<sup>(10)</sup> whereby it took note of the report of the Conference Preparatory Committee (p. 404) and the report of the Secretary-General on the Conference (p. 408). On 7 December, the Second Committee had approved the draft in the same manner, on an oral proposal by the Chairman.

Special measures for LDCs were called for in three other resolutions adopted on 17 December. In a resolution on the United Nations Capital Development Fund,<sup>(8)</sup> the Assembly endorsed a UNDP Governing Council proposal of 19 June that the Fund be enabled to play a direct role in the Programme's implementation<sup>(11)</sup> and requested the Council to enhance the Fund's capacity to respond to the priority needs of LDCs. In a resolution on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly requested the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization to increase technical co-operation and the programmes and projects for LDCs. In a resolution on food,<sup>(6)</sup> the Assembly reiterated its belief that food aid for LDCs should be provided, in so far as possible, in the form of grants or on highly concessional terms and that donors should consider paying transport costs.

Following the adoption of the resolution on follow-up to the Conference, Australia, New Zealand, Poland (on behalf of the Eastern European

States) and the United States reiterated the positions they had taken at the Conference (p. 407).

In the Second Committee's discussion, most speakers welcomed the results of the Conference as constructive and urged action to ensure implementation of the Programme. Among LDCs, Cape Verde said it had intensified its agricultural development efforts but would have to rely on international assistance for its food security. Mali gave rural development and transport and communications as its priorities. Democratic Yemen urged that developed countries provide financial support and open up their markets to help LDCs change their structures and diversify their economies.

With regard to targets for international assistance, Canada said it intended to devote 0.15 per cent of its GNP as ODA to LDCs. France attached particular importance to the unilateral pledges made by donors at the Conference, including some which had announced specific budgetary provisions for ODA. Japan hoped donors would double their aid to LDCs in the first half of the 1980s. New Zealand mentioned its long-term commitment to assist small Pacific island countries. Norway, speaking for the Nordic States, endorsed the 0.15 per cent target as a whole but said it should be viewed in the context of overall development assistance targets and time frames in the International Development Strategy. Denmark, also speaking for this group, welcomed the Conference's mention of the UNDP Special Measures Fund for LDCs as a channel for allocating resources. The United States supported the Programme as a reasonable balance between the primary responsibility of LDCs for their development and the responsibility of the international community to help; the United States had significantly increased its assistance to those countries.

The need for greater assistance to the landlocked LDCs was stressed by Afghanistan. The Congo believed that a number of the poorer developing countries should be able to benefit from the assistance advocated for LDCs. Egypt thought the results of the Conference should be incorporated into the International Development Strategy. Israel said it was willing to continue to share with LDCs its experience in agricultural production, an area to which it believed those countries should accord highest priority. Mexico regarded the Programme as inadequate and said efforts should be made to exceed the agreed ODA target. Romania believed the developed countries had a special responsibility to assist LDCs, though not at the expense of other developing countries.

The Eastern European States held colonialist, neo-colonialist and imperialist practices to be

mainly responsible for the backwardness of LDCs. Bulgaria said their basic problems could not be solved unless fundamental issues such as ensuring peace and promoting disarmament were borne in mind. The Byelorussian SSR considered that a solution depended on the efforts of LDCs to use their resources effectively, introduce reforms, protect their sovereignty over their natural resources and strengthen the economic role of the state sector. The German Democratic Republic said some LDCs had expressed concern at politically motivated decisions to suspend aid to them; a credible commitment to the Programme for LDCs meant being guided by those countries' objective economic needs, which excluded a political approach.

Regarding follow-up to the Conference, Bangladesh favoured the arrangement envisaged in the Programme according to which each LDC had the option of selecting the lead agency for its contacts with its development partners and working out details of consultative arrangements with that agency. Austria remarked that the regional meetings that had preceded the Conference (p. 405) had initiated an innovative and promising approach to collaboration between LDCs and donor countries.

Australia was of the view that UNCTAD should not require additional resources for follow-up. The Sudan, on the other hand, hoped the Assembly would provide UNCTAD and other bodies with the financial and human resources they needed for the purpose.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.115.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>4th inter-agency consultations, ACC/1981/18; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/660.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503); <sup>(5)</sup>36/182, sect. I, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 579); <sup>(6)</sup>36/185, para. 13, 17 Dec. (p. 724); <sup>(7)</sup>36/194, 17 Dec., text following; <sup>(8)</sup>36/196, paras. 3 & 4, 17 Dec. (p. 469).

Decisions: <sup>(9)</sup>ACC: 1981/15, 30 Oct. <sup>(10)</sup>GA: 36/448, 17 Dec., text following. <sup>(11)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1): 81/2, para. 6, 19 June.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/828; S-G statements, A/C.2/36/L.127, A/C.5/36/95.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10.26, 28-32, 34, 44, 46 (24 Sep.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/194

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.12) without vote, 7 December (meeting 461; draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.139), based on Informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.115); agenda item 69 (p).

United Nations Conference on the  
Least Developed Countries

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the

Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Reaffirming that in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade the General Assembly stated, *inter alia*, that as an essential priority within the Strategy, the least developed countries-the economically weakest and poorest countries with the most formidable structural problems-require a special programme of sufficient size and intensity consistent with their national plans and priorities to make a decisive break from their past and present situation and their bleak prospects,

Recalling resolution 122(V) of 3 June 1979 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in which the Conference decided, as one of its major priorities, to launch a Comprehensive New Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries in two phases, an Immediate Action Programme, 1979-1981, and a Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s, which was endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 34/210 of 19 December 1979,

Recalling also its resolutions 34/203 of 19 December 1979 and 35/205 of 16 December 1980 on convening a United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries with the objective of finalizing, adopting and supporting the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the least developed countries,

Deeply concerned at the gravity of the deteriorating economic and social situation of the least developed countries and their dismal development during the past two decades, as well as their bleak development prospects for the 1990s.

Recalling that the objective of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries, adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, is to transform the economies of those countries towards self-sustained development and enable them to provide internationally accepted minimum standards of nutrition, health, transport and communications, housing and education as well as job opportunities to all their citizens, particularly to the rural and urban poor,

Expressing deepest concern that more than two years after the adoption of the Immediate Action Programme, 1979-1981, contained in resolution 122(V) of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, very limited progress has been made towards its implementation,

Reaffirming that there is an immediate need for a greatly expanded programme, including a major increase in the transfer of additional resources, to meet the critical needs of the least developed countries and to help them promote more rapid socio-economic development,

Stressing that external support should be forthcoming from all developed countries, developing countries in a position to do so, multilateral development institutions and other sources,

Emphasising the particular importance of the contribution that economic co-operation and technical co-operation among developing countries can make, *inter alia*, to the development of the least developed among them,

Recognizing the need for extensive public awareness throughout the world of the desperate plight of the least developed countries and the importance and objectives of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries,

Taking note of the Report of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries,

Taking note also of the report of the Secretary-General on secretariat services for the follow-up, monitoring and implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action,

1. Endorses the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Government and the people of France for acting as host to the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, as well as for their gracious hospitality, excellent arrangements and important contribution to the outcome of the Conference;

3. Calls upon all Member States as well as intergovernmental and multilateral institutions, the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, and all others concerned to take immediate, concrete and adequate steps to implement the Substantial New Programme of Action as part of the international action for the establishment of a new international economic order;

4. Emphasizes that, in view of their desperate socio-economic plight, the least developed countries need the urgent and special attention and the large-scale and continued support of the international community to enable them to progress towards self-reliant development, consistent with their own plans and programmes;

5. Strongly urges all donor countries to implement their commitments, as stated in paragraphs 61 to 69 of the Substantial New Programme of Action, so as to achieve, in that regard, a substantial increase of assistance for the development of the least developed countries;

6. Reaffirms that the least developed countries have primary responsibility for their overall development and that, although international support measures are vitally important, the domestic policies those countries pursue will be of critical importance for the success of their development efforts;

7. Urges all donor countries to make adequate special allocation to the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries of the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Capital Development Fund, or through other suitable channels for the least developed countries, in order to provide the extra resources needed by the Governments of those countries for more intensive planning efforts, feasibility studies and project preparation over the first half of the decade of the 1980s and, for that purpose, invites the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme to take appropriate action to mobilize additional resources for the activities under his administration;

8. Decides that regular review and monitoring of the progress in the implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action at the national, regional and global levels should be undertaken, as envisaged in that Programme, to maintain the momentum of commitments made by the international community and to promote the implementation of the plans and programmes of the least developed countries with a view to achieving accelerated growth rates and structural transformation of their economies;

9. Decides also that the Intergovernmental Group on the Least Developed Countries of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at its high-level meeting in 1985 shall carry out the mid-term review, consider the possibility of holding a global review at the end of the decade, which might, inter alia, take the form of a United Nations conference on the least developed countries, and readjust, as appropriate, the Substantial New Programme of Action for the second half of the decade in order to ensure its full implementation, and further decides that the results shall be made available to it, so that they may be taken fully into account in the review and appraisal of the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

10. Calls upon States, organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system and other relevant agencies to give favourable response to invitations to participate in aid consultative groups or other arrangements to be established at the initiative of the least developed countries in accordance with paragraphs 110 to 116 of the Substantial New Programme of Action as a mechanism for the regular and periodic review and implementation of that Programme and suggests that the first round of review meetings for that purpose at the country level should take place as soon as possible, preferably by 1983;

11. Invites the governing bodies of appropriate organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to take the necessary and appropriate measures for the effective implementation and follow-up of the Substantial New Programme of Action within their respective spheres of competence and mandates;

12. Decides further to ensure that resources that will be made available to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and other appropriate organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system are adequate for the effective follow-up, review, monitoring and implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action, including those specified in the report of the Secretary-General on the secretariat services required, as well as in paragraph 8 of the present resolution;

13. Requests the Secretary-General, in conformity with paragraph 123 of the Substantial New Programme of Action, to entrust the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, in close collaboration with the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the executive secretaries of the regional commissions and the lead agencies for the aid groups, with the responsibility of ensuring at the Secretariat level the full mobilization and co-ordination of all organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system for the purpose of implementation and follow-up of the Substantial New Programme of Action and, for this purpose, to retain and effectively utilize the system of focal points in each United Nations agency, which was used in the preparations for the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries;

14. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

#### **General Assembly decision 36/448**

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.12) without vote, 7 December (meeting 46); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 69 (p).

#### **United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries**

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, took note of the report of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries as well as of the report of the Secretary-General on the Conference.

#### **List of LDCs**

Guinea-Bissau was added in 1981 to the United Nations list of LDCs, raising the total number of countries therein to 31 (p. 403). The Economic and Social Council requested in July that the situation of Togo be examined with a view to its inclusion, and the General Assembly took similar action in December with respect to Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Liberia, and Sao Tome and Principe. Recommendations with respect to additions to the list continued to be made by the Committee for Development Planning (CDP) on the basis of three main criteria—per capita gross domestic product (GDP), share of manufacturing output in total GDP and adult literacy rate.

**CDP ACTION.** At its March/April 1981 session, in accordance with 1980 requests by the Economic and Social Council<sup>(12)</sup> and the General Assembly,<sup>(7)</sup> CDP reviewed the economic situation of Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Tonga and certain newly independent developing countries, with a view to their inclusion in

the list of LDCs. The review was based on the most recent available data provided by the Secretariat in respect of the three main criteria,<sup>(3)</sup> covering the aforementioned countries and Dominica, Kiribati, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu and Zimbabwe.

In its report to the Council,<sup>(4)</sup> CDP concluded that only Guinea-Bissau met the criteria and recommended that it be added to the list. The Committee added that the possibility of revising the criteria used to identify LDCs deserved to be explored, as did the broader question of the usefulness of such groupings as developing island and land-locked countries and those most seriously affected by economic crises.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION (MAY). On 8 May, the Economic and Social Council acted on the CDP recommendation by deciding without vote to add Guinea-Bissau to the list. The resolution to this effect,<sup>(5)</sup> based on informal consultations, was submitted by a Council Vice-President.

In the discussion, Djibouti objected to its exclusion from the list, saying that it was a drought-stricken country whose per capita annual GDP (given in the Secretariat note to CDP as \$947 at current market prices for the period 1976-1978) did not take into account high local prices, the presence of many expatriates and the overvaluation of production compared to less urbanized countries having more subsistence production.

Regarding criteria for inclusion in the list, Australia thought additional factors such as nutrition levels and life expectancy should be taken into account; it was also concerned that the current measures might exclude large countries with high enough aggregate figures but having major pockets of poverty, as well as small countries, such as several in the Pacific, whose GDP had been distorted by large amounts of external aid. Denmark, for the Nordic States, agreed with CDP on the desirability for a fresh appraisal of the criteria. Brazil observed that such a review would require political as well as technical input. Bangladesh stated that its approval of the resolution was not intended to prejudge its position on the views of CDP regarding criteria.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION (JULY). On 20 July, the Economic and Social Council requested CDP to examine the economic situation of Togo, with a view to including it in the list on the basis of existing criteria, and to make a recommendation to the Council as soon as possible. The Council acted by adopting without vote a resolution<sup>(6)</sup> sponsored by Burundi, Senegal, Togo, Zaire and Zambia, and introduced by Zambia.

The action was taken after the Council President received a request to this effect from Togo,

contained in a letter dated 6 July,<sup>(2)</sup> which cited figures concerning its economy and noted that it had been classified as least developed by the European Economic Community.

In the Council's discussion, Australia and Denmark reiterated their view that the criteria should be re-examined at an appropriate time; Australia added that the information provided by Togo suggested that its characteristics did not differ much from those of countries which CDP had found not to meet the criteria. The United States also supported a review of criteria and said it could agree to applying them retroactively to countries already on the list if that was generally regarded as appropriate. Togo and Zambia agreed on the need for a review of criteria, but Togo said its figures had been calculated according to accepted methods. Bangladesh opposed any proposal to modify the criteria.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 17 December, in resolutions on special economic assistance to specific African States, the General Assembly requested the Economic and Social Council to invite CDP to consider the eligibility of Djibouti,<sup>(11)</sup> Equatorial Guinea,<sup>(8)</sup> Liberia,<sup>(9)</sup> and Sao Tome and Principe<sup>(10)</sup> for inclusion in the list of LDCs, in the light of new data from those Governments. In the case of Equatorial Guinea, the Assembly noted that UNDP would assist the Government in preparing new statistics on national income and population. The Secretary-General was requested to assist Sao Tome and Principe to prepare new national income figures. In regard to Liberia, the Assembly invited the Government to provide the data to CDP.

The preamble of the resolution on Liberia mentioned a letter from that country to the Council President,<sup>(\*)</sup> dated 20 October, containing statistics on its economic situation and asking for a study of its economic conditions so that it could be classified among the least developed.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Liberia, 20 Oct., E/1981/115; <sup>(2)</sup>Togo, 6 July, E/1981/94.

Note: <sup>(3)</sup>Secretariat, E/AC.54/L.107.

Report: <sup>(4)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(5)</sup>1981/34, 8 May, text following; <sup>(6)</sup>1981/47, 20 July, text following. GA: <sup>(7)</sup>35/106, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, 557); <sup>(8)</sup>36/204, paras. 2 & 5, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 510); <sup>(9)</sup>36/207, paras. 7 & 8, 17 Dec. (p. 516); <sup>(10)</sup>36/209, paras. 7 & 8, 17 Dec. (p. 520); <sup>(11)</sup>36/216, para. 5, 17 Dec. (p. 509).

Decision: <sup>(12)</sup>ESC: 1980/161, 24 July 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 556).

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.8-10, 12, 18, 35, 36, 38 (24 Apr.-8 May & 14-20 July).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/34

Adopted without vote Meeting 18 8 May 1981

Draft by Vice-President (E/1981/L.37), based on informal consultations on COP recommendation (E/1981/27); agenda item 4.



Inclusion of Guinea-Bissau in the list  
of the least developed countries

The Economic and Social Council,

Bearing in mind its decision 1980/161 of 24 July 1980, in which it requested the Committee for Development Planning to expedite the review of the economic situation of Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Tonga and certain newly independent developing countries, with a view to their inclusion in the list of the least developed countries, and to make recommendations concerning those countries to the Council at its first regular session of 1981,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/106 of 5 December 1980, in which the Assembly decided to authorize the Economic and Social Council to consider, at its first regular session of 1981, the recommendations of the Committee for Development Planning on the above-mentioned countries and, accordingly, to add any of those countries to the list of the least developed countries on the basis of existing criteria and the most recent data relating to the above-mentioned countries, and in which the Assembly further decided that that exercise should be without prejudice to any future overall review of the list of the least developed countries which might be authorized at a later date by the Assembly in accordance with established procedures,

Taking note of chapter IV of the report of the Committee for Development Planning on its seventeenth session and statements made in the Council in this regard,

Decides to add Guinea-Bissau to the list of the least developed countries.

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/47

Adopted without vote Meeting 38 20 July 1981

5-nation draft (E/1981/L.46/Rev.1); agenda item 4.

Sponsors: Burundi, Senegal, Togo, Zaire, Zambia.

Review of the economic situation in Togo with a view  
to the inclusion of that country in the list  
of the least developed countries

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 2768(XXVI) of 18 November 1971, 3487(XXX) of 12 December 1975, and 32/92 and 32/99 of 13 December 1977, establishing the current list of the least developed countries.

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 34/121, 34/123, 34/124, 34/126, 34/131 and 34/132 of 14 December 1979,

Recalling also General Assembly resolutions 34/203 and 34/210 of 19 December 1979 and 35/205 of 16 December 1980 concerning the convening of a United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries,

Having examined the letter of 6 July 1981 addressed to the President of the Economic and Social Council by the Permanent Representative of Togo to the United Nations Office and the specialized agencies at Geneva concerning the serious economic situation of his country,

Requests the Committee for Development Planning to examine the economic situation of Togo, with a view to including that country in the list of the least developed countries on the basis of existing criteria and the most recent data relating to those criteria and that country, and to make a recommendation concerning Togo for consideration by the Council as early as possible.

### Land-locked developing countries

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), which managed the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries (p. 415), identified a total of 21 such countries in 1981: 14 in Africa, 5 in Asia and the Pacific and 2 in Latin America.

The Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for LDCs (p. 406) pointed out that 15 of the 31 LDCs were land-locked and urged that, in co-operation with their transit neighbours, they should try to improve transit/transport-related facilities.<sup>(1)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 17 December 1981, by a resolution on action related to the needs and problems of land-locked developing countries,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly reaffirmed their rights to free access to and from the sea and to freedom of transit. It appealed to States and international organizations to implement urgently the actions envisaged in earlier United Nations resolutions, including three adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD),<sup>(4)</sup> as well as in the International Development Strategy<sup>(2)</sup> and the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s. Donor countries, others able to do so and international organizations were urged to provide financial and technical aid in grant form or concessional loans for transport and transit facilities. The Assembly also invited transit countries to co-operate with the land-locked developing countries in harmonizing transport planning and promoting joint transport ventures.

The resolution, sponsored by 20 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 137 to none, with 6 abstentions. Paragraph 1, reaffirming the right of free access and transit to and from the sea, was adopted by a recorded vote of 59 to 9, with 66 abstentions.

The draft was approved on 13 November by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee by a recorded vote of 120 to none, with 7 abstentions, following the approval of paragraph 1 by a recorded vote of 46 to 11, with 65 abstentions. Both Committee votes were requested by India.

Introducing the text in the Committee, Bolivia stated that absence of tangible results showed that the international community was not fully aware of the difficulties faced by land-locked developing countries in exporting products. It was essential not only to remedy an injustice but to correct a situation in which some countries were taking advantage of efforts made by others.

Explaining their 'negative votes on the paragraph concerning free access and transit, Angola, Nigeria, Pakistan and Yemen said these questions were best dealt with bilaterally. This point was also made by Liberia and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; they added that the issues affected the sovereignty of transit countries and had been discussed extensively in the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. India and Thailand spoke similarly and also

expressed reservations with regard to the invitation to transit countries to harmonize transport facilities. Sierra Leone found the paragraph's wording too categorical.

Among those abstaining in the vote on the paragraph, Algeria, Ghana, Jordan, Mauritania, Senegal, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and the United Republic of Cameroon saw the matter as bilateral or subregional. Some of these, along with Benin and Morocco, mentioned that the Conference on the Law of the Sea was dealing with the matter. Mozambique shared the reservations expressed regarding free access.

Voting for the paragraph and the resolution as a whole, Brazil said lack of access to the sea posed problems for the economic development of the least developed land-locked countries which could be significantly reduced by bilateral agreements. Peru and Uruguay stated that adoption of the resolution should not prejudice the results of the Conference on the Law of the Sea; Uruguay added that international law did not provide for unlimited rights of communication with the sea. The USSR said it had bilateral agreements with a number of land-locked countries and had helped some develop their transport infrastructures; the paragraph would place no more responsibilities on the USSR than it had already assumed. Viet Nam believed the issues of access and transit should be settled bilaterally, in full respect for sovereignty.

Abstaining in the vote on the resolution as a whole, Pakistan said the text should have taken account of the needs of transit countries, some of which were among the world's poorest and also needed international assistance to develop their infrastructures.

During 1981, special economic assistance programmes established by the General Assembly were under way in seven land-locked developing countries in Africa: Botswana, Central African Republic, Chad, Lesotho, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe (p. 497).

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Report Of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (A/CONF.104/22/Rev.1), Sales No. E.82.I.8.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/56, annex, paras. 136-146, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 515); <sup>(3)</sup>36/175, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(4)</sup>1972, p. 280; 1976, p. 399; 1979, p. 493.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28, 29-32, 35, 39 (24 Sep.-13 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/175

137-0-6 (recorded vote) Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.1) by recorded vote (120-0-7), 13 November (meeting 39); 20-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.24); agenda item 69.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Bhutan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Mali, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Paraguay, Rwanda, Uganda, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Specific action related to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries

The General Assembly,

Reiterating the specific actions related to the particular needs of the land-locked developing countries stated in resolutions 63(III) of 19 May 1972, 98(IV) of 31 May 1976 and 123(V) of 3 June 1979 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development,

Recalling the provisions of its resolutions 31/157 of 21 December 1976, 32/191 of 19 December 1977, 33/150 of 20 December 1978, 34/198 of 19 December 1979 and 35/58 of 5 December 1980 and other resolutions of the United Nations relating to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries,

Bearing in mind various other resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, its related organs and the specialized agencies, emphasizing special and urgent measures in favour of land-locked developing countries,

Recalling the relevant provisions of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.

Recognizing that the lack of territorial access to the sea, aggravated by remoteness and isolation from world markets, and the prohibitive transit, transport and trans-shipment costs impose serious constraints on the socio-economic development of land-locked developing countries,

Noting with concern that the measures taken so far in favour of land-locked developing countries and the assistance given fall far short of their needs,

1. Reaffirms the right of land-locked developing countries to free access to and from the sea and their right to freedom of transit;

2. Appeals to all States, international organizations and financial institutions to implement, as a matter of urgency and priority, the specific actions related to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries envisaged in resolutions 63(III), 98(IV) and 123(V) of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, in the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries and in other relevant resolutions of the United Nations;

3. Urges all donor countries, as well as others in a position to do so, and the international organizations concerned, to provide land-locked developing countries with appropriate financial and technical assistance in the form of grants or concessional loans for the construction and improvement of their transport and transit infrastructures and facilities;

4. Urges also the international community and multilateral and bilateral financial institutions to intensify efforts in raising the net flow of resources to land-locked developing countries to help offset the adverse effects of their disadvantageous geographical situation on their economic development efforts, in keeping with the overall development needs of each land-locked developing country;

5. Invites the transit countries to co-operate effectively with the land-locked developing countries in harmonizing transport planning and promoting other joint ventures in the field of transport at the regional, subregional and bilateral levels;

6. Commends the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and other United Nations agencies for their work and the assistance they have provided to the land-locked developing countries and invites them to continue to take appropriate and effective measures to respond to the specific needs of those countries;

7. Invites the international community to give financial

support to interested transit and land-locked developing countries in the construction of alternative routes to the sea;

8. Recommends continued and intensified activities relating to the conducting of necessary studies and the implementation of special actions and action programmes for the land-locked developing countries, including those in the area of economic co-operation among developing countries, as well as those that have been envisaged in the programme of work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the regional commissions and other programmes and activities at the regional and subregional levels.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran,<sup>a</sup> Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Burma, Chile, India, Lebanon, Pakistan, Sierra Leone.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain

## UN Special Fund for

### Land-locked Developing Countries

No new projects were financed in 1981 by the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries, in view of the low level of contributions to the Fund (p. 416). Some allocations were made to small-scale projects previously approved. Total allocations since the Fund became operational amounted to \$681,000, covering 12 projects. At year's end some \$400,000 was unencumbered, of which \$350,000 had been allotted to the three regions containing land-locked developing countries; negotiations were under way for commitment of this money. The Fund was in its fifth year; its statute was approved by the General Assembly in 1976.<sup>(3)</sup>

On 19 June, <sup>(9)</sup> the UNDP Governing Council appealed to all countries to review their position with respect to the Fund and to contribute urgently and generously. The Administrator was requested to report on the Fund's activities biennially, beginning in 1983.

On 22 July, <sup>(6)</sup> the Economic and Social Council decided without vote to take note of the Governing Council's action and a report by the Administrator<sup>(2)</sup> on the Fund's 1980 activities.<sup>(10)</sup> The draft decision was similarly approved on 17 July by the Council's Third (Programme and Co-

ordination) Committee, on an oral proposal by its Chairman.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly, urging Member States to give due consideration to the special constraints affecting the development of land-locked developing countries, appealed to donor countries to review their position with respect to the Fund, with a view to giving greater support. It appealed to Member States—particularly developed countries—and to financial institutions to contribute generously in order to implement measures relating to land-locked developing countries provided for in the International Development Strategy.<sup>(4)</sup> The Assembly requested the UNDP Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary-General of UNCTAD and heads of other bodies, to continue action in favour of those countries.

The resolution was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 22 abstentions. The draft, submitted by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77, was approved by the Second Committee on 16 November by 112 votes to none, with 20 abstentions. Introducing the text, Algeria remarked that, owing to lack of resources, the Fund had been unable to meet the needs of the land-locked developing countries.

Explaining the Nordic States' abstentions in the vote, Denmark said they opposed the proliferation of special funds and preferred to channel aid through existing bodies. For the European Community members, the United Kingdom said they felt that assistance to the countries in question should be proportional to their individual levels of development and, therefore, they preferred to contribute through bilateral or multilateral programmes.

On oral proposals of its President, the Assembly took two decisions on 17 December, both without vote, deferring action on the inauguration of the permanent machinery envisaged for the Fund by its statute. First,<sup>(7)</sup> the Assembly deferred to 1982 the election of the Fund's Board of Governors. Second,<sup>(8)</sup> it took note of information contained in a note by the Secretary-General<sup>(1)</sup> to the effect that he was not submitting for Assembly confirmation an appointment for the post of Executive Director. The Fund thus continued on an interim basis under UNDP management, in collaboration with UNCTAD.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G. A/36/816.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/541.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>31/177, annex, 21 Dec. 1976 (YUN 1976, p. 356); <sup>(4)</sup>35/56, annex, paras. 152-155, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 517); <sup>(5)</sup>36/195, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decisions: <sup>(6)</sup>ESC: 1981/173, 22 July, text following. GA: <sup>(7)</sup>36/319, 17 Dec., text following; <sup>(8)</sup>36/321,

17 Dec., text following. <sup>(9)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1): 81/3, 19 June.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(10)</sup>1980, p. 550.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/C.3/1981/SR.9-12, 16 (13-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.39 (22 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3, 6, 33, 38, 39, 40, 42 (24 Sep.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/173

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/102) without vote, 17 July (meeting 16); draft orally proposed by Chairman; agenda item 17.

##### United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries

At Its 39th plenary meeting, on 22 July 1981, the Council took note of:

(a) The report of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme on the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries;

(b) Decision 81/3 of 19 June 1981 adopted by the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme at its twenty-eighth session.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/195

119-0-22 Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/812) by vote (112-0-20), 16 November (meeting 40); draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.64); agenda item 70 (g).

##### United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 31/177 of 21 December 1976, by which it approved the statute of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries,

Recalling also its resolutions 32/113 of 15 December 1977, 33/85 of 15 December 1978, 34/209 of 19 December 1979 and 35/82 of 5 December 1980,

Taking account of resolution 123(V) of 3 June 1979 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and decisions 80/21 of 26 June 1980 and 81/3 of 19 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme,

Recalling its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, and the relevant provisions of the Strategy, in particular paragraphs 152 to 155,

Recalling further the relevant paragraphs of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries, adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries,

Convinced that access to world markets at the least possible cost is an integral part of meaningful economic development of land-locked developing countries,

Bearing in mind that a large number of countries classified as least developed are land-locked developing countries.

Expressing deep concern at the consistently very low level of contributions that have been pledged to the Fund since its establishment,

Noting that, according to the report of the Secretary-General prepared in response to General Assembly resolution 34/207 of 19 December 1979, contributions to the Fund must increase significantly if it is to be effective in meeting the large requirements for reducing the real costs of transit for land-locked developing countries,

Noting further that the demands for assistance from the Fund are additional to, and generally different from, the types of activities financed from other sources of the United Nations system,

1. Urges all Member States to give due consideration to

the special constraints affecting the economic and social development of land-locked developing countries;

2. Appeals to all donor countries to review their position with respect to the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries, with a view to extending greater support to it;

3. Also appeals to all Member States, in particular developed countries, and to multilateral and bilateral financial institutions to contribute significantly and generously to the Fund in order to implement the measures relating to land-locked developing countries provided for in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

4. Requests the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, in consultation with the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the executive heads of other related bodies, to continue to pursue action in favour of land-locked developing countries within the framework of the interim arrangements, bearing in mind that each country concerned should receive appropriate technical and financial assistance.

#### General Assembly decision 36/319

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 17 (e).

##### Election of the members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the proposal of its President, decided to defer to its thirty-seventh session the election of the members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries.

#### General Assembly decision 36/321

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President: agenda item 18 (I)

##### Confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly took note of the information contained in the note by the Secretary-General.

#### Finances of the Fund

**Contributions.** In 1981, a total of \$39,570 was collected from 12 States in contributions to the Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries, and 14 States pledged a total of \$69,291 for 1982 (see table on following page). Most of the contributors were land-locked developing countries. The pledges were made at the 1981 United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities, held at United Nations Headquarters in November (p. 426). Contributions pledged during the five years of the Fund's existence amounted to about \$1 million.

**Financial regulations.** The General Assembly, on 18 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> authorized the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to adopt the financial regulations of the Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries and, in the mean time, to apply the UNDP Financial Regulations to the Fund. Regulations for the Fund would

CONTRIBUTIONS AND PLEDGES TO THE UNITED NATIONS  
SPECIAL FUND FOR LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING  
COUNTRIES FOR 1981 AND 1982  
(As at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment	1982 pledge
Afghanistan	5,000	5,000
Bhutan	1,000	1,000
Bolivia	-	500
Botswana	1,529	1,714
Brazil	20,000	10,000
Democratic Yemen	1,000	-
Lao People's Democratic Republic	-	1,000
Lesotho	-	1,000
Malawi	2,000	2,100
Mali	500	-
Nepal	2,000	-
Philippines	2,500	-
Swaziland	-	1,070
Thailand	2,000	1,000
Togo	-	707
Tunisia	1,913	2,200
Uganda	128	-
Zambia	-	40,000
Zimbabwe	-	2,000
Total	39,570	69,291

first be reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and would be reported to the Assembly following their adoption by the Council. This arrangement was to apply during the interim period before the Fund's own policy and management machinery was established.

This action modified a provision of the Fund's statute,<sup>(1)</sup> adopted by the Assembly in 1976, which specified that the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations would apply until the Assembly approved new ones on the recommendation of the Fund's Board of Governors. The Assembly's 1981 action was taken at the request of the Council, which asked on 30 June 1981<sup>(3)</sup> for authority to formulate financial regulations in respect of all funds which it administered, including the Special Fund (p. 451).

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>31/177, annex, art. 9, 21 Dec. 1976 (YUN 1976, p. 357); <sup>(2)</sup>36/227, para. 3, 18 Dec. 1981 (p. 451).

Decision: <sup>(3)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1): 81/28, para. 3, 30 June.

### Island developing countries

In accordance with a 1979 resolution of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), <sup>(3)</sup> the UNCTAD secretariat issued in January 1981 a note for the Trade and Development Board<sup>(1)</sup> describing UNCTAD studies on common problems of island developing countries.

The note suggested six areas which might be examined by an intergovernmental group of experts, in the event that the Board established such a group, to examine the specific problems of developing island economies, as had been sug-

gested in 1980:<sup>(4)</sup> statistics policy for effective planning; investment policy for national savings and for foreign capital; employment, training and migration policy; integration of marine space into national economic planning; response to technical change in transport and communications; and marketing and export promotion of goods and services.

On 20 March 1981, after considering the question, the Board decided to remit to its March 1982 session a draft decision, submitted by Mexico on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries, which would have the Board decide that an intergovernmental group of experts be convened to prepare a comprehensive action programme to alleviate the special problems of island developing countries.<sup>(2)</sup>

Special economic assistance programmes coordinated by the United Nations were under way in three island developing countries in the Africa region during 1981: Cape Verde (p. 500), the Comoros (p. 506) and Sao Tome and Principe (p. 518). Multiagency missions, studying economic assistance needs resulting from hurricane damage and other problems, visited four Caribbean island nations: Dominica (p. 525), Grenada (p. 526), Saint Lucia (p. 527) and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (p. 528). Several United Nations agencies were providing assistance to Tonga, in the Pacific (p. 530).

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/841.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

Yearbook references: <sup>(3)</sup>1979, p. 569; <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 551.

### UN Special Fund for the most seriously affected countries

On 4 December 1981, the General Assembly decided without vote to continue performing the functions of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund pending further consideration of the matter in 1983.<sup>(3)</sup> It recalled its 1978 decision to suspend ad interim the activities of the Fund for lack of contributions.<sup>(2)</sup> The Fund was established by the Assembly in 1974 to assist countries most seriously affected by economic crises.

The 1981 decision was recommended by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, which approved without vote on 20 November a draft by its Chairman.

During the Committee's discussion of development and international economic co-operation, Sri Lanka urged reactivation of the Fund to meet the grave difficulties faced by the least developed countries.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA: 3202(S-VI), sect. X, 1 May 1974 (YUN 1974, p. 330).

Decisions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>3/431, 19 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 425); <sup>(3)</sup>36/424, 4 Dec. 1981, text following.  
Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-32, 42 (24 Sep.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.84 (4 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/424

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.11) without vote. 20 November (meeting 42); draft by Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.90); agenda item 69 (n).

#### United Nations Special Fund

At its 84th plenary meeting, on 4 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, recalling its decision 33/431 of 19 December 1978, in which it had decided, *inter alia*, to suspend the activities of the United Nations Special Fund, *ad interim*, and to perform the functions of the Board of Governors of the Fund, decided to continue performing the functions of the Board of Governors, within the context of its consideration of the item on development and international economic co-operation, pending subsequent consideration of the question by the Assembly at its thirty-eighth session.

## Chapter II

# Development assistance

Total contributions by Governments to the United Nations system to finance operational activities for development amounted to \$5.3 billion in 1981, compared to \$5.6 billion in 1980 (p. 420). Despite the drop in income, net transfers of resources for development purposes from the United Nations system to developing countries rose to \$6 billion in 1981, up from \$4.8 billion in 1980 (p. 419). Of this total, technical co-operation expenditures amounted to \$2 billion, compared to \$1.8 billion in the previous year (p. 431).

Expenditures by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), including the trust funds it managed, exceeded \$1 billion for the first time; the share of UNDP in total system-wide, grant-financed technical co-operation remained at the same level as in 1980—about 50 per cent (p. 432). The United Nations itself, excluding the specialized agencies, delivered a technical co-operation programme of \$297 million, of which \$204 million came from UNDP (p. 459).

Development assistance, also referred to as operational activities for development, remained by far the largest component of United Nations operational activities. Some of this was rendered by United Nations programmes active in specific fields, of which the largest were the World Food Programme (p. 726), the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (p. 781) and the United Nations Children's Fund (p. 999).

Expenditures by the United Nations system on humanitarian and other assistance not directly related to development came to \$648 million in 1981, raising the value of all operational activities to \$6.7 billion. Such assistance included disaster aid, other emergency assistance and special economic assistance to countries undergoing unusual hardships (p. 471), as well as programmes of assistance to refugees (p. 1027). In addition to direct multilateral assistance, the United Nations promoted special measures for

particular categories of countries, notably the least developed (p. 401).

Pledges for 1982, made to 19 United Nations funds and programmes covered by the 1981 United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities (New York, 3 and 4 November), totalled just over \$1 billion as at 30 June 1982, compared to \$1.1 billion in payments received for 1981 (p. 426). The General Assembly expressed deep concern in December that contributions to the funds and programmes included in United Nations pledging conferences for development activities had been stagnating and urged a rapid and substantial increase of contributions to the United Nations system's operational activities for development on a predictable and continuous basis.<sup>(9)</sup>

The United Nations Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation submitted his first annual report to the General Assembly on operational activities for development,<sup>(2)</sup> forming a basis for discussion by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee of financial and management aspects of development assistance by the United Nations system (p. 428).

For UNDP, 1981 marked the final year of its second development co-operation cycle, a five-year forward plan of comprehensive programming for technical co-operation (p. 432). Despite indications that resources available in the third cycle, spanning 1982-1986, might fall short of the total envisaged, the UNDP Governing Council, at its twenty-eighth session<sup>(3)</sup> (New York, 9 June-1 July), decided to retain, for purposes of forward planning, the level of resources previously envisaged, which assumed a 14 per cent average annual growth of voluntary contributions (p. 444). Both the Economic and Social Council, in July,<sup>(5)</sup> and the General Assembly, in December,<sup>(10)</sup> urged Governments to renew their efforts to provide the resources necessary to estab-

lish a sound financial basis for the Programme's planned activities for 1982-1986.

Also in December, the Assembly authorized the Governing Council to adopt revised financial regulations in respect of all funds administered by UNDP.<sup>(11)</sup>

The year 1981 marked the tenth anniversary of the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme, which at mid-year, for the first time, had 1,000 volunteers serving technical co-operation projects in 91 countries (p. 460). The Assembly, in December, noted with satisfaction the programme's achievement and reiterated its appeal for contributions to overcome the financial straits UNV was experiencing(s).

Promotion of technical co-operation among developing countries was expanding in the development assistance activities of the United Nations system (p. 462). At its second session (New York, 1-8 June),<sup>(1)</sup> the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries recommended a number of measures to overcome what it saw as insufficient progress in this area. The Economic and Social Council in July commended the Committee's decisions to the General Assembly,<sup>(4)</sup> which urged in November that Governments implement the agreements reached by the Committee.<sup>(6)</sup>

For the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), 1981 saw a 150 per cent increase in expenditures over the 1980 level, reaching nearly \$50 million (p. 468). Most of its projects were for rural areas of least developed countries. In December, the Assembly approved a UNDP Governing Council recommendation that UNCDF should meet its own administrative and programme support casts.<sup>(7)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on TCDC, A/36/39; <sup>(2)</sup>Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/478 & Add.1; <sup>(3)</sup>UNDP Council, E/1981/61/Rev.1.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(4)</sup>1981/58 (p. 464), <sup>(5)</sup>1981/59 (p. 435), 22 July. GA: <sup>(6)</sup>36/44, 19 Nov. (p. 464); <sup>(7)</sup>36/196 (p. 469), <sup>(8)</sup>36/198 (p. 462), <sup>(9)</sup>36/199 (p. 429), <sup>(10)</sup>36/200 (p. 435), 17 Dec.; <sup>(11)</sup>36/227, 18 Dec. (p. 451).

## General aspects of operational activities for development

### Financing

Contributions to operational activities for development conducted by the United Nations system decreased in 1981, although expenditures -partly financed by previous years' contributions -increased by 6 per cent over 1980. Pledges made at the 1981 United Nations Pledging Conference fell short of targets established by intergovernmental organizations.

### Expenditures

According to the 1982 report on operational activities submitted by the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation,<sup>(1)</sup> net transfers of resources from the United Nations system to developing countries amounted to \$6 billion in 1981 (see table below), compared to \$4.8 billion in 1980 and \$4 billion in 1979. The 1981 figure consisted of \$2.2 billion in grants, mainly for technical co-operation; \$1.7 billion in concessional loans (commodity and capital assistance), and \$2.2 billion in non-concessional disbursements. (Net transfers represent gross disbursements to recipients and borrowers, less interest and charges on loans.) Most of the loans and non-concessional aid was disbursed by the World Bank (including the International Development Association (IDA)) and the International Finance Corporation (IFC).

#### 1981 EXPENDITURES BY THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM ON OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT

(In millions of US dollars)

<b>I. CONCESSIONAL ASSISTANCE</b>		
<b>A. Grants</b>		
1. Financed from regular budgets	212.7	
2. Financed by UNDP <sup>*</sup>	670.8	
3. Financed from funds administered by UNDP	69.9	
4. Financed by UNFPA	122.5	
5. Financed by UNICEF	218.3	
6. Financed by specialized agencies and other organizations from extrabudgetary resources <sup>**</sup>	322.5	
7. Financed by WFP	541.9	
Subtotal (1-7)		2,158.6
<b>B. Loans</b>		
8. Disbursed by IDA		
(a) Gross disbursements	1,767.7	
(b) Net disbursements	1,722.6	
(c) Net transfer	1,632.9	
9. Disbursed by IFAD <sup>***</sup>	75.2	
Subtotal (8 (c) and 9)		1,708.1
Total (1-7, 8 (c) and 9)		3,866.7
<b>II. NON-CONCESSIONAL ASSISTANCE</b>		
10. Disbursed by World Bank		
(a) Gross disbursements	5,487.0	
(b) Net disbursements	3,879.0	
(c) Net transfer	1,830.5	
11. Disbursed by IFC		
(a) Gross disbursements	644.9	
(b) Net disbursements	509.7	
(c) Net transfer	327.3	
Subtotal (10 (c) and 11 (c))		2,157.8
Total (1-7, 8 (c), 9, 10 (c) and 11 (c))		6,024.5

#### Other expenditures:

Expenditure financed from cost-sharing contributions to UNDP	51.0
Expenditure financed from Government cash counter part contributions to UNDP	9.8
Expenditure financed from self-financing contributions to specialized agencies and other organizations	58.1
World Bank/IDA technical co-operation	516.8

<sup>\*</sup>Main UNDP programme; excludes expenditures financed from cost-sharing and from cash counter part contributions.

<sup>\*\*</sup>From funds not elsewhere specified in the table.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>Includes a small amount of grants.

Both concessional and non-concessional flows increased, the latter in particular. Grant-financed expenditures- those undertaken by organizations of the system other than the World Bank, IFC and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)-rose by 6 per cent over 1980. Concessional flows (grants and concessional loans) accounted for 64 per cent of the total net transfer of resources through the system.

By far the greatest share of operational activities went to developing countries in support of national development programmes; a comparatively small share (about 7 per cent) was for regional, interregional and global activities.

Expenditures on technical co-operation amounted to \$2 billion in 1981, compared to \$1.8 billion in 1980 (p. 431).

Countries with a per capita gross national product (GNP) of less than \$500 accounted for 78 per cent of the transfer of concessional resources through the United Nations system. There was a fairly even distribution of resource flows among the developing regions of the world on a per capita basis, reflecting the universality of participation by all countries in the system's operational activities.

Expenditures on refugee, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance amounted to \$648 million in 1981. This brought the total of official development assistance transferred to developing countries through the United Nations system to \$6.7 billion (see table on next page).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, transmitted by S-G note, A/37/445.

#### Contributions

Total contributions to multilaterally funded operational activities for development declined in 1981. Payments by Governments and other official and non-official sources to the operational activities of the United Nations system amounted to \$5.3 billion, compared to \$5.6 billion in 1980 and \$4.8 billion in 1979. Covered in these totals were all United Nations funds and programmes and the specialized agencies, including the World Food Programme, IFAD, the World Bank (including IDA) and IFC; contributions to United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) cost-sharing activities and self-supporting projects of other organizations were excluded. The decline reflected a slight drop in contributions to the programmes and funds covered by the United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities (p. 426), a \$433 million decrease in contributions to the World Bank and IFC and a delay in securing the first replenishment of IFAD.

These figures were transmitted to the General

Assembly in a 1982 report of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation.<sup>(2)</sup> The report also contained information on the 1981 contributions of each country to United Nations system development assistance, along with performance indicators showing contributions in relation to population size and GNP (see table beginning on p. 422).

Voluntary contributions (in the amount of \$1.1 billion) to the funds and programmes covered by the Pledging Conference declined in 1981, largely the result of stagnation or decline in amounts contributed to the three largest funds-UNDP, the United Nations Fund for Population Activities and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the last mainly because of a drop in contributions to supplementary funds such as that for aid to Kampucheans (p. 494). Contributions to the specialized agencies for operational activities continued to increase, partly through the growth in their regular budgets and partly because of the continued growth in extrabudgetary contributions placed directly at their disposal.

The inter-agency Administrative Committee on Co-ordination expressed concern at the reduction in resources available for development activities. It stated in October<sup>(4)</sup> that, at a time when interdependence was acknowledged as the keystone of world economic prosperity and development, the decline in funds could only be detrimental to developed as well as developing countries. It therefore wished to alert the General Assembly to the urgent need to support the efforts of developing countries, for their own sake but also for the sake of world prosperity.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly strongly reiterated the need for a substantial and real increase in resources for operational activities on an increasingly predictable, continuous and assured basis, and urged all countries, particularly those developed countries whose performance was not commensurate with their capacity, to increase their contributions rapidly and substantially. It decided to review and appraise the situation regularly, taking account of targets set by intergovernmental bodies, and for that purpose it requested the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to provide an annual compilation of information from Governments, together with his comments and recommendations. To ensure more stability in funding, the Assembly urged countries to indicate their probable contributions for a multiyear period. It invited governing bodies in the United Nations system to consider new ways of mobilizing increased resources.

(continued on p. 425)



**1981 EXPENDITURES BY THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM ON OPERATIONAL  
ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NON-DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.  
BY RECIPIENT COUNTRY AND REGION  
(in thousands of US dollars)**

RECIPIENT	Development assistance <sup>1</sup>	Other assistance <sup>2</sup>	RECIPIENT	Development assistance*	Other assistance <sup>2</sup>	RECIPIENT	Development assistance <sup>1</sup>	Other assistance <sup>2</sup>
Developing Member States			Iran	(95,028)	-	Togo	13,792	-
			Iraq	(6,798)	-	Trinidad		
Afghanistan	8,383	10	Ivory Coast	15,933	-	and Tobago	(6,561)	-
Albania	214	-	Jamaica	26,096	-	Tunisia	41,628	-
Algeria	10,256	1,930	Jordan	74,081		Turkey	266,546	172
Angola	14,752	5,164	Kenya	38,211	2,175	Uganda	41,071	2,253
Antigua and Barbuda	782	-	Kuwait	208	-	United Arab Emirates	52	-
Argentina	82,595	2,753	Lao People's Democratic Republic	13,933	2,518	United Republic of Cameroon	38,572	11,849
Bahamas	1,553	-	Lebanon	15,925	337	United Republic of Tanzania	95,159	6,839
Bahrain	1,167	-	Lesotho	28,291	1,858	Upper Volta	23,487	
Bangladesh	187,692	126	Liberia	20,777		Uruguay	(4,497)	-
Barbados	4,324		Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	8,130	-	Vanuatu	1,015	
Belize	569	-	Madagascar	38,717	-	Venezuela	(39,324)	-
Benin	19,698		Malawi	51,397		Viet Nam	55,081	9,864
Bhutan	7,362	-	Malaysia	30,999	10,995	Yemen	29,526	354
Bolivia	33,374	-	Maldives	2,093	-	Yugoslavia	26,999	942
Botswana	17,930	1,842	Mall	43,698	-	Zaire	17,181	21,123
Brazil	144,805	-	Malta	298	-	Zambia	(1,144)	2,866
Bulgaria	1,692	-	Mauritania	28,761	-	Zimbabwe	54,437	-
Burma	55,832		Mauritius	21,402				
Burundi	23,624	1,991	Mexico	332,337	-	Subtotal	5,573,719	399,380
Cape Verde	6,273		Mongolia	2,709	-			
Central African Republic	6,414	-	Morocco	52,246		Developing non- member States		
Chad	7,645	-	Mozambique	18,844				
Chile	8,894	-	Nepal	59,999	(6)	Bermuda	184	
China	42,606	9,652	Nicaragua	31,808	7	Dem. People's Rep. of Korea	6,381	
Colombia	104,889	-	Niger	27,331		Hong Kong	353	8,356
Comoros	7,720	-	Nigeria	21,917	2,286	Namibia	3,468	-
Congo	18,131		Oman	3,215	-	Republic of Korea	114,439	-
Costs Rica	2,407		Pakistan	112,633	109,483	Tonga	1,105	-
Cuba	11,123		Panama	20,644	-	Other countries	13,182	5,462
Cyprus	2,093	12,679	Papua New Guinea	8,806	-	Subtotal	139,112	13,818
Czechoslovakia	819	-	Paraguay	33,877	-	Total	5,712,831	413,198
Democratic Kampuchea	47,771		Peru	35,677	735	Developed countries	(140,498)	-
Democratic Yemen	31,122		Philippines	337,357	13,560	TOTAL (all countries)	5,572,333	413,198
Djibouti	4,808	5,075	Poland	1,353		Intercountry		
Dominica	1,463		Portugal	12,794	1,043	Regional Africa	82,697	17,955
Dominican Republic	27,846	(2)	Qatar	244	-	Regional Americas	47,613	15,024
Ecuador	36,794		Romania	267,346	-	Regional Arab States	21,440	
Egypt	235,560	2,093	Rwanda	20,638	351	Regional Asia	76,555	12,961
El Salvador	9,735		Saint Lucia	1,325	-	Regional Europe	14,172	
Equatorial Guinea	3,376	-	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	873	-	Interregional	74,136	-
Ethiopia	79,641	7,296	Samoa	4,236	-	Global	104,842	16,376
Fiji	9,452	(4)	Sao Tome and Principe	1,265		Total	421,455	62,316
Gabon	(328)		Saudi Arabia	8,247		Not elsewhere classified	30,732	172,381
Gambia	12,042		Senegal	48,696	1,043	GRAND TOTAL	6,024,520	647,895
Ghana	27,262	-	Seychelles	1,048	-			
Greece	(17,230)	295	Sierra Leone	7,764				
Grenada	876	-	Singapore	(14,843)	-			
Guatemala	19,181	-	Solomon Islands	1,397				
Guinea	11,604	-	Somalia	77,238	49,078			
Guinea-Bissau	8,481	-	Spain	(44,420)	1,622			
Guyana	6,448		Sri Lanka	42,002	-			
Haiti	27,677	108	Sudan	112,840	19,817			
Honduras	25,531		Suriname	1,711	-			
Hungary	945	-	Swaziland	11,563	2,122			
India	900,217	-	Syrian Arab Republic	38,044	-			
Indonesia	291,173	11,507	Thailand	225,749	61,579			

<sup>1</sup>Represents the sum of operational activities financed under regular United Nations and agency budgets (\$212.7 million), the UNDP main programme (\$670.8 million), UNDP-administered funds (\$69.9 million), UNFPA (\$122.5 million), UNICEF (\$218.3 million), other extrabudgetary funds (\$322.5 million) and WFP (\$541.9 million), plus net transfers from the World Bank (\$1,830.5 million), IDA (\$1,632.9 million) and IFC (\$327.3 million) and net IFAD disbursements (\$75.2 million).

<sup>2</sup>Represents expenditure financed by UNHCR (\$474.2 million), UNRWA (\$172.3 million), UNDRO (\$0.288 million) and the Trust Fund for Special Economic Assistance Programmes (\$0.498 million).

NOTE: Figures in parentheses are negative.

1981 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM FOR OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES  
FOR DEVELOPMENT AND FOR OTHER ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ACTIVITIES,  
BY DONOR COUNTRY  
(contributions in thousands of US dollars)

CONTRIBUTOR	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS				Contributions to other economic and social activities'
	Contributions to operational activities for development	Dollars per capita	Contributions in dollars per \$1 million of GNP	Percentage of total	
Member States					
Afghanistan	102	0.01	39	0.002	-
Albania	25	0.01	11	-	-
Algeria	4,545	0.24	125	0.086	50
Angola	21	-	6	-	-
Antigua and Barbuda	19	0.25	187	-	-
Argentina	5,513	0.20	83	0.105	133
Australia	121,062	8.36	851	2.301	34,233
Austria	56,611	7.57	740	1.076	600
Bahamas	116	0.48	145	0.002	6
Bahrain	135	0.32	57	0.003	115
Bangladesh	569	0.01	51	0.011	3
Barbados	41	0.17	54	0.001	3
Belgium	101,031	10.27	844	1.920	4,961
Belize	15	0.10	94	-	-
Benin	162	0.05	150	0.003	-
Bhutan	113	0.09	1,027	0.002	-
Bolivia	236	0.04	74	0.004	-
Botswana	102	0.13	140	0.002	5
Brazil	6,926	0.06	28	0.132	45
Bulgaria	1,242	0.14	33	0.024	6
Burma	1,096	0.03	185	0.021	10
Burundi	48	0.01	58	0.001	6
Byelorussian SSR	1,023	0.11	-	0.019	18
Canada	295,461	12.34	1,218	5.615	19,977
Cape Verde	29	0.09	286	0.001	-
Central African Republic	24	0.01	35	-	-
Chad	21	-	40	-	-
Chile	2,384	0.21	99	0.045	47
China	6,359	0.01	22	0.121	2,161
Colombia	2,785	0.10	88	0.053	33
Comoros	21	0.06	206	-	-
Congo	394	0.26	352	0.007	14
Costa Rica	152	0.07	40	0.003	-
Cuba	2,400	0.24	172	0.046	-
Cyprus	223	0.36	101	0.004	14
Czechoslovakia	2,738	0.18	31	0.052	52
Democratic Kampuchea	22	-	-	-	-
Democratic Yemen	52	0.03	65	0.001	3
Denmark	156,182	30.49	2,354	2.968	12,485
Djibouti	24	0.07	141	-	2
Dominica	16	0.19	314	-	-
Dominican Republic	163	0.03	26	0.003	-
Ecuador	1,046	0.13	102	0.020	-
Egypt	2,087	0.05	90	0.040	19
El Salvador	46	0.01	17	0.001	-
Equatorial Guinea	18	0.05	-	-	-
Ethiopia	86	-	20	0.002	-
Fiji	80	0.13	69	0.002	-
Finland	54,677	11.24	1,156	1.039	2,187
France	210,488	3.93	335	4.000	4,939
Gabon	139	0.21	57	0.003	-
Gambia	30	0.05	201	0.001	-
German Democratic Republic	3,963	0.24	33	0.075	180
Germany, Federal Republic of	430,658	7.07	520	8.185	26,775
Ghana	748	0.06	152	0.014	101
Greece	1,979	0.21	47	0.038	162
Grenada	34	0.31	423	0.001	-
Guatemala	653	0.09	84	0.012	-
Guinea	30	0.01	19	0.001	-

CONTRIBUTOR	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS				Contributions to other economic and social activities <sup>1</sup>
	Contributions to operational activities for development	Dollars per capita	Contributions in dollars per \$1 million of GNP	Percentage of total	
Member States (cont.)					
Guinea-Bissau	21	0.03	161	-	-
Guyana	309	0.39	561	0.006	-
Haiti	111	0.02	83	0.002	-
Honduras	132	0.04	64	0.003	1
Hungary	1,279	0.12	28	0.024	20
Iceland	535	2.31	204	0.010	79
India	116,336	0.17	730	2.211	78
Indonesia	4,579	0.03	74	0.087	44
Iran	1,983	0.05		0.038	30
Iraq	1,523	0.12	39	0.029	3,512
Ireland	5,502	1.66	341	0.105	807
Israel	1,047	0.27	60	0.020	484
Italy	282,092	4.95	765	5.361	4,914
Ivory coast	412	0.05	42	0.008	46
Jamaica	347	0.16	154	0.007	10
Japan	593,080	5.09	514	11.272	67,133
Jordan	745	0.23	228	0.014	750
Kenya	542	0.03	82	0.010	41
Kuwait	70,903	52.40	2,295	1.348	4,540
Lao People's Democratic Republic	26	0.01		-	6
Lebanon	9,045	3.40		0.172	73
Lesotho	795	0.59	1,529	0.015	-
Liberia	103	0.06	105	0.002	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	6,112	2.05	238	0.116	4,300
Luxembourg	2,561	7.15	492	0.049	143
Madagascar	316	0.04	104	0.006	4
Malawi	139	0.02	100	0.003	8
Malaysia	1,790	0.13	80	0.034	27
Maldives	27	0.18	676	0.001	2
Mali	30	-	22	0.001	
Malta	109	0.32	92	0.002	4
Mauritania	322	0.20	608	0.006	
Mauritius	118	0.12	116	0.002	2
Mexico	19,440	0.29	135	0.369	274
Mongolia	217	0.13	171	0.004	
Morocco	1,303	0.06	75	0.025	69
Mozambique	25	-	9	-	-
Nepal	132	0.01	67	0.003	-
Netherlands	254,101	18.05	1,574	4.829	11,575
New Zealand	9,659	2.96	417	0.184	483
Nicaragua	58	0.02	30	0.001	-
Niger	48	0.01	27	0.001	
Nigeria	26,696	0.32	312	0.507	3,216
Norway	180,783	44.32	3,503	3.436	17,204
Oman	1,321	1.48	339	0.025	41
Pakistan	3,956	0.05	159	0.075	68
Panama	986	0.54	311	0.019	9
Papua New Guinea	588	0.20	249	0.011	2
Paraguay	405	0.13	98	0.008	
Peru	3,056	0.17	186	0.058	4
Philippines	3,631	0.08	108	0.069	29
Poland	4,161	0.12	30	0.079	45
Portugal	935	0.10	40	0.018	31
Qatar	1,465	6.34	243	0.028	1,510
Romania	1,361	0.06	26	0.026	3
Rwanda	1,904	0.37	1,831	0.036	
Saint Lucia	7	0.05	62	-	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	25	0.24	425	-	-
Samoa	25	0.16			
Sao Tome and Principe	21	0.18		-	1
Saudi Arabia	146,459	16.35	1,451	2.783	37,460
Senegal	275	0.05	108	0.005	6
Seychelles	31	0.47	261	0.001	-
Sierra Leone	280	0.08	295	0.005	-
Singapore	407	0.17	38	0.008	33
Solomon Islands	41	0.18	376	0.001	-

CONTRIBUTOR	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS				
	Contributions to operational activities for development	Dollars per capita	Contributions In dollars per \$1 million of GNP	Percentage of total	Contributions to other economic and social activities*
Member States (cont.)					
Somalia	50	0.01		0.001	3
South Africa	5,369	0.18	80	0.102	
Spain	6,044	0.16	30	0.115	1,080
Sri Lanka	1,222	0.08	306	0.023	1
Sudan	71		8	0.001	9
Suriname	109	0.31	109	0.002	1
Swaziland	46	0.08	121	0.001	2
Sweden	273,635	33.07	2,445	5.200	31,638
Syrian Arab Republic	668	0.07	56	0.013	180
Thailand	3,264	0.07	105	0.062	47
Togo	484	0.20	474	0.009	2
Trinidad and Tobago	947	0.81	185	0.018	7
Tunisia	875	0.14	105	0.017	34
Turkey	8,571	0.19	130	0.163	48
Uganda	26	-	7	-	12
Ukrainian SSR	3,476	0.07		0.066	45
USSR	27,511	0.10	23	0.523	3,698
United Arab Emirates	4,264	4.78	159	0.081	800
United Kingdom	429,783	7.69	971	8.168	27,824
United Republic of Cameroon	559	0.07	99	0.011	
United Republic of Tanzania	571	0.03	119	0.011	33
United States	958,061	4.21	371	18.208	215,790
Upper volta	103	0.02	93	0.002	
Uruguay	753	0.26	91	0.014	2
Vanuatu	425	3.63	7,083	0.008	
Venezuela	4,141	0.28	76	0.079	130
Viet Nam	79	-		0.001	1
Yemen	328	0.06	123	0.006	2
Yugoslavia	8,388	0.38	143	0.159	162
Zaire	737	0.03	116	0.014	
Zambia	732	0.13	227	0.014	4
Zimbabwe	25	-	5	-	5
Total	4,985,053	1.14	447	94.742	550,021
Non-member States					
Bermuda	16	0.26	24	-	-
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	408	0.02	-	0.008	-
Kiribati	17	0.29	337	-	
Republic of Korea	1,779	0.05	30	0.034	40
Switzerland	46,168	7.14	434	0.877	9,465
Tonga	16	0.17	323	-	-
Other	1,078	0.15	38	0.020	161
Total	49,514	0.56	213	0.940	9,666
TOTAL (all countries)	5,034,567	1.12	442	95.683	559,687
Inter/non-governmental					
Arab Gulf Programme for UN Development Organizations	22,000	-	-	0.418	
European Communities	87,651	-	-	1.666	76,999
Other Intergovernmental	69,922	-	-	1.329	7,087
Non-governmental	47,596	-	-	0.905	16,844
Total	227,169	-	-	4.317	100,930
GRAND TOTAL	5,261,736	1.18	462	100.000	660,617

\*Includes contributions from Governments and other sources to UNHCR, UNRWA, UNDRO, UNEP and Trust Fund for Special Economic Assistance Programmes.

NOTE: Three dots (...) Indicate that data are not available or are not separately reported; a dash (-) indicates that the amount is nil or negligible or the item is not applicable.

The resolution superseded a draft submitted by Algeria for the Group of 77 developing countries,<sup>(1)</sup> which was withdrawn by the sponsor. By that draft, the Assembly would have strongly reiterated its appeals to Governments to increase their contributions rapidly and substantially on a more continuous and assured basis, and would have made a special request to those developed countries whose overall performance was not commensurate with their capacity to increase significantly their contributions in real terms. It would have invited all developed countries and other countries in a position to do so to inform it in 1982 of the steps they intended to take to expand their contributions, with a view to realizing the agreed targets and funding levels of various programmes and funds. United Nations governing bodies would have been invited to recommend specific ways of increasing resources on a predictable, continuous and assured basis, including the establishment of funding targets whenever possible. The Director-General would have been asked for recommendations in that regard, including the feasibility of establishing targets.

Speaking in the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, where the 17 December resolution originated, the USSR said it had not opposed the text on the understanding that the targets referred to did not apply to the USSR and that the resolution should be implemented on the basis of resources already allocated for such activities, without entailing additional expenditures.

In the Committee's debate, calls for increased resources for operational activities were made by a number of developing countries, including China, Cuba, the Gambia, Kenya, the Niger, Sri Lanka, the Sudan and Tunisia.

Bangladesh appealed to all developed donor countries to contribute and said the centrally planned economies of Eastern Europe could not shy away from their responsibilities. Bhutan noted that most developed countries had failed to meet agreed contribution targets while the developing countries had gradually increased their contributions even though their economies had not significantly improved. Elaborating on this point, Mauritania noted that Kuwait, Qatar and Saudi Arabia had been among the major contributors to operational activities in per capita terms and in share of GNP. Pakistan remarked that the 11 per cent increase in contributions reported by the Director-General for 1980<sup>(5)</sup> represented near stagnation in real terms, after discounting the effects of inflation, and that the major developed countries had fallen behind in terms of the ratio of their contributions to their

gross domestic product; Pakistan suggested that a target be established for such contributions.

Indonesia hoped the discouraging trend in contributions for multilateral assistance did not signal a change of heart but was a sign that, for a time, uncertainty and domestic concerns had overshadowed the sense of international responsibility. The Philippines expressed hope that the decline in funds was a passing trend resulting from budgetary restrictions. However, Madagascar thought the drop in voluntary contributions to United Nations agencies was due to centrifugal forces in international economic relations, resulting in an erosion of multilateral economic co-operation.

Among developed countries, Belgium remarked that real growth of resources for operational activities would probably be small in coming years, not because States were unaware of needs but because most industrialized countries were facing virtually insurmountable budgetary difficulties because of the continuing economic crisis. Japan made a similar point but added that it had excluded official development assistance from its zero-growth budget policy. Italy believed the major donors should try to keep the level of their contributions at least constant in real terms and to increase them whenever possible.

The United States, observing that it had given nearly twice as much as the second largest contributor to the United Nations development system, said the most significant untapped source of additional revenue could be found among the capital-surplus developing countries and the industrialized socialist States. Australia, France and the Federal Republic of Germany made similar points, the last adding that the industrialized centrally planned economies had contributed barely more than India.

Responding, the USSR asked whether it was right to say that the socialist countries, whose economy was based exclusively on the work of their own people and the development of their own resources, had a responsibility equal to that of the imperialist countries, which had plundered the resources of their colonies for centuries and were still exploiting them.

Several developed countries-including Denmark (for the Nordic States) and the United Kingdom-made the point that operational activities were still largely dependent on contributions by a small group of donor countries. Yugoslavia believed that the more economically advanced developing countries should become net contributors as soon as possible, thereby becoming direct partners in assisting less fortunate developing countries. The Philippines sug-

gested a study of proposals to finance assistance through such means as assessments on arms sales, an international tax on ocean-resource exploitation, a brain-drain tax and the linking of the International Monetary Fund's special drawing rights to development aid.

Canada supported the concept of central funding for development assistance by the United Nations system and regretted what it saw as a tendency by certain specialized agencies to canvass for direct contributions to their technical co-operation programmes, bypassing UNDP. France and Poland also endorsed central funding as opposed to a proliferation of special funds; Poland added that all funds should be administered by UNDP and their activities integrated within country and intercountry programming, while retaining each fund's specialization in its own field. The United Kingdom criticized the proliferation of funds as drawing resources away from other funds and absorbing scarce resources for bureaucracy. Central funding was also supported by Italy.

Different views were expressed on the possibility of moving from annual to multiyear pledging. Denmark, speaking for the Nordic States, said they attached importance to stability and predictability in the flow of funds and had therefore proposed that the UNDP Governing Council reconvene its study group on long-term financing. Support for reconvening this group was expressed by Madagascar. Canada stated its willingness to explore proposals for multiyear pledging, provided that it was not limited to the traditional major donors and that others made contributions in convertible currency. France thought it would not be easy to meet the requirements of predictability and continuity, especially since national budgets were adopted annually, but said it might be possible in the medium term and through increased co-ordination to achieve a reasonable degree of predictability. India favoured measures to ensure greater automaticity in multiyear funding.

Hungary, however, thought it unrealistic to demand that Governments commit themselves several years in advance with regard to the amount of their contributions. The United Kingdom thought the price of achieving predictability might have to be a revision of assumptions about continued growth.

Several Eastern European countries thought UNDP could make better use of contributions in national currencies (p. 456).

Egypt expressed alarm at signs that some major donors were moving away from traditional support of multilateral aid in favour of greater reliance on bilateral assistance. Ethiopia said the countries which, for political reasons, were

trying to strengthen bilateralism at the expense of multilateralism should reconsider their attitude and stop exerting pressure on multilateral organizations. However, a number of Western donor countries believed there was no cause for concern, since they viewed bilateral and multilateral assistance as complementary.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.89.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, transmitted by S-G note. A/37/445.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA. 36/199, paras. 3-8, 17 Dec. (p. 429). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>ACC, 1981/24, 30 Oct. (transmitted by-secretariat note, A/C.2/36/5).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 579.

Pledging Conference for Development Activities. The 1981 United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities was held at United Nations Headquarters on 3 and 4 November to receive government pledges for 1982 to 19 United Nations funds and programmes concerned with development and related assistance. As at 30 June 1982, pledges and payments to these funds by individual Governments totalled \$1,014,563,000,<sup>(2)</sup> down from a corresponding figure of \$1,106,907,000 in payments received for 1981<sup>(3)</sup> (see table on p. 427). Few funds and programmes experienced real growth and contributions to 12 of them-including the largest, UNDP and UNICEF-declined.

(For contributions by country as at 31 December 1981, refer to the SUBJECT INDEX for page references to individual funds and programmes.)

The General Assembly, in a resolution of 17 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> expressed deep concern that voluntary contributions to the funds and programmes included in the United Nations pledging conferences for development activities had been stagnating and falling short in many cases of targets set by intergovernmental bodies. That situation, it added, had serious consequences for the organizations concerned with respect to their capacity to maintain the level of their operational programmes in support of the growing needs of developing countries for multilateral concessional assistance through the United Nations system.

The original draft of this resolution,<sup>(1)</sup> submitted by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 and later withdrawn by the sponsor, would have had the Assembly express deep concern that contributions to the funds and programmes included in the pledging conferences had been stagnating and in many cases declining in real terms, despite the existence of agreed targets and funding levels, with serious consequences for the capacity of the organizations concerned to maintain the real value of their operational programmes.

# 1981 AND 1982 CONTRIBUTIONS TO FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES INCLUDED IN THE UNITED NATIONS PLEDGING CONFERENCE FOR DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

(1981, as at 31 December 1981; 1982, as at 30 June 1982;  
in thousands of US dollars)

FUND OR PROGRAMME	1981 PAYMENT		1982 PLEDGE	
	Amount	Number of donor countries	Amount	Number of donor countries
United Nations Development Programme	689,641	137	657,084	127
Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries	12,887	4	16,353	8
Energy Account	2,844	2	972	2
United Nations Children's Fund	193,803	122	156,722	109
United Nations Fund for Population Activities	126,885	71	131,440	86
United Nations Capital Development Fund	29,668	38	24,802	39
United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development <sup>1</sup>	16,240	33	4,488	31
United Nations Industrial Development Fund	14,285	83	11,150	82
United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control	6,668	35	5,170	37
United Nations Trust Fund for Sudano-Sahelian Activities	3,993	10	563	6
United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation	3,071	32	1,576	36
Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women	2,145	34	1,676	34
United Nations Trust Fund for African Development Activities	1,856	20		
Trust Fund for the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations	1,192	6	491	3
United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration	862	3	1,019	5
Special Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Volunteers	581	12	583	18
United Nations Trust Fund for the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women	205	9	328	9
United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries	40	11	69	14
Special Account for Financing the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification	39	4	-	-
Transport and Communications Decade in Africa	2	2	77	8
Total	1,106,907		1,014,563	

<sup>1</sup>Funds for 1982 were pledged to the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development.

NOTE: Figures exclude contributions from intergovernmental and non-governmental sources. No contributions were received in 1981 or 1982 to the Trust Fund for the Economic Commission for Western Asia Regional Activities.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36.L.89.

Note: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/CONF.110/2 & Corr.1,2.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, transmitted by S-G note, A/37/445.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/199, para. 3, 17 Dec. (p. 429).

Meeting records: Pledging Conference for Development Activities, A/CONF.110/SR.1-3 (3, 4 Nov.).

## Arrangements for future pledging conferences.

By a decision adopted without vote on 17 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly took note of a Secretariat note of 4 November-stating the intention of adding the United Nations Trust Fund for Social Defence (p. 774) to the list of programmes and funds included within the scope of future United Nations pledging conferences for development activities.<sup>(2)</sup> This action was similarly recommended on 10 December by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, as orally proposed by the Chairman.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/446, 17 Dec., text following.

Note: <sup>(2)</sup>Secretariat, A/C.2/36/3.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 47 (24 Sep.-10 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/446

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/C.2/36/694/Add.8) without vote. 10 December (meeting 47); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 69 (I).

## United Nations pledging conferences for development activities

At Its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, took note of the note by the Secretariat on arrangements for future United Nations pledging conferences for development activities.

Arab Gulf Programme for UN Development Organizations. In early 1981, an Arab Gulf Programme for United Nations Development Organizations was established to provide support for the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and other United Nations organizations concerned with the development of human resources. Founding members were Bahrain, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. Originally known as the Arab Gulf Development Foundation for the United Nations, it made its initial contribution to UNICEF in 1981 (p. 1009).

#### Review of operational activities

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL. Operational activities for development of the United Nations system were reviewed in 1981 in the first annual report to the General Assembly on this topic by the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation.<sup>(2)</sup> The report analysed trends in expenditures and contributions, and provided information and recommendations on measures under way or contemplated to enhance the efficiency of operational activities.

A synthesis of measures reported by various organizations, adopted in October by the Consultative Committee on Substantive Questions (Programme Matters) of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), was included in the report. Among the measures mentioned were: formulation of long-range strategies and plans of action, and of medium-term plans; organizational surveys aimed at cost-saving; decentralization of management responsibilities to regional or country offices; involvement of recipient Governments in the formulation and implementation of field projects, and other measures to make country programming more responsive to immediate needs; improved project design to ensure that assumptions made at the planning stage remained valid; strengthened management information and evaluation; and better recruitment techniques and headquarters backstopping for projects.

The report also included observations by the Director-General on broad issues of efficiency and effectiveness in operational activities. Pointing to the decentralized nature of the United Nations system as well as the need for common approaches and co-ordinated actions on certain issues, he thought the Assembly should begin by identifying such issues and then elaborate common approaches to them. He made the point that the pursuit of administrative economy was not the sole component of efficiency or effectiveness; other elements included the objective of improving quality and responsiveness, links between operational activities and headquarters-based research and analysis functions, and the adequacy and predictability of resources. Presenting his report to the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 9 November, the Director-General cautioned against dismantling services and getting rid of expertise that might be needed in future when operational activities resumed their upward growth.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly took note with appreciation of the Director-General's report. After reiterating the need for increased contributions (p. 420), the Assembly welcomed a

June decision of the UNDP Governing Council urging a reduction in the Programme's administrative budget (p. 448) and urged other governing bodies, as a general guideline, to seek to minimize administrative and overhead costs with a view to increasing the proportion of resources available to meet the assistance requirements of developing countries. It favoured measures leading to a greater use of developing countries' capacities in procuring material and equipment, providing training and services, finding local contractors and recruiting personnel. It requested the Director-General to include in his 1983 report to the Assembly recommendations on ways to increase the participation of developing countries in programme execution. It invited governing bodies to take action to reduce administrative and other support costs and improve efficiency, and asked for information on what was being done in that regard.

The resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 7 December. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on a draft sponsored by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77,<sup>(1)</sup> subsequently withdrawn.

According to the original draft, the Assembly would have urged governing bodies responsible for operational activities to minimize (instead of seek to minimize) administrative and overhead costs, and would have urged them to make greater use (instead of inviting them to adopt appropriate measures leading to a greater use) of the capacities of developing countries in regard to equipment and personnel.

Introducing the draft, Algeria said it reflected the deep concern of the developing countries at the financial crisis hampering operational activities for development.

In the Second Committee debate on this topic, many States emphasized the need for improved administration of development assistance activities in order to enhance their credibility and make them more attractive to donors. The Federal Republic of Germany remarked that the extent of contributions would largely depend on keeping administrative expenditures within reasonable limits. France regarded rigorous management of development assistance funds as essential if Governments were to retain confidence in United Nations organizations and regretted that the Director-General's report contained little information about measures taken in that regard. Austria asked for more such information in the 1982 report. Italy said there could be no improvement in the trend in contributions unless the organizations improved their efficiency and co-ordination.



Denmark, speaking for the Nordic States, believed the various agencies should join their resources in field offices to achieve savings and increased efficiency. The United Kingdom also opposed wasteful duplication of bureaucracy at field offices and hoped the Director-General would report on the extent to which the problem had been reduced by the appointment of resident co-ordinators for the development assistance activities of the United Nations system (p. 430).

Belgium regretted that the Director-General's report had not fulfilled expectations for proposals to reduce administrative and support costs and to harmonize agency procedures; if there was to be real growth in resources for development, maximum resources must be allocated to projects by cutting non-essential costs. Canada considered that the Director-General and the resident co-ordinators of development assistance in the field were not getting the full support of all parts of the United Nations system; it believed the Assembly should remain the final authority in defining the system's development objectives and that the specialized agencies should be asked for reports on implementation of Assembly resolutions. Austria, France and Italy supported this request for reports.

Ecuador was among those which thought headquarters bureaucracies should be reduced; it deplored the attitude of agency heads who expressed satisfaction at increases in their budgets but announced 20 per cent cuts in field programmes. Others calling for a cut in excessive administrative costs included Kenya and Mongolia.

Some speakers urged caution regarding attempts to reduce administrative expenses. Bangladesh, Bhutan and Indonesia feared that the quality of services might deteriorate if administrative expenses were cut back excessively. The Netherlands thought the field network should be reduced only as a last resort. Pakistan said it was hard to enhance efficiency when the level of resources was not predictable; it also saw a need to preserve a basic infrastructure of policy formulation, administrative capacity and field organization. The Philippines suggested that estimates be drawn up of the threshold levels at which further lowering of support costs would harm the effectiveness or quality of assistance. Sri Lanka did not believe cost-cutting should be at the expense of field office efficiency.

Bhutan and others stressed the importance of improved monitoring and evaluation of operational activities. Tunisia thought that evaluation should be regarded as an integral part of measures to improve the effectiveness of development assistance.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77. A/C.2/36/L.89.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/478 & Corr.1.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/199, 17 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3, 6, 33-39, 42, 46 (24 Sep.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/199

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/812) without vote, 7 December (meeting 46); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.131), based on informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.89); agenda item 70 (a).

#### Operational activities for development

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362 (S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling also its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recalling further its resolutions 33/201 of 29 January 1979 and 35/81 of 5 December 1980 on a comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development,

Recalling its resolutions 2688 (XXV) of 11 December 1970 on the capacity of the United Nations development system and 3405 (XXX) of 28 November 1975 on new dimensions in technical co-operation,

Having noted with deep concern the outcome of the 1981 United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities, held on 3 and 4 November 1981,

Having examined the annual report for 1981 of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation on operational activities for development of the United Nations system,

Reiterating that a substantial part of world resources, material as well as human, continues to be diverted to armaments with detrimental effect on international security and on efforts to achieve the new international economic order, including operational activities for development of the United Nations system, and calling upon Governments to take effective measures in the field of real disarmament that would increase the possibilities of allocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, especially development of developing countries,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the annual report for 1981 of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation on operational activities for development of the United Nations system, and takes note of the areas identified by the Director-General in which further progress can be made;

2. Reaffirms that the operational activities for development of the United Nations system should contribute effectively to the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, which should provide the framework within which those activities should be planned and conducted;

3. Expresses its deep concern that over all voluntary contributions from Governments and other sources to the funds and programmes that are included in the United Nations pledging conferences for development activities have been stagnating and falling short in many cases of targets which have been set by the relevant intergovernmental bodies, with serious consequences for the organizations concerned with respect to their capacity to maintain the level of their opera-

tional programmes in support of the growing needs of developing countries for multilateral concessional assistance through the United Nations system;

4. Strongly reiterates the need for a substantial and real increase in the flow of resources for operational activities on an increasingly predictable, continuous and assured basis and, in this context, urges all countries, particularly those developed countries whose overall performance is not commensurate with their capacity, to increase rapidly and substantially their contributions to the system's operational activities for development;

5. Invites all countries to inform the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session of the steps they have taken or intend to take in response to the present resolution and other relevant resolutions of the Assembly, taking into account targets which have been set by the relevant intergovernmental bodies;

6. Decides to review and appraise on a regular basis the mobilization of resources for operational activities for development, taking into account targets which have been set by the relevant intergovernmental bodies and, for this purpose, requests the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to include in his annual report to the General Assembly a compilation of information provided by Governments, in accordance with paragraph 5 above, and other relevant information, together with his comments and recommendations;

7. Expresses its deep concern at the slow progress towards placing the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system engaged in operational activities for development on a more stable financial basis and, in this context, urges all countries that are able to do so to indicate, while making their pledges, their probable contributions for a multiyear period, taking into account the need to ensure increased resources in real terms on an increasingly predictable, continuous and assured basis;

8. Reiterates its invitation to the governing bodies of the relevant organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, as appropriate, to consider new and specific ways and means of mobilizing increased resources for operational activities for development on an increasingly predictable, continuous and assured basis and requests the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to take into account the outcome of these considerations in the preparation of his report to be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session;

9. Welcomes paragraph 4 of decision 81/16 of 27 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme, in which the Council urged the Administrator to reduce the size of the administrative budget of the Programme, and urges all the governing bodies of the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system engaged in operational activities for development, as a general guideline, to seek to minimize the administrative and overhead costs with a view to increasing the proportion of resources available to meet the assistance requirements of developing countries;

10. Invites all organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system engaged in operational activities for development to adopt appropriate measures leading to a greater use of the capacities of developing countries in local or regional procurement of material and equipment, in training and in services, in facilitating the increased use of local contractors, and in the recruitment of training, technical and managerial personnel, bearing in mind decision 81/28 of 30 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme;

11. Requests the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to include in his report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session recommendations on specific ways and means of increasing the participation of developing countries in the execution of programmes and projects of the operational activities for development of the United Nations system, bearing in mind paragraphs 8,9 and 10 of Assembly resolution 35/81;

12. Invites the governing bodies of the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system engaged in operational activities to take the action requested in paragraphs 8,9 and 11 of General Assembly resolution 35/81, and invites the Secretary-General and the heads of those organs, organizations and bodies to provide information on the action taken by the governing bodies, and requests the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to include that information, together with his own recommendations, in his reports to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth sessions and, in preparing the recommendations requested in paragraph 18 of that resolution, to take into account the responses made by the above-mentioned governing bodies and the comments made thereon by delegations during the thirty-sixth session of the Assembly;

13. Welcomes the establishment by the Secretary-General of the consultative process in pursuance of paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 34/213 of 19 December 1979, in which the Assembly called for consultations with Governments, through the resident co-ordinator, and for the participation of all organizations concerned both at the country level and subsequently through the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, calls upon the executive heads of the relevant organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to co-operate fully in that process, and requests the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to include in his annual report information on the outcome of those consultations;

14. Requests the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to provide in his annual report comprehensive statistical information on operational activities for development of the United Nations system on the same basis as that contained in the annual report for 1981, and to include separately in his report information pertaining to the United Nations Trust Fund for Special Economic Assistance Programmes and the Fund of the United Nations Environment Programme, as well as information relating to administrative, programme and other support costs incurred by organizations engaged in operational activities for development.

#### Role of resident co-ordinators

By the end of 1981, resident co-ordinators had been designated by the Secretary-General in most countries receiving United Nations development assistance. Their functions, defined in 1979,<sup>(3)</sup> involved responsibility for and co-ordination of operational activities for development carried out by the United Nations system at the country level, in co-operation with national authorities. The first co-ordinators were designated in 1980.<sup>(6)</sup>

The UNDP Governing Council, on 27 June 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> noted with appreciation the progress achieved in the designation of resident co-ordinators as further evidence of the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system.

The Economic and Social Council in a resolution on UNDP adopted on 22 July,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the organizations participating in the United Nations development system to strengthen co-ordination between their headquarters and in the field, in particular to enable the resident co-ordinators to act as the central co-ordinating authority on behalf of the United Nations development system in the field.

In his 1981 report to the General Assembly on operational activities for development,<sup>(1)</sup> the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation stated that the co-ordinators were consulting Governments on the best way of enabling them to exercise their responsibilities. The outcome of those exploratory contacts would be brought to the attention of ACC in the context of its future review of arrangements for the exercise of the co-ordinators' functions.

The Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on operational activities for development,<sup>(4)</sup> welcomed the establishment of this consultative process and requested the Director-General to inform it of the outcome.

In the Second Committee debate on operational activities, Australia and Bangladesh saw the resident co-ordinators as playing an important role in avoiding waste, duplication and competition between organizations. Argentina, Ecuador and Zambia thought that agencies should discontinue the establishment of regional offices with functions similar to those of the co-ordinators. The Philippines thought the co-ordinators' key function was to facilitate the integration of United Nations assistance into the Government's development programmes and said it was better to adopt an experimental approach rather than rigid guidelines for their work.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/478.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC: 1981/59, para. 5, 22 July (p. 435). GA: <sup>(3)</sup>34/213, 19 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 528 ); <sup>(4)</sup>36/199, para. 13, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 430).

Decision: <sup>(5)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1): 81/19, 27 June.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 613.

counted for nearly half of the system's expenditures on technical co-operation. The largest amounts went to agriculture and health (see tables below).

The General Assembly, in a resolution on UNDP of 17 December 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> stressed that the realization of the goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, approved by it in 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> required a renewed emphasis on technical co-operation and a significant increase in the resources provided for that purpose.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/1982/63.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503); <sup>(3)</sup>36/200, para. 3, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 436).

UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION  
EXPENDITURES IN 1981, BY EXECUTING AGENCY  
(In thousands of US dollars)

Executing agency	Non-UNDP	UNDP	Total
UNIDO	21,099	66,900	87,999
UNCTAD	2,205	17,100	19,305
UN Centre on Transnational Corporations	1,035	-	1,035
ECA	9,071	7,800	16,871
ECE	157	900	1,057
ECLA	6,989	2,100	9,089
ECWA	1,748	500	2,248
ESCAP	8,503	5,200	13,703
UNHCR	8	-	8
UNCHS	2,326	11,000	13,326
Other United Nations	49,382	91,500	140,882
<b>Subtotal United Nations</b>	<b>102,523</b>	<b>203,000</b>	<b>305,523</b>
IAEA	16,087	4,900	20,987
ILO	50,653	54,000	104,653
FAO	133,692	182,500	316,192
UNESCO	47,674	52,200	99,874
WHO	274,949	23,600	298,549
World Bank and IDA	516,522	35,500	554,022
ICAO	21,881	39,800	61,681
UPU	1,074	3,300	4,374
ITU	7,640	32,300	39,940
WMO	8,538	12,400	20,938
IMCO	1,822	7,100	8,922
WIPO	1,258	500	1,758
International Trade Centre	11,125	-	11,125
UNDP	30,850	56,900	87,750
UNICEF	4,708	-	4,708
UNFPA	39,109	-	39,109
<b>Subtotal other UN system</b>	<b>1,169,582</b>	<b>505,000</b>	<b>1,674,582</b>
World Tourism Organization	8	400	408
Asian Development Bank	n.a.	2,500	2,500
Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development	n.a.	600	600
Governments	26,414	20,100	46,514
Non-governmental organizations	12,825	-	12,825
<b>Subtotal non-UN system</b>	<b>39,247</b>	<b>23,600</b>	<b>62,847</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,311,352</b>	<b>731,600</b>	<b>2,042,952</b>

n.a. = not available

<sup>(1)</sup>Including \$1,705,000 financed by UNDP-administered trust funds and \$8,038,676 financed by the European Economic Community.

<sup>(2)</sup>Represents expenditures by United Nations Volunteers, Office for Projects Execution and United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration.

<sup>(3)</sup>Including government cash counterpart expenditures of \$9,798,000.

NOTE: Figures for UNDP are provisional data covering indicative planning figures. Special Programme Resources. Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries. Special Industrial Services and cost-sharing

## Technical co-operation

Expenditures by the United Nations system for technical co-operation amounted to \$2,043 million in 1981, compared to \$1,800 million in 1980, according to information provided to the UNDP Governing Council by the Programme's Administrator.<sup>(1)</sup> Of the total, UNDP financed \$732 million, other extrabudgetary financing accounted for \$1,097 million (including \$519 million from the World Bank) and the remaining \$213 million was supplied from the regular budgets of United Nations organizations. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development ac-

UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION  
EXPENDITURES IN 1981, BY SECTOR  
(In thousands of US dollars)

Sector	Non-UNDP	UNDP	Total
Political affairs	-	200	200
General development	28,054	91,700	119,754
Natural resources	52,639	79,500	132,139
Agriculture, forestry and fisheries	125,564	175,900	301,464
Industry	27,697	80,700	108,397
Transport and communications	47,694	104,100	151,794
International trade and development finance	13,874	17,700	31,574
Population	127,199	500	127,699
Human settlements	4,790	12,700	17,490
Health	266,755	33,700	300,455
Education	28,793	49,100	77,093
Employment	34,105	39,400	73,505
Humanitarian and relief	85	2,900	2,985
Social conditions and equity	5,621	5,400	11,021
Culture	8,173	6,600	14,773
Science and technology	23,492	31,500	54,992
Unspecified	516,817	-	516,817
Total	1,311,352	731,600 <sup>1</sup>	2,042,952

<sup>1</sup>Including government cash counterpart expenditure of \$9,798,000

NOTE: Figures for UNDP are provisional data covering Indicative planning figures. Special Programme Resources. Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries. Special Industrial Services and cost-sharing.

#### Information on technical co-operation expenditures

The Economic and Social Council endorsed on 22 July 1981<sup>(1)</sup> a 27 June decision of the UNDP Governing Council<sup>(2)</sup> by which the UNDP Administrator was requested, pending alternative arrangements, to continue to provide information on regular and extrabudgetary technical co-operation expenditures by specialized agencies financed from sources other than UNDP.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/59, para. p. 22 July (p. 435). Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1). 81/34. 27 June.

### UN Development Programme

#### UNDP activities

For the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) -the largest source of multi-lateral technical co-operation - 1981 marked the final year of the Programme's second development co-operation cycle, a five-year forward plan of comprehensive programming for technical co-operation at the country and intercountry levels. The first cycle extended from 1972 to 1976 and the second from 1977 to 1981, while the third was to extend from 1982 to 1986. Expenditures for the second cycle were virtually on target.

In his report to the UNDP Governing Council for 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the UNDP Administrator noted that project-related expenditures were increasingly directed towards lower income countries, especially in Africa and Asia. Least developed countries, and others given similar treatment, ac-

counted for 32.6 per cent of all allocations to individual countries in the 1977-1981 cycle. The dollar value of the programmes they received more than doubled over the previous cycle, as measured by the indicative planning figures (IPFs) by which UNDP allocated funds to country and intercountry programmes. These countries were to account for 40.2 per cent of IPF allocations in the third development cycle, while all countries with an annual gross national product of under \$500 per capita were projected to receive almost 80 per cent of country IPF allocations in the same period. Third cycle IPFs were confirmed by the UNDP Governing Council in June 1981 (p. 444).

The share of total UNDP field expenditures going to industry, transport and communications, human settlements and, especially, general development issues, policy and planning increased in the second cycle as compared to the first, while the share of expenditures for agriculture, population, health and education declined somewhat. For natural resources, international trade and development finance, employment, and science and technology, the proportion of field expenditure remained relatively unchanged between the first two cycles.

Other quantitative indicators for the first two cycles showed: a rough doubling of voluntary contributions and expenditures; a substantial rise in cost-sharing contributions to UNDP-supported projects by developing country and third party Governments; a loss in the value of contributions received, particularly severe in 1981, due to exchange-rate fluctuations; a significant decline in the share of project expenditures spent on international project personnel, counterbalanced by a growth in the training and equipment components; an across-the-board increase in the share of project inputs provided by developing countries, particularly in terms of experts and sub-contracts; and a total of more than \$42 billion of investment commitments reported during the period 1972-1981 as a follow-up to UNDP aid.

UNDP continued to shift the mode of its country and intercountry assistance from a project to a programme orientation. Previously, programmes had been elaborated on the basis of a list of projects rather than a comprehensive assessment of the countries' technical co-operation needs; little effort had been made to identify linkages between national objectives, sectoral diagnoses and specific projects. Recent qualitative improvements in programming included: efforts to assess technical co-operation needs more rigorously; an integrated approach to sectoral assistance based on wide-ranging participation by project-implementing agencies; increased

use of project personnel from the receiving country and emphasis on technical co-operation among developing countries; provision for additionality and co-ordination with other sources of assistance; and closer relationships with related intercountry activities.

Field expenditures of the main programme<sup>a</sup> rose by 8 per cent from the previous year, to a record level of \$732 million in 1981. Country projects accounted for \$600.1 million, or 82 per cent, of total field expenditures. For intercountry programmes, \$97.5 million was spent on regional projects, \$9.6 million on interregional and \$15 million on global projects. Programme support and administrative services costs for 1980-1981 amounted to 13.6 per cent of main programme expenditures and were projected to increase to 14.5 per cent for 1982-1983 (p. 447).

The number of UNDP projects approved in 1981 declined compared to the previous year, from 1,321 in 1980 costing \$466.1 million to 1,114 in 1981 costing \$406.3 million. Of the total cost, new country projects in Asia and the Pacific accounted for 37.5 per cent; Africa, 31 per cent; Arab States, 11 per cent; Latin America, 10.8 per cent, and Europe, 0.7 per cent. The share of new regional, interregional and global projects was 9 per cent.

Field work was completed in 1981 on 194 UNDP-supported projects costing \$150,000 or more: 78 in Africa, 52 in Asia and the Pacific, 32 in Latin America, 17 in the Arab States, 12 in Europe and 3 global projects.

The year 1981 was the first billion dollar year in the Programme's history, with expenditures of all UNDP-managed operations totalling \$1,043.8 million, against income of \$890.7 million (p. 446). However, voluntary contributions paid by Governments to the main UNDP account decreased for the first time, from \$691.8 million in 1980 to \$688.7 million in 1981 (p. 451). Total income for the year in this account was \$804.3 million, a 2 per cent decrease from the \$821.4 million received in 1980 (p. 446).

**UNDP COUNCIL ACTION.** The UNDP Governing Council held its twenty-eighth session at United Nations Headquarters from 9 June to 1 July. Its Budgetary and Finance Committee met concurrently, from 8 June to 1 July.

The Council approved 14 new country programmes whose sectoral allocations showed a continued emphasis on agriculture, with natural resources, industry and human resource development as the next most important sectors (p. 436).

The Council took note of an intercountry programme for Asia and the Pacific proposed for the third programme cycle- the first such programme to have been conceived, formulated and submitted in accordance with the UNDP policy

of enlarged government participation in programme planning (p. 442). Six new global projects were approved (p. 443).

Despite indications that resources available in the third programming cycle might fall short of the total envisaged, the Council decided to retain, for purposes of forward planning, the level of resources initially envisaged for the 1982-1986 programme cycle, which assumed a 14 per cent average annual growth of voluntary contributions from the 1977-1981 level (p. 444).

On other programme matters, the Council endorsed revised country programming procedures (p. 445), requested stronger ties between UNDP and multilateral financial institutions (p. 443) and called for a further report on a proposal to upgrade the UNDP fisheries vessels pool (p. 444). It took note of a report on evaluation of technical co-operation activities (p. 445) and decided that full consideration should be given to making Governments rather than international organizations responsible for executing more UNDP projects (p. 446).

Taking note of the report of the Administrator for 1980, <sup>(2)</sup> the Council commended him for his efforts to improve programme performance, for the growing field service functions of UNDP and for the substantial continued growth in programme delivery. <sup>(7)</sup>

Among its financial actions, the Council approved supplementary appropriations for 1980-1981 amounting to \$32 million for the main programme and other UNDP-managed activities, raising the administrative budget for that biennium to \$204.4 million. For 1982-1983, it approved appropriations totalling \$262.7 million (p. 448).

To ease the burden on smaller agencies executing UNDP projects, which often had to spend more to administer those projects than they were reimbursed by the Programme, the Council approved support cost flexibility arrangements that would permit higher reimbursement rates under specified conditions (p. 449). For 1982-1983, it approved an allocation of \$3.7 million for sectoral support activities designed to complement project and programming activities financed by the agencies themselves (p. 450).

The Council adopted revised UNDP Financial Regulations and, at its request, the General Assembly authorized it in December to adopt financial regulations in respect of all funds administered by UNDP (p. 451). Noting with concern the increasing level of unpaid pledges, it invited Governments to pay amounts due for

<sup>a</sup> The UNDP main programme consisted of projects financed under IPFs Special Programme resources, the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries, Special Industrial Services and government cost-sharing

1981 and prior years (p. 456). It was unable to agree on additional action to reduce its holdings of non-convertible currencies contributed by some Governments (p. 456).

To improve management and administrative functions, the Council authorized a strengthening of the Division of Management Information Services (p. 457) and decided to continue financing the Inter-agency Procurement Services Unit (p. 457). It also took action on matters concerning the recruitment of project professional staff (p. 458). A UNDP study programme was established to promote greater understanding of development problems and to generate new resources and ideas (p. 458).

The Council adopted measures to streamline and rationalize its work, including steps to enable it to concentrate on policy issues (p. 458).

Other actions by the Council related to several funds and programmes managed by or in co-operation with UNDP: the United Nations Volunteers (p. 461), the United Nations Capital Development Fund (p. 468), the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries (p. 415), the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office (p. 486), the joint venture with the United Nations Environment Programme to combat desertification in the Sudano-Sahelian region (p. 829), the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration (p. 675), the UNDP Energy Account (p. 711), the United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development (p. 742) and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (p. 781).

In addition, the Council: reviewed United Nations technical co-operation programmes (p. 460) and requested that it continue to be given information on programmes not financed by UNDP (p. 432); approved new policies, rules and procedures for the use of UNDP country programme funds for technical co-operation among developing countries (p. 467); called for continued assistance to Palestinians (p. 273) and to national liberation movements (p. 1099), and welcomed plans for a report on the development problems of Namibia (p. 1170); authorized preparatory and follow-up action on the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (p. 405); appealed for international assistance to drought-stricken areas of Africa (p. 486) and authorized UNDP aid to Uganda (p. 520), while deferring action on Lebanon (p. 529); and authorized assistance to maritime transport training institutions (p. 568).

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** By a resolution of 22 July,<sup>(5)</sup> adopted without vote, the Economic and Social Council reaffirmed the central funding and co-ordinating role of UNDP

in the field of technical co-operation within the United Nations system and recommended that intergovernmental bodies take full account of the need to preserve that role when considering new funding arrangements for technical co-operation.

The Council noted the Governing Council's report and decisions,<sup>(4)</sup> particularly its decision on preparation for the 1982-1986 programming cycle; welcomed decisions on recruitment of professional staff, government execution of projects, project evaluation, establishment of a study programme and rationalization of the Governing Council's work; and endorsed the request for information on technical co-operation expenditures by executing agencies. It urged renewed efforts to place UNDP on a sound financial basis (p. 452), favoured improved inter-agency co-ordination through resident co-ordinators (p. 430), and commended to the General Assembly's attention the view that the United Nations Capital Development Fund should be authorized to meet its administrative and programme support costs from its own resources (p. 468).

The Council's Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee approved this resolution, which was introduced by India on behalf of 22 nations, without vote on 17 July.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** The Economic and Social Council resolution was endorsed by the General Assembly on 17 December, by a resolution adopted without vote.<sup>(6)</sup> Noting with satisfaction the Governing Council's report and decisions, the Assembly stressed the need for renewed emphasis on technical co-operation and a significant increase in resources. It further decided that, beginning in 1983, a policy review of UNDP-managed funds and programmes should be undertaken biennially-with a brief report on them, including a financial statement, to be made available in intervening years-and invited the Governing Council to act accordingly. The Assembly reiterated the need for a substantial increase in contributions to UNDP (p. 452) and encouraged greater efforts to increase its efficiency and effectiveness, taking account of the need to restrain administrative expenditures (p. 449).

The Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee approved the resolution without vote on 1 December. The draft, submitted by a Vice-Chairman and orally revised by him, was based on informal consultations on a text introduced by Yugoslavia on behalf of 32 nation<sup>(1)</sup> - mostly developing countries-and subsequently withdrawn. The drafts differed in their provisions on contributions and administrative expenditures; the oral revision affected the reference to administrative expenditures.

Draft resolution withdrawn<sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gambia, India, Italy, Jamaica, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.107.

Reports: UNDP Administrator. <sup>(2)</sup>DP/510 & Add.1, <sup>(3)</sup>DP/1982/6 & Add.1,2; <sup>(4)</sup>UNDP Council, E/1981/61/Rev.1.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/59, 22 July, text following; <sup>(6)</sup>GA, 36/200, 17 Dec., text following. Dec.: <sup>(7)</sup>UNDP Council, 81/14, 27 June.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.9, 10-12, 17 (13-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.39 (22 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3, 6, 33-39, 42,44,45 (24 Sep.-1 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/59

Adopted without vote Meeting 39 22 July 1981

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/C.3) without vote, 17 July (meeting 17); 22-nation draft (E/1981/C.3/L.14); agenda item 17.

Sponsors: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burundi, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, India, Indonesia, Italy, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Turkey, United States, Yugoslavia.

#### Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 35/56 of 5 December 1980, containing the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, and 35/81 of 5 December 1980, on the comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development,

Mindful of the continuing urgent problems of development faced by the peoples of developing countries, and reaffirming that the attainment of the individual and collective self-reliance of the developing countries would make an important contribution to the ultimate solution of those problems,

Bearing in mind the role of the United Nations Development Programme in multilateral technical co-operation for the economic and social development of developing countries, as defined by the General Assembly in its resolutions 2888(XXV) of 11 December 1970 and 3405(XXX) of 28 November 1975,

Recalling its resolution 2024(LXI) of 4 August 1978 on operational activities for development,

Recognizing that the United Nations Development Programme is making an important contribution to the accelerated development of developing countries,

Having considered the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme on its twenty-eighth session,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme on its twenty-eighth session and the decisions contained therein;

2. Notes in particular Governing Council decision 81/16 of 27 June 1981 on the preparation for the third programming cycle, 1982-1988, by which decision 80/30 of 26 June 1980 was reaffirmed;

3. Urges all Governments to renew their efforts to provide the United Nations Development Programme with the resources necessary to establish the sound financial basis needed to implement the Programme's planned activities for the third programming cycle, 1982-1986, which, for the purpose of forward planning, also assumes an overall average growth of resources of at least 14 per cent;

4. Reaffirms the central funding and co-ordinating role of the United Nations Development Programme in the field of technical co-operation within the United Nations system in conformity with the consensus of 1970 and General Assembly resolutions 32/197 of 20 December 1977, 33/202 of 29 January 1979 and 35/81 of 5 December 1980, and recommends to the intergovernmental bodies concerned that the need to preserve this role should be taken fully into account in the consideration of new funding arrangements for technical co-operation activities;

5. Requests all international organizations participating in the United Nations development system to strengthen their mutual co-ordination, both between headquarters and at the field level, with a view to improving the integration of technical assistance, in particular to enable the resident co-ordinators to act as the central co-ordinating authority on behalf of the United Nations development system at the field level;

8. Commends to the attention of the General Assembly the view that the United Nations Capital Development Fund should be authorized to meet the administrative and programme support costs pertaining to its activities from its own resources;

7. Welcomes Governing Council decisions 81/20 on the improvement of the methods and procedures for the recruitment of project professional staff and consultants; 81/21 on government execution and management, project design, monitoring and evaluation, and experts financed by the United Nations Development Programme; 81/30 on the establishment of a United Nations Development Programme study programme; and 81/37 on the streamlining and rationalization of the work of the Governing Council, all dated 27 June 1981;

8. Notes with satisfaction that the Governing Council, in its decision 81/37, decided that "New and specific ways and means of mobilizing increased resources on an increasingly predictable, continuous and assured basis" will be the subject of its agenda item on policy review for its twenty-ninth session;

9. Endorses Governing Council decision 81/34 of 27 June 1981, by which the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme was requested to continue to provide information on agency regular and extrabudgetary technical co-operation expenditures financed from sources other than the United Nations Development Programme, until alternative arrangements for the provision of such data have been made within the United Nations system.

General Assembly resolution 36/200

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/812) without vote, 1 December (meeting 45): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.121), orally revised, based on informal consultations on 32-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.107); agenda item 70 (b).

#### United Nations Development Programme

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, 35/81 of 5 December 1980 on the comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development and 35/83 of 5 December 1980 on the United Nations Development Programme,

Reaffirming the unique and important contribution which the United Nations Development Programme is making to the development efforts of developing countries,

Having considered the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme on its twenty-eighth session and Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/59 of 22 July 1981 on the report of the Governing Council,

Concerned at the shortfall of voluntary contributions in relation to the assumed overall average annual growth of resources,

Aware that, together with efforts to obtain additional voluntary contributions, steps are being taken to increase further the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of the United Nations Development Programme,

Noting that the Governing Council of the Programme has decided to retain for the purposes of forward planning for the third programming cycle, 1982-1986, an assumed overall average annual growth of resources of at least 14 per cent,

Noting with appreciation the statement made before the Second Committee on 24 September 1981 by the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme,

Reaffirming the validity of the consensus of 1970, as set forth in the annex to its resolution 2688(XXV) of 11 December

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme on its twenty-eighth session and the decisions contained therein;

2. Endorses Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/59;

3. Stresses that the realization of the goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade requires a renewed emphasis upon technical co-operation and a significant increase in the resources provided for that purpose;

4. Endorses also decision 81/37 of 27 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme on streamlining and rationalizing the work of the Governing Council;

5. Commends the efforts made by the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme to increase further the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of the Programme, and encourages the Administrator to continue to intensify those efforts, taking account, *inter alia*, of the need to restrain administrative expenditures in order to maximize programme delivery in accordance with paragraph 4 of decision 81/16 of 27 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the Programme;

6. Expresses its appreciation to all Governments of both developed and developing countries which, at the 1981 United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities, announced contributions or their intention to contribute to the United Nations Development Programme for 1982, in particular those Governments which have consistently increased their voluntary contributions to the Programme;

7. Expresses its deep concern nevertheless that the likely shortfall in 1982 in overall voluntary contributions may adversely affect the proposed programme delivery for the third programming cycle of the United Nations Development Programme;

8. Urges all Governments, especially those whose voluntary contributions may not reflect their capacity to contribute, to renew their efforts to provide the United Nations Development Programme with the resources necessary to establish a sound financial basis for the implementation of the Programme's planned activities for the third programming cycle, 1982-1986, which for the purpose of forward planning would assume an overall average annual growth of resources of at least 14 per cent;

9. Strongly reiterates the need for a substantial and real increase in the flow of resources for the United Nations Development Programme on an increasingly predictable, continuous and assured basis, and in that context welcomes decision 81/37 of the Governing Council of the Programme in which the Council decided to review this issue at its twenty-ninth session;

10. Reaffirms the request of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme, in its decision 81/16, to the Administrator of the Programme to continue consultations with donor countries with a view to reaching the level of resources envisaged for 1982-1986 in order to

maintain the level of programme planning for participating countries, as approved by the Governing Council for the third programming cycle, 1962-1986;

11. Decides that, beginning in 1983, a broad policy review of those funds and programmes which are under the guidance of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme and managed by the Administrator of the Programme should be undertaken on a biennial basis, on the understanding that a brief report, including a financial statement, on those funds and programmes should be made available to the Governing Council in the intervening years, and invites the Governing Council to act accordingly.

## Country programmes

The UNDP Governing Council, on 15 and 26 June 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> approved country programmes proposed by the Administrator for Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bulgaria, the Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Kenya, Maldives, Mauritius, Nepal, the Philippines, Poland, Rwanda and Viet Nam. It authorized him to proceed with appraisal and approval of requests for assistance falling within the outlines of the respective country programmes while ensuring that expenditures were kept in conformity with the IPFs for each country and contained within the financial resources actually available.

With respect to the Viet Nam programme, it requested the Administrator to report in 1982 on steps set forth in his programme recommendation, which envisaged that UNDP missions would be sent to determine precisely what work was needed and what inputs were required for projects in that country. The Council also asked him to submit to it those projects which required its consideration and approval.

On 24 June,<sup>(1)</sup> the Council took note of an April report by the Administrator on trends and problems in these 14 new country programmes.<sup>(3)</sup>

The new country programmes ranged in size from \$175 million for Bangladesh- the second largest UNDP country programme and the largest for any least developed country- to \$4.8 million each for Bulgaria and Poland. Most of them covered the period 1982-1986, though a few were to begin earlier. Agriculture was the largest single sector in all programmes except those of Bulgaria and Cuba, where industry accounted for about half of the projected expenditure. The focus in the agricultural sector was on food production and self-sufficiency in basic foodstuffs. Natural resources, industry and human resource development were the next most important sectors.

Only in a few of these countries were UNDP resources to be augmented by Governments and third-party cost-sharing. A government cost-sharing contribution of \$3.5 million was envisaged in the Congo, while in Maldives and Nepal additional financing was expected from multi-bilateral sources.

(continued on p. 447)



UNDP INDICATIVE PLANNING FIGURES, 1981 EXPENDITURES  
AND PROGRAMME COMPONENTS

STATE, TERRITORY OR OTHER	INDICATIVE PLANNING FIGURES -		PROJECT EX- PENDITURES (thousands of US dollars)	1981 PROGRAMME				EQUIPMENT ORDERED  (thousands of US dollars)	SUB-CONTRACTS AWARDED  (thousands of US dollars)
	1977-1981	1982-1986		EXPERTS		FELLOWSHIPS			
	(thousands of US dollars)	(thousands of US dollars)		By country of assignment	By na- tionality	By host country	By na- tionality		
Africa									
Angola	10,950	41,500	5,966	117	2	-	29	95	-
Benin	16,250	33,500	4,009	60	15	3	36	237	52
Botswana	8,500	8,500	2,092	37	-	23	10	65	-
Burundi	18,750	48,500	5,782	86	1	3	42	113	-
Cape Verde	4,000	11,250	1,422	25	-	-	11	2	-
Central African Republic	11,750	25,500	2,965	33	2	3	14	51	-
Chad	19,000	52,000	3,966	13	1	1	120	32	-
Comoros	7,200	12,000	2,909	34	-	-	12	93	3
Congo	7,500	11,000	2,583	47	8	3	40	259	110
Equatorial Guinea	4,256	-	1,396	10	-	-	11	57	-
Ethiopia	42,000	112,000	15,436	171	27	28	204	486	-
Gabon	7,500	6,000	2,548	43	-	-	3	48	-
Gambia	7,000	14,250	1,713	37	2	-	6	100	-
Ghana	19,000	40,000	4,979	40	44	5	41	47	-
Guinea	21,750	44,500	7,736	65	13	2	56	50	66
Guinea-Bissau	6,120	21,750	2,491	48	-	37	49	-	-
Ivory Coast	15,000	16,500	3,419	47	1	42	20	43	77
Kenya	27,500	52,000	7,398	126	23	109	77	269	8,011
Lesotho	13,250	22,250	3,305	63	2	8	12	51	64
Liberia	10,000	13,500	1,883	31	1	7	23	110	-
Madagascar	23,750	49,000	5,812	95	12	2	60	142	75
Malawi	19,750	53,000	6,309	100	1	7	110	342	10
Mali	24,000	65,000	6,218	64	27	1	46	377	238
Mauritania	9,750	24,500	3,759	63	8	-	32	73	-
Mauritius	5,250	7,000	1,409	26	11	27	23	13	40
Mozambique	19,000	74,000	8,010	145	-	1	7	104	78
Namibia	7,750	7,750	501	5	-	-	70	-	-
National liberation movements**	20,500	15,000	1,784	-	-	-	66	-	-
Niger	19,750	45,000	6,437	81	2	39	46	457	55
Nigeria	45,500	55,000	13,743	203	24	15	120	51	4
Rwanda	19,750	45,000	8,166	91	6	-	40	419	18
Sao Tome and Principe	1,500	2,000	411	6	-	-	3	-	-
Senegal	11,750	33,000	3,404	43	38	90	56	1,130	835
Seychelles	1,600	1,600	341	8	-	-	2	-	-
Sierra Leone	13,250	32,500	4,160	77	12	-	32	99	28
Somalia	18,250	48,000	7,810	94	3	8	51	32	3
South Africa	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	89	-
Swaziland	5,750	5,750	1,616	31	2	7	26	154	-
Togo	11,000	21,750	3,332	25	8	16	22	89	-
Uganda	30,000	59,500	12,282	57	21	2	69	173	-
United Republic of Cameroon	17,250	27,500	6,922	94	12	45	48	289	402
United Republic of Tanzania	33,500	72,000	11,248	167	19	92	211	244	-
Upper Volta	23,750	55,000	6,765	73	7	10	41	380	145
Zaire	34,500	79,000	10,216	109	6	-	121	30	-
Zambia	15,000	21,250	4,499	67	3	81	19	41	21
Zimbabwe	5,600	24,250	2,294	34	6	3	1	-	-
Other Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	673	-
Subtotal	714,728	1,509,850	221,446	2,891	374	720	2,139	7,609	10,335

STATE, TERRITORY OR OTHER	INDICATIVE PLANNING FIGURES		PROJECTEX- PENDITURES (thousands of US dollars)	1981 PROGRAMME				EQUIPMENT ORDERED  (thousands of US dollars)	SUB-CONTRACTS AWARDED
	1977-1981  (thousands of	1982-1986 us dollars)		EXPERTS		FELLOWSHIPS			
				By country of assignment	By na- tionality	By host country	By na- tionality		
Asia and the Pacific									
Afghanistan	38,000	71,500	5,402	51	6	2	289	146	-
Australia		-	-	-	210	145	-	1,167	1,819
Bangladesh	65,500	201,000	22,010	287	47	26	353	120	1,345
Bhutan	12,250	36,500	2,947	29	-	-	76	130	-
Brunei		200	(7)		-	-	7	3	-
Burma	41,500	102,000	10,175	124	12	64	103	218	-
China	15,000	142,000	15,157	111	13	3	423	91	
Cook Islands		1,400	489	15	-		17	14	-
Democratic Kampuchea	25,500	-	10,588	7	-			-	-
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	8,850	24,750	5,405	-	3	3	-	-	
Fiji	5,000	5,000	1,523	40	6	75	40	147	25
Hong Kong	500	500	243	8	1	14	23	1,117	400
India	97,000	252,000	24,834	262	589	559	418	2,712	12,321
Indonesia	69,500	106,000	15,203	258	55	115	477	442	480
Iran	20,000	-	979	-	12	-	18	-	-
Japan	-	-	-	6	112	246	1	15,460	3,311
Kiribati	1,140	1,300	257	7	-	2	15	-	-
Lao People's Democratic Republic	17,750	52,500	5,343	63	5	-	21	203	
Malaysia	15,000	15,000	3,138	98	24	105	173	92	-
Maldives	2,500	7,000	830	26	-		41	50	-
Mongolia	10,000	10,000	1,648	22		-	22	54	-
Nauru		60		1	-	-	3	-	
Nepal	32,500	98,000	8,586	189	54	10	205	131	291
New Caledonia	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
New Zealand	-		-	-	85	45	5	165	136
Niue	1,000	1,000	282	10	-	1	7	7	13
Pakistan	52,500	118,000	12,161	145	119	33	210	316	222
Papua New Guinea	8,750	13,500	2,072	32	-	57	120	57	-
Philippines	30,500	46,000	8,414	187	173	409	358	420	176
Republic of Korea	18,000	18,000	3,181	59	15	25	98	25	25
Samoa	5,250	5,250	1,420	22	3	5	28	67	-
Singapore	7,500	7,500	1,925	39	8	281	58	1,150	
Solomon Islands	3,145	4,000	1,049	19	-	6	27	116	-
South Pacific Islands	-	-	670	1		-	-	-	-
Sri Lanka	31,500	76,000	7,271	86	99	77	185	253	306
Thailand	29,500	43,000	8,007	357	218	272	175	934	1,202
Tokelau		950	86	-	-	-	2	-	-
Tonga	2,128	2,500	759	19	1	2	36	2	-
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	1,000	1,000	171	7		-	-	-	-
Tuvalu	1,140	1,140	395	4	-	1	16		-
Vanuatu	2,000	2,000	604	19		2	10	13	-
Viet Nam	44,000	118,000	7,064	42	17	2	38	22	-
Other Asia and the Pacific	3,000	-	-	-		-	1	-	-
Subtotal	718,403	1,584,550	190,281	2,652	1,887	2,588	4,107	25,844	22,072
Arab States									
Algeria	20,000	20,000	6,167	182	10	18	98	4	8
Bahrain	2,500	2,500	1,830	24	2	2	17	-	33
Democratic Yemen	14,500	17,250	3,286	50	-	-	62	326	-
Djibouti	2,200	5,250	878	13		-	8	9	
Egypt	31,500	56,000	9,174	116	159	155	213	187	226
Iraq	15,000	15,000	2,991	49	14	2	20	13	-
Jordan	15,000	15,000	3,749	67	30	45	102	79	-
Kuwait	-	-	2,767	48	-	12	21	31	-

## Development assistance

439

STATE, TERRITORY OR OTHER	INDICATIVE PLANNING FIGURES -		1981 PROGRAMME						
	1977-1981	1982-1986	PROJECT EX- PENDITURES (thousands of US dollars)	EXPERTS		FELLOWSHIPS		EQUIPMENT ORDERED	SUB-CONTRACTS AWARDED
				By country of assignment	By na- tionality	By host country	By na- tionality		
	(thousands of US dollars)	(thousands of US dollars)	(thousands of US dollars)					(thousands of US dollars)	
Arab States (cont.)									
Lebanon	10,000	-	3,829	60	21	9	55	167	-
Libyan Arab Jamihiriya	5,000	5,000	2,672	42	-	-	1	5	-
Morocco	20,000	27,000	3,640	95	13	54	37	-	14
Oman	4,000	4,000	1,696	27	-	-	6	10	52
Qatar	-	-	334	22	-	2	-	7	-
Saudi Arabia	10,000	10,000	6,781	91	-	13	68	31	480
Sudan	33,000	58,500	12,805	117	63	6	77	132	-
Syrian Arab Republic	15,000	15,000	4,880	76	27	14	47	136	-
Tunisia	15,000	15,000	3,826	82	55	56	89	44	-
United Arab Emirates	1,000	1,000	2,326	33	-	5	2	61	-
Yemen	23,750	30,000	11,778	110	-	11	99	43	-
Other Arab States region	-	-	802	-	-	-	2	-	-
Subtotal	237,450	296,500	86,211	1,304	394	404	1,024	1,285	813
Europe									
Albania	4,250	10,250	154	-	-	-	25	-	-
Austria	-	-	-	-	76	201	1	1,689	21
Belgium	-	-	-	-	290	224	1	739	214
Bulgaria	7,500	6,000	1,382	25	35	56	124	9	24
Cyprus	5,000	5,000	1,191	33	10	23	10	26	-
Czechoslovakia	2,500	2,500	769	8	88	14	110	103	555
Denmark	-	-	-	-	91	61	-	1,402	753
Finland	-	-	-	-	54	65	-	236	17
France	-	-	-	-	846	922	11	8,426	5,645
German Democratic Republic	-	-	-	-	11	25	-	91	340
Germany, Federal Republic of	-	-	-	-	280	584	-	12,347	432
Greece	7,500	6,000	1,500	49	28	26	180	13	-
Hungary	3,500	3,500	420	7	92	59	43	187	715
Iceland	-	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	15
Ireland	-	-	-	-	48	46	-	3	547
Israel	-	-	-	-	55	19	1	131	235
Italy	-	-	-	-	250	285	-	5,341	2,563
Liechtenstein	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38	-
Luxembourg	-	-	-	-	1	30	-	-	-
Malta	2,500	2,500	457	12	5	25	10	-	-
Netherlands	-	-	-	-	275	254	-	1,995	2,031
Norway	-	-	-	-	80	30	-	384	1,050
Poland	7,500	6,000	1,062	11	165	68	84	508	210
Portugal	4,000	4,000	1,129	47	81	18	66	55	125
Romania	7,500	7,500	860	22	28	18	76	223	27
Spain	-	-	-	-	110	157	-	220	1,877
Sweden	-	-	-	-	223	196	-	2,048	376
Switzerland	-	-	-	3	119	203	1	6,072	490
Turkey	20,000	20,000	6,707	118	47	24	182	56	-
USSR	-	-	-	-	96	63	-	80	586
United Kingdom	-	-	-	3	1,223	1,259	32	20,064	8,742
Yugoslavia	7,500	7,500	1,388	39	136	95	62	2	1,130
Subtotal	79,250	80,750	17,019	377	4,857	5,050	1,019	62,488	28,720
Latin America									
Antigua and Barbuda	-	1,100	537	31	-	5	7	-	-
Argentina	20,000	20,000	5,032	65	181	58	53	16	536
Bahamas	-	2,400	1,011	21	-	1	26	4	-

STATE, TERRITORY OR OTHER	INDICATIVE PLANNING FIGURES		PROJECT- PENDITURES  (thousands of US dollars)	1981 PROGRAMME				EQUIPMENT ORDERED  (thousands of US dollars)	SUB-CONTRACTS AWARDED
	1977-1981	1982-1986		EXPERTS	FELLOWSHIPS				
					By country of assignment	BY na- tionality	By host country		
Latln America (cont.)	(thousands of US dollars)								
Barbados	2,500	2,500	385	9	3	32	8	25	-
Belize	1,000	1,400	328	6	-	1	1	-	-
Bermuda		550	179	9	-	-	1	19	-
Bolivia	15,500	19,500	5,294	115	40	4	34	50	229
Brazil	30,000	30,000	9,293	165	69	120	85	101	369
British Virgin Islands		300	174	1	1		1	-	-
Caribbean multi- island		4,516	1,729	27	-	-	-	32	-
Cayman Islands	-	560	108	5	1	-	4		
Chile	20,000	20,000	4,640	95	197	51	83	32	763
Colombia	20,000	22,000	5,726	149	117	30	78	409	109
Costa Rica	5,000	5,000	635	30	24	98	58	7	253
Cuba	13,500	20,500	1,712	31	16	3	16	22	31
Dominica		2,300	595	14	-	-	6	-	-
Dominican Republic	7,500	12,000	1,665	64	2	7	17	41	-
Ecuador	15,000	15,000	4,552	106	19	16	38	257	30
El Salvador	9,250	15,250	2,185	36	10	1	81	69	-
Grenada		2,100	679	2	-	1	4	-	-
Guadeloupe	-	-	-	-	-		1		-
Guatemala	8,000	13,000	1,937	29	11	11	25	49	-
G u y a n a	5,000	8,500	965	27	24	1	9	11	206
Haiti	18,750	38,000	4,907	102	42	2	27	48	8
Honduras	9,250	16,000	2,129	64	11	4	28	12	49
Jamaica	7,500	7,500	1,961	30	23	11	27	102	10
Mexico	20,000	20,000	4,696	134	28	125	36	109	493
Montserrat		700	92	-	-	1	3	-	-
Netherlands Antilles	-	1,500	932	22			1		
Nicaragua	5,323	9,500	3,221	49	13	2	25	113	-
Panama	7,500	7,500	1,547	33	9	10	8	91	9
Paraguay	7,500	9,750	2,128	35	4	-	28	12	278
Peru	15,000	25,000	3,072	70	123	8	49	61	11
Puerto Rico	-	-	-	-	-	20	1	-	6
St. Kitts-Nevis- Anguitia		1,300	162	3	-	-	13	-	-
Saint Lucia	-	2,100	691	5	-	-	12	3	-
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		3,250	665	8	2	-	6	6	-
Suriname	3,500	3,500	798	19	1		12	3	-
Trinidad and Tobago	5,000	5,000	2,143	36	14	11	20	38	
Turks and Calcos Islands		850	99	2			6	-	
Uruguay	10,000	10,000	2,561	59	49	3	20	2	8
Venezuela	10,000	10,000	3,782	65	10	27	20	14	327
Other Latin America	23,447				-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	315,020	389,926	85,187	1,781	1,044	664	978	1,758	3,725
North America									
Canada	-	-	-	-	269	211	-	2,708	3,858
United States	-	-	-	-	1,007	1,775		39,517	12,147
Subtotal	-			-	1,276	1,986	-	42,225	16,005
Total	2,064,851	3,861,576	600,144	9,005	9,832	11,412	9,267	141,209	81,670
INTERCOUNTRY									
Global	50,200	114,800	14,954	64	-	-	-	-	-
Interregional	33,600	73,500	9,605	361	-	-	-	-	-

STATE, TERRITORY OR OTHER	INDICATIVE PLANNING FIGURES		1981 PROGRAMME						
	1977-1981	1982-1986	PROJECT EX- PENDITURES (thousands of US dollars)	EXPERTS		FELLOWSHIPS		EQUIPMENT ORDERED (thousands of US dollars)	SUB-CONTRACTS AWARDED
	(thousands of US dollars)	(thousands of US dollars)		By country assignment	By na- tionality	By host country	By na- tionality		
Regional									
Africa	109,400	263,400				-	-	-	-
Asia and the Pacific	95,700	296,100			-	-	-	-	-
Arab States	33,970	57,600				-	-	-	-
Europe	10,330	16,200			-	-	-	-	-
Latin America	63,000	76,500			-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	312,400	730,000	97,499	1,260	-	-	-	-	-
Total	396,200	918,300	122,058	1,705	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER									
Stateless persons		-	-	-	11	-	-	-	-
Other and undefined	499	222,124	9,798	3	20	31	26	1	19
Total	499	222,124	9,798	3	31	31	26	10	19
GRAND TOTAL	2,461,550	5,002,000	732,000	10,713	9,863	11,443	9,293	141,219	81,689

\*These countries have partially or wholly relinquished their IPFs.  
 \*Recognized by the Organization of African Unity.

#### GENERAL NOTES TO TABLE:

Indicative planning figures: Figures for 1982-1986 are illustrative; actual figures may vary from those in the table, depending on the total financial resources available to UNDP. Figures for "Other Asia and the Pacific" and "Other Latin America" are undistributed IPFs; figure under "Other and undefined" is for future participants, etc. Amounts are given as of April 1982.

1981 programme: Data cover expenditures financed under IPFs. Special Programme Resources. Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries. Special Industrial Services and government cost-sharing.

Project expenditures: Figure under "Other Arab States region" is for Palestinian people; figure under "Other and undefined" is government cash counterpart.

Experts: Data cover professional project personnel serving in the field, including members of firms and organizations working under sub-contract to participating and executing agencies, as well as UNDP operational assistance personnel and associate experts. Totals under country of assignment differ from those under nationality because some experts had more than one assignment during the year.

Fellowships: Numbers include participants in seminars, training courses and related projects. "By nationality" column gives number of fellowships awarded by country or area receiving assistance. Totals under host country differ from those under nationality because some fellowship awards called for study in two or more countries. Figure under "Other Arab States region" refers to stateless persons.

Equipment ordered: Data are for country of procurement. Figure under "Other Africa" relates to unspecified countries in the French franc area.

Sub-Contracts: Data show cost of new sub-contracts by headquarters of contractor, as well as net additions to sub-contracts awarded in previous years. The cost of sub-contracts to the following Institutions are included under the countries indicated: International Centre for Diarrhoeal Diseases Research, Bangladesh, \$950,000; International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics, India, \$5,700,000; International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology, Kenya, \$7,925,000. Included under "Other and undefined" is \$19,000 for a contract with an international organization.

Three dots (...) indicate that data are not available or are not separately reported.

Regional classification as provided by UNDP.

Highlights of the new country programmes follow.

-Bangladesh. Increasing allocation to agriculture; emphasis on training, planning and investment-oriented activities.

-Bhutan. Major emphasis on training; further emphasis on sector analyses and feasibility studies to plan and attract investments, filling technical deficiencies and revenue-generating activities, particularly for foreign exchange.

-Bulgaria. Particular efforts to use programme to offer training facilities for technical and scientific personnel from developing countries and sending expert consultants to those countries.

-Congo. Agriculture to receive half of programmed resources.

-Cuba Directed to development of science and technology, including research development and application on pilot basis, programme to provide access to advanced foreign technology.

-Egypt. Sectoral priorities: agriculture and industry, emphasizing food security and improving living conditions of the rural poor; further emphasis on training.

-Kenya. Concentration on selected areas, with emphasis on short- and medium-term objectives, minimizing assistance for long-term undertakings such as research.

-Maldives. Sectoral priorities: agriculture and fisheries, transport, education and training; emphasis on development of human resources and economic and social infrastructure.

-Mauritius. Increasing emphasis on short-term expertise, training and equipment; sectoral emphasis on agriculture and health.

-Nepal Sectoral emphasis on rural areas including agricultural production, forestry and integrated rural development; pre-investment activities, training, institutions and their planning capability.

-Philippines. Emphasis on training, institution building and pre-investment, particularly for

energy and investments generating employment and exports.

- Poland. Emphasis on research and development and pre-investment activities; sectoral emphasis on health and agriculture.

- Rwanda. Emphasis on pre-investment activities, reinforcing government institutions and avoiding parallel structures.

- Viet Nam. Focus on increasing production of food and consumer goods, promotion of scientific research to apply technical innovations and enhance self-reliance, and restoration of infrastructure.

Expenditures on country projects, amounting to \$600,144,000, represented 81.98 per cent of total UNDP project expenditures in 1981 (see table on p. 437). On a regional basis, main UNDP field expenditures on country projects, exclusive of \$9.8 million in government cash counterpart contributions, were as follows: Africa, \$221.4 million (36.89 per cent); Asia and the Pacific, \$190.3 million (31.71 per cent); Arab States, \$86.2 million (14.36 per cent); Latin America and the Caribbean, \$85.2 million (14.2 per cent); and Europe, \$17 million (2.83 per cent).

In the debate on operational activities for development in the General Assembly's Second Committee, Nepal found the country programme approach helpful in establishing a link between the technical co-operation and pre-investment programme and national development plans. The Netherlands suggested that, to give a more complete picture of UNDP and related assistance, the Assembly consider inviting recipient countries to attach to their country programmes, for information purposes, statistics on UNDP aid from sources other than IPFS.

Viet Nam, supported by the Lao People's Democratic Republic, said the United States and other countries had tried in the Governing Council to prevent the Viet Nam country programme from being adopted, despite the fact that UNDP and other United Nations agencies were generally regarded as non-political bodies that should not be used as instruments of pressure. The United States replied that Viet Nam would have fewer economic problems if it were not occupying a neighbouring country.

Decision: UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/23: <sup>(1)</sup>sect. I, 24 June; <sup>(2)</sup>sect. II, 15 & 26 June.  
Report: <sup>(3)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/522.

#### Intercountry programmes

Regional programmes. By a decision of 26 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNDP Governing Council took note of a \$226 million intercountry programme for Asia and the Pacific for the third programming cycle, 1982-1986, presented by the Administrator.<sup>(2)</sup> The Administrator was requested to proceed with appraisal and approval of requests for assistance falling within the programme's out-

lines, ensuring that expenditures were in conformity with the region's IPF and contained within available financial resources.

Activities under the programme were to concentrate on seven key sectors. Ranked in the order of resources allocated to each, they were: energy, natural resources and environment; transport and communications; human resources development; agriculture, fisheries and forestry; planning and administration; technology and industry; and trade and economic co-operation. A total of 159 projects were identified, of which 133 were costed. In planning the programme, Governments gave the highest priority to energy and food production.

In the paper presenting this programme, the Administrator noted that it was the first inter-country programme for the region entirely conceived, formulated and submitted under the principles of enlarged government participation. Programming commenced early in 1980 and culminated at the Intergovernmental Meeting of Development Assistance Co-ordinators of Asia and the Pacific (New Delhi, India, February 1981), attended by Governments, executing agencies and UNDP representatives. In addition, missions were assigned to 34 countries, entities and territories in the region; regional and sub-regional intergovernmental organizations were consulted; and Governments, executing agencies and UNDP reviewed regional projects and current and future project planning and implementation.

Regional projects accounted for \$97,499,000 of UNDP expenditures in 1981.

In the debate on operational activities for development in the General Assembly's Second Committee, Hungary saw the organization of intergovernmental consultations on regional programmes as a positive step which allowed recipient countries to be more actively involved; it thought such consultations might be held midway in the 1982-1986 cycle to review results and prepare for the following cycle.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/23 sect. III, 26 June.  
Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP, DP/523.

Interregional programme. Interregional activities during the second programming cycle, 1977-1981, and proposed activities for the third cycle, 1982-1986, were summarized in a UNDP report of March 1981.<sup>(2)</sup>

During the second cycle, priority was given to the development of ocean fisheries and aquaculture, which absorbed one third of available resources, and international trade projects, which accounted for one quarter. Next in importance were a special public works programme for the least developed countries, training and ad-

visory services in transport and communications, and health projects. Training assumed a growing importance, with particular attention given to course design, selection procedures, training techniques and evaluation.

Over the five years, 105 projects were operational, some in more than one phase, and there was a continuing trend towards larger-scale activities. Expenditures for the second cycle were estimated at approximately \$32 million against the IPF for interregional projects, with an additional \$4.6 million for special measures for the least developed countries. Project expenditures in 1981 totalled \$9,605,000.

The interregional programme proposed for 1982-1986 continued to give priority to international trade and fisheries. However, greater diversification was planned, with continuing emphasis on training and human resources development but with the addition of new sectoral themes in energy planning and water and sanitation. Activities were to continue, at least for the early years of the cycle, on the National Household Survey Capability Programme (p. 1072) and an expanded immunization programme. Other areas suggested for exploration were research and advisory services in science and technology, hydrology and marine telecommunications.

On 27 June,<sup>(1)</sup> the Council took note of the Administrator's report, which also covered the global programme (see below).

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/23 sect. V, 27 June.

Report <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP, DP/524 & Add.1.

**Global programme.** The UNDP Governing Council approved six global projects on 26 June 1981 and authorized the Administrator to arrange for their execution.<sup>(1)</sup> The projects were: special programme for research and training in tropical diseases (phase II); development of long-range means of control of crop and livestock pests and diseases (International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology, Kenya); testing and demonstration of small-scale, solar-powered pumping systems; research and development in integrated resource recovery; West African sorghum and millet improvement programme (phase III) (International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics, India); and research, graining and production programme for nutritional quality maize.

For the third programming cycle, 1982-1986, an illustrative global IPF of \$114.8 million was established by the Council. This was more than double the \$52.9 million figure approved for 1977-1981. High priority was given during the earlier cycle to agricultural development. In addition, global projects in health-related areas

were aimed at providing new institutional structures of importance to future development.

Besides agriculture and health, energy was identified as the third priority area for 1982-1986; a commitment to those three areas was likely to absorb 80 to 90 per cent of available resources, according to a report by the Administrator giving details of the programme.<sup>(3)</sup> The Council took note of this report on 27 June.<sup>(2)</sup>

Decision: UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/23: <sup>(1)</sup>sect. IV 26 June. <sup>(2)</sup>sect. V, 27 June.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>UNDP, DP/524 & Add.1.

#### Pre-investment activities

With the aim of encouraging follow-up investments in UNDP-assisted projects, the Governing Council, on 27 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> requested the Administrator to strengthen relationships with multilateral financial institutions and regional development banks and other sources of finance. It authorized the use of \$100,000 from the 1981 Special Programme Resources in addition to a similar amount authorized in 1980<sup>(3)</sup> to implement co-operative arrangements with participating and executing agencies directed towards generating additional information required to make such projects attractive to potential investors. It invited Governments, in preparing their country programmes, to give due priority to pre-investment activities.

The Council endorsed a revised definition of pre-investment agreed upon by an Inter-agency Consultative Meeting in December 1980 and presented by the Administrator in a March 1981 report.<sup>(2)</sup> Pre-investment projects were defined as those that clearly identified, as an objective, the task of collecting, analysing and presenting economic, financial, technical, institutional and social data, in any development sector, in a form which would facilitate decision-making concerning the feasibility of committing capital for the creation of physical assets, production of goods and services or the development of human and natural resources. These were distinguished from investment-oriented projects such as natural resource surveys, sector studies, master plans, regional plans, research and pilot schemes.

During 1981, UNDP entered into new co-operative arrangements to stimulate pre-investment activities with the International Labour Organisation, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and the United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development. It strengthened arrangements with development finance institutions through an increased flow of project and country programme information related to possible investment

follow-up opportunities. In co-operation with the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank, it offered two training courses in investment development, in April/May and November, for UNDP resident representatives and their deputies.

Investment commitments of \$4,799.6 million were reported in relation to UNDP projects in 1981, mainly in the industrial sector. This was 18 per cent above the 1980 level.

During the debate on operational activities for development in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, the USSR said it opposed the control of UNDP activities by the World Bank and similar institutions on the excuse-mentioned in the Governing Council's decision of 27 June-of strengthening relationships between UNDP and those organizations. The Byelorussian SSR also thought that caution should be exercised in relations with the World Bank, where one group of countries predominated.

Argentina supported the Council decision, stating that it attached great importance to pre-investment activities. Japan favoured more efforts to help Governments plan technical co-operation projects in areas where there were good possibilities of a link with sources of capital.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/22 27 June.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/521.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 581.

#### Fisheries vessels pool

On 30 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNDP Governing Council requested the Administrator to report in 1982 on the continued need to develop the Programme's fisheries vessels pool, consisting of 16 fisheries research and training vessels used for UNDP projects throughout the world and managed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. After examining a May 1981 note by the Administrator proposing the purchase of four to seven modern vessels equipped with advanced electronic instruments to replace vessels that were becoming obsolete,<sup>(2)</sup> the Council asked him to formulate proposals on financing, utilization and maintenance, based on the assumption of full international competitive bidding. The Administrator's proposal had been that such bidding be pursued only if contracts could not be concluded through a limited call for bids aimed at permitting the maximum use of accumulated non-convertible currencies in the Programme's accounts.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/44, 30 June.

Note: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/563.

#### Programme planning and execution

Preparations for the 1982-1986 programme cycle. On 27 June 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the UNDP Governing Council took note of consultations carried out by the UNDP Administrator which indicated that resources available to UNDP in the third programming cycle, 1982-1986, might fall short of the total envisaged by the Council in 1980 when it decided on the allocation of resources for the cycle.<sup>(6)</sup> The Council decided none the less to retain, for purposes of forward planning, the level of resources envisaged for the third cycle, which assumed a 14 per cent average annual growth of voluntary contributions from the 1977-1981 level. Accordingly, it confirmed the figures it had approved in 1980 for third-cycle country, intercountry and unallocated indicative planning figures (IPFs) (see table on p. 437), as well as for Special Programme Resources, Special Industrial Services p. 587) and sectoral support (p. 450).

In order to conserve resources, the Council urged the Administrator to reduce the administrative budget during the third cycle (p. 448) and requested host Governments to increase significantly their contributions towards local costs of UNDP field offices. It also called for measures to increase contributions and make further use of non-convertible currencies (p. 452).

On 30 June, in adopting the 1982-1983 administrative budget,<sup>(5)</sup> the Governing Council appropriated \$2.5 million to meet the costs resulting from the need to dismiss staff members in some countries and hire additional ones elsewhere as a consequence of the redistribution of programme resources during the third cycle (p. 448).

The Economic and Social Council, on 22 July <sup>(2)</sup> and the General Assembly, on 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> urged all Governments to renew their efforts to provide UNDP with the resources necessary to establish the sound financial basis needed to implement the Programme's planned activities for 1982-1986. The Assembly expressed deep concern that the likely shortfall in 1982 might adversely affect programme delivery and reaffirmed the Governing Council's request that the Administrator continue consultations with donor countries with a view to reaching the level of resources envisaged for 1982-1986.

The Assembly resolution, based on a text submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, differed in several respects from an earlier draft sponsored by 32 nations.<sup>(1)</sup> It referred to the adverse effect of a contributions shortfall on proposed programme delivery for the third cycle, whereas the initial draft said the shortfall might seriously affect the impact of the operational activities of the United Nations development system for the



benefit of developing countries. The provision reaffirming the Governing Council request for continued consultations with donor countries was not in the original text.

In the Committee's debate on operational activities for development, Canada said that, as an annual growth of even 8 or 9 per cent in contributions might not be achieved, the Council would have to address the difficult question of reduced IPFs and administrative costs would have to be kept as low as possible. Bulgaria supported a proposal to meet the situation by assigning 80 per cent of IPFs for 1982 and making any necessary corrections later in the cycle.

Ecuador opposed any reduction in IPFs, observing that each UNDP dollar generated local expenditures in ratios of 4 to 1 and even sometimes 10 to 1. Bangladesh said the decision to restrict IPF expenditures had already affected implementation of the Bangladesh country programme and dealt a severe blow to the central role of UNDP in technical co-operation. Italy hoped the Governing Council could find a way to keep programme delivery at a maximum.

Argentina, observing that the impact of the reduction of available funds seemed to fall almost entirely on Latin America, objected to any distinction between developing countries which led to a reduction for those considered most developed. Suriname observed that, ever since the Governing Council had decided in June 1980 to shift the Programme's emphasis to lower-income countries, many developing countries, including Suriname, had seen their hopes of a nominal increase in their third-cycle IPFs diminish.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gambia, India, Italy, Jamaica, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.107.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC: 1981/59, paras. 2 & 3, 22 July (p. 435); <sup>(3)</sup>GA: 36/200, 17 Dec. (p. 435).

Decisions: UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1): <sup>(4)</sup>81/16, 27 June; <sup>(5)</sup>81/27, paras. 5-8, 30 June.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 582.

**Programming procedures.** The UNDP Governing Council endorsed on 27 June 1981<sup>(1)</sup> the Administrator's recommendations for revised country programming procedures. These centred around the concept of continuous programming, designed to maintain the relevance of UNDP technical co-operation to evolving national objectives, needs and priorities through a process of continuing review and assessment. Also endorsed were the Administrator's proposals for simplified programme documents, annual progress reports to the Council on programme imple-

mentation in each region, and criteria and procedures to allow extension of country programmes beyond their established duration when necessary. He was asked to ensure the timing of country programmes was decided in full agreement with the Government concerned.

In a March report setting out these proposals, <sup>(2)</sup> the Administrator stated that a continuing dialogue between the United Nations system and Governments- their ministries as well as their central planning and co-ordinating authorities-should be the corner-stone of continuous programming. That dialogue should be the basis for formulation of the country programme, continuing review of its implementation and identification of new activities. He indicated that the revised procedures would be followed during the third programming cycle, 1982-1986.

During the debate in the General Assembly's Second Committee on operational activities for development, Poland praised the country programming approach as one which safeguarded the sovereignty of the countries concerned and synchronized assistance with their development objectives, while retaining co-ordinating authority of UNDP over rational spending of funds.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/15, 27 June.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/518 & Corr.1 & Add.1.

**Project evaluation.** In a March 1981 report to the Governing Council,<sup>(2)</sup> the UNDP Administrator summarized work done on thematic evaluations of technical co-operation activities. He noted that seven studies had been completed and that reports were in preparation on rural co-operatives, innovation and reform in education, and export promotion. A study on industrial training was in progress, while two others-on national agricultural research institutes and on manufactures industries-were in the planning phase. All these studies were conducted in collaboration with the Governments concerned, executing agencies and UNDP. The cost of carrying out the thematic evaluations for 1980-1981 was expected to be \$400,000.

On 27 June,<sup>(1)</sup> the Governing Council took note with appreciation of the report and of an appended extract from an evaluation of the International Trade Centre (p. 547) which suggested ways of making more effective its technical co-operation projects for strengthening national trade promotion organizations.

In the General Assembly, during the debate in the Second Committee on operational activities for development, Tunisia said much remained to be done to ensure that internal

monitoring systems were effectively used; evaluation should be regarded as an integral part of measures to improve the effectiveness and quality of operational activities.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>JNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/29, 27 June.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/515 & Add.1.

**Government execution of projects.** While most UNDP projects continued to be executed by intergovernmental organizations, expenditures on projects directly executed by Governments increased by 32 per cent in 1981 over the 1980 level, to an amount of \$10.3 million. Approvals of such projects in 1981 totalled \$12.3 million, signalling a continuing increase.

In a decision of 27 June,<sup>(4)</sup> the UNDP Governing Council requested the Administrator, in co-operation with other United Nations organizations: to give full consideration, in the designation of executing agents, to implementation of UNDP assistance by the host Governments; to review and analyse in greater detail the reasons for lack of progress in implementing government execution and to report to the Council in 1982 on proposals for amending financial and administrative arrangements with a view to increasing the use of government execution; and to examine how government implementation would affect the work-load of UNDP field offices, particularly in the least developed countries, and make proposals for any additional staff that might be needed. The Council took note of the Administrator's view that any additional costs would be offset by savings in the support costs UNDP paid to executing agencies as reimbursement for their expenses in implementing a project. The decision also dealt with alternatives to use of internationally recruited experts (p. 458).

In a February report to the Council,<sup>(1)</sup> the Administrator identified some reasons for the general lack of government execution and proposed that such execution become the preferred approach for implementing all UNDP assistance, unless there were reasons for deciding otherwise. Under this approach, another executing agent would be chosen only if the Government rejected responsibility for executing a project.

The Governing Council's decision was welcomed by the Economic and Social Council on 22 July.<sup>(2)</sup>

During the year the UNDP/Inter-Agency Task Force, established in 1977 to assist in efforts towards a better articulation of operational activities for development within the United Nations system, collaborated in the review of government execution undertaken at the Governing Council's request.

In the debate on operational activities for de-

velopment held in the General Assembly's Second Committee, several speakers commented on likely benefits from expanded government execution. Bangladesh thought it would increase resources for development, as the savings in support costs would be made available to the countries concerned. Hungary believed that project execution might be simplified and accelerated if Governments were responsible for execution. Pakistan remarked that the Governing Council had shown a reluctance to accept increased financing of government execution through UNDP reimbursement of support costs, despite a clear directive from the Assembly in 1980<sup>(3)</sup> and the Administrator's estimate that savings would result. The USSR thought that government execution could help rectify the practice of entrusting projects to a group of Western countries. The Gambia and India also believed that Governments of recipient countries should assume responsibility for executing more projects.

Indonesia remarked that Governments were inhibited from assuming greater responsibility for project execution by procedural, administrative and financial restraints; it hoped recommendations would be made to solve those problems.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/558 & Corr.1.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/59, para. 7, 22 July (p. 435); <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/81, para. 10, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 612). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/21, 27 June.

## UNDP finances

### Financial situation

Income received by UNDP in 1981 totalled \$890.7 million, against expenditures of \$1,043.8 million, according to the Programme's financial reports and accounts.<sup>(2)</sup> These figures covered all funds for which UNDP was responsible, including the Programme's central account and 13 special-purpose trust funds. Income of the central account was \$804.3 million, a 2 per cent decrease from the \$821.4 million received in 1980.

While field expenditures of the central account rose in 1981 by 8 per cent from the previous year to a record level of \$732 million (p. 447), voluntary contributions pledged by Governments decreased for the first time, from \$691.8 million in 1980<sup>(5)</sup> to \$688.7 million in 1981 (p. 451). According to the Administrator's review of the financial situation in 1981<sup>(4)</sup> income was \$136.3 million less than anticipated.

After considering the Administrator's report on the 1980 financial situation,<sup>(3)</sup> the Governing Council, on 30 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> noted with satisfaction the continuing steady growth in programme delivery but expressed concern at the increasing level of unpaid pledges. It invited Governments to pay amounts due, past and current, before the

end of 1981 (p. 456). It also authorized additional funds for the Special Industrial Services programme (p. 587).

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1). 81/25,30 June.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Board of Auditors and financial statements, A/37/5/Add.1; UNDP Administrator, <sup>(3)</sup>DP/547 & Corr. 1, <sup>(4)</sup>DP/1982/49.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 588.

#### Expenditures

Expenditures of UNDP in 1981 totalled \$1,043.8 million,<sup>(1)</sup> or 11.7 per cent above the 1980 level.<sup>(3)</sup> Of this, \$962.8 million was from the Programme's central accounts, \$75.2 million was from special-purpose trust funds and \$5.9 million was spent on the Junior Professional Officers' Programme.

Expenditures in 1981 exceeded income by \$153.2 million. For the central accounts, the excess of expenditure over income was \$133.2 million. The deficit was financed by applying unspent income from previous years.

Excluding \$25.25 million in transfers between accounts, the \$937.5 million spent against the central accounts included the following principal elements: \$731.6 million (78 per cent) in project costs, \$104.6 million (11.2 per cent) for UNDP administrative and programme support costs (see below), \$94.3 million (10.1 per cent) for agency support costs (p. 449) and \$5.6 million (0.6 per cent) for sectoral support activities (p. 450). (A country and regional breakdown of project costs is given in the table on p. 437, and a breakdown by executing agency in the table on p. 431.)

Expenditures on project costs by component (excluding government cash counterpart expenditure of \$9.8 million) were: project personnel, \$372.7 million (51.6 per cent); equipment, \$161.2 million (22.3 per cent); sub-contracts, \$88.5 million (12.3 per cent); training, \$72.3 million (10 per cent); miscellaneous, \$27.1 million (3.8 per cent). Also, UNDP administered or supported in varying degree some \$1,008 million in project expenditures under other United Nations system or bilateral development programmes, almost 18 per cent more than in 1980.<sup>(5)</sup>

The major elements of UNDP expenditures are given in the table in the next column.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Board of Auditors and financial statements, A/37/5/Add.1; <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/1982/6/Add.1.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 587.

**Administrative budgets.** Programme support and administrative services costs constitute the UNDP administrative budget, which is adopted on a biennial basis. Expenditures under this budget in 1981 came to \$104.6 million. The administrative budget amounted to 13.6 per cent

of main programme expenditures for 1980-1981 and was projected to increase to 14.5 per cent for 1982-1983, due mainly to a fall in contributions to UNDP which forced reductions in programme delivery while administrative services for delivery had to be maintained.

On 30 June 1981, the UNDP Governing Council approved appropriations covering the administrative costs of the main programme and of five other activities managed by UNDP: the United Nations Volunteers (p. 461), the United Nations Capital Development Fund (p. 470), the United

#### UNDP EXPENDITURES, 1981

(in US dollars)

##### UNDP Account:

##### Programme expenditure:

##### Project costs:

Indicative planning figures	649,839,803
From government cost-sharing contributions	50,985,837
Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries	14,959,240
From government cash counterpart contributions	9,797,763
Special Programme Resources	4,458,347
Special Industrial Services	1,563,234

Subtotal project costs 731,604,224

##### Reimbursement of programme support costs to participating and executing agencies

UNDP sectoral support	94,258,702
Expert hiatus financing and extended sick leave	5,569,880
UNDP/UNEP joint venture Institutional support	896,661
Adjustments to 1980 programme expenditure and programme support costs (net)	397,597
	201,998

Subtotal programme expenditure 832,929,062

UNDP administrative and programme support	104,606,834
Transfer to Operational Reserve	25,000,000
Transfer to UN Volunteers	250,000

Total UNDP Account 962,785,896

##### Trust funds:

UN Capital Development Fund	48,778,856
UN Trust Fund for Sudano-Sahelian Activities	8,511,441
UN Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development	6,175,668
UN Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration	5,756,346
UNDP Trust Fund for the Nationhood Programme for Namibia	1,763,196
UN Volunteers	1,608,408
UNDP Energy Account	927,702
UN Trust Fund for Operational Programme in Lesotho	881,244
UNDP Trust Fund for Projects Financed by the Voluntary Fund for the UN Decade for Women	681,094
UN Trust Fund for Operational Personnel in Swaziland	143,255
UN Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries	47,260
UN Korean Reconstruction Agency (residual assets)	8,176
Trust Fund For Assistance to Colonial Countries and Peoples	(120,240)*

Total trust funds 75,162,406

Junior Professional Officers' Programme 5,877,330

GRAND TOTAL 1,043,825,632

\*Net refund of expenditure due to adjustment to 1980 programme expenditure (\$126,156) less 1981 programme expenditure (\$7,916).

Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration (UNRFRNRE) (p. 674), the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office (UNSO) (p. 485), and the joint venture organized by UNSO, UNDP and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (p. 828) (see table below).

Supplementary appropriations for 1980-1981. The Governing Council approved net supplementary appropriations for 1980-1981 amounting to \$31,960,700, raising to \$204,354,800 the total appropriations for the programmes managed by UNDP.<sup>(6)</sup> This included \$28,995,100 in supplementary appropriations for the main programme, raising its appropriations for the biennium to \$192,798,900. The Administrator had proposed a net increase of \$31,259,100 for the main programme.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Administrator ascribed most of the rise to unforeseen increases in salaries, wages and other costs. In addition, he requested 63 new posts, of which the Council approved 50, including 25 in a new field office at Pyongyang, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and 7 in the Division of Management Information Services at UNDP headquarters (p. 457). This brought the total number of established posts to 4,382.

Administrative budget for 1982-1983. The Council approved a net appropriation of

\$262,659,100 for the period 1982-1983, of which \$245,465,300 was for the main programme.<sup>(7)</sup> Added to the main programme allocation was \$2,500,000 for transitory measures in 1982 due to a reallocation of posts between field offices resulting from changing programme allocations during the 1982-1986 development cycle (p. 444). The latter sum was to be used to compensate staff members whose employment contracts had to be terminated in countries receiving reduced resource allocations and to hire up to 100 additional staff members in countries whose programmes were to be increased.

The Council decided to reduce the Administrator's proposed appropriations<sup>(2)</sup> by \$7 million gross, calling on him to exercise extreme caution and to ensure that expenditures were closely controlled. It approved 9 of the 13 additional posts which had been requested but not approved for 1981, including 2 for the Emergency Co-ordination Unit at headquarters and a regional information officer for the Arab States. The Administrator requested no additional posts for 1982-1983, ascribing the proposed budget increase to inflation and similar causes.

Future budgets. The Governing Council, on 27 June,<sup>(5)</sup> urged the Administrator to reduce the administrative budget in the third programming cycle, 1982-1986, and decided that the budget in

### UNDP ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGETS, 1980-1981 AND 1982-1983 (in US dollars; as adopted on 30 June 1981)

REVISED 1980- 1981 APPROPRIATIONS

PROGRAMME	SUPPLEMENTARY			TOTAL			1982-1983 APPROPRIATIONS		
	Gross	Estimated income	Net	Gross	Estimated income	Net	Gross	Estimated income	Net
Resources of UNDP									
UNDP (excluding Office for Projects Execution)	32,662,800	3,667,700	28,995,100	240,278,600	47,479,700	192,798,900	303,129,100	57,663,800	245,465,300
Transitory measures in 1982 due to reallocation of posts between duty stations	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,500,000		2,500,000
Office for Projects Execution (including support services)	3,202,900	3,202,900	—	12,320,500	12,320,500	—	15,151,200	15,151,200	—
UN Volunteers	817,600	423,900	393,700	4,432,100	682,000	3,750,100	5,461,500	871,000	4,590,500
UN Capital Development Fund	1,668,800	202,700	1,466,100	3,314,000	414,200	2,899,800	4,359,100	558,300	3,800,800
UNSO-UNDP/UNEP joint venture	—	—	—	1,822,100	1,006,100	816,000	2,395,300	1,469,800	925,500
Subtotal UNDP	38,352,100	7,497,200	30,854,900	262,167,300	61,902,500	200,264,800	332,996,200	75,714,100	257,282,100
Resources of UNRFRNRE	938,700	85,200	853,500	2,513,400	266,400	2,247,000	3,075,500	309,100	2,766,400
Resources of UNSO	267,600	15,300	252,300	2,117,000	274,000	1,843,000	3,022,700	412,100	2,610,600
Total	39,558,400	7,597,700	31,960,700	266,797,700	62,442,900	204,354,800	339,094,400	76,435,300	262,659,100

\*Includes estimated support cost reimbursements of \$2.4 million in respect of UNCDF-funded activities, \$1,272,700 in respect of UNSO-funded activities and \$300,000 in respect of UNRFRNRE-funded activities.

\*\*Includes UNEP half-share of the cost of the joint venture institutional support.

that cycle should not rise in real terms beyond the level approved for 1982-1983. The need for additional resources tied to any increase in programme delivery should be met by redeployment of staff and other facilities.

The General Assembly, in its 17 December resolution on UNDP,<sup>(4)</sup> commended the Administrator's efforts to increase the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of UNDP and encouraged him to continue to intensify those efforts. The text, as adopted following informal consultations, incorporated a phrase that had not been in the original 32-nation draft,<sup>(1)</sup> asking the Administrator to take account, *inter alia*, of the need to restrain administrative expenditures in order to maximize programme delivery in accordance with the Council's 27 June decision. The words "*inter alia*" were added orally by a Vice-Chairman of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee who submitted the final text.

In the Committee's debate on operational activities for development, a number of countries -including the Byelorussian SSR, Japan and the USSR-urged a reduction in administrative expenses so that more resources would be available for programmes. China considered that agencies applying a zero-growth policy to their administrative costs could economize still further by careful saving and strict budgeting; expansion of bureaucracies should be avoided. Madagascar welcomed the Administrator's decision not to increase UNDP administrative expenditure in real terms during 1982-1983 and to limit any future increase.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gambia, India, Italy, Jamaica, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.107.

Reports: UNDP Administrator, <sup>(2)</sup>DP/548, <sup>(3)</sup>DP/550.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA: 36/200, para. 5, 17 Dec. (p. 436).

Decisions: UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1):

<sup>(5)</sup>81/16, para. 4, 27 June; <sup>(6)</sup>81/26, 30 June; <sup>(7)</sup>81/27, 30 June.

**Programme support costs.** Agency support costs reimbursed by UNDP increased from \$87.9 million in 1980 to \$94.3 million in 1981, or 12.9 per cent of field programme expenditures (see table below), excluding sectoral support provided to agencies (p. 450). These support costs were reimbursements to agencies executing UNDP projects, in accordance with a 1980 formula which, from 1 January 1982, was to provide 13 per cent of project delivery costs, down from the previous 14 per cent.<sup>(4)</sup>

As the reimbursement did not cover the full cost of providing technical and administrative

support to UNDP projects, especially in the case of smaller agencies, the UNDP Governing Council, on 30 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> approved support cost flexibility arrangements to permit higher reimbursement rates to agencies executing a relatively small volume of UNDP projects. Eligible to benefit were autonomous organizations in the United Nations system whose annual delivery did not exceed \$15 million. A sliding scale was set according to which agencies handling less than \$5 million of UNDP projects could receive as much as 22 per cent of their cost, with the reimbursement rate dropping as project delivery increased. In reviewing requests for flexibility, the UNDP Administrator would ensure that no executing agency would receive less in total support cost reimbursement for delivering a higher programme level than it had received for delivering a lower level.

United Nations organizations not eligible for support cost flexibility arrangements would be entitled to limited compensation if the average annual currency exchange rate at their headquarters had appreciated by at least 11 per cent

AGENCY PROGRAMME SUPPORT COSTS REIMBURSED BY UNDP  
AND PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAMME EXPENDITURES, 1981  
(In thousands of US dollars)

Executing agency	Amount	Percentage
UNIDO	9,380	13.94
UNCTAD	2,390	14.01
ECA	1,099	14.00
ECE	123	14.01
ECLA	298	14.01
ECWA	64	13.97
ESCAP	684	13.12
UNCHS	1,536	14.00
Other UN	12,806	13.89
<b>Subtotal United Nations</b>	<b>26,380</b>	<b>13.91</b>
IAEA	992	19.57
ILO	7,547	13.92
FAO	25,044	13.26
UNESCO	7,290	13.94
WHO	3,301	13.96
World Bank	3,596	9.66
ICAO	5,565	13.95
UPU	648	19.37
ITU	4,369	13.49
WMO	1,882	15.20
IMCO	986	13.95
WIPO	127	24.90
UNDP	3,845	7.29
<b>Subtotal other UN system</b>	<b>65,192</b>	<b>12.91</b>
World Tourism Organization	57	14.11
Asian Development Bank	344	14.01
Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development	86	14.03
Governments	199*	1.92
<b>Subtotal non-UN system</b>	<b>686</b>	<b>2.91</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>94,258</b>	<b>12.88</b>

\*Programme support Costs paid to executing agencies as co-Operating agencies participating in government-executed projects.

NOTE: Percentages are based on field programme expenditures (UNDP column on p. 431) less government cash counterpart contributions.

vis-à-vis the United States dollar between one year and the next.

The Council also approved reimbursement of support costs to the UNDP Office for Projects Execution based on the rates in effect for other executing agencies.

The new arrangements were based on proposals made by the Administrator in a March report to the Council.<sup>(3)</sup> In that report he also described consultations between UNDP and agencies on devising a format for ex post facto reporting of actual support costs incurred by agencies, and said he intended to submit a format in 1982 so that reporting could begin in 1983.

With regard to a request by the International Telecommunication Union for additional support cost reimbursement of \$87,955 for 1980 as a consequence of currency exchange losses, the Council, noting that the exchange rate of the dollar vis-à-vis the Swiss franc had considerably improved in 1981, decided to review the request in 1982 in conjunction with 1981 data.<sup>(2)</sup>

Decisions: UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 30 June: <sup>(1)</sup>81/40, <sup>(2)</sup>81/43.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/556 & Add.1.2. yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 592.

**Sectoral support activities.** In 1981, UNDP allocated \$1,925,000 to eight executing agencies for sectoral support activities—principally regional advisers and short-term missions of experts—designed to complement similar activities undertaken by the agencies from their own resources. This was in addition to the largest programme of this type, Senior Industrial Development Field Advisers (SIDFAS), managed by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (p. 587).

The UNDP Governing Council, on 30 June,<sup>(1)</sup> approved the Administrator's proposal to allocate \$3,689,000 for sectoral support for 1982-1983, primarily for the smaller agencies. This amount, up slightly from \$3,650,000 for 1980-1981, was out of a total of \$12 million allocated for all sectoral support, the balance of which was for the SIDFA programme.

The need for sectoral support activities was confirmed by the Administrator in an April 1981 report to the Council.<sup>(2)</sup> He considered that UNDP should continue to finance such activities in the third programming cycle, 1982-1986 (p. 444), mainly for agencies which had neither an established field structure nor access to regular programme funds for technical co-operation. He proposed that funds be made available primarily to agencies which had received allocations in 1980-1981, with the addition of the World Intellectual Property Organization, the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements and the Universal Postal Union.

Decision <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1) 81 / 39 , p a r a s 1 - 3 , 30 J u n e  
Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/555

#### Accounts

**Accounts of executing agencies for 1979.** The UNDP Governing Council, on 30 June 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> took note with satisfaction of the audit reports of participating and executing agencies relating to funds allocated to them by UNDP as at 31 December 1979.<sup>(1)</sup> Noting the Administrator's observations on the auditors' comments, it requested him to continue submitting observations and to consult with executing agencies that used commercial external auditors on the possibility of including in future audit reports observations on substantive matters as well as on financial planning and control mechanisms, ways of improving reporting to decision-making bodies, management controls and electronic data processing systems.

Audit reports: <sup>(1)</sup>DP/557.

Decision: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/41, 30 June.

**Accounts for 1980.** By a resolution of 30 November 1981 on the 1980 accounts of various United Nations programmes and funds,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly accepted the UNDP accounts for the year ended 31 December 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> concurred with observations and comments by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ),<sup>(1)</sup> and requested remedial action where required by the Board of Auditors in its comments on the accounts.

Investment and contract procedures were among the matters discussed by the Board, ACABQ and the Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee in connection with the accounts. Also considered were two matters pertaining to contributions-collection of contributions and non-convertible currencies (p. 456)—n which the UNDP Governing Council took decisions. The UNDP administration responded in its financial statements and in the Fifth Committee.

**Investments.** The Board noted that the Administrator was exploring the possibility of transferring responsibility for placing UNDP funds for investment from the United Nations to UNDP. The UNDP administration said it intended to carry out such a review by the end of 1981, after which it might consult with United Nations officials if a change was desirable. ACABQ recommended that it be given the opportunity to review any proposal to change the current arrangement.

In the Fifth Committee, Ghana agreed that any proposals should first be submitted to ACABQ, though any change in arrangements should be left to the UNDP Governing Council.

The ACABQ recommendation was also supported by Bangladesh and Japan.

Contracts. The Board recommended that UNDP discourage the practice of submitting contracts involving significant amounts of money for ex post facto approval. ACABQ also favoured a tightening of procedures in this regard. UNDP responded that 17 out of 173 cases reviewed by its Contracts Committee in 1980 had been submitted ex post facto; its representative informed the Fifth Committee in October that the number of such approvals as of that time in 1981 had been halved, and the administration was reviewing measures to reduce such cases to a minimum.

In the Fifth Committee, Bangladesh considered it important to prevent anomalies or negligence in the approval of contracts ex post facto. Ghana felt that UNDP had been lax in controlling the award of contracts. Japan called for a tightening of approval procedures. India urged UNDP to expand its coverage of potential suppliers, particularly in developing countries, so that the system of international competitive bidding would live up to its name.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup> ACABQ, A/36/480; <sup>(2)</sup> Board of Auditors and financial statements, A/36/5/Add. 1 & Corr. 1.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup> GA, 36/65, 30 Nov. (p. 1302).

#### Financial regulations

Revised UNDP Financial Regulations were approved by the UNDP Governing Council on 30 June 1981.<sup>(5)</sup> The modifications were aimed at meeting the long-term requirements of UNDP, including its needs in programme and project management. The initial redrafting was done by the Administrator; <sup>(2)</sup> the text approved by the Council took into account comments by ACABQ. <sup>(3)</sup> Certain proposed changes concerning contributions in non-convertible currencies (p. 456) were left for a decision in 1982 because of a lack of consensus in the Council.

Acting at the Council's request, the General Assembly, by a resolution adopted without vote on 18 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> authorized the Council to adopt financial regulations in respect of all funds administered by UNDP. It also decided that the Financial Regulations of UNDP would apply to the United Nations Capital Development Fund (p. 471) and the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries (p. 416) until the Council adopted special financial regulations for them. The Fifth Committee, acting on a draft by the Secretary-General, approved the text on 16 December, also without vote.

In a note of 3 December,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General indicated that the two funds were the only ones administered by UNDP on which action was needed, as in other cases the Assem-

bly had either specified that the UNDP Financial Regulations would apply or had not stated that the Financial Regulations of the United Nations would apply.

Notes: <sup>(1)</sup> S-G, A/C.5/36/80; <sup>(2)</sup> UNDP Administrator, DP/552 & Add.1 & Add.1/Corr.1, Add.2 & Add.21 Corr.1, Add.3.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup> ACABQ DP/553.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(4)</sup> GA. 36/227. 18 Dec., text following. Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup> UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/28, 30 June.

Meeting records: CA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.79 (16 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/227

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/843) without vote. 16 December (meeting 79); draft by Secretary-General (A/C.5/36/80): agenda item 12.

Financial regulations in respect of the funds administered by the United Nations Development Programme

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme on its twenty-eighth session, In particular Governing Council decision 81/28 of 30 June 1981 concerning the Financial Regulations of the United Nations Development Programme,

1. Authorizes the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme to adopt financial regulations in respect of all funds administered by the Programme and requests it to report such regulations to the General Assembly;

2. Decides to adopt, on a Provisional basis, the following measures in implementation of its resolutions 2186(XXI) of 13 December 1966 and 2321 (XXII) of 15 December 1967:

(a) The financial regulations of the United Nations Capital Development Fund, after they have been reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, shall be adopted by the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme, which shall report such regulations to the General Assembly; In the preparation of those regulations, account shall be taken of the special requirements of the operations of the Fund;

(b) Pending the adoption by the Governing Council of financial regulations for the Fund, the Financial Regulations of the United Nations Development Programme shall apply:

3. Decides that until the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries becomes operational In the manner specified In General Assembly resolution 31/177 of 21 December 1976:

(a) The financial regulations for the Fund, after they have been reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, shall be adopted by the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme, which shall report such regulations to the General Assembly; in the preparation of those regulations, account shall be taken of the special requirements of the operations of the Fund;

(b) Pending the adoption by the Governing Council of financial regulations for the Fund, the Financial Regulations of the United Nations Development Programme shall apply.

#### Contributions

Governments paid a total of \$776.3 million to the central UNDP accounts in 1981 (see table beginning on p. 453), a slight increase over the \$772.7 million recorded for 1980. The main source of funds was voluntary contributions for the main UNDP account, received from 147 Governments in the amount of \$688.7 million; this compared to

\$691.8 million paid in 1980, representing the first such decline in the Programme's history. Another \$12.9 million was paid by four Governments to the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), up from \$11.7 million in 1980. The rest of the contributions came from recipient countries: \$62.7 million as cost-sharing contributions from 67 Governments and three intergovernmental organizations (a 7.6 per cent increase over the previous year); \$10.8 million from 28 Governments and an intergovernmental body in cash counterpart contributions for projects; and \$1.3 million from five Governments in assessed programme costs.

For 1982, a total of \$416,299,290 was pledged for the main UNDP account by 108 Governments as at 31 December 1981, mostly at the 1981 United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities, held on 3 and 4 November (p. 426). In addition, eight Governments pledged \$17,355,860 for the Fund for LDCs, bringing total pledges for 1982 to \$433,655,150.

The UNDP Governing Council, although noting with concern indications that UNDP resources might fall short of the amount needed to sustain the programme at the level envisaged for the 1982-1986 cycle (p. 444), decided on 27 June 1981<sup>(4)</sup> to retain, for purposes of forward planning, the previously envisaged level. This was based on the assumption that voluntary contributions would grow by an annual average of 14 per cent from the level set for 1977-1981.

The Council requested the Administrator to continue consultations with donor countries with a view to reaching the level envisaged for 1982-1986. It asked all countries to reconsider the magnitude of their third-cycle contributions and urged donors which lagged behind in the first part of the cycle to increase their contributions later in the cycle so that the overall objective could be reached. All countries, particularly those whose previous contributions were below their capacity, were asked to consider increasing their contributions substantially.

The Council's decision also contained provisions on contributions in non-convertible currencies (p. 456).

In another action of 27 June,<sup>(5)</sup> the Council decided that the policy review item for its 1982 session would be entitled "New and specific ways and means of mobilizing increased resources on an increasingly predictable, continuous and assured basis".

The Economic and Social Council, in its 22 July resolution on UNDP,<sup>(2)</sup> urged Governments to renew their efforts to provide UNDP with the resources necessary to establish the sound financial basis needed to implement activities planned for the third programming cycle.

The General Assembly, on 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> expressed deep concern that the likely shortfall in 1982 contributions might adversely affect programme delivery for the third cycle. It urged Governments, especially those whose contributions might not reflect their capacity, to renew their efforts to provide UNDP with the resources needed to establish a sound financial basis for the upcoming cycle. It strongly reiterated the need for a substantial and real increase in resources on an increasingly predictable, continuous and assured basis, and welcomed the Governing Council's decision to review the issue in 1982. It reaffirmed the Council's request that the Administrator consult with donors in order to reach the resource level envisaged for 1982-1986.

The reaffirmation of the Council's request was added, as a result of informal consultations in the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, to the initial draft of the resolution as submitted by 32 nations, mainly developing countries.<sup>(1)</sup> Another difference concerned the paragraph on the need for a substantial and real increase in resources: the earlier draft did not mention the Council decision to review the issue but would have had the Assembly appeal to all Governments to contribute on an increasingly predictable, continuous and assured basis.

During the Committee's debate on operational activities for development, many countries, including Bangladesh, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, India, Indonesia, Italy, Kenya, Madagascar, the Niger, Pakistan, the Philippines, Rwanda, the Sudan, Suriname, Tunisia, the Upper Volta and Yugoslavia, warned of the consequences of a shortfall in contributions to UNDP and urged donors to make adequate contributions.

Ecuador said only by maintaining the 14 per cent growth target would UNDP assistance reach \$2 billion by 1986, a figure consistent with the minimum requirements of the developing world. The Niger thought that the 14 per cent goal was still remote.

Argentina, Australia and France pointed out that they had substantially increased their contributions. Austria estimated that one quarter to one third of the anticipated shortfall might be due to currency exchange rate fluctuations with respect to the United States dollar; to maintain its contribution at the 1981 dollar level, Austria had had to raise it by more than 20 per cent in terms of its national currency. Denmark, speaking for the Nordic States, said they could not increase their contributions, which accounted for nearly 30 per cent of UNDP resources; in the long run, UNDP could not continue to depend on a limited number of donors.

(continued on p. 456)



CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME, 1981 AND 1982  
 (as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

CONTRIBUTOR	1981 PAYMENT						1982 PLEDGE		
	UNDP Account	Fund for LDCs	Government cost- sharing	Government cash counterpart	Assessed programme costs	Total	UNDP Account	Fund for LDCs	Total
Afghanistan	33,000	—	—	—	—	33,000	33,000	—	33,000
Albania	4,285	—	—	—	—	4,285	5,000	—	5,000
Algeria	616,807	—	727,539	111,663	—	1,456,009	731,500	—	731,500
Antigua and Barbuda	18,401	—	—	—	—	18,401	—	—	—
Argentina	1,748,297	—	541,000	1,929	—	2,291,226	2,214,908	—	2,214,908
Australia	11,264,368	—	5,537	—	—	11,269,905	—	—	—
Austria	6,000,000	—	—	—	—	6,000,000	6,000,000	—	6,000,000
Bahamas	91,500	—	405,745	—	—	497,245	11,500	—	11,500
Bahrain	56,000	—	822,582	—	—	878,582	56,000	—	56,000
Bangladesh	122,767	—	—	—	—	122,767	183,900	—	183,900
Barbados	—	—	100,000	9,261	—	109,261	22,615	—	22,615
Belgium	31,165,217	—	—	—	—	31,165,217	—	—	—
Belize	15,000	—	22,800	—	—	37,800	25,253	—	25,253
Benin	9,958	—	33,145	—	—	43,103	5,000	2,000	7,000
Bermuda	15,766	—	—	—	—	15,766	—	—	—
Bhutan	2,990	—	—	—	—	2,990	3,440	—	3,440
Bolivia	15,000	—	2,639,166	1,500,000	—	4,154,166	20,000	—	20,000
Botswana	22,293	—	—	—	—	22,293	24,000	1,143	25,143
Brazil	1,609,050	—	5,359,598	287,326	—	7,255,974	—	—	—
British Virgin Islands	10,480	—	—	—	—	10,480	—	—	—
Brunei	—	—	(15,036)	—	—	(15,036)	—	—	—
Bulgaria	762,911	—	—	—	—	762,911	850,939	—	850,939
Burma	807,711	—	—	—	—	807,711	122,117	—	122,117
Burundi	21,744	—	200,000	—	—	221,744	30,000	—	30,000
Byelorussian SSR	190,409	—	—	—	—	190,409	189,341	—	189,341
Canada	37,657,563	—	—	—	—	37,657,563	41,525,424	—	41,525,424
Cape Verde	7,000	—	—	—	—	7,000	4,000	—	4,000
Cayman Islands	14,800	—	—	—	—	14,800	—	—	—
Central African Republic	1,899	—	—	—	—	1,899	—	—	—
Chile	750,000	—	31,514	—	—	781,514	820,000	—	820,000
China	1,400,000	—	—	—	—	1,400,000	1,500,000	—	1,500,000
Colombia	1,044,235	—	1,196,770	145,321	—	2,386,326	1,259,208	—	1,259,208
Congo	21,930	—	867,243	—	316,619	1,205,792	—	—	—
Cook Islands	38,721	—	6,240	—	—	44,961	—	—	—
Costa Rica	60,000	—	—	—	—	60,000	220,000	—	220,000
Cuba	715,995	—	—	—	—	715,995	710,700	—	710,700
Cyprus	102,000	—	—	—	—	102,000	—	—	—
Czechoslovakia	630,238	—	—	—	—	630,238	601,375	—	601,375
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	213,415	—	—	—	—	213,415	198,020	—	198,020
Democratic Yemen	6,612	—	—	—	—	6,612	7,603	—	7,603
Denmark	47,106,101	—	—	—	—	47,106,101	46,197,183	2,112,676	48,309,859
Djibouti	2,000	—	—	—	—	2,000	2,000	—	2,000
Dominica	12,438	—	—	—	—	12,438	—	—	—
Dominican Republic	—	—	98,880	—	—	98,880	—	—	—
Ecuador	569,215	—	1,162,463	162,562	—	1,894,240	406,813	—	406,813
Egypt	711,164	—	342,284	689,009	—	1,742,457	636,445	21,166	657,611
El Salvador	24,700	—	227,900	—	—	252,600	—	—	—
Fiji	50,000	—	—	—	—	50,000	50,000	—	50,000
Finland	7,959,181	—	—	—	—	7,959,181	8,488,372	—	8,488,372
France	23,652,174	—	—	—	—	23,652,174	30,442,478	—	30,442,478
Gabon	91,233	—	179,187	—	—	270,420	—	—	—
German Democratic Republic	953,043	—	—	—	—	953,043	909,091	—	909,091
Germany, Federal Republic of	47,633,645	—	259,384	—	—	47,893,029	—	—	—
Ghana	218,324	—	—	22,273	—	240,597	—	—	—
Greece	626,001	—	54,390	—	—	680,391	810,000	—	810,000

CONTRIBUTOR	1981 PAYMENT						1982 PLEDGE		
	UNDP Account	Fund for LDCs	Government cost- sharing	Government cash counterpart	Assessed programme costs	Total	UNDP Account	Fund for LDCs	Total
Grenada	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,967	-	6,967
Guatemala	341,000	-	-	3,360	-	344,360	189,000	-	189,000
Guinea	-	-	26,938	-	-	26,938	-	-	-
Guyana	140,938	-	61,961	-	80,000	282,899	132,533	-	132,533
Haiti	6,500	-	45,800	-	-	52,300	6,500	-	6,500
Holy See	2,000	-	-	-	-	2,000	2,000	-	2,000
Honduras	10,156	-	(8,500)	-	-	1,656	82,000	-	82,000
Hong Kong	8,000	-	-	-	-	8,000	8,000	-	8,000
Hungary	470,575	-	-	-	-	470,575	707,429	-	707,429
Iceland	79,096	-	-	-	-	79,096	455,696	-	455,696
India	7,590,361	-	623,500	29,992	-	8,243,853	7,909,605	-	7,909,605
Indonesia	2,005,459	-	55,000	( 4 , 6 9 9 )	-	2,055,760	1 ,000,000	-	1 ,000,000
Iran	-	-	(75,378)	( 186,838)	-	(262,216)	-	-	-
Iraq	-	-	2,464	-	-	2,464	762,712	-	762,712
Ireland	1,227,455	-	-	-	-	1,227,455	-	-	-
Israel	54,878	-	-	-	-	54,878	63,636	-	63,636
Italy	24,078,341	-	100,000	-	-	24,178,341	27,731,092	-	27,731,092
Ivory Coast	142,633	-	1,173,186	-	-	1,315,819	-	-	-
Jamaica	68,197	-	48,630	29,288	-	146,115	77,495	-	77,495
Japan	58,000,000	-	183,453	-	-	58,183,453	-	-	-
Jordan	220,000	-	298,507	-	-	518,507	240,000	-	240,000
Kenya	71,429	-	-	-	-	71,429	72,816	-	72,816
Kiribati	16,860	-	-	-	-	16,860	-	-	-
Kuwait	570,000	-	2,467,280	-	-	3,037,280	570,000	-	570,000
Lao People's Democratic Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	19,600	-	19,600
Lebanon	473,076	-	239,224	-	398,164	1 ,1 10,464	340,000	-	340,000
Lesotho	65,762	-	-	-	-	65,762	38,916	-	38,916
Liberia	71,000	-	-	-	-	71,000	104,000	-	104,000
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	1,150,000	-	821,547	-	-	1,971,547	-	-	-
Luxembourg	108,261	-	-	-	-	108,261	99,600	-	99,600
Madagascar	272,156	-	(20,437)	-	-	251,719	-	-	-
Malawi	38,466	2,064	-	-	-	40,530	24,800	2,000	26,800
Malaysia	385,000	-	79,384	9,153	-	473,537	385,000	-	385,000
Maldives	1,800	-	-	-	-	1,800	1,800	-	1,800
Mali	2,000	-	-	-	-	2,000	-	-	-
Malta	64,480	-	-	-	-	64,480	-	-	-
Mauritius	81,891	-	-	-	-	81,891	-	-	-
Mexico	1,574,949	-	328,901	-	-	1,903,850	1,673,810	-	1,673,810
Monaco	4,674	-	-	-	-	4,674	3,929	-	3,929
Mongolia	187,119	-	-	-	-	187,119	187,937	-	187,937
Montserrat	18,554	-	-	-	-	18,554	-	-	-
Morocco	630,435	-	101,714	567,153	-	1,299,302	306,731	-	306,731
Mozambique	-	-	-	-	-	-	45,763	-	45,763
Nepal	40,000	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-
Netherlands	63,874,760	-	6,015,031	-	-	69,889,791	67,291,667	-	67,291,667
Netherlands Antilles	684	-	736,088	7,490	-	744,262	-	-	-
New Zealand	1,239,316	-	-	-	-	1,239,316	1,239,316	-	1,239,316
Nicaragua	1,000	-	-	-	-	1,000	1,000	-	1,000
Niger	8,389	-	143,697	-	-	152,086	-	-	-
Nigeria	942,589	-	3,963,528	-	-	4,906,117	758,725	-	758,725
Norway	48,841,467	4,312,251	-	-	-	53,153,718	54,385,965	3,508,772	57,694,737
Oman	75,000	-	1,344,034	-	-	1,419,034	75,000	-	75,000
Pakistan	1,994,121	-	-	-	-	1,994,121	2,229,603	-	2,229,603
Panama	569,400	-	345,800	-	-	915,200	356,000	-	356,000
Papua New Guinea	169,347	-	10,848	-	-	180,195	166,471	-	166,471
Paraguay	360,000	-	597,922	(807)	-	957,115	-	-	-
Peru	290,000	-	-	-	-	290,000	776,884	-	776,884
Philippines	1,367,170	-	-	15,000	-	1,382,170	700,000	-	700,000
Poland	1,167,902	-	-	-	-	1,167,902	1,250,102	-	1,250,102
Portugal	75,828	-	19,423	-	1,159	96,410	-	-	-
Qatar	400,000	-	(27,509)	-	-	372,491	200,000	-	200,000

CONTRIBUTOR	1981 PAYMENT						1982 PLEDGE		
	UNDP Account	Fund for LDCs	Government cost-sharing	Government cash counterpart	costs	Total	UNDP Account	Fund for LDCs	Total
Republic of Korea	600,000	-	7,000	290,543	-	897,543	893,000	-	893,000
Romania	838,301	-	-	-	-	838,301	672,727	-	672,727
Rwanda	20,000	-	29,657	-	-	49,657	-	-	-
St. Kitts - Nevis-Anguilla	12,950	-	-	-	-	12,950	-	-	-
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	23,973	-	-	-	-	23,973	-	-	-
Samoa	3,000	-	-	-	-	3,000	-	-	-
Saudi Arabia	2,500,000	-	2,233,893	4,744,374	-	9,478,267	2,500,000	-	2,500,000
Senegal	250,272	-	-	-	-	250,272	-	-	-
Seychelles	1,000	-	-	-	-	1,000	1,000	-	1,000
Sierra Leone	225,259	-	-	-	-	225,259	-	-	-
Singapore	220,000	-	-	-	-	220,000	220,000	-	220,000
Solomon Islands	40,000	-	-	-	-	40,000	1,000	-	1,000
Somalia	5,618	-	10,260	861,296	-	677,174	-	-	-
Spain	840,000	-	-	-	-	840,000	1,243,740	-	1,243,740
Sri Lanka	600,000	-	214,521	113,284	-	927,805	660,000	-	660,000
Sudan	-	-	291,000	100,000	-	391,000	200,000	-	200,000
Suriname	82,500	-	32,000	-	-	114,500	82,500	-	82,500
Swaziland	15,787	-	478,697	-	-	494,484	16,043	-	16,043
Sweden	62,618,459	6,542,227	-	-	-	69,160,686	63,535,912	9,208,103	72,744,015
Switzerland	15,329,949	2,030,457	-	-	-	17,380,406	18,693,182	2,500,000	21,193,182
Syrian Arab Republic	283,526	-	-	-	-	283,526	-	-	-
Thailand	2,073,060	-	-	15,000	-	2,088,060	1,001,030	-	1,001,030
Togo	303,299	-	35,935	100,671	-	439,905	7,774	-	7,774
Tokelau	971	-	-	-	-	971	-	-	-
Trinidad and Tobago	165,838	-	1,355,812	-	-	1,521,650	186,667	-	166,667
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	-	-	(4,515)	-	-	(4,515)	-	-	-
Tunisia	274,954	-	-	-	144,911	419,865	487,600	-	487,600
Turkey	1,189,144	-	2,053,382	-	-	3,222,526	-	-	-
Turks and Caicos Islands	25,533	-	-	-	-	25,533	-	-	-
Ukrainian SSR	476,023	-	-	-	-	476,023	473,352	-	473,352
USSR	3,913,043	-	-	-	-	3,913,043	3,786,816	-	3,786,816
United Arab Emirates	675,000	-	3,764,130	-	-	4,439,130	675,000	-	675,000
United Kingdom	34,175,971	-	-	-	-	34,175,971	-	-	-
United Republic of Cameroon	288,389	-	3,782,808	257,978	-	4,309,175	317,410	-	317,410
United Republic of Tanzania	219,492	-	1,827,098	-	-	2,046,590	121,212	-	121,212
United States	106,000,000	-	400,000	-	-	106,400,000	-	-	-
Upper Volta	-	-	-	139,641	-	139,641	-	-	-
Uruguay	649,800	-	258,545	128,701	-	1,037,046	-	-	-
Venezuela	2,245,981	-	1,870,494	38,565	-	4,155,040	2,200,000	-	2,200,000
Viet Nam	5,000	-	-	-	-	5,000	10,000	-	10,000
Yemen	8,000	-	2,802,252	-	-	2,810,252	10,000	-	10,000
Yugoslavia	2,403,414	-	-	783,782	-	3,167,176	-	-	-
Zaire	588,699	-	181,818	-	-	770,517	-	-	-
Zambia	-	-	-	-	-	-	276,000	-	276,000
Zimbabwe	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	50,000
Caribbean Development Bank	-	-	33,000	-	-	33,000	-	-	-
Mekong Committee*	-	-	-	32,400	-	32,400	-	-	-
OPEC Special Fund	-	-	5,776,354	-	-	5,776,354	-	-	-
West African Development Bank	-	-	273,110	-	-	273,110	-	-	-
Total	688,700,260	12,886,999	62,857,618	10,784,651	1,299,677	776,329,205	416,299,290	17,355,860	433,655,150

\*Interim Committee for Co-ordination of Investigations of the Lower Mekong Basin.

\*\*Total includes \$358,824 charged to indicative planning figures in respect of unpaid balances of assessed programme costs.

NOTE: 'Fund for LDCs' columns show contributions to the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries.

Bangladesh pointed out that exchange rate fluctuations and high inflation rates contributed to the negative growth rate of UNDP resources. Poland, warning against the proliferation of special funds and the resulting dispersion of resources, observed that the UNDP share of global technical co-operation funding had fallen below 60 per cent in 1980.

The USSR opposed fixing amounts for contributions to UNDP; in its opinion, proposed changes in current pledging arrangements undermined the principles of universality and voluntariness. Japan remarked that targets were recommendations rather than rigid legal commitments.

Speakers also touched on the consequences of a decrease in contributions for development assistance as a whole (p. 425) and for UNDP activities during the 1982-1986 programming cycle (p. 445).

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup> Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gambia, India, Italy, Jamaica, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.107.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup> ESC: 1981/59, para. 3, 22 July (p. 435). <sup>(3)</sup> GA: 36/200, paras. 7-10, 17 Dec. (p. 436).

Decisions: UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.I), 275 June: <sup>(4)</sup>81/16; <sup>(5)</sup>81/37, sect. II.

Collection of contributions. Noting with concern the increasing level of unpaid pledges to UNDP, the Governing Council, in a decision of 30 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> invited Governments to pay amounts due for 1981 and prior years before the end of 1981 or to indicate the date in early 1982 on which they expected to make payment. It also called on Governments to pay their annual pledges as early as possible in the year for which the pledge was made and requested the Administrator to consult with donors on the extent to which payment schedules could be established.

The matter of unpaid contributions was also raised by the Board of Auditors in connection with the 1980 UNDP accounts (p. 450). The Board recommended intensified efforts to collect from Governments.<sup>(3)</sup> The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, in its report on the accounts,<sup>(2)</sup> said it had been informed that, of the total of \$102.3 million unpaid under the UNDP account as at 31 December 1980, \$89.2 million related to contributions for 1980. UNDP told the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee that the amount of unpaid contributions for prior years had been reduced to less than \$14 million by the end of September 1981.

Ghana remarked in the Fifth Committee that the matter required a political solution and the

co-operation of States. Japan urged that Governments either pay their pledges in full or indicate that the amounts were uncollectable.

In the Second Committee's discussion of operational activities for development, Sri Lanka observed that the time-lag between pledges and the receipt of contributions had compounded the problem caused by inadequate resources for UNDP.

Derision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.I), 81/25, para. 2, 30 June.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/480; <sup>(3)</sup>Board of Auditors and financial statements, A/36/5/Add. 1 & Corr. 1.

Non-convertible currencies. A paragraph on the issue of non-convertible currencies held by UNDP, resulting mainly from the practice by some Governments of paying their voluntary contributions in their national currencies, was included in the Governing Council's decision of 27 June 1981<sup>(1)</sup> on preparation for the third programming cycle, 1982-1986 (p. 444). However, much of the wording was in square brackets, reflecting the Council's inability to reach a consensus on the matter. The provision was to the effect that donor countries not receiving UNDP assistance and contributing in non-convertible currencies should pay a gradually increasing share in convertible currencies, and that entities headquartered in net donor countries which contributed in non-convertible currencies should be reimbursed for services and equipment purchased by UNDP in the currencies in which their contribution was paid.

The issue of non-convertible currency holdings was also left unresolved when the Council considered revisions in the UNDP Financial Regulations (p. 451).

The Board of Auditors, in its report<sup>(2)</sup> on the 1980 UNDP accounts (p. 450), recommended that UNDP intensify efforts to exchange for readily usable currencies its non-convertible currency holdings, the value of which had risen to \$45.2 million as at 31 December 1980. The UNDP administration said it was making every effort to increase the utilization of such currencies or to exchange them; its representative told the Fifth Committee in October that a reduction of several million dollars in holdings of such currencies was expected in 1981.

In the Committee, Italy called for action by the administration to use the accumulated currencies, while Japan regretted that no progress had been made on the matter. Morocco thought a solution must be found by the countries that had contributed the currencies. Yugoslavia welcomed the auditors' recommendations. India said it was unfortunate that the Administrator's proposal to use non-convertible currencies to

purchase ships in the socialist countries for the fisheries vessels pool (p. 444) had been rejected by the Governing Council for political reasons.

The USSR remarked that the issue had been trumped up by certain circles with the aim of discriminating against some national currencies, undermining the international character of UNDP activities and helping transnational corporations perpetuate their preferential position with regard to the award of UNDP contracts. The German Democratic Republic could not subscribe to the Board's recommendation and said the amount and form of voluntary contributions was at the sole discretion of Governments.

Nigeria said the UNDP administration had admitted that the task was beyond its capabilities; the problem called for action by either the Fifth Committee or the General Assembly.

The issue was also discussed in the Second Committee during the debate on operational activities for development. The Gambia called on the countries concerned to make their future contributions in convertible currencies. Denmark (speaking for the Nordic States) and Italy urged those concerned to reconsider their position, while Rwanda expressed concern at the lack of flexibility shown by those who paid in non-convertible currencies.

On the other hand, Bulgaria remarked that, given goodwill, there were no obstacles to utilizing all available currencies. The Byelorussian SSR thought the problem had been exaggerated and that the ability of the socialist countries to aid developing countries had not been fully exploited. Czechoslovakia said it could increase its contribution to UNDP if full use was made of the non-convertible currencies in which it contributed; the services its economic, scientific and technical organizations provided to UNDP could be financed entirely from that source. Hungary regretted what it viewed as attempts to exploit the issue, stating that, if Governments were required to contribute only in convertible currencies, their decisions on how much to contribute would be subject to foreign currency availability. Poland urged that no effort be spared to utilize contributions in national currencies.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/16, para. 8.27 June.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Board of Auditors and financial statements, A/36/5/Add.1 & Corr.1.

#### UNDP management and staffing

##### Strengthening the Division of Management Information Services

New management information systems, designed to supply UNDP administrators with current data required for decision-making and con-

trol, became operational in 1981. They consisted of computerized systems for programme and project management, accounts, income and cash management, administrative budget and personnel. They were designed and developed by the Integrated Systems Improvement Project (ISIP), established in 1977. The Division of Management Information Services took over the functions of ISIP in June 1980, and began maintaining and enhancing the new systems.

After receiving a report from the Administrator on implementation of the new systems as of April 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> the UNDP Governing Council, on 30 June,<sup>(2)</sup> approved the Administrator's staffing proposals for the Division, contained in his reports on supplementary budget estimates for 1980-1981<sup>(4)</sup> and estimates for 1982-1983.<sup>(3)</sup> As specified in the Council's decision on supplementary estimates for 1980-1981,<sup>(1)</sup> this called for the addition of 7 posts to the existing complement of 30. The number of posts was to be reduced by one in 1982-1983.

Decisions: UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 30 June: <sup>(1)</sup>81/26, para. 3 (a); <sup>(2)</sup>81/38.

Reports: UNDP Administrator, <sup>(3)</sup>DP/548, <sup>(4)</sup>DP/550, <sup>(5)</sup>DP/INF/30.

##### Inter-agency Procurement Services Unit

The UNDP Governing Council, on 30 June 1981, <sup>(1)</sup> expressed support for continued development of the work of the Inter-agency Procurement Services Unit and decided that the Unit should continue to be financed from the UNDP budget, as a part of support services for UNDP-executed projects. As described in a March report by the Administrator<sup>(2)</sup> in response to a 1979 Council request,<sup>(3)</sup> the Unit's primary objective was to procure equipment at the lowest possible cost, consistent with the maintenance of adequate standards.

According to this report, more than \$200 million a year was spent by the United Nations system on common-user items. Among the benefits ascribed to the Unit were cost savings of 5 to 10 per cent through preferential discounts based on economy of scale, the establishment of motor-vehicle standards, increased procurement from developing countries, more equitable geographical distribution of procurement and utilization of accumulated non-convertible currencies.

China, speaking in the debate on operational activities for development in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, expressed the view that suppliers who delivered defective goods to UNDP should be subject to economic penalties. In Romania's view, greatly increased purchases of equipment from developing countries would enable UNDP to promote technical co-operation more effectively.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/42 30 June.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/559.

Yearbook reference.: <sup>(3)</sup>1979, p. 544.

#### Recruitment of professional staff

The UNDP Governing Council, recognizing the need to improve methods for recruiting project professional staff and consultants, especially from developing countries, decided on 27 June 1981<sup>(3)</sup> to invite countries to establish or strengthen national expert recruitment services and requested the Administrator to assist. The Administrator was asked to submit in 1982 a report on what was being done to prepare and update rosters of project professional staff and consultants, and to provide national recruitment services with information on vacancies. He was requested to make recommendations for improving such recruitment and for ensuring that the best qualified experts were recruited world-wide for UNDP-supported projects.

In another decision of 27 June,<sup>(4)</sup> dealing mainly with government execution of UNDP-financed projects (p. 446), the Council made suggestions on alternatives to the use of internationally recruited experts. It invited Governments, UNDP and United Nations organizations to make increasing use of qualified national professional staff, bearing in mind the importance of continuing to obtain the best-qualified advice and expertise. They were also invited to consider such other available options as non-resident nationals and institutional twinning, keeping in mind the requirements of each project and the availability of qualified national resources.

In a February report to the Council,<sup>(1)</sup> the Administrator noted that agencies had been instructed to give primary consideration, when recruiting professional staff for a UNDP-supported project, to use nationals of the assisted country having the required qualifications and experience.

The Economic and Social Council, in its 22 July resolution on UNDP,<sup>(2)</sup> welcomed both Governing Council decisions.

In the General Assembly's Second Committee, during the debate on operational activities for development, Romania said that more experts should be recruited from developing countries, since they had worked in development conditions similar to those in which UNDP projects operated. The Byelorussian SSR believed that project staff should be recruited locally. The Ukrainian SSR said the Administrator must remedy an intolerable situation in which the human resources of the socialist countries were not being used.

Report <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP, DP/558 & Corr.1.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC: 1981/59, para. 7, 22 July (p. 435).

Decisions: UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 27 June: <sup>(3)</sup>81/20; <sup>(4)</sup>81/21, para. 4.

#### Establishment of a study programme

The UNDP Governing Council requested the Administrator on 27 June 1981<sup>(2)</sup> to establish a study programme on technical co-operation issues. The programme was to organize seminars attended by high-level national policy-makers, government representatives to international organizations, senior secretariat officials and field experts. They would informally discuss aspects of technical co-operation in order to promote greater understanding of development problems and to generate new resources and ideas. The programme was to be financed by voluntary contributions from Governments, international institutions and private foundations. An annex to the Council's decision set out the objectives, organization and management of the study programme.

The Governing Council's decision was welcomed by the Economic and Social Council on 22 July, in its resolution on UNDP.<sup>(1)</sup>

On 15 October, the Administrator wrote to Governments and organizations requesting their support for the programme.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/59, para. 7, 22 July (p. 435). Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/30, 27 June.

#### Relations with NGOs

The UNDP Administrator reported to the Governing Council in January 1981 on relations between UNDP and external institutions, mainly non-governmental organizations (NGOs).<sup>(2)</sup> According to the report, Council members and the administration shared a common desire to see the number of co-operating organizations increase steadily. Additional steps were being taken, through UNDP resident representatives, to associate organizations from developing countries. Co-operating organizations included the Aga Khan Foundation, the International Co-operative Alliance, the Catholic Relief Services, the International Federation of Consulting Engineers, the Young Presidents' Organization, the International Federation of Institutes of Advanced Study and the Industry Council for Development.

The Governing Council took note of the Administrator's report on 27 June.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/36 27 June.

Report: UNDP Administrator, DP/561.

#### Rationalization of the work of the Governing Council

The UNDP 'Governing Council, on 27 June 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> adopted measures to streamline and rationalize its work.

The Council decided to allocate time to major policy issues and emerging developments in the activities under its supervision on which immediate action was necessary. Such policy reviews would be a major item on the agenda of each annual session, the precise topic to be defined a year in advance. A short part of each session would be held at a senior policy-maker level, and short sessions might be held on specific matters, including one in 1982 on country and intercountry programmes and another in 1983 on approval of new country programmes. The Budgetary and Finance Committee would meet one week prior to the annual Council sessions. An organizational meeting of one or two days would be held in New York each February.

The Council decided to establish the substantive agenda of each session under five main headings: policy review; programme implementation; programme planning; other funds and programmes; and financial, budgetary and administrative matters. Two topics—a policy review of other funds and programmes, and technical co-operation among developing countries—would be considered biennially.

The Council adopted measures to streamline the organization of its work and approved corresponding revisions to three of its rules of procedure. It also decided on steps to control documentation, including specific limits on the number of pages to be submitted to it in 1982, excluding country and intercountry programme papers.

The Economic and Social Council, in its 22 July resolution on UNDP,<sup>(2)</sup> welcomed the Governing Council's decision. On 24 July, in connection with the calendar of future meetings, it requested the General Assembly to consider the feasibility of altering the dates of Governing Council sessions so that its reports might be submitted in good time for the mid-year sessions of the Economic and Social Council in 1982 and 1983.

The Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on UNDP,<sup>(3)</sup> endorsed the Governing Council's decision and decided that, beginning in 1983, a broad policy review of the funds and programmes under UNDP guidance should be undertaken biennially. This text omitted a phrase in an earlier draft sponsored by 32 countries<sup>(1)</sup> stressing the need for further streamlining and rationalization of the Governing Council's work.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gambia, India, Italy, Jamaica, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.107.

Resolutions and decisions: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/59, para. 7, 22

July (p. 435); <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/200, paras. 4 & 11, 17 Dec. (p. 436). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1981/192, para. (b), 24 July (p. 1089); <sup>(5)</sup>JNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.I), 81/37, 27 June.

Publication: Rules Of Procedure Of the Governing Council Of the United Nations Development Programme (September 1981) (DP/1/Rev.3), Sales No. E.81.1.25.

### UN technical co-operation programmes

In 1981, the United Nations continued its work to further the economic and social progress of the developing countries by supplying experts, awarding fellowships, providing advisory services, and organizing workshops and study tours. These activities covered a broad range of subjects, including development planning (p. 396), public administration (p. 398), rural development (p. 400), international trade (p. 535), shipping (p. 567), industrial development transnational corporations (. 604), mineral resources (p. 680), population (P. 787), environment (p. 841), statistics (p. 1072) and human rights (p. 937). Emphasis on the needs of the least developed countries (LDCs) was intensified.

The United Nations delivered a technical co-operation programme of approximately \$297 million in 1981, according to a report by the Secretary-General to the UNDP Governing Council.<sup>(\*)</sup> Of this total, \$204 million came from UNDP, \$46 million from special-purpose trust funds contributed by Governments, \$32 million from the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) and \$15 million from the United Nations regular programme of technical co-operation (see table on following page).

Slightly less than half of the United Nations programme—\$137 million, compared to \$134 million in 1980—was carried out by the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development (DTCD). The share of DTCD programmes funded by UNDP increased to 67 per cent (\$92 million) of the Department's total delivery, while that financed by trust funds and other sources decreased: UNFPA, 19 per cent (\$26 million); trust funds and other resources, 9 per cent (\$12 million); regular programme, 5 per cent (\$6 million).

The regional commissions delivered \$37 million, or 12 per cent of the United Nations programme, while the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) was responsible for \$13 million, or 4 per cent. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) executed \$90 million in projects and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) \$20 million, or 30 per cent and 7 per cent of the total, respectively.

Of expenditures on DTCD projects, the programme for Africa remained the largest, account-

ing for \$54 million or 39 per cent of the total. Expenditures in Asia and the Pacific amounted to \$36 million or 26 per cent, while those in the Americas, at \$20 million, represented a decrease from 21 per cent in 1980 to 15 per cent in 1981. Arab States accounted for \$9 million (7 per cent) and Europe for \$8 million (6 per cent). The remainder was spent on interregional (6 per cent) and global (0.3 per cent) projects. More than 35 per cent of DTCD field activities were concentrated in LDCs.

The sectoral breakdown of the DTCD programme changed only slightly. Natural resources and energy projects rose from 35 to 37 per cent of the programme and amounted to \$51 million. Projects in statistics increased to 22 per cent, or \$30 million. Projects in development administration (public administration and finance) remained at 9 per cent and involved expenditures of \$13 million, while development planning increased slightly from 19 to 20 per cent, with expenditures of \$27 million. Population projects amounted to 4 per cent or \$6 million, and social development projects were 2 per cent or \$3 million. Fellowships under the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa (p. 1117) and programmes in other sectors accounted for the remaining expenditures.

Under the United Nations regular programme of technical co-operation, financed as part of the United Nations regular budget, \$3.3 million was spent on industrial development activities. Projects in the area of natural resources accounted for over \$2.8 million of the programme's \$14.8 million total, while more than \$1.4 million was spent on development strategies, policies and planning. The programme also financed regional and subregional advisory services managed by the regional commissions, at a total expenditure of \$3.7 million. The \$1.3 million in activities by the Economic Commission for Africa was the largest of the regional components.

In 16 countries whose UNDP country programmes were to be reviewed by the Governing Council in 1982 and 1983, DTCD missions assisted national authorities in reviewing the objectives of their national and regional development plans in order to identify technical co-operation needs. Special efforts were made in 1981 to increase the level of investment-oriented work and to include assessment of investment potential as an integral part of the Department's missions and advisory services. Many activities related to technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC) (p. 462) were undertaken by DTCD during the year, leading to the formulation of pilot or experimental projects and promoting new approaches. DTCD also provided training facilities and assistance to students: in 1981, the

number of fellowship awards increased to 3,531, and developing countries hosted more than 1,300 fellows.

The Governing Council, by a decision of 24 June,<sup>(1)</sup> endorsed the orientation of DTCD work and the use of the regular programme of technical co-operation for innovative activities for promoting TCDC and the global priorities recognized by United Nations bodies, special consideration being given to the needs of LDCs and the island and land-locked developing countries. The Council invited the UNDP Administrator to take account of the special competence, experience and expertise of DTCD in its fields of specialization when selecting executing agencies for implementing projects financed by UNDP or UNDP-managed funds, including those entrusted to UNDP in the future. It also endorsed a recommendation on co-ordination between DTCD and the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration (p. 675).

During the debate on operational activities for development in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, the USSR said DTCD had been ineffective in arranging for the training of personnel from developing countries in the USSR and other socialist countries.

UNITED NATIONS TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION  
PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN 1981  
(in thousands of US dollars)

	Regular programme	UNDP	UNFPA	Trust funds	Total
DTCD	6,466	92,220	25,807	12,081	136,574
ECA	1,331	7,717	2,300	285	11,633
ECE	-	878	-	157	1,035
ECLA	938	2,128	2,716	2,847	8,629
ECWA	723	458	437	143	1,761
ESCAP	670	5,214	707	7,191	13,782
UNCHS	620	10,971	-	1,591	13,182
UNCTAD	795	17,058	-	2,043	19,896
UNIDO	3,278	67,291	-	19,928	90,497
Total	14,821	203,935	31,967	46,266	296,989

<sup>(1)</sup>Excludes \$858,821 in expenditures of the Special Trust Fund for the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations.

<sup>(2)</sup>Includes \$459,590 for the human rights advisory services portion of the regular programme, administered in Geneva.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/11, 24 June.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, DP/1982/22 & Add.1.

## UN Volunteers

By the middle of 1981, its tenth anniversary year, the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme reached for the first time the level of 1,000 volunteers serving in the field. The number dropped to 975 by 31 December. The number of countries receiving assistance from the programme increased from 87 in December 1980 to 91 by the end of 1981.



According to a report by the UNDP Administrator on the programme's 1981 activities,<sup>(3)</sup> UNV increasingly emphasized service in least developed countries: 460 volunteers were assigned to such countries as of December. In terms of regional distribution, the programme expanded considerably in Asia and the Pacific, where 44 per cent of the serving volunteers were assigned as of December, compared to 35 per cent a year earlier. Africa accounted for 38 per cent, the Arab States 14 per cent, and Latin America and the Caribbean 4 per cent.

The programme continued work in its two principal areas, domestic development services and youth. Funds were earmarked from the UNDP indicative planning figure for Africa for a project, commencing in 1982, in which UNV would co-operate with organizations active in those areas. A review and programming meeting with organizations participating in a similar project in Asia and the Pacific was held at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, from 8 to 14 November 1981, to assess the project and chart its second phase, due to begin in 1983. Some 60 organizations from 14 Asian and Pacific countries participated in the project in 1981, and 95 volunteers were assigned. In Latin America, government representatives participating in a UNV-executed regional project on promotion of youth participation in social development activities decided to set up continuing machinery to facilitate exchange of information and promote co-operation in the field of youth.

Volunteers included engineers, agronomists, vocational teachers, medical doctors, nurses and midwives, social and community workers, mechanics and persons of many other skills and professions. The programme assigned an average of 39 new volunteers per month throughout the year, for an annual total of 470. At year's end, 760 volunteers- 78 per cent of the total-were nationals of 57 developing countries. More than 20 per cent of all volunteers were women.

The financial position of UNV deteriorated in 1981, since the level of annual contributions to the Special Voluntary Fund, established to support the programme's activities, remained static while the programme grew rapidly. Total contributions paid to the Fund in 1981 amounted to \$581,187 from 15 countries (see table on p. 462). In addition, UNDP allocated \$250,000 to the programme, and interest income, derived mainly from previous years' contributions, provided another \$540,125. Project expenditures totalled \$1,608,408, or \$235,616 more than total income. For 1982, a total of \$492,182 was pledged by 17 countries as at 31 December 1981.

Administrative costs continued to be met from the UNDP budget (p. 447). Acting on 30

June 1981, the UNDP Governing Council, through a supplementary appropriation of \$393,700, raised its 1980-1981 appropriation for this purpose to \$3,750,100 (net) and added four posts to the UNV staff of 37,<sup>(7)</sup> and appropriated \$4,590,500 for 1982-1983, including the cost of six additional posts.<sup>(8)</sup>

Both the Governing Council and the General Assembly reconfirmed their support for UNV. The Council, on 18 June,<sup>(6)</sup> noted the programme's progress in response to its related mandates in the fields of domestic development service and youth, requested the UNV Executive Co-ordinator to continue recruiting volunteers on the widest possible geographical basis and reiterated its invitation to donors to increase contributions to the Special Voluntary Fund. On 30 June, in its decision on support costs of executing agencies,<sup>(9)</sup> the Council decided to review in 1982 the question of reimbursing UNV for costs related to non-UNDP-financed activities and requested the Administrator to present proposals.

The Economic and Social Council, on 22 July,<sup>(5)</sup> took note of the Governing Council's 18 June decision as well as of the UNDP Administrator's report on the 1980 activities of UNV.<sup>(2)</sup> This decision was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee, as orally proposed by the Committee Chairman and approved without vote on 17 July.

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December adopted without vote,<sup>(4)</sup> noted with satisfaction the programme's successful achievement during its first decade and that it had achieved ahead of schedule the target of 1,000 volunteers in service. It considered UNV a valuable instrument of multilateral technical co-operation and reiterated its appeal to donors to contribute or increase their contributions to the Special Voluntary Fund so as to overcome the financial straits affecting it.

The Second Committee approved this text without vote on 27 November, as submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on a lo-nation draft<sup>(1)</sup> introduced by the Philippines. The original draft, which was withdrawn, would have had the Assembly reaffirm its conviction (instead of consider) that the programme was a unique (rather than valuable) instrument of multilateral technical co-operation. Also, the original text called for enabling the programme to overcome financial constraints affecting its growth, whereas the adopted text used the phrase "affecting it". All three revisions were made orally on behalf of the original draft's sponsors and were carried over into the Vice-Chairman's draft.

In the Committee's debate on operational activities for development, a number of speakers commended UNV and urged its continued support. Among them, Bhutan said that although the programme had been working in that country for less than two years, it was already an important source of skilled manpower. Rwanda regretted that its nationals had been recruited outside its borders to serve with the programme, depriving Rwanda of their services when their United Nations contracts had terminated. The Syrian Arab Republic said volunteers had performed well in that country and would be used for training local supervisory staff under its development plan.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SPECIAL VOLUNTARY FUND FOR  
THE UNITED NATIONS VOLUNTEERS, 1981 AND 1982  
(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment	1992 pledge
Austria	7,700	7,700
Bangladesh	-	1,000
Belgium	222,222	-
Bhutan	500	575
Botswana	510	571
Brazil	10,000	10,000
Denmark	12,577	-
India	5,000	5,000
Indonesia	-	1,000
Italy	-	168,067
Lesotho	-	200
Liberia	10,275	2,000
Morocco	5,000	5,000
Netherlands	200,000	193,750
Norway	-	87,719
Philippines	1,000	-
Solomon Islands	-	500
Sri Lanka	-	3,000
Switzerland	103,865	-
Thailand	1,500	1,500
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	1,000	-
Tunisia	-	4,600
Uganda	36	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>581,187</b>	<b>492,182</b>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Egypt, Italy, Liberia, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Syrian Arab Republic, A/C.2/36/L.77.

Reports: UNDP Administrator, <sup>(2)</sup>DP/535, <sup>(3)</sup>DP/1982/37.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA: 36/198, 17 Dec., text following.

Decisions: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/172, 22 July, text following.

UNDP Council (report. E/1981/61/Rev.1): <sup>(6)</sup>81/1, 18 June; <sup>(7)</sup>81/26, 30 June; <sup>(8)</sup>81/27, paras. 4 (b) & 10, 30 June; <sup>(9)</sup>81/40, para. 8, 30 June.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.9, 10-12, 76 (13-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.39 (22 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3, 6, 33-39, 42, 44 (24 Sep.-27 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/172

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/102) without vote. 17 July (meeting 16); draft orally proposed by Chairman; agenda item 17.

United Nations Volunteers programme

At its 39th plenary meeting, on 22 July 1981, the Council took note of:

(a) The annual report of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme for 1980 on the United Nations Volunteers;

(b) Decision 81/1 of 18 June 1981, adopted by the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme at its twenty-eighth session.

General Assembly resolution 36/198

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/812) without vote, 27 November (meeting 44); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.114), based on informal consultations on lo-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.77); agenda item 70 (f).

United Nations Volunteers programme

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 2659(XXV) of 7 December 1970,

Having considered the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme on its twenty-eighth session and its decision 81/1 of 18 June 1981 on the United Nations Volunteers programme,

1. Notes with satisfaction the successful achievement of the United Nations Volunteers programme during the first decade of service, that it is active in ninety-three countries, including the least developed countries, and that it has, in response to General Assembly resolution 34/107 of 14 December 1979, reached ahead of schedule the target of one thousand volunteers in service;

2. Notes the activities of the programme in the fields of youth and domestic development service;

3. Considers that the programme is a valuable instrument of multilateral technical co-operation in response to the needs of the developing countries, in particular the least developed and newly independent countries;

4. Reiterates its appeal to Governments, organizations and individuals to contribute or to increase their contributions to the Special Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Volunteers so as to enable the programme to overcome the financial constraints affecting it, and requests the Executive Co-ordinator to explore ways of ensuring increased resources and to make proposals thereon to the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme.

### Technical co-operation among developing countries

UNDP continued in 1981 to play a leading role in efforts by the United Nations to promote the exchange of experts and skills among developing countries (p. 467). A committee of the General Assembly reviewed activities by the United Nations system in regard to technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC) and made suggestions for future work. These activities paralleled action in favour of economic co-operation among developing countries, taken by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and others (p. 383).

Among its activities in Africa, UNDP was helping to strengthen an African aquaculture centre in Nigeria, a national centre in Mauritius where research and training facilities in sugar-cane production were provided for 12 African countries, and a project for rice production in West Africa. UNDP field offices helped Governments which participated in the November TCDC Meeting of the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Council to prepare their country profiles.

Among Arab States, regional projects with a TCDC component included an Arab planning

institute in Kuwait, desert-locust survey and control, and an Arab institute for banking and financial studies, primarily serving the Gulf area. Thirty-nine TCDC projects in Asia and the Pacific were under way in 1981, with a UNDP contribution of about \$31.4 million, or approximately 34 per cent of all Asian and Pacific regional programmes in the 1977-1981 planning cycle. About 85 per cent of regional projects in Latin America and the Caribbean involved TCDC, including the Inter-American Research and Documentation Centre on Vocational Training (Montevideo, Uruguay) and support to the Caribbean Community secretariat.

Many interregional and global projects also promoted TCDC activities. A number of these involved support for institutions, such as the International Centre for Public Enterprises in Developing Countries (Ljubljana, Yugoslavia), or for links between institutions, as in a project to find ways in which management development bodies in developing countries might co-operate more closely. Others were training projects, including one designed to develop vocational training in telecommunications.

While most TCDC projects were regional or interregional, some were financed as part of the programmes of individual countries. One example was a computer software development and training project in India, begun in 1981 by the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development, in which Indians joined with Africans, Asians and Latin Americans to develop training courses.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON TCDC. The second session of the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries was held at United Nations Headquarters from 1 to 8 June 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> The Committee's tasks were to review TCDC activities within the United Nations system, ensure that efforts to strengthen such activities were sustained, support new policies and approaches to further the development of TCDC, consider the availability of funds and their effective use by the United Nations system, and ensure co-ordination of TCDC activities within the system. These functions were defined by the Plan of Action for Promoting and Implementing Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries, adopted in 1978 by the United Nations Conference on Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries, held at Buenos Aires, Argentina.<sup>(8)</sup>

The Committee adopted 10 decisions on 7 June 1981, aimed at promoting TCDC in general and in specific areas. In one of these, it urged action to reverse what it saw as insufficient progress in implementing the Buenos Aires Plan

of Action (p. 465). It sought to encourage potential sources for financing TCDC (p. 465), called for an exchange of information on government activities in this field (p. 466), invited developing countries to co-operate in strengthening institutional and administrative mechanisms (p. 466) and legal arrangements (p. 467) for TCDC, and suggested policy and procedural changes to facilitate the use of UNDP country programme funds for TCDC (p. 467).

In other decisions, the Committee called for activities to develop transport and communications between developing countries (p. 568) and to promote women's participation in development programmes through TCDC (p. 986), and recommended greater co-operation among developing countries in scientific and technological research (p. 749). Finally, it adopted a provisional agenda for its next (1983) session, concentrating on a review of progress and on organizational and support arrangements for

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. On 22 July, the Economic and Social Council, by a resolution<sup>(3)</sup> adopted without vote, took note with satisfaction of the report of the Committee on TCDC and commended its decisions to the attention of the General Assembly. The Council's Third Committee had recommended this action on 17 July, also without vote, on the basis of a 16-nation draft introduced by India.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 19 November,<sup>(4)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly also took note of the report and urged Governments to implement the agreements reached by the Committee. It requested that the third session of the Committee be convened prior to the 1983 session of the UNDP Governing Council; invited participants in UNDP to send high-level representatives to the Committee's next session; and requested the executive heads of United Nations organs, organizations and bodies, including the regional commissions, to contribute to the preparation of the session and participate actively in it.

The Second Committee approved the resolution without vote on 11 November. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman, based on informal consultations on a draft introduced by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77.<sup>(1)</sup> The adopted text added a clause stating that preparations by United Nations organs and organizations should be conducted "within their spheres of competence, programmes of work and available resources".

In the Committee's debates on development and international economic co-operation and on operational activities for development, several speakers, including Argentina, the Gambia and

Guinea, urged developed countries to support TCDC. India said it was unfortunate that developed countries paid only lip-service to TCDC and felt threatened by it. Romania regarded it as unsatisfactory that most TCDC activities were financed by the developing countries and felt that developed countries, development banks and the United Nations system should increase their contributions substantially.

Other speakers mentioned action which developing countries could take to strengthen TCDC. Egypt suggested that they create pools of skilled manpower and establish joint institutions for planning and education. The Philippines said the Committee on TCDC had reaffirmed the key principle that activities in this sphere had to be initiated, organized and directed primarily by developing countries. The Republic of Korea noted that during 1980 it had provided courses for 127 trainees from developing countries and had sent experts to 17 such countries; it would ensure that its companies operating overseas were mindful of the host countries' need for employment and training.

In other comments, Argentina stressed the supremacy of Governments in decision-making on the subject of TCDC. The Congo, though realizing that the current economic crisis did not favour TCDC, remarked that there was no substitute for a firm resolve to transfer the concept into well-established operational activities. The Gambia hoped the Committee on TCDC would consider the role of TCDC in promoting agricultural production, rural development, desertification control and the exchange of skills. Tunisia said TCDC was aimed at taking advantage of the complementarity of developing countries so that they could make better use of their resources. The Ukrainian SSR considered that TCDC was impeded by political, financial, economic and social problems which developing countries had to overcome by changing their economic and social structures and providing full employment through the development of domestic industries.

**TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD ACTION.** On 9 October,<sup>(6)</sup> the Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to prepare, in collaboration with the International Labour Organisation and other agencies, an action-oriented study on the co-operative exchange of skills, including recommendations for further action, and to submit that study to the 1983 session of the Committee on TCDC. The Board invited UNDP to co-operate in the study. The suggestion that UNCTAD consider initiating such a study was made by the Committee in its 7 June decision on scientific and technological co-operation among developing countries (p. 749).

The Board's resolution was endorsed by the General Assembly on 16 December, in a resolution on UNCTAD.<sup>(5)</sup>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.16.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on TCDC, A/36/39.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC: 1981/58, 22 July, text following. GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/44, 19 Nov., text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/145, para. 13, 16 Dec. (p. 534). <sup>(6)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15): 242(XXIII), 9 Oct.

Decision: <sup>(7)</sup>Committee on TCDC: 2/10, 7 June.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(8)</sup>1978, p. 467.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.9, 10-12, 16 (13-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.39 (22 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-24, 25, 26, 28-32, 35 (24 Sep.-11 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.64 (19 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/58

Adopted without vote Meeting 39 22 July 1981

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/102) without vote, 17 July (meeting 16): 16-nation draft (E/1981/C.WL.15); agenda item 17.

Sponsors: Argentina. Bahamas. Bangladesh. Burundi. Fiji. India. Indonesia. Kenya. Malawi. Mexico. Nepal. Pakistan. Romania. Spain. Turkey. Yugoslavia.

High-level Committee on the Review of Technical

Co-operation among Developing Countries

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling the Buenos Aires Plan of Action for Promoting and Implementing Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries and General Assembly resolution 33/134 of 19 December 1978, endorsing the recommendations contained in the Plan of Action,

Having examined the report of the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries on its second session,

Noting decisions 81/31 and 81/32 of 26 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme concerning technical co-operation among developing countries,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries on its second session;

2. Commends to the attention of the General Assembly the report of the High-level Committee and the decisions contained therein.

General Assembly resolution 36/44

Adopted without vote Meeting 64 19 November 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.7) without vote, 11 November (meeting 35): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.34), based on informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.16); agenda item 69 (h).

Technical co-operation among developing countries

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362 (S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation.

Recalling also its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recalling further its resolution 33/134 of 19 December 1978, in which it endorsed the Buenos Aires Plan of Action for Promoting and implementing Technical Co-operation

among Developing Countries, and its resolutions 34/117 Of 14 December 1979 and 35/202 of 16 December 1980 on technical co-operation among developing Countries.

Having examined the report of the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries on its second session, held from 1 to 8 June 1981,

Taking note of decisions 81/31, 81/32 and 81/33 of 26 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme, relating to technical co-operation among developing countries,

Taking note also of Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/58 of 22 July 1981 relating to the Committee.

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries on its second session;

2. Urges all Governments to take immediate steps to implement the agreements reached by the Committee at its second session;

3. Requests the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme to convene the third session of the Committee prior to the commencement of the thirtieth session of the Governing Council of the Programme, to be held in 1983;

4. Decides that the organization of the session of the Committee in 1983 shall provide for plenary meetings and for meetings of only one working group;

5. Invites all participants in the United Nations Development Programme to undertake the necessary preparations for the third session of the Committee and to be represented at a high level;

6. Requests the executive heads of the organs, organizations and bodies in the United Nations system, including the regional commissions, within their spheres of competence, programmes of work and available resources and in close co-operation with the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, to contribute to the preparation of the third session of the Committee and to participate actively therein.

#### Implementation of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action

The Committee on TCDC, in a decision of 7 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> expressed concern that progress in implementing the Buenos Aires Plan of Action for TCDC<sup>(4)</sup> had been insufficient. It invited developing countries to increase and promote activities in this sphere and developed countries to continue and consider increasing and improving their support for such activities. The Committee requested governing bodies in the United Nations system to continue providing support for TCDC, with maximum use of local inputs and of those provided by developing countries. It requested the UNDP Administrator to prepare a report for the Committee's 1983 session that would review progress and provide information on potential sources of finance (see below) and on the UNDP contribution (p. 468). The UNDP administration was also requested to emphasize action-oriented activities by supporting regional and interregional technical co-operation projects, and to promote the exchange of information in this sphere (p. 466).

The UNDP Administrator, in a March report to the Committee on implementation of the Plan of Action,<sup>(2)</sup> stated that significant progress was being made in introducing and applying TCDC.

United Nations organizations had reoriented their structures and policies to that end, or were in the process of doing so. Many activities of the United Nations system were financed by UNDP (p. 467). However, there were still major obstacles, such as the lack of a concrete manifestation of a political will in some cases to sustain co-operation between developing countries, and the lack of adequate financial, technical and human resources. Also, sufficient effort had not been made to mobilize professional and technical organizations in furthering TCDC, and the private sector in developing countries had scarcely been involved. Continued support for TCDC promotional activities by the United Nations system could be seriously affected by the lack of adequate catalytic resources.

The Committee for Development Planning (p. 395), in the report on its March/April session,<sup>(2)</sup> mentioned the need for developing countries vigorously to initiate a strengthening of South-South interdependence. In addition to suggesting various types of economic co-operation (p. 383), it favoured more TCDC to promote technology, particularly through the greater use by developing countries of each other's professionals, consultancy firms, construction contractors and skilled workers.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on TCDC (report, A/36/39), 2/3, 7 June.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27; <sup>(3)</sup>UNDP Administrator, TCDC/2/5.

rearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1978, p. 467.

#### Financing

By a decision of 7 June 1981 on potential sources for financing TCDC,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee on TCDC invited developing countries to consider incorporating resources in their national budget to finance TCDC activities and setting up national funds for technical co-operation. It reiterated requests to regional and interregional funds, development banks and other intergovernmental financial institutions and aid agencies to make special efforts to support such activities. Developed countries were invited to continue to consider requests for financial support for national TCDC projects, promotional activities such as training of personnel and pre-feasibility studies, and strengthening of intercountry institutions and physical infrastructure. The Committee requested the UNDP Administrator to devote the greatest possible share of intercountry resources to TCDC activities with subregional, regional and interregional objectives (p. 468).

In its decision of the same date concerning implementation of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action (see above), the Committee requested the Administrator to provide information on poten-

tial sources of TCDC financing from international institutions and organizations, multilateral development banks and funds, and government agencies of developed and developing countries.<sup>(1)</sup>

Examining the potential sources for financing TCDC, the Administrator, in a March report to the Committee,<sup>(3)</sup> pointed out that few countries included TCDC appropriations in their national budget. However, development banks and funds in developing countries had no apparent problem in financing bankable TCDC activities, and developed countries, through their bilateral assistance programmes, assisted specific projects of interest to them. Some multinational institutions had also fostered TCDC.

Decisions: Committee on TCDC (report, A/36/39), 7 June:  
<sup>(1)</sup>2/3 para. 5<sup>(b)</sup>; <sup>(2)</sup>2/8.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>UNDP Administrator, TCDC/2/16.

#### Exchange of information

Following up a recommendation by the UNDP Administrator, the Committee on TCDC, by a decision of 7 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> invited Governments of developing countries to consider collecting systematically information on their bilateral and multilateral TCDC activities and, when they deemed it appropriate, to share that information with the United Nations development system. The Administrator was invited, in preparing future reports on government TCDC activities, to attempt more complete and more analytical coverage.

In a decision of the same date<sup>(2)</sup> on implementation of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action (p. 465), the Committee requested the Administrator to work towards a methodology of information for TCDC which would be homogeneous and easily understood, and to continue efforts for a proposed Development Information Network which would help foster information exchange among developing countries. To permit an effective response to countries interested in TCDC, it requested the Secretary-General, in collaboration with the Administrator, to continue efforts in the United Nations system to make the different information networks compatible so that the information flow would become systematic and timely.

In a March report to the Committee,<sup>(3)</sup> the Administrator concluded that the main obstacle to the preparation of comprehensive information on TCDC activities by Governments had been the lack of national arrangements or systems for the preparation of such information, and possibly the lack of time to gear up the necessary system.

Decisions: Committee on TCDC (report, A/36/39), 7 June:  
<sup>(1)</sup>2/1; <sup>(2)</sup>2/3, paras. 7-9.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>UNDP Administrator, TCDC/2/7.

#### Institutional arrangements

Endorsing recommendations of the UNDP Administrator on institutional arrangements and administrative mechanisms for TCDC, the Committee on TCDC recommended on 7 June 1981<sup>(1)</sup> that developing countries consider what administrative arrangements should be established or strengthened to enhance the implementation of TCDC objectives and invited them to intensify co-operation among themselves as part of that process. It urged the United Nations system to assist developing countries in establishing and/or strengthening national focal points or co-ordinating mechanisms for TCDC, and invited UNDP to assist developing countries in organizing, primarily at the regional and subregional levels, TCDC training programmes for government officials.

In its decision of 7 June on potential sources for financing TCDC,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee included the strengthening of intercountry institutions as one of the TCDC activities it invited developed countries to assist financially.

The Administrator, in a March report,<sup>(3)</sup> mentioned the need for national focal points to reinforce TCDC national and bilateral efforts, and pointed out that the UNDP Special Unit for TCDC, in co-ordination with UNDP resident representatives, could provide a link with national focal points.

Decisions: Committee on TCDC (report, A/36/39), 7 June:  
<sup>(1)</sup>2/6; <sup>(2)</sup>2/8, para. 4<sup>(c)</sup>.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>UNDP Administrator, TCDC/2/14.

#### Regional institutions

A Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) report of December 1980, prepared by Inspector Julio C. Rodriguez Arias and transmitted to the General Assembly in February 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> examined assistance by the United Nations system to regional intercountry technical co-operation institutions. The report stressed that United Nations aid should support rather than supplant the mutual activities of countries participating in such institutions and not encroach on their management and administrative responsibilities. Regional institutions should be self-reliant; it was at variance with the purposes of United Nations technical co-operation for them to be totally dependent on the United Nations system for resources.

Commenting on the JIU report, the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) agreed with its thesis that the United Nations system should avoid supplanting the central role which only Governments could play in regard to such institutions. However, while supporting the notion that they should be financially independent, ACC stressed that the capacity of participating countries to provide basic financial support had to be taken into account in each instance.

The Economic and Social Council, in a decision of 22 July adopted without vote,<sup>(1)</sup> took note of the JIU report and the ACC comments. The action was recommended by the Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee on an oral proposal by its Chairman, approved without vote on 17 July. The General Assembly acted similarly on 17 December,<sup>(2)</sup> on the recommendation of its Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, which approved the decision on 7 December, also without vote, as orally proposed by its Chairman.

During the Second Committee's debate on operational activities for development, Kenya said it did not agree with the JIU recommendation that regional institutions should be legally constituted before they received United Nations assistance; such bodies might be able to assist other countries without having a legal agreement.

Decisions: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/174, 22 July, text following; <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/449, 17 Dec., text following.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/101 & Corr.1, and ACC comments, transmitted by S-G note, Add.1.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.9-12, 16 (13-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.39 (22 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3, 6, 33-39, 42, 46 (24 Sep.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/174

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/102) without vote. 17 July (meeting 16); draft orally proposed by Chairman: agenda item 17.

Assistance by the United Nations system to regional

intercountry technical co-operation institutions

At its 39th plenary meeting, on 22 July 1981, the Council took note of:

(a) The report of the Joint inspection Unit entitled 'Assistance by the United Nations system to regional intercountry technical co-operation institutions';

(b) The comments of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination thereon.

General Assembly decision 36/449

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/812) without vote. 7 December (meeting 46); oral proposal by Chairman: agenda item 70 (a).

Assistance by the United Nations system to regional intercountry technical co-operation institutions

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, took note of the report of the Joint inspection Unit entitled "Assistance by the United Nations system to regional intercountry technical co-operation institutions" and of the comments of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination thereon.

#### Legal aspects

As suggested in a consultants' report submitted in March 1981 by the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP),<sup>(2)</sup> the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Devel-

oping Countries (TCDC), by a decision of 7 June,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended that developing countries consider adopting laws and regulations to facilitate TCDC, including provisions on sending their technical and professional personnel abroad without loss of benefits. It also invited multi-lateral agencies to consider adjusting their rules and procedures so as to support TCDC, and recommended that developing countries continue sending legal instruments on technical co-operation to the UNDP Special Unit for TCDC.

The Administrator's report surveyed legal arrangements for TCDC and suggested elements to be incorporated in legal instruments.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on TCDC (report, A/36/39), 2/7, 7 June.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, TCDC/2/15.

#### UNDP programme

New policies, rules and procedures designed to facilitate the use of UNDP country programme funds to help recipient countries aid others through TCDC were approved on 26 June 1981 by the UNDP Governing Council.<sup>(4)</sup> The Council acted on the basis of proposals in a March report by the Administrator,<sup>(6)</sup> endorsed on 7 June by the Committee on TCDC.<sup>(3)</sup>

The new arrangements lifted the blanket restriction imposed in 1980<sup>(7)</sup> which largely prevented UNDP from reimbursing a recipient Government for TCDC-related costs it incurred in its own currency, as when it paid the transportation costs of its nationals attending training courses in another developing country or purchased equipment and supplies at home for use in a TCDC project elsewhere. The Administrator reported that the restriction on reimbursement probably helped account for the fact that little use had been made of country programme funds for TCDC. Under the new arrangements, funds available under a recipient country's indicative planning figure (IPF), used to finance the UNDP country programme, could be used as a catalyst and supplementary contribution for a country's TCDC activities, though the primary responsibility would be that of the developing countries.

For the 1982-1986 programming cycle, the Committee recommended and the Council decided that earmarkings from IPFs for TCDC activities should not exceed 10 per cent of a country's IPF or \$7.5 million, whichever was less. In addition, basic guidelines were approved for assessing TCDC project proposals and stipulations were made concerning the payment of expenses for services, materials and personnel, allowing the same flexibility as for the rest of UNDP projects.

As requested by the Committee, the Council asked the Administrator to report to both bodies

in 1983 on the costs of TCDC projects funded from country IPFs, with details on local cost reimbursement and on expenditures for expertise, equipment and supplies, consultancy services and training.

In addition to this action affecting country IPFs, the Council, on the Committee's recommendation, decided on 26 June to allocate \$1 million from UNDP Special Programme Resources for TCDC promotional purposes for 1982-1983.<sup>(5)</sup> The Council requested a report from the Administrator in 1982 on the use of those funds.

With regard to UNDP intercountry programmes, the Administrator noted in his report that it was up to the Governments concerned to decide the extent to which TCDC elements should be incorporated. The Committee, in a 7 June decision on TCDC financing,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the Administrator to devote the greatest possible share of regional, interregional and global IPFs to support projects with TCDC elements to be carried out by intergovernmental agencies having subregional, regional and interregional objectives. In another decision of the same date,<sup>(3)</sup> on implementation of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action for Promoting and Implementing TCDC (p. 465), the Committee requested the UNDP administration to give more emphasis to action-oriented activities by supporting regional and interregional technical co-operation projects, bilateral and multilateral.

The Governing Council, in a decision of 26 June<sup>(5)</sup> on the report of the Committee on TCDC, requested the Administrator to submit in 1982 a study on the possibility of financing TCDC activities from other sources, including regional and interregional IPFs, and a report on TCDC activities under regional and interregional programmes.

Decisions: Committee on TCDC (report, A/36/39), 7 June: <sup>(1)</sup>2/3, paras. 5 <sup>(c)</sup> & 6; <sup>(2)</sup>2/8, para. 7; <sup>(3)</sup>2/9, UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 26 June: <sup>(4)</sup>S1/31, <sup>(5)</sup>81/32.

Report <sup>(6)</sup>UNDP Administrator. TCDC/2/17.  
Yearbook reference <sup>(7)</sup>1980, p. 590.

## UN Capital Development Fund

In 1981, the seventh year of operations of the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), the Fund's operations accelerated sharply. Project expenditures totalled \$48.2 million, representing a 150 per cent increase over the previous year, while new commitments approved in 1981 totalled \$71 million, compared with \$52.2 million in 1980. Income in 1981 totalled \$42.1 million, including \$29.7 million contributed by Governments (p. 470).

A report by the UNDP Administrator on the Fund's 1981 activities<sup>(3)</sup> indicated that, of the 35 new projects approved in 1981, 19 became operational during the year, bringing the total number to 164 operational projects in 39 countries. Of the recipients, 31 were least developed countries (LDCs) and the others were countries which the General Assembly had directed be given similar consideration. As at 31 December 1981, total cumulative commitments reached \$220.1 million for 188 projects (including 24 completed projects) in 42 countries, while cumulative expenditures totalled \$102 million.

About 80 per cent of the Fund's assistance continued to be devoted to the rural sector. Emphasis was on: basic social infrastructure, such as provision of food, drinking water and sanitation, schools and training institutions, health centres and basic medical equipment, low-cost housing and slum rehabilitation; and on economic infrastructure and production inputs, such as feeder roads, water resources development and irrigation schemes, rural electrification, crop storage and distribution facilities, and small-scale agro-based and agriculture-related industries.

The Fund acted to increase co-operation with international and bilateral agencies and multilateral financing institutions and with United Nations regional commissions and other regional bodies, particularly in such critical areas as desertification control, water resources management and other priority sectors affecting LDCs. In July it began negotiations for a basic agreement with beneficiary Governments establishing the legal framework for its assistance.

After receiving a report by the Administrator on the Fund's 1980 activities,<sup>(2)</sup> the UNDP Governing Council, on 19 June 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> decided to continue the partial funding system for projects (p. 470) and reiterated its request that UNCDF be authorized to meet its own administrative and programme support costs (p. 469).

The Assembly approved the proposal on administrative and programme support costs in a resolution of 17 December, adopted without vote.<sup>(4)</sup> It also reaffirmed the role of UNCDF as a supplementary source of concessional capital assistance, first and foremost to LDCs, and requested the Governing Council to consider measures to enhance the Fund's capacity to respond effectively to the priority needs of those countries, including measures to improve complementarity between the Fund's assistance and other types of assistance administered by UNDP (p. 409). The Assembly endorsed the programme orientation and operational policies of UNCDF and stressed the importance of achieving a balance between resources allocated for meeting



basic needs of low-income groups and those required for strengthening the productive sectors and dealing with other structural bottle-necks, with a view to prompting national self-reliance and accelerated self-sustained economic growth of LDCs. It called on Governments to provide financial support to the Fund (p. 470).

The Second (Economic and Financial) Committee approved the resolution on 20 November, also without vote. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an essentially similar 26-nation draft introduced by the Gambia and subsequently withdrawn by its sponsors.<sup>(1)</sup>

In the Committee's debate on operational activities for development, the Gambia called for steps to ensure complementarity between UNCDF and the UNDP Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries, since the mandate of UNCDF precluded it from financing technical co-operation even when such assistance was a prerequisite for capital financing. The Upper Volta thought UNCDF should give greater attention to strengthening training, transport and energy infrastructures. Yugoslavia believed that UNCDF resources should be totally committed to LDCs.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Cape Verde, China, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Guinea, Italy, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Rwanda, Samoa, Sweden, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, A/C.2/36/L.70.

Reports: UNDP Administrator. <sup>(2)</sup>DP/536 & Corr.1, <sup>(3)</sup>DP/1982/38.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/196, 17 Dec., text following. Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1). 81/2, 19 June.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3, 6, 33-39, 40-42 (24 Sep.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/196

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/812) without vote. 20 November (meeting 42): draft by Vice-Chairman (Ac.2/36/L.93), based on informal consultations on 26-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.70); agenda item 70 (c).

#### United Nations Capital Development Fund

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 1521 (XV) of 15 December 1960 and 2186 (XXI) of 13 December 1966, in pursuance of which the United Nations Capital Development Fund was established, as well as subsequent resolutions and decisions relating to the administration and operations of the Fund, in particular resolutions 2321 (XXII) of 15 December 1967, 3122 (XXVIII) of 13 December 1973 and 3249 (XXIX) of 4 December 1974, and decisions 34/428 of 14 December 1979 and 35/422 of 5 December 1980,

Noting with satisfaction the substantial increase in the operations of the United Nations Capital Development Fund and the progress achieved in providing timely and effective assistance first and foremost to the least developed among the developing countries, as described in the report of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme on the activities of the Fund in 1980.

Recognizing the central role of the United Nations Development Programme in providing unified management and administration to the United Nations Capital Development Fund,

Reaffirming the need to utilize and reinforce existing mechanisms for channelling additional resources to the least developed countries and to ensure effective co-ordination and complementarity between the assistance programmes of the various financing institutions of the United Nations system.

Noting with appreciation the steady increase in voluntary contributions to the general resources of the United Nations Capital Development Fund,

Having duly considered and noted chapter XXIX of the report of the Economic and Social Council, on operational activities, as well as decision 81/2 of 19 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme, particularly as regards the question of the administrative costs of the United Nations Capital Development Fund,

1. Reaffirms the role and mandate of the United Nations Capital Development Fund as a supplementary source of concessional capital assistance, first and foremost to the least developed among the developing countries;

2. Commends the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme on the effective measures taken to increase the scope and momentum of the activities of the United Nations Capital Development Fund;

3. Endorses the proposal of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme, contained in its decision 81/2, that the United Nations Capital Development Fund should be enabled to play a direct role in the implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries, adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries;

4. Requests the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme to consider measures to enhance the capacity of the United Nations Capital Development Fund to respond effectively to the priority needs of the least developed countries, including measures to improve complementarity between the capital assistance available to them from the Fund and other types of assistance available to the least developed countries administered by the United Nations Development Programme, with a view to maximizing the impact and effective utilization of those resources in the implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries;

5. Endorses the programme orientation and operational policies of the United Nations Capital Development Fund as described in the report of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme on the activities of the Fund in 1980 and, in particular, stresses the importance of achieving a balance between resources allocated for meeting basic needs of low-income groups and those required for strengthening the productive sectors and dealing with other structural bottle-necks, with a view to promoting national self-reliance and accelerated self-sustained economic growth of the least developed among the developing countries;

6. Decides that the administrative and programme support costs of the United Nations Capital Development Fund shall be met from the general resources of the Fund, while the United Nations Development Programme will continue to provide field support services as well as all headquarters administrative support services to the Fund;

7. Calls upon Governments not already contributing to the United Nations Capital Development Fund, particularly developed countries and others in a position to do so, to provide financial support to the activities of the Fund.

#### UNCDF finances

##### Administrative budget

In its resolution of 17 December 1981 on UNCDF,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly approved a

19 June request by the UNDP Governing Council<sup>(3)</sup> that UNCDF be authorized to meet its own administrative and programme support costs, currently financed from the UNDP administrative budget. The Assembly decided that UNDP would continue to provide the Fund with field support and all headquarters administrative support services. The Governing Council's view had been commended to the Assembly's attention by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution of 22 July on UNDP.<sup>(1)</sup>

For 1980-1981, through a supplementary appropriation of \$1,466,100, the Governing Council added 14 posts to the Fund's authorized strength of 15 and more than doubled its administrative budget, to a total of \$2,899,800.<sup>(4)</sup> The Council appropriated \$3,800,800 for 1982-1983.<sup>(5)</sup> Both actions were taken on 30 June 1981 in connection with the UNDP administrative budget (p. 447).

Resolutions and decisions: Res.:<sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/59, para. 6, 22 July (p. 435);<sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/196, para. 6, 17 Dec. Dec.: UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1);<sup>(3)</sup>81/2, 19 June; <sup>(4)</sup>81/26, 30 June; <sup>(5)</sup>81/27, para. 10, 30 June.

#### Partial funding system

The UNDP Governing Council decided on 19 June 1981<sup>(1)</sup> that UNCDF should continue for one more year a partial funding system which for the previous two years had enabled it to increase the level of project disbursements and to absorb accumulated liquidity resulting from the former full funding policy. Partial funding permitted UNCDF to programme projects on a cash-flow basis beyond resources actually pledged, while maintaining an operational reserve at 20 per cent of outstanding project commitments.

This procedure was initially established in 1979 for an experimental period of two years.<sup>(4)</sup> Continuation of the practice was recommended in a June 1981 report by the UNDP Administrator,<sup>(2)</sup> who said the implementation of partial funding had led to an acceleration in the Fund's disbursement rate.

According to a 1982 report of the Administrator,<sup>(3)</sup> the annual volume of UNCDF operations increased from \$40 million in 1979 to \$71.1 million in 1981, while programme disbursements increased from \$8.9 million in 1979 to \$48.2 million (revised figure) in 1981. Accumulated liquidity (exclusive of non-convertible currencies) had been reduced from \$89.5 million in 1980 to \$83.1 million at the end of 1981, including \$23.3 million of operational reserve.

Decision: UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/2, paras. 2 & 3, 19 June.

Reports: UNDP Administrator, <sup>(2)</sup>DP/INF/34, <sup>(3)</sup>DP/1982/39.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1979, p. 604.

#### Contributions

Thirty-nine Governments paid a total of \$29.7 million to UNCDF in 1981 (see table below). For 1982, 32 countries pledged contributions totalling \$24.4 million as at 31 December 1981, and several major donors indicated that they would announce their 1982 contributions early in the new year.

The UNDP Governing Council, on 19 June 1981, called on all countries to contribute to the Fund so as to enable it to maintain the momentum achieved the previous year.<sup>(2)</sup> The General Assembly, on 17 December, called on Governments not already contributing, particularly developed countries and others in a position to do so, to provide financial support.<sup>(1)</sup>

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND, 1981 AND 1982

(as at December 1981: In US dollar equivalent)

country	1981 payment	1 9 8 2 pledge
Afghanistan	2,000	2,000
Algeria	29,280	32,200
Argentina	26,854	-
Bangladesh	2,784	3,289
Benin	-	2,000
Bhutan	1,000	1,150
Botswana	5,350	5,714
Cape Verde	1,000	-
China	129,032	127,168
Cuba	27,211	24,814
Cyprus	500	-
Democratic Yemen	1,456	1,456
Denmark	1,960,784	2,112,676
Egypt	24,846	-
Finland	428,571	697,674
Greece	7,907	5,000
Iraq	-	13,559
Italy	-	2,100,840
Ivory Coast	13,636	-
Jamaica	-	3,000
Japan	1,000,000	-
Lao People's Democratic Republic	-	1,500
Lesotho	-	1,000
Liberia	-	10,000
Malawi	7,741	7,550
Maldives	1,100	600
Mali	450	-
Mauritius	1,694	-
Morocco	10,870	9,615
Nepal	1,000	-
Netherlands	7,723,419	6,041,667
Norway	7,686,936	4,912,281
Pakistan	96,162	-
Philippines	20,000	-
Samoa	1,000	-
Sweden	5,607,623	5,893,186
Switzerland	2,187,500	2,187,500
Tunisia	4,184	3,400
Turkey	295,626	153,153
Uganda	1,923	-
United Republic of Cameroon	52,909	1,166
United Republic of Tanzania	2,424	2,424
United States	2,000,000	-
Viet Nam	1,000	1,000
Yemen	2,000	2,300
Yugoslavia	300,000	-
Zambia	-	23,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>29,667,772</b>	<b>24,383,882</b>

Resolution and decision: Res.:<sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/196, para. 7, 17 Dec. (p. 469). Dec.:<sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/2, para. 7, 19 June.

## Financial regulations

The General Assembly, in a resolution of 18 December 1981 on the financial regulations of funds administered by UNDP,<sup>(1)</sup> decided that the UNDP Regulations should be applied to UNCDF until the Governing Council adopted special regulations for the Fund following a review by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

This action modified arrangements in effect

since 1969, by which the Fund had been operating under the Financial Regulations of the United Nations. The action was taken at the request of the Council, which asked on 30 June 1981<sup>(2)</sup> for authority to formulate financial regulations in respect of all funds which it administered, including UNCDF (p. 451).

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/227, para. 2, 18 Dec. (p. 451). Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/28, para. 3, 30 June.

## Chapter III

## Disasters, emergency relief and economic assistance

The United Nations continued in 1981 to mobilize international assistance for disaster and other emergency relief for countries stricken by natural or man-made disasters, as well as for countries in need of special economic assistance due to acute hardships.

Following study and discussion of ways to improve the response of the United Nations system to meet humanitarian needs in emergency situations, the General Assembly, in December, reaffirmed the mandate of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator (UNDRO) as the focal point for disaster relief co-ordination, called for its strengthening and established guidelines for the system to follow in a co-ordinated response to major disasters.<sup>(26)</sup> The Assembly expressed appreciation to the outgoing Co-ordinator.<sup>(25)</sup>

During the year, UNDRO responded to 17 disasters in 14 countries, involving floods, earthquakes, droughts and civil strife (p. 482). It also helped disaster-prone countries prepare for emergencies and plan to prevent their avoidable effects (p. 484). Much of this work was financed by the Trust Fund for Disaster Relief Assistance (p. 483).

The United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office mobilized \$30.9 million in 1981 to assist eight countries in the Sudano-Sahelian region of Central and West Africa recover from a long-lasting drought (p. 485). The money came through bilateral and multilateral channels, including \$8.5 million in expenditures by the United Nations Trust Fund for Sudano-Sahelian Activities (p. 489). In addition to medium- and long-term recovery and rehabilitation projects, part of this money was spent for desertification control to render future droughts less damaging (p. 827). Both the Economic and Social Council, in J<sup>(3)</sup> uly, and the General Assembly, in December,<sup>(4)</sup> urged States to increase resources for this purpose.

Kenya was added during the year to the list of East African States for which the United Nations was mobilizing international assistance to help the population in drought-stricken areas. The Economic and Social Council, in May, appealed for increased aid to drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia.<sup>(1)</sup> Following a July recommendation by the Council that a mission be sent to assess the needs of Kenya's drought-stricken areas,<sup>(2)</sup> the Assembly, in December, authorized United Nations assistance to such areas in Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda, and endorsed the recommendations of a multiagency mission which visited most of those countries in September/October.<sup>(22)</sup>

The United Nations Children's Fund continued to act as lead agency for an emergency assistance programme for the Kampuchean people, providing humanitarian aid to the people of Kampuchea inside the country as well as to those who had sought refuge in neighbouring countries, principally Thailand (p. 494).

Special economic assistance programmes continued for African and other countries suffering acute economic hardships due to a variety of causes ranging from drought and other natural disasters to civil strife. Multiagency missions visited most of them to identify reconstruction and development projects requiring international funding, and the information was circulated to prospective donors, bilateral and multilateral.

Reviewing these programmes in December, the General Assembly added the Gambia<sup>(21)</sup> and Liberia(\*) to the list of those benefiting and authorized a continuation of the programmes for 15 other countries-Benin,<sup>(9)</sup> Botswana,<sup>(23)</sup> Cape Verde,<sup>(12)</sup> the Central African Republic,<sup>(7)</sup> Chad,<sup>(11)</sup> the Comoros,<sup>(13)</sup> Djibouti,<sup>(17)</sup> Equatorial Guinea,<sup>(5)</sup> Guinea-Bissau,<sup>(18)</sup> Lesotho,<sup>(20)</sup> Mozambique,<sup>(16)</sup> Sao Tome and Principe,<sup>(10)</sup> Uganda,<sup>(19)</sup> Zambia<sup>(15)</sup> and Zimbabwe.<sup>(24)</sup> . A

reconstruction and development effort was also under way in Lebanon, for which the Assembly authorized increased United Nations assistance. It did likewise in respect of Nicaragua and recommended that that country continue to receive treatment appropriate to its special needs until the economic situation returned to normal.<sup>(14)</sup> Economic missions were sent to four Caribbean island States stricken by hurricanes in 1980 and 1981 - Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (p. 525). Plans were being made to send a mission to Tonga, in Oceania (p. 530).

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(1)</sup>1981/33, 6 May (p. 492); <sup>(2)</sup>1981/48, 20 July (p. 493); <sup>(3)</sup>1981/55, 22 July (p. 488). GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/203 (p. 488), <sup>(5)</sup>36/204 (p. 510), <sup>(6)</sup>36/205 (p. 529), <sup>(7)</sup>36/206 (p. 503), <sup>(8)</sup>36/207 (p. 516), <sup>(9)</sup>36/208 (p. 498), <sup>(10)</sup>36/209 (p. 519), <sup>(11)</sup>36/210 (p. 505), <sup>(12)</sup>36/211 (p. 501), <sup>(13)</sup>36/212 (p. 507), <sup>(14)</sup>36/213 (p. 527), <sup>(15)</sup>36/214 (p. 523), <sup>(16)</sup>36/215 (p. 517), <sup>(17)</sup>36/216 (p. 508), <sup>(18)</sup>36/217 (p. 512), <sup>(19)</sup>36/218 (p. 521), <sup>(20)</sup>36/219 (p. 514), <sup>(21)</sup>36/220 (p. 511), <sup>(22)</sup>36/221 (p. 490), <sup>(23)</sup>36/222 (p. 499), <sup>(24)</sup>36/223 (p. 524), <sup>(25)</sup>36/224 (p. 482), <sup>(26)</sup>36/225 (p. 480), 17 Dec.

## Disasters and emergency relief

The capacity of the United Nations system to respond to disasters and other emergencies, and the role and mandate of UNDRO, were re-examined in 1981 by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), the Secretary-General and the General Assembly (see below). The Assembly, in December, reaffirmed the mandate of UNDRO as the focal point of the United Nations system for disaster relief co-ordination, called for its strengthening and established guidelines for the system to follow in a co-ordinated response to major disasters.

During 1981, UNDRO dealt with nearly 300 disaster alerts, 17 of which were major emergencies requiring its intervention and the provision of international relief assistance (p. 482). In addition to its involvement with individual emergency situations as they arose, UNDRO assisted Governments to plan for disaster preparedness and prevention (p. 484). A number of these activities were financed by the Trust Fund for Disaster Relief Assistance, to which Governments made voluntary contributions (p. 483). The 1981 activities of UNDRO were described in reports of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly in June 1981<sup>(1)</sup> and June 1982.<sup>(2)</sup>

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/259, <sup>(2)</sup>A/37/235 & Corr.1,

### Co-ordination in the UN system

JIU REPORT. An evaluation of UNDRO, completed by JIU in October 1980, was transmitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-

General in January 1981.<sup>(8)</sup> The report concentrated on the 1976-1980 period, during which time the staff and activities of UNDRO had been substantially expanded.

In the report, JIU found that UNDRO had had difficulty in implementing its programme. Its involvement in relief co-ordination had been only modest. Despite many missions, neither a coherent technical co-operation programme nor major projects had been developed. Most planned research had been delayed or never undertaken, and information dissemination and sponsorship of meetings had been limited. Other organizations of the United Nations system had not accepted the leadership of UNDRO; disaster-prone countries would like more direct contacts and innovation from it, and donor countries had been increasingly critical of its performance. Internally, UNDRO had major staff turnover and vacancy problems, lacked management procedures and controls, and did not fully use its staff because of a tightly centralized management system.

To improve the performance of UNDRO, JIU made six recommendations. (1) The basic function of UNDRO should be confined to sudden natural disasters, excluding "creeping" disasters such as droughts, epidemics and famines. (2) The Trust Fund for Disaster Relief Assistance (p. 483) should be phased out, although UNDRO could continue to receive voluntary contributions for specified disasters. (3) The Trust Fund's subaccount for disaster prevention and pre-planning should be replaced by funding of projects by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (4) The UNDP Governing Council should become the governing body of UNDRO. (5) The Co-ordinator should report directly to the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation for day-to-day guidance. (6) Management reforms should be instituted, including: a programme review to eliminate some activities and establish priorities and targets for the remaining ones; a substantial reduction in staff, up to 50 per cent; development of an information centre on disasters; introduction of internal assessment and evaluation of UNDRO activities; and greater delegation of authority.

The report also suggested a possible new approach to disaster co-ordination in the United Nations system, through the establishment of an inter-agency Emergency Assistance Committee that would approve a plan of action for assistance in each disaster situation requiring an effort of more than a few weeks. The plan would specify the role and contribution of each organization. The Committee would also organize any collaboration required for technical co-operation proj-

ects and, on request, advise UNDRO on policies and techniques for dealing with sudden natural disasters.

The Secretary-General, in comments on the report circulated in May, outlined what had been done since UNDRO became operational in 1972<sup>(18)</sup> to improve preparedness for natural disasters and other emergencies, and to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations system to respond: organizational units had been created and others strengthened; more funds had been made available and steps had been taken to ensure their more effective and flexible use; the capacity to assess needs had been improved; and much experience with inter-agency co-ordination had been accumulated.

Commenting on some specific JIU recommendations, the Secretary-General made the following points. (1) The UNDRO mandate, as defined in the 1971 General Assembly resolution establishing the Office,<sup>(12)</sup> had stood the test of time; to limit its scope to sudden natural disasters would risk leaving certain situations uncovered, reduce flexibility and limit the application of UNDRO experience and capabilities. (2) Steps would be taken to clarify the objectives of the Trust Fund; elimination of the subaccount for strengthening UNDRO could be considered only after the Office's overall requirements were determined. (3) The purpose of the technical assistance subaccount should be clarified and more efforts made to develop disaster preparedness projects for UNDP funding. (4) Existing machinery would allow effective direction of UNDRO; placing it under the UNDP Governing Council could create jurisdictional issues, since UNDP was among the bodies whose disaster-related activities UNDRO was supposed to co-ordinate. (5) The Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation should not become involved in day-to-day UNDRO operations; he should concentrate on policy matters, including arrangements for integration of UNDRO activities with those of the system as a whole.

With regard to the JIU recommendations for improving the operations of UNDRO, the Secretary-General agreed that prompt action was needed in each of the management areas identified in the report. Some of them were already being addressed by a high-level official appointed by the Secretary-General; the Secretariat's Administrative Management Service was conducting a management survey, and UNDRO was reviewing certain delayed activities with a view either to phase them out or accelerate them.

Concerning the recommendation for an inter-agency committee, the Secretary-General noted that ACC had recently adopted measures to deal

with exceptional emergencies (see below). He felt that that approach should be developed, that the possibility of convening when necessary an ad hoc inter-agency co-ordinating committee should be considered and that the extension of such a system to deal with lesser emergencies might be explored.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. A report on international efforts to meet humanitarian needs in emergency situations, prepared by a consultant, George F. Davidson, in response to a July 1980 request by the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(11)</sup> was submitted to the Council in March 1981 under cover of a note by the Secretary-General.<sup>(9)</sup> The factual report, containing no recommendations, described how the United Nations system had carried out, over the previous decade, its role of co-ordinating and implementing humanitarian emergency assistance in cases other than those caused by natural disasters.

The report concluded that, while problems remained and difficulties arose from time to time owing to lack of adequate co-ordination, the basic facilities and services required for coping with man-made emergencies were reasonably well in place and could be made available without unreasonable delays. Further improvement would depend not so much on the development of new or different mechanisms as on the flexibility and ingenuity of organizations in adjusting to unforeseen situations and on the human factor, including the ability to work as members of a team.

ACC ACTION. On 14 April, ACC adopted arrangements for inter-agency co-ordination in regard to exceptional and complex emergencies.<sup>(15)</sup> It stated that these measures were meant to apply to emergencies like the one in Bangladesh in the early 1970s and the current one in Democratic Kampuchea (p. 494), and not to most emergencies, for which the response of the United Nations system had been generally effective. The approved measures, annexed to the Committee's annual report to the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(5)</sup> included the following.

At the initiative of the Secretary-General or the executive head of a United Nations organization, full consultations would be held to determine whether an exceptional situation existed. These would be based on information and assessment from UNDRO, officials of the United Nations system in the country concerned, voluntary organizations and emergency units in United Nations organizations. An assessment mission might be dispatched to evaluate needs and the probable duration of the emergency.

Once the Secretary-General had determined the existence of an exceptional emergency situa-

tion requiring system-wide action, he would, in consultation with the organizations involved, designate a lead entity—either an organization or a special representative. Within the overall effort co-ordinated by that entity, each organization would be responsible for assistance falling within its competence. The scope and duration of the relief operation would be periodically reviewed. When operational responsibility was assumed by other organizations such as the Red Cross, the United Nations system should consider supporting them. To remedy the lack of resources in the United Nations system, the Secretary-General, the lead entity and organizations concerned would consult on the nature of an appeal to outside donors.

ACC decided that its Consultative Committee on Substantive Questions (Operational Activities) would consider elaborating the role and terms of reference of the lead entity and related questions, including relations with donor Governments, the International Red Cross and voluntary organizations.

CPC CONSIDERATION. The Economic and Social Council, on 6 May,<sup>(16)</sup> referred the Secretary-General's report to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) and decided to consider that report and the comments of CPC at its mid-year session. The decision was taken without vote on a proposal by the President.

The Committee reviewed the report on 22 and 27 May, along with the JIU report, while considering the section relating to UNDRO in the proposed United Nations programme budget for 1982-1983 (p. 1274).

According to the Committee's report,<sup>(6)</sup> most delegations were of the view that it did not seem necessary or desirable to revise the UNDRO mandate. The Committee believed there was need to strengthen intergovernmental supervision of UNDRO activities, though there were differences about whether the existing machinery should be changed. Members generally shared the Secretary-General's view that it would not be necessary or practicable for the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to be involved in the day-to-day operations of UNDRO, as recommended by JIU. Delegations attached importance to strengthening the performance of UNDRO.

At the annual Joint Meetings of CPC and ACC, held from 29 June to 1 July, the Secretary-General, speaking as ACC Chairman, emphasized that the ability of the United Nations system to respond effectively to emergencies depended on the resources at its disposal and could only complement and support the activities of Governments. The Chairman of CPC felt that disaster

relief and development activities should be regarded as part of a continuum; in that context, a network of organizations could be assigned specific responsibilities to provide the various elements of assistance in a co-ordinated fashion.

In the ensuing debate, as summarized in a report to the Economic and Social Council by the two Chairmen,<sup>(7)</sup> all speakers emphasized that the United Nations system must play a strong role in disaster situations and that its capacity to meet assistance requirements must be enhanced. The general view was that the establishment of additional machinery should be avoided; CPC members preferred ad hoc mechanisms to a permanent ACC committee.

UNICEF BOARD ACTION. The Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), at its May 1981 session (p. 999), adopted a set of conclusions reaffirming its current policy with regard to UNICEF involvement in emergency relief, rehabilitation and special situations.<sup>(10)</sup> This included recognition of the following: that UNICEF might have to play a distinctive role not available to other agencies in meeting the immediate and particular needs of children in natural and man-made emergencies; that large-scale emergency assistance should, in principle, be financed to the maximum extent possible by specific contributions; that UNICEF would not assume lead-agency responsibilities in a major emergency, except in rare instances; and that lead-agency responsibilities should be accepted only after consultation and agreement with the Board.

The Board also believed that, without detriment to the Fund's major concern with long-range development programmes, more systematic attention should be given to consolidating its capacity to respond to emergencies and that it should co-operate closely with other organizations.

The UNICEF Executive Director informed the Board of plans to upgrade the emergency unit at headquarters and to make other arrangements at headquarters and in the field which would help ensure a more rapid response in procurement and delivery, financial management and staffing in large-scale emergencies, and strengthen links with other United Nations bodies and non-governmental organizations. The Board did not accept his proposal to increase the emergency reserve fund from \$3 million to \$5 million in order to cope with small-scale emergencies.

The Board also took action with respect to UNICEF emergency relief activities in Kampuchea (p. 495) and Africa (p. 1001).

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. Taking note of the reports on emergency assistance, the Economic and Social Council decided

on 23 July<sup>(17)</sup> to transmit them to the General Assembly, along with a draft resolution submitted to the Council by France proposing new mechanisms to co-ordinate emergency relief.<sup>(3)</sup> The Council invited the Secretary-General to provide the Assembly with any appropriate additional information and/or suggestions, with a view to developing the views expressed by delegations in the Council's Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee which reflected consensus.

This decision was adopted without vote following its approval in similar manner on 17 July by the Third Committee, based on a proposal by the Chairman.

The draft resolution by France would have had the Council recommend that, particularly in disaster-prone countries, the United Nations resident co-ordinator should provide for the convening of a relief co-ordination unit of United Nations organizations and voluntary bodies, including the International Committee of the Red Cross. Assistance provided would include promotion of an early-warning system, measures to enhance disaster prevention and preparedness, and assessment and monitoring in the event of a disaster. The relief co-ordination unit would report simultaneously to the host Government and to UNDRO, which would disseminate information to Governments and organizations. The Council would have recommended that agencies involved in disaster relief establish emergency units.

The Secretary-General would have been requested to establish at Geneva a co-ordinating committee, serviced by UNDRO, to be convened when there was an emergency situation which did not fall clearly within the mandate of any single entity. This committee would review disaster assessments, assist the Secretary-General in co-ordinating action, keep in touch with Governments on fund-raising and maintain liaison with the League of Red Cross Societies.

The Council would have called on Member States to respond to the Secretary-General's appeals for contributions, and invited them to keep UNDRO informed of relief actions and to provide the United Nations system with personnel and logistical support. The Council would have reaffirmed the mandate of UNDRO and called on the Secretary-General to pursue measures aimed at assuring its effective management.

The French proposal was submitted following informal discussions in the Third Committee which did not produce an agreed text. Varying views were expressed on when and where the matter should be taken up next. Most delegations agreed to the resumption of discussions no later than the 1981 Assembly session, using the

text of the draft resolution as a starting point. Accordingly, the French proposal was not pressed to a vote.

The USSR said it did not regard the French text as a suitable basis for the Assembly's discussion. Kenya said it would have difficulty with the idea that the discussion should be based on that text alone. However, France responded that the text would be a basis for discussion, not the only basis. Venezuela said the Group of 77 developing countries understood that the French text was not binding and that anyone could adopt any position in the Assembly's discussion.

In the debate, France said the Council was the most suitable body for the type of co-ordination required in order to improve United Nations emergency assistance procedures; it regretted what it described as a lack of determination to make improvements and instances in which specific agencies had obstructed prospective co-ordination. The United States voiced disappointment at the Council's inaction on the question of better co-ordination and said those who tried to curtail the international community's ability to deliver disaster assistance or who failed to contribute for disaster relief performed a disservice. Australia, China, the Sudan and the United Kingdom also expressed disappointment that the Council had not reached agreement.

Kenya said it opposed attempts to eliminate or replace UNDRO, could not accept the idea of turning that Office into a minor service with a restricted mandate and opposed the suggestion for a standing committee to co-ordinate emergency relief. The USSR said there was already sufficient machinery for emergency assistance; the need for new co-ordination machinery was purely fanciful.

The Secretary-General, responding to the Council's invitation that he provide additional information and/or suggestions, stated in a note to the Assembly in October that, since no consensus had been reached at the intergovernmental level, he was not in a position to do so.<sup>(4)</sup>

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 17 December, the General Assembly adopted, by a recorded vote of 128 to 9, with 6 abstentions, a resolution on strengthening the capacity of the United Nations system to respond to natural disasters and other disaster situations.

By this text, the Assembly reaffirmed the UNDRO mandate, endorsed the Secretary-General's approaches in his comments on the JIU report, and called for steps to strengthen the Office's capacity and effectiveness, its management and its information collection and dissemination capability. The Assembly outlined steps to be taken in response to a Government's request for disaster relief, including: meetings of

international organizations, convened by the local United Nations resident co-ordinator, to plan, monitor and take immediate action; inter-agency meetings convened by the Secretary-General or by the Disaster Relief Co-ordinator as his representative, to develop a concerted relief programme and consult on delivery; and designation by the Secretary-General of a lead entity in the United Nations system in the case of an exceptional or complex disaster requiring system-wide action. The Assembly reiterated its appeal for increased contributions to the UNDRO Trust Fund, particularly for emergency relief (p. 483). The international community was urged to help disaster-prone countries establish early-warning systems (p. 485).

This resolution, introduced by Kenya and sponsored by 27 nations, was approved on 11 December by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, by a recorded vote of 109 to 11, with 5 abstentions. The sponsors revised the text three times in writing and once orally before its approval. The oral changes affected the two paragraphs on inter-agency meetings; they moved to the beginning of these paragraphs phrases stating that steps to convene such meetings should be taken in response to or following a request for disaster relief from a disaster-stricken State.

On 14 December, in a resolution on the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the Assembly requested the High Commissioner to co-ordinate and co-operate closely with other organizations for greatest efficiency of relief in the case of major emergencies.<sup>(13)</sup>

Before approving the resolution on disaster relief, the Second Committee, by 81 votes to 15, with 20 abstentions, rejected a set of 20 amendments to this text proposed by the USSR.<sup>(1)</sup> Among other things, these would have: replaced a preambular reference to shortage of resources by mention of the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States; deleted references to "other disaster situations", so that the resolution would deal solely with natural disasters; deleted references about strengthening the capacity of UNDRO and its information collection and dissemination capability, and replaced a request for strengthening its management by a request to improve its effectiveness; and deleted a reference to the ACC decision on arrangements to be applied in exceptional emergencies.

With regard to paragraphs 8 to 10, on co-ordination in the United Nations system, the USSR amendments would have: replaced paragraph 8, on the convening of meetings by resident co-ordinators to plan and take immediate action on requests for assistance, by a paragraph authorizing such meetings to assist the Govern-

ment in assessing the scope of damage and in planning assistance; replaced paragraph 9, on the convening of meetings by the Secretary-General or his representative to develop a concerted relief programme, by a paragraph providing for meetings to be convened by UNDRO when intergovernmental bodies could not consider a situation at their regular sessions, for the purpose of mobilizing, directing and co-ordinating relief activities without impeding the right of each agency to respond autonomously; and deleted paragraph 10, on the designation of a lead entity in exceptional or complex disasters.

The USSR amendments would also have: replaced a request that ACC examine the roles of the lead entity and participating organizations by a request that it sum up experience concerning the designation of a lead entity with a view to developing the mandate of that entity; limited a request for information from States on relief actions to "such information as they consider desirable"; deleted a phrase urging international assistance to help States establish national early-warning systems; specified that emergency units or focal points in organizations involved in humanitarian assistance should be established "within the limits of available resources"; and deleted a request for a comprehensive report by the Secretary-General in 1983.

These amendments incorporated earlier amendments by the USSR to replace paragraphs 8 and 9, which the sponsor withdrew when introducing the set of 20 amendments. The USSR, supported by Bulgaria and the Ukrainian SSR, later requested separate votes on the amendments to paragraphs 8 to 10 and then sought to withdraw all of its other amendments. However, on a motion by the Sudan, supported by Pakistan, the Committee decided, by 84 votes to 14, with 7 abstentions, to vote on the amendments as a whole.

After introducing its amendments, the USSR submitted a draft decision proposing that the draft resolution and amendments be transmitted to the Assembly's 1982 session, through the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(2)</sup> However, the Committee rejected, by 88 votes to 15, with 15 abstentions, a USSR motion to vote on its draft decision before acting on the draft resolution. After approving the resolution, the Committee decided without vote not to act on the draft decision.

Kenya, introducing the resolution in its initial version, said its key concepts were efficiency and speed of assistance, having regard to the roles of disaster-stricken countries and of donor countries and organizations. Closer co-operation among the parties was needed to facilitate the co-ordination of relief, not by creating a new institu-



tion but by strengthening the roles of UNDRO and the United Nations system.

In proposing the amendments, the USSR stated that the resolution, by authorizing inter-agency meetings to decide 'which situations were to be treated as "complex disasters and emergencies of exceptional magnitude"', would entrust secretariat units with prerogatives belonging to inter-governmental bodies. For secretariats to decide on the provision of relief over the heads of organs established by the Charter of the United Nations would be a serious violation of the Charter. Moreover, to authorize the Secretary-General to designate a lead entity to co-ordinate international relief implied a considerable expansion of his functions. The USSR amendments would safeguard States' sovereignty by preventing the proposed machinery from interfering in their internal affairs. The amendments sought to eliminate references to strengthening the existing machinery, which would inevitably lead to unwarranted expenditure and the establishment of new machinery.

Pakistan replied that the sponsors of the resolution could not accept the USSR amendments, as they would fundamentally alter its purpose. The sponsors' intention had been to strengthen the United Nations system and not to restrict it, as appeared to be the intent of the amendments.

A representative of the Secretary-General from the Office of Legal Affairs, responding to a question by the German Democratic Republic as to whether the inter-agency machinery provided for in the resolution was compatible with the relationship agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies, said there seemed to be no legal objections in this regard, although implementation would depend in part on decisions to be taken by the agencies. To a further question by that delegation as to whether the Secretary-General was empowered to designate a lead entity to carry out relief operations in a given situation, he replied that the General Assembly could indicate what organ could take action in such matters; if the resolution was adopted, the Secretary-General would be responsible for making the designation.

Explaining their votes against the resolution, Poland, speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, stated that the proposed method of convening meetings of United Nations organizations and the fact that assistance could be provided even when there was no prior request from the country concerned might violate that country's sovereignty; that the concept of "complex disasters and emergencies of exceptional magnitude" was not defined

and it was not known who would decide whether such a situation existed; and that problems which did not arise from natural disasters were evidently due to causes of a different nature, not within the Second Committee's competence.

Among those which abstained in the vote, Argentina said it believed that the function of UNDRO was limited to assistance in cases of natural disaster. The Lao People's Democratic Republic said it had great difficulty in believing in the efficacy of the new machinery provided for in the resolution; moreover, a mechanism that would operate almost automatically when disasters occurred ran counter to the inviolability of a State's independence. Viet Nam said it would have voted against paragraphs 8 to 10 because concepts such as "complex disasters" and "emergencies of exceptional magnitude" could be interpreted in ways that might affect the sovereignty of disaster-stricken countries and because action on the resolution was premature without the agreement of all countries concerned.

Among countries which voted for the resolution, several commented on its provisions on the role of disaster-stricken States. Nigeria stated that the Governments of the countries concerned would have to consent to the convening of meetings by the United Nations resident co-ordinator and any conclusions or recommendations resulting from those meetings would have to be approved by those Governments. Sweden stated that there should be no restriction of any kind on eligibility for disaster relief, even when the affected country was not in a position to ask for it. The United States regarded the resolution as a step towards swift and efficient delivery of emergency assistance whenever and wherever it was needed, though it was concerned that the oral revisions (on prior requests by disaster-stricken States) might prove an obstacle to a swift and effective response.

Jordan stated that any United Nations initiative in response to a disaster in that country would have to be the result of a prior request by its Government and be subject to its full participation. Similarly, Turkey said that any such activities on its territory could be carried out only with the Government's prior request and consent and under its full control; Turkey added that UNDRO should normally be designated as the lead agency in disasters and that countries "affected" by a disaster could include the neighbours of those directly affected.

In Australia's view, the resolution provided a more precise definition of the significant role played by the United Nations in disaster relief operations. Canada stated that the resolution, although not reflecting all its concerns, was an

important step in the collective effort to improve the speed and effectiveness of the United Nations system in responding to emergencies. China and Venezuela thought the resolution met the twofold concern of strengthening the capacity of the United Nations system to respond to disasters while safeguarding national sovereignty.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community (EC) members, said they would have preferred stronger co-ordination measures but the resolution was a start in that direction; they hoped Governments would be kept fully informed of the co-ordination measures taken by the United Nations system so that the international community could respond to disaster situations in a fully integrated manner.

Explaining their votes against the USSR amendments, China and Turkey stated that the changes would have altered the main purpose of the resolution by limiting its scope to natural disasters. Zimbabwe said the capacity of the United Nations system to respond to situations where humanitarian considerations were of the utmost importance should not be limited.

Peru said that, ideally, some of the amendments might have been accepted, especially the proposed preambular paragraph on non-intervention and the affirmation of the concept of natural disasters.

During the debate on disaster relief assistance, many States, including Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Madagascar, the Sudan, Turkey, the United States and Yugoslavia, stated that the mandate of UNDR0 to assist countries affected by natural and other disasters should be reaffirmed. Canada believed that UNDR0 must be at the heart of a well co-ordinated relief system because its work, particularly the collection and dissemination of information to Governments, United Nations agencies and voluntary organizations, was absolutely vital to a successful operation.

Turkey stated that the JIU report had ruthlessly and unjustifiably attacked UNDR0 with the purpose of dismantling it and reducing it to a minor size and function; Turkey was grateful to the Secretary-General for clearly arguing against the diminution of the Office's mandate. Uganda had serious difficulties with the JIU recommendations; it believed that a central co-ordinating organization in the area of disaster relief was useful and should not be hampered by a lack of resources or bureaucratic procedures. The United States said that the roles of UNDR0 in co-ordination and information dissemination were useful, and its involvement in areas not clearly within the mandate of other organizations, such as assistance to persons displaced within their

own countries by war or civil strife, was a legitimate function of the Office.

Some countries acknowledged the importance of UNDR0 while emphasizing the need to improve its functioning. Australia saw an urgent need to streamline and strengthen the Office by resolving its administrative and management problems and promoting greater understanding and acceptance of its mandate. France believed that the key role of UNDR0 should be reaffirmed but said its functioning could be improved in view of its increasing responsibilities.

The USSR believed that UNDR0 activities should be limited to co-ordinating the relief efforts of United Nations organizations. Yugoslavia thought that, in addition to co-ordination, the Office should develop methods that would help national authorities to assess the consequences of disasters. Zaire supported the conclusions and recommendations of JIU and cited shortcomings the Unit had found in the functioning of UNDR0.

The suggestion by JIU that the UNDR0 mandate should be limited to sudden natural disasters was supported by Peru and Viet Nam. Such a limitation was opposed or questioned by Egypt, India and Yugoslavia. Portugal favoured a clarification of the mandate, observing that some of the difficulties of UNDR0 reflected uncertainties about its precise functions in mobilizing and co-ordinating assistance and in disaster preparedness and planning.

Madagascar believed that the JIU proposal for an intergovernmental body to control and direct UNDR0 activities might politicize assistance and render decision-making more cumbersome. Support for the suggestion to place UNDR0 under the UNDP Governing Council was voiced by the USSR, which also believed that the Office should be financed entirely by voluntary contributions.

France and a number of other countries stressed the importance of safeguarding the sovereignty of a State stricken by disaster. Egypt said the Government concerned must give its approval before relief was provided, especially in the case of man-made disasters occurring on the border between two countries.

Several countries, including Democratic Yemen and Egypt, stressed the close relationship between disaster relief and development problems. The German Democratic Republic remarked that the relief of short-term problems was not enough; it was essential to create conditions that would prevent their recurrence.

France stressed the need for co-ordination among the specialized and voluntary agencies concerned with disasters, and added that such co-ordination could be effective only if planned

in advance; it should not be interpreted as an infringement on the autonomy and fields of competence of those organizations. The United Kingdom, on behalf of the EC members, stated that, bearing in mind the need to assure the speed and efficiency of relief delivery, the Secretary-General, under the authority of the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, should guide co-operative efforts; effective contact should be established not only between United Nations agencies but also between them and voluntary agencies and, at the administrative level, between the agencies and representatives of interested Governments.

Several States, including Bangladesh, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Sierra Leone, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia, opposed the establishment of an inter-agency co-ordinating committee as suggested by JIU or said they were not convinced of the need for such a body. Kenya could not accept any supranational arrangement for imposing decisions on Governments in emergencies.

Australia favoured an ad hoc decision-making authority of agency heads, chaired by the Secretary-General or his representative. Canada favoured the use of an ad hoc committee which could be called into operation by the Secretary-General when a complex situation arose. Kenya stated that ad hoc consultations between the Secretary-General and the heads of United Nations organizations concerned with disaster relief operations should not be subject to bureaucratic procedures which would impede a prompt response to disasters. The Lao People's Democratic Republic regarded ad hoc arrangements for dealing with individual emergencies as more effective than the establishment of a new mechanism. Speaking for the Nordic States, Sweden believed that an ad hoc co-ordinating committee should meet only to discuss emergencies that did not fall clearly within the mandate of one organization; there was no question of creating a new headquarters unit. Yugoslavia recognized that in the case of major disasters there might be a need for special consultations, which could be undertaken either by the Secretary-General or by an institution authorized by him. India opposed the setting up of ad hoc groups, remarking that they were bound to perpetuate themselves.

China said co-ordination would be strengthened by making maximum use of existing agencies and avoiding the creation of new ones. The German Democratic Republic stated that the problems of organizing emergency multilateral assistance could not be overcome merely by establishing new organs or expanding the activities of existing bodies without cause. The USSR con-

sidered that the United Nations system already had adequate machinery to co-ordinate international emergency assistance; moreover, it could not approve proposals to require consensus among organizations on assistance to specific countries, as that would justify attempts by some capitalist States to deprive certain countries of aid.

Regarding co-ordination in the field, Australia thought that arrangements should be formalized—for example, through the establishment of relief co-ordination units where appropriate; UNDP resident representatives should be able to convene local relief co-ordination meetings while respecting the sovereignty of the Government concerned and the special expertise of the various agencies. Bangladesh stated that co-ordination of disaster relief activities at the country level must be improved. Canada favoured relief co-ordination units, under the local resident co-ordinator where appropriate, for better co-ordination. Sweden, on behalf of the Nordic States, believed that the setting up of such a unit should be arranged with the full concurrence of the Government concerned. Zaire also supported the establishment of such units.

Kenya regarded a field co-ordination facility as necessary but stressed that it should assist the Secretary-General and not attempt to co-ordinate activities itself in an imperial way.

Amendments rejected: <sup>(1)</sup>USSR, A/C.2/36/L. 149 (incorporating USSR amendments, A/C.2/36/L.147).

Draft decision not noted upon: <sup>(2)</sup>USSR, A/C.2/36/L.156.

Draft resolution not pressed: <sup>(3)</sup>France, E/1981/C.3/L.11 (transmitted to GA by Secretariat note, A/C.2/36/L.4).

Note: <sup>(4)</sup>S-G, A/36/636.

Reborts: <sup>(5)</sup>ACC, E/1981/37 & Corr.1; <sup>(6)</sup>CPC, A/36/38; <sup>(7)</sup>CPC and ACC Chairmen, E/1981/86; <sup>(8)</sup>JIU, transmitted by S-G note: A/36/73, and S-G comments, Add.1; <sup>(9)</sup>S-G, transmitted by note E/1981/16 & Corr.1; <sup>(10)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/1981/48.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(11)</sup>ESC: 1980/43 para. 2, 23 July 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 542). GA: <sup>(12)</sup>2816 (XXVI), 14 Dec. 1971 (YUN 1971, p. 477); <sup>(13)</sup>36/125, para. 15, 14 Dec. 1981 (p. 1032); <sup>(14)</sup>36/225, 17 Dec., text following.

Decisions: <sup>(15)</sup>ACC: 1981/2, 14 Apr. ESC: <sup>(16)</sup>1981/132, 6 May, text following; <sup>(17)</sup>1981/178, 23 July, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(18)</sup>1972, p. 414.

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR.8-10, 15, 40 (24 Apr.-6 May & 23 July); 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.1-3, 5, 6-8, 15, 16 (2-17 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30-33, 44, 46-48 (6 Oct.-10 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/132

Adopted without vote

Draft by President (E/1981/L.35); agenda item 4.

Summary report of the Secretary-General on International efforts to meet humanitarian needs in emergency situations

At its 15th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council, Pursuant to Its resolution 1980/43 of 23 July 1980, decided

to refer the summary report of the Secretary-General on international efforts to meet humanitarian needs in emergency situations to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination at its twenty-first session, and decided to consider that report, together with the comments of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, at its second regular session of 1981.

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/178

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/96 (Part II)) without vote, 17 July (meeting 16): draft by Chairman (E/1981/C.3/L.16); agenda items 18 and 19.

#### International efforts to meet humanitarian needs in emergency situations

At its 40th plenary meeting, on 23 July 1981, the Council:

(a) Took note of the summary report on international efforts to meet humanitarian needs in emergency situations, the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, the relevant text in the annual overview report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination for 1980/81, the relevant paragraphs of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the work of its twenty-first session, the relevant section of the report of the Chairman of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination on the Joint Meetings of those Committees, and the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Evaluation of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator" and the comments of the Secretary-General thereon;

(b) Decided to transmit the draft resolution entitled "International efforts to meet humanitarian needs in emergency situations" to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, together with the documents referred to in paragraph (a) above;

(c) Decided further to invite the Secretary-General to provide the General Assembly at that session with such additional information and/or suggestions regarding the co-ordination of international efforts to meet humanitarian needs in emergency situations as might be necessary and appropriate, with a view to developing those views expressed by delegations in the Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee at the second regular session of 1981 of the Council which were reflective of consensus.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/225

128-9-6 (recorded vote) Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737/Add.1) by recorded vote (109-11-5). 11 December (meeting 48); 27-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.117/Rev.3), orally revised; agenda item 72 (a).

Sponsors: Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, United, Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Strengthening the capacity of the United Nations system to respond to natural disasters and other disaster situations  
The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2816(XXVI) of 14 December 1971, by which it established the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, 3243(XXIX) of 29 November 1974 on the strengthening of that Office, 3440(XXX) of 9 December 1975, in which it provided, *inter alia*, for measures to be taken in support of the activities of the Office, and 3532(XXX) of 17 December 1975 on the financing of emergency relief assistance and technical co-operation activities of the Office,

Recalling also its resolution 31/173 of 21 December 1976 on financial arrangements for the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator,

Recalling further the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recalling the report of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries containing the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries, in particular the section concerning disaster assistance for the least developed countries,

Deeply concerned about the increasing number of natural disasters and other disaster situations, the economic burden borne by disaster-stricken and affected countries, particularly the developing countries, and the disruption thereby caused to their development process,

Also recalling its resolution 35/107 of 5 December 1980,

Further recalling Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/43 of 23 July 1980 regarding international efforts to meet humanitarian needs in natural disasters and other disaster situations,

Fully cognizant of the sovereign interests and rights of affected countries and of the primacy of their role in caring for the victims of natural disasters and other disaster situations,

Anxious that the international community should respond speedily and effectively to calls for emergency humanitarian assistance,

Recognizing that the quality and appropriateness of material and other assistance provided by the international community should meet the particular needs of the populations of disaster-affected areas,

Recognizing the contribution made by the United Nations system to the relief of suffering and provision of humanitarian relief in natural disasters and other disaster situations,

Recognizing that the primary responsibility of administration, relief operations and disaster preparedness lies with the affected countries and that the major part of the material assistance and human effort in disaster relief comes from the Governments of those countries,

Recognizing also the importance in international relief of the contribution of the International Committee of the Red Cross, the League of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and appropriate voluntary organizations,

Recognizing further that, in order to attain an effective co-ordination system of humanitarian and disaster relief assistance, it is essential to strengthen and improve the capacity and effectiveness of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator and the United Nations system as a whole in order to enable the Office to respond to natural disasters and other disaster situations speedily, efficiently and effectively, and thereby ensure prompt delivery of concerted relief,

Recognizing that a major constraint for the United Nations system to respond effectively to natural disasters and other disaster situations has been the shortage of resources,

1. Takes note of the reports of the Secretary-General and other reports on international efforts to meet humanitarian needs in emergency situations, as well as on measures for strengthening the capacity of the United Nations system to respond to natural disasters and other disaster situations and of the statement made by the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator before the Second Committee on 5 November 1981;

2. Reaffirms the sovereignty of individual Member States, recognizes the primary role of each State in caring for the victims of disasters occurring in its territory and stresses that all relief operations should be carried out and co-ordinated in a manner consistent with the priorities and needs of the countries concerned;

3. Reaffirms the mandate of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, established by the General Assembly in resolution 2816(XXVI) as the focal point of the United Nations system for disaster relief co-ordination, and calls for strengthening and improvement of the capacity and effectiveness of the Office;

4. Endorses the approaches outlined by the Secretary-General in his comments on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit concerning the role of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator in the various phases of disaster assistance;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to take the necessary steps to strengthen the management operations of

the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator;

6. Stresses the need to take full advantage of information provided by existing early-warning monitoring systems that have been developed to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations system in responding to natural disasters and other disaster situations and to co-ordinate, as far as feasible and useful, all the relevant early-warning systems, and stresses that, to this effect, the capability of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator in information collection and dissemination should be further strengthened and improved;

7. Urges the appropriate organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system. Including the United Nations Children's Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Health Organization, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the World Food Programme and other appropriate bodies, to co-operate closely, in their respective areas of competence, with the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator in disaster relief activities and other disaster situations, to respond effectively to the needs of the situation and to comply promptly with the requests of disaster-affected countries;

8. Decides that, in response to a request for disaster relief from a disaster-stricken State and, as necessary, in particular in disaster-prone countries, the United Nations resident co-ordinator shall, with the full concurrence, consent and participation of the Government, convene meetings of the concerned organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to plan, monitor and take immediate action to provide assistance and the International Committee of the Red Cross, the League of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and appropriate voluntary organizations may be invited to participate in such meetings with the approval of the host country;

9. Decides that, following a request for disaster relief from a disaster-stricken State and whenever required to deal effectively with complex disasters and emergencies of exceptional magnitude, the Secretary-General or his representative, who would normally be the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, shall convene meetings of the concerned organizations of the United Nations system in order to develop a concerted relief programme and conduct ad hoc consultations with the heads or representatives of the agencies concerned with disaster-relief questions, with a view to ensuring speedy and efficient delivery of goods and services to the disaster-stricken areas, and decides that these ad hoc consultations should draw on information provided by the Government concerned, as well as on the assessments of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, the resident co-ordinator and representatives of other United Nations organizations in the countries concerned, and take into account advice offered by the International Committee of the Red Cross, the League of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and appropriate voluntary organizations in the field with the understanding that all agencies with responsibilities for natural disasters and other disaster situations should be involved at the appropriate level in such consultations;

10. Decides that, once it has been determined on the basis of the above-mentioned information and consultations that an exceptional or complex natural disaster or other disaster situation requiring system-wide action exists, the Secretary-General shall designate, at the international level, a lead entity from among the United Nations organizations, agencies and bodies, including the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, and, at the country level, the appropriate entity of the United Nations system to carry out relief operations, taking into account the specific requirements of the situation and in consultation with the host Government, and calls upon all organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to co-operate closely with one another in their relief operations;

11. Invites the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination to examine urgently the role of the lead entity and participating organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations

system in complex disaster situations, taking into account decision 1981/2 of that Committee, and requests the Secretary-General to submit a report, through the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982, to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, on the deliberations of the committee;

12. Strongly calls upon all States to respond positively and expeditiously to the Secretary-General's appeals for contributions to meet natural disasters and other disaster situations;

13. Reiterates, in particular, its appeal in resolution 35/107 for increased contributions to the Trust Fund of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, in particular to the subaccount for humanitarian emergency relief;

14. Stresses in this regard the need to strengthen the operational capacity and the human, material and financial resources available to individual agencies and organizations, in order to enable them to play their respective roles more promptly, efficiently and effectively in natural disasters and other disaster situations;

15. Requests all States to ensure a full flow of information to the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, especially regarding relief actions, and also to provide the United Nations system with the necessary personnel and logistic support;

16. Urges Governments in disaster-prone countries to explore further, with the assistance of the donors, appropriate organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, the possibility of improving storage, communication and transportation facilities, as well as measures to ensure disaster preparedness and prevention;

17. Also urges the international community to assist disaster-prone countries, upon their request, with the establishment of effective national early-warning systems, the development of contingency plans for disasters and the strengthening of assessment capacity for relief requirements and for distribution and monitoring of relief supplies;

18. Calls upon organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system involved in the provision of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief to establish emergency units or focal points if they are not already in existence;

19. Reaffirms the need for the international community to respond fully to requests for emergency and humanitarian assistance, in particular through increased financial contributions for affected developing countries, bearing in mind the relevant provisions of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade and of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries, as well as those of the Trust Fund of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator;

20. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a preliminary progress report on the implementation of the present resolution to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, through the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982, and a comprehensive report to the Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, through the Council at its second regular session of 1983.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Granada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome

and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Cuba, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Viet Nam.

#### Tribute to the UN

##### Disaster Relief Co-ordinator

On 17 December 1981, the Assembly adopted a resolution expressing appreciation to the outgoing United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, Faruk N. Berkol, for his dedication in discharging his responsibilities. (\*)

This resolution, introduced by Pakistan and sponsored by 12 nations, was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 10 December. The draft replaced an essentially similar text submitted by the Chairman, <sup>(1)</sup> which was withdrawn.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>2nd Committee Chairman, A/C.2/36/L.122.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/224, 17 Dec., text following.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/224

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737/Add.1) without vote, 10 December (meeting 47): 12-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.150): agenda item 72 (a).

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Madagascar, Pakistan, Philippines, Somalia, Sudan, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

#### Expression of appreciation to the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator

The General Assembly,

Noting that the incumbent United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator will shortly be relinquishing his duties,

Recognizing the role he has played in organizing and guiding the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator in the performance of its functions.

Deeply appreciative of the contribution he has made in creating and further developing that Office and of his unrelenting efforts to alleviate human suffering through the special humanitarian tasks entrusted to him,

1. Expresses its sincere appreciation to Mr. Faruk N. Berkol for the dedicated manner in which he has discharged the responsibilities of his office;

2. Extends its best wishes to him for his future undertakings and well-being.

### Disaster relief

At the request of the Governments concerned, the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator (UNDRO) responded during 1981 to eight flood emergencies, five earthquakes, two droughts and two situations involving civil strife, affecting 14 countries.

Its functions in individual disasters included several or all of the following: (a) gathering information and disseminating it in the form of situation reports to Governments and potential

donors; (b) conducting assessment missions; (c) mobilizing relief contributions and ensuring the rapid transport of relief supplies; (d) seconding relief co-ordination officers to the offices of resident co-ordinators of the United Nations development system and resident representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); (e) assessing the impact of major relief programmes; and (f) advising Governments on the inclusion of disaster prevention concepts in the post-emergency phase.

The Office was authorized to draw from the United Nations budget up to \$30,000 per country for relief assistance in the case of any one disaster. It made this maximum allocation on 10 occasions during 1981. Specific disaster relief operations in which UNDRO was involved during the year are described below.

- China. An UNDRO-led multiagency assessment mission visited flood-stricken Hubei province and drought-stricken Hebei province, 12-31 January. UNDRO launched an international appeal in March for food, fertilizer, clothing, blankets and medical supplies, resulting in contributions of \$25 million. Aid was delivered and distributed during the latter part of 1981.

An earthquake struck Daofu, Sichuan province, on 24 January. An UNDRO grant of \$30,000 was used for medical supplies and other assistance.

-Indonesia. In response to a typhoon and floods in central Java, 7-19 January, UNDRO allocated \$5,000 for temporary shelter.

After an earthquake damaged about 16 villages in Irian Jaya, UNDRO allocated \$10,000 for emergency shelter.

-Greece. An earthquake in the Athens and Corinth areas, 24 February, killed 22 persons and rendered 80,000 temporarily homeless. UNDRO issued situation reports and appealed for 2,000 tents, most of which were provided by the international community.

-Mozambique. Areas of extensive floods in February were visited by a multiagency assessment mission in March, which found that approximately 160,000 people had lost their subsistence crops. Participating organizations contributed most of the relief supplies needed. A \$30,000 grant by UNDRO was used to purchase light boats and medical supplies.

-Djibouti Heavy rains in March/April left some 100,000 people, almost a third of the country's population, temporarily homeless. The Government appealed through UNDRO for power generators, pumps, mobile kitchens, tents, food and medicines. Most needs were covered by a number of international organizations; contributions reported to UNDRO reached \$1 million. An UNDRO grant of \$30,000 was used for tents and sugar.

-Somalia Food and relief supplies were provided by Governments and international organizations following heavy seasonal rains, March/April, especially in Hiran and Juba provinces. United Nations resident co-ordinators assumed responsibility for the receipt and distribution of supplies.

-Democratic Yemen Flash floods in March killed 70 persons, left 64,000 homeless, destroyed buildings and damaged agricultural land and crops; 13,000 head of livestock were lost. An UNDRO appeal resulted in reported contributions of \$1.8 million, including \$30,000 from UNDRO and a grant from UNDP for tents, medicines and blankets.

Flash floods in September in Abyan governorate on the southern coast destroyed a major dam and heavily damaged housing and infrastructure. The World Food Programme provided emergency food rations; UNDRO and UNDP grants, including \$30,000 from UNDRO, were used for blankets, beds, stoves and kitchen utensils. UNDRO assisted the Government to assess relief needs and advised on flood control.

-Iran. Earthquakes struck Kerman province, east-central Iran, 11 June and 28 July, killing more than 2,000 persons and leaving 37,000 homeless. An UNDRO representative visited the area, assessed the damage and evaluated relief needs. Several United Nations organizations, 20 Governments and many non-governmental organizations responded to an UNDRO appeal. A \$30,000 UNDRO grant was used for soap, blankets and foodstuffs.

-Angola. In July the Government requested assistance for its displaced population in the southern provinces and central plateau. UNDRO led a multi-agency fact-finding mission which recommended a \$12 million, six-month emergency relief programme to be followed by a longer-term relief and rehabilitation scheme. Designated by the Secretary-General as co-ordinating agency for the programme, UNDRO launched a major appeal which brought contributions of about \$11 million, including the Office's maximum grant of \$30,000. A follow-up mission in November reported that the programme was being implemented but was being hindered by military operations and civil strife.

-Gambia. Following civil unrest in July, causing heavy loss of life and damage to the economy and infrastructure, an UNDRO-led multi-agency assessment mission recommended a food programme for 120,000 persons and other emergency assistance. Virtually all emergency needs were met within a month; international contributions exceeded \$12 million, including \$30,000 from UNDRO, used to purchase 83 tons of rice.

-Comoros. Responding to a Government request in August, UNDRO contributed \$4,000 for motor pumps and water containers needed for drought-affected populations.

-Guinea. Following a Government request in August, UNDRO assessed flood damage caused by the overflow of the Selingué reservoir in Mali. With a \$20,600 allocation, it joined other United Nations agencies in providing food, tents and blankets.

-Nepal. Floods and landslides in September in central regions left several hundred persons dead, affected more than 2,600 families, and damaged houses, crops and roads. The international community provided almost \$300,000 worth of relief assistance.

-Chad. In November, in response to a situation caused by years of civil strife (p. 504), the Secretary-General appealed for reconstruction and rehabilita-

tion assistance and designated UNDRO as the lead agency to mobilize and co-ordinate emergency relief. UNDRO made its maximum allocation of \$30,000 for direct assistance and sent a representative to N'Djamena, the capital; he reported that substantial resources and a special logistic effort would be needed to move relief supplies.

#### Trust Fund for Disaster Relief Assistance

The activities of UNDRO were financed partly from the United Nations budget and partly from the voluntary Trust Fund for Disaster Relief Assistance. Budget appropriations for 1980-1981 totalled \$4,482,500; expenditures under the Trust Fund were \$2,835,212 for the same period, of which \$940,424 pertained to 1981.

The Trust Fund had three main subaccounts, under which 1981 expenditures were: strengthening of UNDRO, \$563,068 (60 per cent); emergency relief assistance, \$235,719 (25 per cent); and disaster prevention and pre-disaster planning, \$141,637 (15 per cent) (see table below). (Most of the 1981 expenditures for relief were recorded for activities in connection with disasters which occurred in 1980.<sup>(3)</sup>)

1981 EXPENDITURES OF THE TRUST FUND  
FOR DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE  
(in US dollar equivalent)

ACCOUNT/PURPOSE	AMOUNT
Emergency relief assistance	
Angola	37,901
Bangladesh	126,030
Djibouti	17,906
Haiti	1,931
Iran	101
Viet Nam	36,879
General disaster relief operations	30,067
Adjustments to 1980 expenditures	(15,096)
Subtotal	235,719
Strengthening of UNDRO	
General	553,146
UNDRO/UNEP projects	9,922
Subtotal	563,068
Disaster prevention and pre-disaster planning	
General	89,293
Pan-Caribbean preparedness and prevention project	52,344
Subtotal	141,637
Total	940,424

A recommendation to phase out the Trust Fund was made by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) in its evaluation of UNDRO (p. 472). In December, however, the General Assembly reiterated a previous appeal for increased contributions to the Fund, particularly to its subaccount for humanitarian emergency relief.<sup>(2)</sup>

During discussion of disaster relief assistance in the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee (p. 478), a number of speakers

commented on the role of the Trust Fund. Egypt and Turkey pointed out that the Assembly had decided in December 1980 to maintain the Fund for two years from 1 January 1982.<sup>(1)</sup> Madagascar favoured maintaining the Fund until a valid system of financing UNDR0 had been set up. Peru stated that the Fund should be maintained as a channel for voluntary economic assistance by Governments and for direct co-operation which donors wanted to channel through UNDR0. Sierra Leone agreed with the Secretary-General's comment that the Fund's future could be decided only after the Assembly had made known its views on the role and functions of UNDR0.

Contributions paid to the Trust Fund in 1981 totalled \$886,712, consisting of \$821,873 from 16 Governments (see table below) and public donations in the amount of \$64,839. The Fund's total income, including interest, was \$1,495,327, or \$554,903 more than its expenditures.

1981 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TRUST FUND  
FOR DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE  
(In US dollar equivalent)

PURPOSE/CONTRIBUTOR	AMOUNT PAID
Disaster relief in Angola	
Australia	11,818
Ireland	31,500
Norway	323,193
Subtotal	366,511
Disaster relief in the Caribbean	
United States	60,000
Subtotal	60,000
Disaster relief in Djibouti	
Australia	17,906
Subtotal	17,906
Disaster relief in viet Nam	
Italy	36,931
Subtotal	36,931
Disaster prevention and pre-disaster planning	
United Kingdom	3,898
Subtotal	3,898
Strengthening of UNDR0	
Australia	115,024
Bahamas	1,500
Barbados	1,000
Chile	3,000
Iceland	6,000
Italy	9,770
Jamaica	2,241
Japan	50,000
Madagascar	2,193
Norway	81,224
Philippines	5,000
Switzerland	56,818
Turkey	2,857
Subtotal	336,627
Total	821,873

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>35/107, para. 4, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 981); <sup>(2)</sup>36/225, para. 13, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 480). Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 974.

### Disaster preparedness and prevention

In addition to its disaster relief activities, UNDR0 continued its pre-disaster planning functions, which involved it in promoting the study, prevention, control and prediction of natural disasters, and the collection and dissemination of information.

The Pan-Caribbean disaster preparedness and prevention project was initiated in September 1981. Serving all island States of the region, the project included 33 activities relating to updating of emergency plans, training of personnel, stimulation of public awareness, and vulnerability analysis and risk mitigation. UNDR0 was responsible for general co-ordination of the project, including the appointment of staff and supervision of technical activities.

Often in co-operation with other United Nations organizations, the Office provided assistance in pre-disaster planning to Governments that requested it, as summarized below.

-Jamaica. A joint mission in January advised the Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Relief Co-ordination on priorities of its work programme.

-Nicaragua. A joint mission in January with the World Health Organization advised the Government on the structure and work programme of a national civil defence office responsible for future in-country disaster relief operations and disaster prevention.

-Panama. UNDR0 advised in January on the establishment of a national emergency office, including its structure and work programme.

-Peru. A multiagency mission in January formulated a comprehensive national disaster preparedness and prevention programme and identified six projects for implementation by international agencies. In April UNDR0 initiated a study to assess tsunami (tidal wave) risks in the vicinity of Lima.

-Somalia. An UNDR0 consultant completed in January a mission of advice on revising the national disaster preparedness plan.

-United Republic of Tanzania. An UNDR0 consultant completed in January a mission to assist the Government in identifying priorities related to land use and in drafting a general preparedness scheme for the country.

-Ecuador. A multiagency mission in January/February determined the country's needs for international assistance in disaster preparedness and prevention.

-Mexico. A joint mission in January/February with the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) advised on the establishment of a work programme in disaster preparedness and prevention and on possible joint activities by national agencies.

-Venezuela. An UNDR0 mission in February identified technical co-operation projects in disaster



preparedness and made arrangements for closer involvement of Venezuela in international disaster relief operations and possibly in disaster preparedness activities in the Caribbean.

-Senegal An UNDRO consultant completed in March a mission to advise the Government on strengthening its relief organization plans and operations.

-Indonesia An UNDRO consultant in March/April surveyed disaster-prone areas and recommended ways of raising the level of provincial disaster preparedness.

-Ecuador. A joint mission in October with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization assessed emergency preparedness measures to be taken in the event of an eruption of the Pichincha volcano, near Quito.

In addition, UNDRO continued to provide advisory and physical planning services to Yugoslavia following the 1979 earthquake in Montenegro republic, and assistance to Egypt in vulnerability analysis and housing reconstruction following flooding in Upper Egypt in November 1979.

A number of UNDRO activities were financed by the subaccount for disaster prevention and pre-disaster planning in the Trust Fund for Disaster Relief Assistance (p. 483).

The role of UNDRO in regard to disaster preparedness and prevention was discussed during the year in connection with the assessment of the capacity of the United Nations system to deal with emergencies. JIU, in its report on UNDRO (p. 472), recommended that the subaccount for disaster prevention and pre-planning should be replaced by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) funding of projects. In his comments on this report, the Secretary-General stated that more efforts should be made to develop disaster preparedness projects for UNDP funding.

When the Committee for Programme and Coordination discussed this topic in May (p. 474), different views were expressed as to whether UNDRO should deal with pre-disaster planning and preparedness. The draft resolution which France presented to the Economic and Social Council, and which the Council decided in July to transmit to the General Assembly (p. 474), included a provision for United Nations assistance in promotion of an early-warning system and of prevention and preparedness measures.

In its resolution of 17 December on strengthening the capacity of the United Nations system to respond to natural and other disasters,<sup>(1)</sup> the r Assembly urged Governments in disaster-prone countries to explore, with the assistance of donors and the United Nations system, the possibility of improving storage, communication and transportation facilities, as well as measures to ensure disaster preparedness and prevention.

The international community was urged to assist such countries with the establishment of national early-warning systems, the development of contingency plans for disasters, and the strengthening of assessment capacity for relief requirements and for distribution and monitoring of relief supplies.

During discussion of disaster relief assistance in the Assembly's Second Committee, Egypt expressed the view that UNDRO had a role in co-ordinating scientific research by specialized agencies and disseminating disaster-control technology. Democratic Yemen, Sierra Leone and Sweden, the last speaking for the Nordic States, wished to see pre-disaster planning and preparedness activities strengthened; Sierra Leone could not support the JIU suggestion to phase out the subaccount for this purpose. The Sudan and the United States believed that UNDRO should continue to fulfil disaster preparedness functions.

Some speakers suggested that UNDP become more active in this area. India believed that UNDP should include technical co-operation for disaster preparedness and prevention in its regional and interregional programmes, helping disaster-prone communities in developing countries to improve their ability to cope with such tragedies. Peru thought such assistance might be channelled through UNDP country programmes, keeping UNDRO as the executing agency.

Sweden, on behalf of the Nordic countries, stated that it was essential that development plans and programmes of developing countries, especially those which were disaster prone, should include programmes for disaster prevention and preparedness; United Nations organizations could provide the tools and financial means so that such countries would be prepared in the event of disaster.

The USSR could not agree to proposals for an international early-warning system, on the ground that they could lead to interference in the internal affairs of States; it also believed that UNDRO should not deal with pre-disaster planning.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/225, paras. 16 & 17, 17 Dec. (p. 480).

### Drought-stricken areas of Africa

#### Sudano-Sahelian region

The United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office (UNSO), operating within UNDP, continued in 1981 to serve as the principal unit of the United Nations system for co-ordinating efforts by United Nations agencies to help eight drought-stricken countries of the Sahel to implement medium- and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programmes. These programmes were aimed at mitigating the effects of future

droughts, achieving self-sufficiency in food staples and accelerating socio-economic development. The countries assisted-Cape Verde, Chad, the Gambia, Mali, Mauritania, the Niger, Senegal and the Upper Volta-were the members of the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS).

Under a separate mandate, UNSO also assisted 19 countries in Central and East Africa to control desertification, under a joint venture between UNDP and the United Nations Environment Programme (p. 827).

General Assembly in 1981<sup>(2)</sup> and early 1982,<sup>(3)</sup> described the activities undertaken in 1981 under the medium- and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme. As a result of expanding operational capability, the number of UNSO-assisted projects for drought-related recovery and rehabilitation reached 119 (28 regional and 91 national) by the end of 1981, at a total cost of more than \$701 million.

In 1981 UNSO mobilized \$30.9 million in international assistance to finance priority drought-related recovery and rehabilitation projects as well as desertification control projects of the States members of CILSS. Sources for these funds were bilateral and multilateral, and included the United Nations Trust Fund for Sudano-Sahelian Activities (p. 489). Since the inception of UNSO in 1973,<sup>(10)</sup> close to \$450 million had become available from various quarters by the end of 1981, of which more than \$60 million was contributed by and through the Trust Fund.

Projects assisted by UNSO were concentrated mainly in the transport infrastructure and agricultural sectors. The affected Governments placed growing emphasis on range management and conservation, control of water resources with special attention to surface-water harvesting, improved food production, intensified reforestation and afforestation, the development of national capabilities through expanded training of personnel, the establishment or strengthening of national units for drought-related recovery and rehabilitation, and the development of new and renewable energy sources.

Prominent among UNSO-assisted regional activities was a \$150-million programme for the construction, improvement and maintenance of a region-wide, 3,900-kilometre system of all-weather feeder roads. Approximately \$105 million had been secured by the end of 1981 for the construction of some 2,150 kilometres, including \$60 million through UNSO. A total of 1,300 kilometres had been constructed since the programme's inception, including close to 300 kilometres in 1981.

The UNDP Administrator, in a March 1981

report to the UNDP Governing Council on assistance to drought-stricken countries in Africa,<sup>(4)</sup> noted that in 1980-1981 the CILSS member States had had a shortfall of 200,000 tons of grain which had to be offset by commercial imports and aid, and that rainfall in almost the entire Sahelian area had again been unevenly distributed in both time and space. However, the Administrator subsequently reported<sup>(5)</sup> that most Sahelian countries had experienced nearly normal rainfall and weather in 1981, with generally satisfactory grain harvests. The exceptions had been Cape Verde and Chad, which had had a serious drought, while Mauritania and the Niger had been affected to a lesser extent.

Describing assistance provided by United Nations organizations in 1981 to the most seriously affected countries, the Administrator reported that aid to Cape Verde had concentrated on soil and water conservation, water resource development and the expansion of agricultural production. In Chad, where the crisis caused by drought had been made worse by civil strife, inter-agency missions visited three times to assess the situation and alert donors about the most urgent needs. In Mauritania, UNDP, UNSO and the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) were helping to establish construction brigades to maintain secondary roads and dams. Projects of UNDP in the Niger were designed to strengthen agrometeorological services, soil cartography and collection of agricultural statistics; others assisted agricultural mechanization, reafforestation, and construction, maintenance and improvement of secondary roads.

The Governing Council, on 19 June,<sup>(9)</sup> called on Governments to make special efforts to enable UNSO to respond to priority requirements, including voluntary contributions at the 1981 United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities (p. 426). It noted with satisfaction the decisive role played by UNSO in combating the effects of drought and requested the Administrator to continue to enhance the Office's capacity through the greater use of available resources, particularly from the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, UNCDF and the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. By a resolution of 22 July,<sup>(7)</sup> the Economic and Social Council called on Governments to make special efforts to increase UNSO resources through voluntary contributions, including those to be made at the 1981 Pledging Conference. It requested UNSO to continue co-operating with the States members of CILSS with a view to hastening implementation of the recovery and rehabilitation programme, and invited the

Secretary-General to pursue consultations—originally suggested by the Council in July 1980<sup>(6)</sup>—for joint undertakings between UNSO and other United Nations organs, agencies and programmes. The Council asked for a further report in 1982.

The resolution, introduced by Senegal and sponsored by 11 nations, was adopted without vote following its approval without objection by the Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee on 16 July. The approved text included a drafting change made by the sponsors after the USSR orally proposed to delete “including”

from the original phrase calling on Governments to increase UNSO resources “including through voluntary contributions” at the Pledging Conference.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. Another call for voluntary contributions to UNSO, through the Pledging Conference and bilateral channels, was made by the General Assembly in a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(8)</sup> adopted without vote. The Assembly requested United Nations bodies to continue and increase their assistance through joint undertakings with UNSO and invited the Secretary-General to pursue consultations on arrangements for such undertakings. It reaffirmed the role of UNSO as the central point and principal body responsible for co-ordinating the efforts of United Nations agencies to help the countries of the Sahel to implement their recovery and rehabilitation programme, and invited UNSO to continue to strengthen the close co-operation with CILSS and its member States.

This resolution was submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier 17-nation draft,<sup>(1)</sup> introduced by the Gambia and subsequently withdrawn. It was approved in Committee without vote on 20 November, as orally amended by the Gambia on behalf of the sponsors of the earlier draft. These changes affected the latter part of paragraph 8, by which the Assembly noted with appreciation the effective manner in which UNSO was discharging its responsibilities. In place of the phrase “in responding to the programme priority” of CILSS member States, the revised text read “in responding to the priority requests” of CILSS member States and added “within the framework of their programme”.

The resolution differed from the 17-nation draft by the addition of a reference to bilateral channels in paragraph 3, asking States to increase the resources of UNSO.

The Gambia, introducing the original draft, said that a lasting solution to the problems caused by persistent drought in the Sahel depended on the provision of funds and technol-

ogy by the international community. The States members of CILSS had submitted 116 national and regional projects costing an estimated \$656 million. A significant portion of that amount had been secured and UNSO would pursue resources for the remaining projects.

Several African countries cited projects under way to alleviate drought conditions in the Sahel. Guinea said that UNSO-assisted development of the Fouta-Djallon massif in Guinea, watershed for the main rivers of West Africa, was aimed at ensuring the navigability of rivers for a length of 2,610 kilometres in several States, dredging those rivers to facilitate drought and flood control, developing hydroelectric production through the construction of 14 dams, and serving as the linchpin of African economic integration. Mali mentioned its joint programme with Mauritania and Senegal to develop the Senegal River basin for irrigation and electric power generation and to give Mali access to the sea. The Niger noted that in 1981 UNSO had contributed more than \$4 million towards a \$6.3 million feeder-road construction and maintenance programme in that country.

Mauritania, observing that more developing countries were contributing to the Trust Fund, said that technical co-operation among developing countries should play a major role in the recovery and development of the Sahel. Sierra Leone said it would have liked to see an increase in unearmarked contributions so that UNSO could be more responsive to the needs of recipients.

Poland, also speaking on behalf of other Eastern European countries and Mongolia, said they would continue to provide technical assistance to the Sahelian countries bilaterally and through certain multilateral programmes, including UNDP. The German Democratic Republic added that in January 1981 it had given assistance amounting to several million marks to Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mali and the Niger. The United States said its Congress had been asked to appropriate \$107.5 million for Sudano-Sahelian recovery and rehabilitation in 1982.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Bangladesh, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Gambia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Sierra Leone, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia. A/C.2/36/L.28.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/208 & Add.1, <sup>(3)</sup>A/37/209; UNDP Administrator, <sup>(4)</sup>DP/544 & Corr.1, <sup>(5)</sup>DP/1982/47.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(6)</sup>1980/51, para. 5, 23 July 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 976); <sup>(7)</sup>1981/55, 22 July 1981, text following. <sup>(8)</sup>GA: 36/203, 17 Dec., text following.

Decision: <sup>(9)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1): 81/5, 19 June.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(10)</sup>1973, p. 454.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.12, 13, 15 (14-16 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.39 (22 July).

GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 42 (6 Oct.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/55

Adopted without vote Meeting 39 22 July 1981

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/101) without objection. 16 July (meeting 15); 11 -nation draft (E/1981/C.3/L.9), orally revised taking into account oral amendment by USSR; agenda item 22.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, France, Iraq, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Nigeria, Senegal, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region  
The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, particularly Assembly resolution 35/86 of 5 December 1980 and Council resolution 1980/51 of 23 July 1980,

Recalling further decision 81/5 of 19 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region;

2. Expresses its profound gratitude to the Governments, agencies of the United Nations system, intergovernmental organizations, private organizations and individuals that have contributed to the implementation of the recovery, rehabilitation and development programme in the Sahel;

3. Calls upon all Governments to make special efforts to increase the resources of the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office through voluntary contributions, including those to be made at the 1981 United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities, so as to enable the Office to respond more fully to the priority requirements of the Governments of the States members of the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel;

4. Requests the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office to continue its close co-operation with the States members of the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel, with a view to hastening the implementation of the recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region;

5. Takes note of the progress made in the implementation of the provisions of paragraphs 4 and 5 of Council resolution 1980/51 aimed at increasing the assistance of the competent organizations of the United Nations system and enhancing the ability of the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office to respond more adequately to the priority requirements of the States members of the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel;

6. Invites the Secretary-General to pursue further the consultations envisaged in paragraph 5 of Council resolution 1980/51, with a view to working out specific arrangements for joint undertakings between the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office and the appropriate organs, agencies and programmes of the United Nations;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution to the Council at its second regular session of 1982.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/203

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 20 November (meeting 42); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.98), based on informal consultations on 17-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.28), orally amended by Gambia for sponsors of draft A/C.2/36/L.28; agenda item 72 (c).

Implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region  
The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2816(XXVI) of 14 December 1971, 2959(XXVII) of 12 December 1972, 3054(XXVIII) of 17 October 1973, 3253(XXIX) of 4 December 1974, 3512(XXX) of 15 December 1975, 31/180 of 21 December 1976, 32/159 of 19 December 1977, 33/133 of 19 December 1978, 34/16 of 9 November 1979 and 35/86 of 5 December 1980, as well as its resolution 35/69 of 5 December 1980,

Recalling also Economic and Social Council resolutions 1918(LVIII) of 5 May 1975, 2103(LXIII) of 3 August 1977, 1978/37 of 21 July 1978, 1979/51 of 2 August 1979, 1980/51 of 23 July 1980 and 1981/55 of 22 July 1981,

Taking note of decision 81/5 of 19 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme concerning the implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region,

Noting with satisfaction the decisive role played by the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office in helping to combat the effects of the drought and to implement the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme adopted by the States members of the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel, and in mobilizing the necessary resources to finance priority projects,

Considering that the nature and magnitude of the needs of the countries of the Sudano-Sahelian region, which are among the least developed countries, urgently call for the continuation and further strengthening of actions of solidarity by the international community in support of the recovery efforts and the economic development of those countries,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region;

2. Expresses its gratitude to the Governments, agencies of the United Nations system, intergovernmental organizations, private organizations and individuals that have contributed to the implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region;

3. Strongly urges all Governments to make special efforts to increase the resources of the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office, including voluntary contributions through the United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities, as well as other bilateral channels, so as to enable it to respond more fully to the priority requirements of the Governments of the States members of the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel;

4. Requests all organs, agencies and programmes of the United Nations system to continue and increase their assistance through joint undertakings with the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office, in response to requests from the Governments of the Sudano-Sahelian countries, for the implementation of their recovery, rehabilitation and development programmes;

5. Invites the Secretary-General to pursue further the consultations envisaged in paragraph 5 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/51, with a view to working out specific arrangements for joint undertakings between the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office and the appropriate organs, agencies and programmes of the United Nations system;

6. Commends the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme for the results achieved through the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office in assisting the States members of the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel in the implementation of their medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme;

7. Reaffirms the role of the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office as the central point and principal body responsible for co-ordinating the efforts of United Nations agencies to help the countries of the Sahel to Implement their recovery and rehabilitation programme;

8. Notes with appreciation the effective manner in which the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office is discharging its responsibilities in responding to the priority requests of the States members of the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel within the framework of their programme;

9. Invites the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office to continue to strengthen its close co-operation with the States members of the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel and with the Committee, with a view to hastening the implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region;

10. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to report to the General Assembly, through the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme and the Economic and Social Council, on the implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region.

#### UN Trust Fund for Sudano-Sahelian Activities

Expenditures from the United Nations Trust Fund for Sudano-Sahelian Activities totalled \$8,511,441 in 1981. Of this sum, \$6,992,873 represented project costs, \$1,110,463 was for administrative costs and \$408,105 was paid to agencies executing UNSO projects in reimbursement for their support costs.

Ten Governments contributed a total of \$3,992,562 to the Trust Fund in 1981 (see table below). Total income for the year, including interest on investment of contributions received in previous years, came to \$6,595,983, or \$1,915,458 less than expenditures.

1981 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS TRUST FUND FOR SUDANO-SAHELIAN ACTIVITIES

(in US dollar equivalent)

Country	Amount paid
Australia	114,180
Denmark	926,879
Finland	150,150
Germany, Federal Republic of	1,165,021
Ireland	28,612
Italy	605,365
Netherlands	983,379
Sudan	2,400
United Republic of Cameroon	6,975
Yugoslavia	9,601
Total	3,992,562

#### East Africa

Six East African countries affected by drought-Djibouti (p. 491), Ethiopia (p. 491), Kenya (p. 493), Somalia (p. 493), the Sudan (p. 494) and Uganda (p. 494)-were the subject of action by United Nations bodies in 1981. A multiagency mission visited most of them to assess needs and recommend specific measures, and the General Assembly appealed to organiza-

tions and States to assist the affected populations. Five of these countries had been the subject of earlier appeals; the Assembly added Kenya to the list in December.

The Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), in reports to the Governing Council issued in March 1981<sup>(2)</sup> and April 1982,<sup>(3)</sup> reviewed the situation in Africa, including East Africa, and the assistance provided by the United Nations system other than that given through UNSO (p. 485). He reported that food aid from the World Food Programme and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, much of it integrated with development projects, was being provided to all these countries except the Sudan and Uganda, where rainfall was reported to be relatively normal in 1981.

On 19 June,<sup>(7)</sup> the Governing Council appealed to the international community to give drought-stricken African countries generous emergency assistance and requested the Administrator to continue to report on the situation.

The United Nations Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes informed the Economic and Social Council on 14 July that developments in some of the affected countries, including heavy rains and floods, had made it necessary to postpone the inter-agency mission originally scheduled for May. This oral report was noted by the Economic and Social Council on 20 July.<sup>(6)</sup>

During September and October, the United Nations multiagency mission visited Kenya (20-25 September), Uganda (25-30 September), Somalia (1-8 October), Djibouti (8-15 October) and the Sudan (17-24 October). A recurrent theme in the resulting reports-which the Secretary-General transmitted to the General Assembly - was that planning should be re-oriented from emergency measures to longer-term preventive measures, and that steps to combat drought should be integrated into economic and social planning in such a way as to make them a stimulus for development rather than stop-gap measures to counter the cyclical recurrences of drought.

On 6 November, in a statement to the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, the leader of the mission said the persistent drought in East Africa had become a crisis in the previous two or three years because of the narrow margin of subsistence in poor rural areas, rising demand in wealthier rural and urban areas, the financial difficulty of importing food, and the extra burdens caused by disabled persons and refugees and by security problems. Although the mission had recommended a number of pressing projects to donors, in general it had

concentrated on outlining the steps required to lay down a general policy and programme which would permit the development of high-priority projects. Four of the five Governments had welcomed measures suggested by the Assembly in December 1980 for regional co-operation through an intergovernmental body that would be responsible for co-ordinating measures against drought and other natural disasters and for dealing with recovery and rehabilitation efforts;<sup>(4)</sup> Djibouti had said it would respond after studying the mission's reports.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** In a resolution adopted without vote on 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the multiagency mission and appealed to Member States and organizations to contribute to the projects and programmes described in its reports. Governments of the region were urged, with assistance from the Secretary-General and the UNDP Administrator, to arrange for the establishment of an intergovernmental body to co-ordinate and support national efforts to combat drought and other natural disasters and to deal with recovery and rehabilitation. The Assembly reiterated an appeal to Member States and organizations to contribute towards the cost of a UNDP co-ordinating unit that would assist the affected countries in drought mitigation and economic and social development. The Secretary-General, in co-operation with the Administrator, was requested to assist the Governments in establishing policies for dealing with drought in the context of their national development programmes and to mobilize international assistance.

The resolution was submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier and essentially similar draft, introduced in a revised version by the Sudan and sponsored by 20 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup> The Committee approved it without vote on 24 November.

The USSR withdrew an oral amendment it had submitted to paragraph 2 which, instead of having the Assembly endorse the mission's recommendations, would have had it recommend that the specialized agencies consider them.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Bangladesh, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, A/C.2/36/L.61/Rev.1.

Reports: UNDP Administrator, <sup>(2)</sup>DP/544 & Corr.1, <sup>(3)</sup>DP/1982/47.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/90, para. 6, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 978); <sup>(5)</sup>36/221, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decisions: <sup>(6)</sup>ESC: 1981/168, para. (c), 20 July (p. 497). <sup>(7)</sup>UNDP Council (report. E/1981/61/Rev.1): 81/6, 19 June.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.8, 9-10, 12, 15, 35, 36, 37, 38 (24 Apr.-6 May & 14-20 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 42, 43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/221

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.113), based on informal consultations on 20-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.61/Rev.1); agenda item 72 (b).

Assistance to the drought-stricken areas in Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 35/90 and 35/91 of 5 December 1980 on the question of assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda,

Recalling further Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/48 of 20 July 1981 on assistance to the drought-stricken countries, particularly Kenya,

Having heard the statement made before the Second Committee on 6 November 1981 by the head of the United Nations multiagency mission which visited Djibouti, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda, to assess the immediate, medium-term and long-term needs of the Governments concerned for their drought-affected populations,

Noting with satisfaction the reports of the Secretary-General on assistance to the drought-stricken areas in Djibouti, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda, to which were annexed the relevant reports of the multiagency mission,

Aware of the adverse effects of the drought on the economic and social development of the countries concerned as well as on their ecology,

Bearing in mind the imperative need for the international community to render assistance to Member States in the event of major natural disasters,

Recalling its resolutions and those of the Economic and Social Council concerning assistance in cases of natural disaster, in particular General Assembly resolutions 2816(XXVI) of 14 December 1971 and 2959(XXVII) of 12 December 1972,

Taking into account the regional nature of the drought and the practical and regional co-operation arrangements which already exist among the affected countries,

Recalling its recommendation in paragraph 6 of its resolution 35/90 that the Governments of the drought-stricken countries of the region should consider the establishment of an intergovernmental body with the responsibility for co-ordinating and supporting the countries' efforts to combat the effects of drought and other natural disasters and to deal with the problem of medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation,

Noting that, in response to paragraph 7 of its resolution 35/90, arrangements have been made by the Secretary-General for a unit within the United Nations Development Programme to be established when funds are made available through voluntary contributions and to be assigned responsibility for assisting the countries of the region,

Noting further that, also in response to paragraph 7 of resolution 35/90, the Secretary-General appealed to Member States and international organizations for voluntary contributions to meet the costs of such a unit to enable it to provide the assistance envisaged in that paragraph,

1. Commends the Secretary-General for his positive response to the urgent situation of the drought-stricken areas in Djibouti, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda, and for his action in dispatching a multiagency mission to those countries to assess their medium-term and long-term needs, and also commends the multiagency mission for the excellent efforts it deployed and requests the Secretary-General to send a similar mission to those countries for which such reports do not exist:

2. Endorses the recommendations made by the multi-agency mission in its reports, which were annexed to the reports of the Secretary-General;

3. Appeals to Member States, the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system and Intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to contribute generously, in the form of financial, material and technical assistance, towards the projects and programmes to help the affected populations, as described in the reports of the multi-agency mission;

4. Urges the Governments of the drought-stricken countries of the region to continue their consultations and to finalize the necessary arrangements for the establishment of an intergovernmental body with the responsibility for co-ordinating and supporting each country's efforts to combat the effects of drought and other natural disasters and to deal with the problem of medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation;

5. Invites the Secretary-General, in close co-operation with the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, and within existing resources, to assist those countries in the establishment of the proposed Intergovernmental body;

6. Relates its appeal to Member States and international organizations to make voluntary contributions to meet the cost of the special co-ordinating unit, to be established within the United Nations Development Programme, and to enable it to provide assistance to the Governments of the affected countries to strengthen their national and regional capabilities to mitigate the effects of drought and to promote sustained economic and social development;

7. Requests the Secretary-General, in close co-operation with the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme:

(a) To extend all necessary assistance to the Governments of Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda in establishing detailed policies for dealing with drought as a recurring phenomenon within the context of their national development programmes;

(b) To mobilize international assistance for the populations affected as a result of drought and other natural disasters in the countries concerned;

8. Further requests the Secretary-General to keep the situation under review and to report to the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, and to the General Assembly, at its thirty-seventh session, on the progress achieved in the implementation of the present resolution.

#### Djibouti

The multi-agency mission which visited Djibouti from 8 to 15 October 1981 (p. 489) reported the Government's estimate that there were 30,000 drought victims living in camps and another 30,000 refugees among the country's population of 350,000. The Government intended to settle the camp inhabitants into activities such as fishing, animal husbandry linked with agriculture, and small-scale manufacture or handicrafts; until that happened, food and other basics would have to be provided.

Until a national development plan could be drawn up, the mission stated in a report circulated to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> a policy and integrated programme of measures against drought should be prepared. In view of the shortage of trained personnel, it suggested that international organizations provide training and experts during a transition period. It saw an urgent

need to ascertain how many persons were in camps, to find employment for them and to educate camp-dwelling children.

The head of the mission told the Second Committee in November that Djibouti's unique problems consisted of a lack of natural resources, absence of a potential for agricultural development and a critical shortage of water. Djibouti informed the Committee that it supported the establishment of a regional intergovernmental body to combat the effects of drought and other natural disasters.

Along with assistance to drought-stricken areas, Djibouti benefited from a special economic assistance programme organized by the United Nations (p. 507) and received aid for its refugees (p. 1042).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G and mission, A/36/276.

#### Ethiopia

According to the March 1981 report of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on assistance to drought-stricken countries in Africa,<sup>(2)</sup> 5.1 million persons in Ethiopia were endangered by drought and another grain deficit was expected.

On 24 April, the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator told the Economic and Social Council that the outlook for 1981 was not promising, as poor harvests were again expected in the drought-stricken areas. A report in March by the United Nations Co-ordinating Committee for Relief and Rehabilitation in Ethiopia had indicated that about 1.5 million people desperately required help. Food was the most pressing need, with a 350,000-metric-ton deficit expected. The Co-ordinator stated that the problems of the long-term drought in the Horn of Africa were compounded by the presence of refugees and displaced persons in locations unable to support them without massive international assistance.

At the same meeting, the Ethiopian Commissioner for Relief and Rehabilitation said that despite reports by two United Nations missions to Ethiopia, establishing the extent of damage and the assistance required, the international response had been disappointing. Later in the Council's discussion, Ethiopia recalled that the region had been affected for almost a decade by severe droughts in Ethiopia and Somalia; it noted that, on 2 May, the Secretary-General had issued a statement appealing for international assistance in regard to floods which had recently struck both countries.

By a resolution of 6 May on assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia,<sup>(3)</sup> the Economic and Social Council requested United Nations programmes and organizations to continue and intensify assistance to that country in

its relief and rehabilitation efforts, particularly the Government's resettlement programme. It appealed to Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and voluntary agencies to continue and intensify their assistance for relief, rehabilitation and recovery of those areas.

This resolution, introduced by Zimbabwe and sponsored by 20 nations, was adopted without vote following the withdrawal of amendments proposed by Somalia.<sup>(1)</sup> These would have made the following changes: added a paragraph calling on all concerned to ensure that assistance was used solely for relief and rehabilitation to drought-stricken people; replaced references to drought-stricken "areas" by "people"; omitted mention of assistance to the Ethiopian Government's resettlement programme; and reformulated the appeal to non-United Nations donors so as to mention only the continuance of assistance and not its increase, and replace the reference to assistance to the Government by "assistance for relief and rehabilitation of the drought-stricken people in Ethiopia".

In the Council's discussion, the German Democratic Republic said it had granted assistance to Ethiopia worth 16 million marks in 1980 and further bilateral relief measures had been agreed upon in December 1980. The USSR said it was giving large-scale assistance and expressed concern that the implementation of past General Assembly resolutions on this subject was being sabotaged by some United Nations organizations.

Addressing the Assembly's Second Committee on 5 November, the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator said that, in addition to the food relief programme, a \$25-million, short-term emergency programme had been drawn up for the improvement of services, including provision of drugs and supplies and the repair and reconstruction of damaged health facilities. Contributions received by his Office for 1980-1981 amounted to some \$40 million, and the World Food Programme would provide 10,000 tons of wheat valued at \$3 million-enough to feed the 280,000 drought victims in the Ogaden area for three months.

Ethiopia stated that some 3.9 million people in that country were seriously affected by man-made and natural disasters, 1.5 million of whom had been identified as most needy, requiring assistance of \$217 million and 244,000 tons of food over two and a half years. Ethiopia was ready to join a regional intergovernmental body whose establishment the Assembly had suggested in December 1980 to co-ordinate measures against drought and other natural disasters and to deal with recovery and rehabilitation efforts.<sup>(4)</sup>

The United Nations also acted in 1981 to mobilize international assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia (p. 1044).

Amendments withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Somalia, E/1981/L.33.  
Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/544 & Corr.1.  
Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/33, 6 May, text following;  
<sup>(4)</sup>GA, 35/90, para. 6, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980. 978).  
Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.8, 9-10, 12, 15, 24 Apr.-6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/33

Adopted without vote Meeting 15 6 May 1981  
20-nation draft (E/1981/L.23); agenda item 4.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Burundi, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Nepal, Pakistan, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia  
The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/91 of 5 December 1980, in which the Assembly, inter alia, requested the Secretary-General to report to the Economic and Social Council on the implementation of the relevant resolution; the Assembly and the Council on assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia,

Having heard the oral report of the Secretary-General, presented by the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator 24 April 1981, outlining the substantial assistance requirements for the year 1981,

Noting with concern the statement of the Commissioner for Relief and Rehabilitation of Ethiopia underlining the grave situation facing the people of the drought-affected areas and the urgent assistance required to provide them with relief and rehabilitation,

Noting further the call made by the multi-donor mission, the inter-agency mission and the United Nations Co-ordinating Committee for Relief and Rehabilitation for generous urgent assistance to the people in the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia,

Noting with appreciation the continued efforts in this regard of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, the United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Children's Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the World Food Programme, as well as other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and voluntary agencies,

Recalling also that, despite the assistance offered to Government of Ethiopia by Member States, organizations within the United Nations system and voluntary agencies enormous difficulties still persist in the rehabilitation and recovery efforts,

1. Takes note of the oral report of the Secretary-General presented by the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator on assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia;

2. Requests the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Food Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund and other United Nations organizations and specialized agencies to continue and intensify assistance to Ethiopia in its relief and rehabilitation efforts particularly the Government's resettlement programme in their respective areas of competence and to implement promptly and fully the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolutions 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, 3441 (XXX) of 19 December 1975 and 31/172 of 21 December 1976, Economic and Social Council resolutions 1833(LVI) of 8 July 1974, 1876(LVII) of 16 July 1974, 1971 (LIX) of 30 December 1975, 1986(LX) of 6 May 1976, 1978/2 of 2 May 1978 and 1980/2 of 16 April 1980;

3. Appeals to the Governments of Member States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations



all voluntary agencies to continue and increase their assistance to the Government of Ethiopia for relief, rehabilitation and recovery of the drought-stricken areas:

4. Decides to keep the matter under review.

## Kenya

The UNDP Administrator informed the Governing Council, in his March 1981 report on assistance to drought-stricken countries in Africa,<sup>(2)</sup> that all of Kenya had been affected by drought in 1980 and 350,000 tons of maize, costing \$73.5 million, would have to be imported in 1981, along with \$41.3 million worth of wheat.

On 20 July, the Economic and Social Council recommended to the General Assembly a draft resolution by which the Secretary-General would be requested to send a multiagency mission to Kenya to survey drought-stricken areas and assess the Government's short-, medium- and long-term needs. The mission would report to the Assembly in 1982, through the Council.

The Council's resolution was adopted without vote on a draft introduced by Bangladesh and also sponsored by Barbados, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Kenya and Malawi.

Kenya told the Council that it had been affected by drought since 1979 and had formulated agricultural and cattle-raising policies that would require extensive resources. It hoped neighbouring States-particularly Ethiopia, the Sudan and the United Republic of Tanzania-would participate with it in joint projects.

The United States, while joining in the consensus on the resolution, questioned the value of further multiagency missions; it believed the local UNDP resident representative should study and report on such situations.

The multiagency mission which visited five East African nations in September/October (p. 489) went to Kenya from 20 to 25 September. It noted that the country had been in an economic downturn since 1977, with a trade deficit that had quintupled over four years to about \$700 million in 1980. Kenya had had to import food during the previous two years, although it had previously been self-sufficient in food.

In a report transmitted to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the mission recommended that, within the national development plan, a policy on measures against drought be instituted. That policy should relate national economic programmes to the resolution of specific drought problems, and establish priorities for intensifying the use of high-yield land and increasing the use of arid and semi-arid lands while safeguarding them from degradation by applying desertification controls. A national drought-mitigation programme should be prepared, with emphasis on meteorological monitoring of drought condi-

tions, rangeland control and development in arid and semi-arid areas, and implementation of a food security policy, including an early-warning system for crop failures, improved storage, and planning and institutional arrangements for meeting food shortages and managing food reserves.

The head of the mission, speaking to the Assembly's Second Committee in November, said Kenya would probably have been able to handle a drought without external assistance had it not been for the combined effect of the recent drought and global economic problems. Kenya would continue to need some food aid, but the need would not persist indefinitely.

The Committee, following its approval on 24 November of a draft resolution on assistance to drought-stricken areas in six East African States including Kenya (p. 490), decided not to act on the draft resolution on Kenya recommended by the Economic and Social Council.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G and mission, A/36/712 & Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/544 & Corr.1.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/48, 20 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.35, 36, 37, 38 (14-20 July

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/48  
Adopted without vote Meeting 38 20 July 1981  
I-nation draft (E/1981/L.49); agenda item 4.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Barbados, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Kenya, Malawi.

Assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Kenya  
The Economic and Social Council,

Recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution at its thirty-sixth session:

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolutions 35/90 on assistance to the drought-stricken areas in Djibouti, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda, and 35/91 on assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia, of 5 December 1980,

"Recalling also Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/43 of 23 July 1980 on international efforts to meet humanitarian needs in emergency situations,

"Requests the Secretary-General to send, as a matter of urgency, after consultation with the Government of Kenya and under the terms of General Assembly resolution 35/90, a multiagency mission to Kenya which would, inter alia, survey the drought-stricken areas of the country and assess the short-term, medium-term and long-term needs of the Government in the current situation, and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, through the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982, on the results of the mission and on the progress achieved in the implementation of the present resolution."

## Somalia

With a refugee population that had risen to around 900,000, Somalia could have a 40,000-ton food deficit in 1981 following inadequate rainfall in 1980, the UNDP Administrator reported to the Governing Council in March 1981.<sup>(2)</sup>

The multiagency mission which visited Somalia from 1 to 8 October as part of a trip to several

East African countries (p. 489) reported that the refugee situation ~~the~~ object of separate United Nations action (p. 1046)-had eased. However, there had been little international response to proposals for emergency and longer-term action made by a similar mission in September 1980.<sup>(3)</sup> During the first six months of 1981, cereal imports had risen to 194,000 tons, of which 53,000 were for refugees. The effects of desertification were expanding as the search for fuel and construction wood went further into the countryside around camps.

In its report,<sup>(1)</sup> circulated to the General Assembly, the mission recommended that the Government adopt an official policy on anti-drought measures so that the planning and work of official agencies could be brought into focus. It also suggested the establishment of a technical assistance programme for the training of personnel and the assumption by donors of the local costs of projects until the country's financial situation improved.

Addressing the Assembly's Second Committee in November, the head of the mission said Somalia faced major difficulties and would need much help over a lengthy period. Given the improvement in food production in the previous year, donors should consider supplying fertilizer and pesticides in partial replacement for food.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G and mission, A/36/275; <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/544 & Corr. 1.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 970.

## Sudan

The multiagency mission sent to assess the drought situation in East Africa (p. 489) visited the Sudan from 17 to 24 October 1981. In a report transmitted to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> it noted that the Government was establishing a national co-ordinating body for the drought problem but that there was no formal drought policy-due perhaps to earlier optimistic forecasts of agricultural production. There was also a severe shortage of trained people due to emigration and much work was needed to build the factual basis for good programming.

In addition to measures to deal with these problems, the mission proposed: intensification and acceleration of measures against desertification; improvement of the meteorological service and full utilization of available data for planning purposes; and the establishment of self-help schemes, requiring a build-up of local food reserves, more appropriate systems of crop production and animal husbandry, extension services and a drought-warning system.

The head of the mission, addressing the General Assembly's Second Committee in November, said there was every reason in principle for the Sudan to become a major food export-

er in the long term. Had the drought not coincided with global economic problems and domestic difficulties, the Sudan might have handled it without external aid. The country should be able eventually to extract itself from its drought-related difficulties, but it would require considerable external assistance in the mean while.

The Sudan informed the Committee that a national co-ordinating body with a permanent secretariat was to be established with responsibility for drought control strategy and for co-ordination among ministries and between donors and the Government. In addition, the Sudan had invited neighbouring States to meet at Khartoum early in 1982 to discuss ways of establishing a regional body.

The United Nations also provided assistance to the Sudan for its refugee problem (p. 1049).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G and mission, A/36/277.

## Uganda

On average, drought was not a serious problem in Uganda except in the north-east and some other areas, according to the multiagency mission which visited five East African countries in 1981 (p. 489), including Uganda from 25 to 30 September. But there had been serious security problems, including cattle-raiding, robbery, killing and inter-tribal fighting, and Uganda had had food and water shortages during the previous two years.

The mission thought it essential for the Government and external aid bodies to improve their co-ordination, separately and collectively. In a report transmitted to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> it further suggested that a formal policy was needed to combat drought, covering both preventive and relief measures. There would still be a need to continue a feeding programme in the north-east and in some newly affected areas. The most immediate economic task was the attainment of food self-sufficiency by revitalizing the agriculture and livestock sector. A special and integrated programme should be developed for the Karamoja region in the north-east.

The head of the mission, speaking to the General Assembly's Second Committee in November, said Uganda had once been self-sufficient in food and there was no reason why it should not be so again, though the drought and other events had put off the time when that could be achieved.

Uganda was also the subject of a special economic assistance programme established by the Assembly (p. 520).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G and mission, A/36/274.

## Emergency relief for Kampucheans

The United Nations system continued in 1981 to participate in a programme of humanitarian

assistance to the people of Kampuchea, including those who had sought refuge in neighbouring countries. It co-operated and co-ordinated with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), many non-governmental organizations and donor countries providing bilateral assistance. Reporting to the General Assembly in October on the Kampuchea situation,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that the international relief efforts had been successful in helping to ameliorate significantly the worst conditions of hunger, malnutrition and disease among the Kampucheans (p. 242).

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) continued to act as the lead agency for the United Nations system in the Kampuchea emergency programme. This programme consisted of emergency assistance within Kampuchea as well as for the Khmer people at the Kampuchea-Thailand border. Also included were Kampuchean refugees in holding centres operated by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and Thai villagers displaced by events at the border. Harmonization of humanitarian assistance provided by the United Nations system to the people of Kampuchea remained the responsibility of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Co-ordination of the United Nations Humanitarian Programmes Resulting from Developments in Kampuchea, Sir Robert Jackson.

Since its inception in October 1979, the relief programme had provided \$634 million in assistance to Kampuchean civilians, according to a note by the UNICEF Executive Director to the Fund's Executive Board in March 1982.<sup>(2)</sup> Through 1981 the programme had provided food, shelter, water, health care, environmental sanitation, supplementary feeding, basic education and social services to over half a million Kampucheans camped along the Thai-Kampuchean border and in UNHCR holding centres, as well as to 80,000 Thais affected by the influx of Kampucheans. Inside Kampuchea the relief effort had provided over 300,000 metric tons of food aid, of which the World Food Programme (WFP) had provided about 62,700 tons in the first 10 months of 1981. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations had given emergency agricultural assistance, including rice seeds, fertilizers and other agricultural inputs as well as assistance in animal husbandry and fisheries.

The return of Kampuchean refugees to their communities was assisted by UNHCR in co-operation with the Kampuchean Red Cross. Since its inception in late 1980, this programme had covered 400,000 Kampucheans. The number of Kampucheans in the holding centres had been reduced from a peak of 177,000 in June

1980 to 90,000 by late 1981, and the population in the border camps had decreased to about 200,000 by the end of 1981. UNHCR, in co-operation with ICRC, continued tracing activities in Kampuchea to reunite with their families the unaccompanied minors remaining in UNHCR children's centres in Thailand. The number of Kampucheans in Thailand of concern to UNHCR stood at 97,804 as at the end of 1981 (p. 1033).

At a special session on 22 and 23 January,<sup>(4)</sup> the Executive Board took note with approval of a 9 January letter, annexed to an information note to the Board,<sup>(1)</sup> in which the Executive Director confirmed, in response to a request by the Secretary-General, that UNICEF would continue as lead agency in Kampuchea through 1981, as it had done since 1979.<sup>(6)</sup> UNICEF ceased performing this function at the end of 1981, turning over its responsibilities for co-ordinating services at the Thai-Kampuchean border to the United Nations and WFP.

The General Assembly, in its 21 October resolution on the Kampuchea situation,<sup>(5)</sup> expressed appreciation to donor countries, the United Nations and its agencies and other national and international humanitarian organizations for their assistance and appealed to them to continue to assist Kampucheans in need, especially those along the Thai-Kampuchean border and in the holding centres in Thailand. It expressed appreciation for the Secretary-General's efforts in co-ordinating humanitarian relief assistance and monitoring its distribution and requested him to continue his efforts.

In the Assembly debate on the Kampuchea situation, India said it had continued its bilateral efforts to improve the situation in Kampuchea and would shortly send a mission with a view to expanding such co-operation. The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community (EC) members, said that, thanks to international efforts, the survival of the Kampucheans seemed assured; if food shortages recurred, EC members, which had contributed some 40 per cent of the international relief, might give more.

Notes: UNICEF Director, <sup>(1)</sup>E/ICEF/678, <sup>(2)</sup>E/ICEF/L.1449.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/583; <sup>(4)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/ICEF/680.

Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>GA, 36/5, paras. 12 & 13, 21 Oct. (p. 246).  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1979 p. 907.

## Economic assistance

The United Nations continued in 1981 to mobilize special economic assistance programmes for countries identified by the General Assembly as facing particularly onerous economic difficulties. Under mandates from

the Assembly, the United Nations Secretariat's Unit for Special Economic Assistance Programmes helped to co-ordinate activities by the United Nations system and monitored other assistance efforts by Governments.

For most of the affected countries, multiagency missions in previous years had drawn up assistance programmes and identified individual projects, as guidance for multilateral and bilateral assistance. During 1981, similar missions, organized by the United Nations, again visited most of the countries to assess the situation and update the assistance programmes. They ascertained the level of assistance-bilateral and multilateral-received by each country, described ongoing projects and, in many cases, identified new projects proposed by the Government. The estimated cost of projects was given, for the information of potential donors. The missions' reports were annexed to a series of reports by the Secretary-General to the Assembly, which had requested this information in December 1980.

The Secretary-General also submitted to the Assembly in October a report containing replies by 19 United Nations bodies and specialized agencies, describing their assistance to the countries concerned.<sup>(2)</sup>

After receiving these reports, the Assembly, on 17 December, adopted resolutions on most of the countries, appealing to United Nations Member States and intergovernmental bodies to assist them, and requesting United Nations organizations and programmes to increase their assistance, co-operate with the Secretary-General in organizing a programme for each country, and report to him periodically on what they had done and spent for that purpose. The Secretary-General was asked to continue mobilizing resources, to maintain contact with States and organizations, and to arrange for a further review of each country's economic situation and of progress in organizing and implementing the programmes. He was to apprise the Economic and Social Council in 1982 of the status of the programmes and report to the Assembly later in 1982.

Preliminary information on the affected countries was provided to the Council on 14 July 1981 in an oral report by the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes, Gordon K. Goundrey. The Council took note of this report without vote on 20 July, on an oral proposal by the President.<sup>(1)</sup> Updated information was given to the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 6 October by the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes, Abdulrahim Abby Farah.

Of the 24 countries which were the object of special economic assistance programmes and

related activities, 17 were in Africa (p. 497) and 5 were in Latin America and the Caribbean area (p. 525). The others were Lebanon (p. 528) and Tonga (p. 530).

Most financing for the projects identified in these programmes was provided bilaterally or through the regular assistance programmes of multilateral agencies. Five Governments contributed a total of \$74,293 in 1981 to the United Nations Trust Fund for Special Economic Assistance Programmes (see table on p. 497). Expenditures by the Fund totalled \$199,324 during the year, mostly for Uganda; a balance of \$217,892 remained as at 31 December 1981.

During discussion of special economic assistance programmes by the Economic and Social Council in July, China observed that many newly independent countries were experiencing slow or even negative growth because of unfavourable economic conditions, prolonged exploitation under colonialism and unequal international economic relations; they therefore needed generous international assistance. The German Democratic Republic stated that many emergency situations were the result of colonial rule and neo-colonialism; accordingly, economic assistance to the affected countries should be supplemented by support for their struggle for economic independence and against colonialism.

Swaziland was critical of countries that refused to increase their contributions on the ground that they had not been involved in the colonization of Africa, as well as of those which only wished to help countries they regarded as sure friends.

Australia said it would like to see the Joint Co-ordinator's capacity for action strengthened without a corresponding increase in bureaucracy.

During the General Assembly's debate on special economic and disaster relief assistance, Guinea said that emergency international assistance would be more effective if the raw materials and exports of recipient countries commanded a fair price in international markets, if the loans given to them did not carry high interest charges which had to be paid quickly, and if the price of equipment and manufactures needed for development was not set arbitrarily. The German Democratic Republic thought it useful to examine whether United Nations organizations working in countries which were the subject of special economic assistance programmes might take over the tasks previously performed by special missions.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/168, 20 July, text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/599.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.35, 36, 37, 38 (14-20 July).

## Economic and Social Council decision 1981/168

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 4.

## Special economic assistance

At its 38th plenary meeting, on 20 July 1981, the Council took note of the oral report made by the Joint Co-ordinator, Special Economic Assistance Programmes, on behalf of the Secretary-General on:

(a) The situation in Benin, Botswana, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, the Comoros, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Lesotho, Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe;

(b) The situation of refugees in the Sudan;

(c) Assistance to the drought-stricken areas in Djibouti, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda.

## 1981 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TRUST FUND FOR SPECIAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMMES

(in US dollar equivalent)

SPECIAL ACCOUNT/CONTRIBUTOR	Amount paid
Assistance to Benin	
Cyprus	500
Subtotal	500
Assistance to Djibouti	
Bahrain	50,000
Cyprus	500
Mexico	2,928
Subtotal	53,428
Assistance to Equatorial Guinea	
Cyprus	500
Mexico	9,509
Subtotal	10,009
Assistance to Guinea-Bissau	
Cyprus	500
Subtotal	500
Assistance to Nicaragua	
Papua New Guinea	1,500
Subtotal	1,500
Assistance to Seychelles	
Cyprus	500
Subtotal	500
Assistance to the Sudan	
Mexico	2,928
Subtotal	2,928
Assistance to Uganda	
Mexico	2,928
Subtotal	2,928
Assistance to Yugoslavia	
Barbados	1,000
Subtotal	1,000
Assistance to Zimbabwe	
Cyprus	1,000
Subtotal	1,000
Total	74,293

## Africa

On 17 December 1981, the General Assembly added the Gambia (p. 511) and Liberia (p. 515) to the list of African countries which were the object of special economic assistance pro-

grammes. This raised the number of such States to 17, all south of the Sahara. In addition to these two West African countries, the beneficiaries were: in Central Africa, the Central African Republic (p. 502), Chad (p. 504), Equatorial Guinea (p. 509) and Sao Tome and Principe (p. 518); in East Africa, Djibouti (p. 507) and Uganda (p. 520). off the East African coast, the Comoros (p. 506); in southern Africa, Botswana (p. 499), Lesotho (p. 513), Mozambique (p. 516), Zambia (p. 522) and Zimbabwe (p. 524); and in West Africa, Benin (see below), Cape Verde (p. 500) and Guinea-Bissau (p. 512). Inter-agency missions organized by the United Nations to review the economic assistance programmes were sent during the year to all these countries except Uganda.

These programmes were in addition to assistance rendered to the drought-stricken countries of the Sudano-Sahelian region (p. 485) and East Africa (p. 489).

On 9 December, in a resolution on co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU),<sup>(1)</sup> the Assembly reiterated its appreciation to the Secretary-General for organizing and mobilizing special economic assistance programmes for African States experiencing grave economic difficulties, particularly newly independent and front-line States (neighbouring South Africa). It called on the international community to participate in those programmes, requested the Secretary-General to keep OAU informed, and called on States and organizations to increase assistance to States stricken by natural or other disasters, particularly where displaced persons were involved.

In southern Africa, some of the reconstruction and rehabilitation projects identified in reports by previous United Nations review missions were incorporated into a subregional programme organized by the newly formed Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference. Composed of nine States of the area—Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, the United Republic of Tanzania,

Zambia and Zimbabwe—the organization was emphasizing the development of transport and communications systems.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/80, 9 Dec. (p. 230).

## Benin

A \$149-million assistance programme, directed primarily to strengthening Benin's physical and social infrastructure and its modest but growing industries, was recommended by an inter-agency mission sent to review the country's economic situation in pursuance of a December 1980 request by the General Assembly.<sup>(3)</sup> In its

report,<sup>(2)</sup> based on a visit to the country from 4 to 12 May 1981, the mission identified 52 projects, classifying some of them as urgent and others as part of a medium- and long-term programme. Among the largest of the urgent projects were a national seed-multiplication plan, bridges on the Mono and Sazue rivers, potable water supply for villages and urban water development. While most of the projects were for economic development, some \$21 million of them were designed to meet urgent food and health needs.

In his oral report to the Economic and Social Council in July, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes said that Benin was handicapped by a lack of known mineral resources, a very limited economic base, a chronic deficit in external trade, a deficiency of capital and an unfavourable climate.

The General Assembly, on 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> endorsed the mission's recommendations and urged Member States and organizations to respond at a donors' conference which Benin planned to organize in 1982, assisted by the United Nations Development Programme. It also urged them to provide food, medicines and essential equipment for hospitals and schools.

This action was taken by a resolution adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 24 November. The text was introduced by a Vice-Chairman following informal consultations on an essentially similar draft introduced by Algeria and sponsored by 43 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup>

Supporting the resolution, the Byelorussian SSR believed that assistance should be given to countries that had freed themselves from colonial dependency and were trying to introduce progressive changes in the interest of the entire population.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, France, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Thailand, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.46.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G and mission, A/36/269.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/88, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 276); <sup>(4)</sup>36/208, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 36, 42, 43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/208

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.95), based on in-

formal consultations on 43-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.46); agenda item 72 (b).

#### Special economic assistance to Benin

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/88 of 5 December 1980, in which it appealed to the international community to provide effective and continuous financial, material and technical assistance to Benin so as to help that country overcome its financial and economic difficulties,

Recalling also Security Council resolution 419(1977) of 24 November 1977, in which the Council appealed to all States and all appropriate international organizations, including the United Nations and the specialized agencies, to assist Benin,

Having heard the statement made by the representative of Benin before the Second Committee on 29 October 1981 describing his country's serious economic and financial situation,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General, to which was annexed the report of the inter-agency mission which he dispatched to Benin in May 1981,

Noting from the report the serious economic and financial problems that confront Benin, which arise primarily from the weak and underdeveloped state of its economic and social infrastructure, its lack of financial and material resources and its chronic foreign trade deficit,

Noting further that Benin's terms of trade have deteriorated sharply and that the production of export crops has been adversely affected by drought,

Taking note of the recommended programme of assistance to Benin drawn up by the mission in consultation with the Government,

Noting further Benin's urgent need for international assistance in its health programmes, as well as for food aid,

Aware of the desire of the Government of Benin to organize, with the assistance of the United Nations Development Programme, a round-table conference of providers of funds in 1982 to discuss the country's development needs and to consider ways and means of backing the Government in its efforts to meet those needs,

Bearing in mind that Benin is classified as one of the least developed countries,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the measures he has taken to organize an international economic assistance programme for Benin;

2. Endorses fully the assessment and recommendations of the mission, contained in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General;

3. Urgently reiterates its appeal to all Member States to provide ample and appropriate assistance, through bilateral and multilateral channels, wherever possible in the form of grants or concessionary loans, in order to enable Benin to implement fully the recommended special programme of economic assistance;

4. Urges Member States, organizations and programmes of the United Nations system, regional and interregional governmental bodies, financial and development institutions and non-governmental organizations to support fully the efforts of the Government of Benin to mobilize funds for its special programme of economic assistance and, to this end, to respond generously to the needs of Benin at the forthcoming round-table conference;

5. Requests the appropriate organizations and programmes of the United Nations system in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the international Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Children's Fund to maintain and expand their programmes of assistance to Benin, to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General in organizing an effective international programme of assistance and to report periodically to him on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to help that country;

6. Calls upon regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental bodies and non-governmental organizations, as well as international financial and development Institutions, to give urgent consideration to the establishment of a programme of assistance to Benin or, where one is already in existence, to the expansion of that programme;

7. Urges Member States and the relevant United Nations bodies-in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the World Food Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities--to provide all possible assistance to help the Government of Benin to meet the critical humanitarian needs of the population and to provide, as appropriate, food, medicines and equipment for hospitals and schools;

8. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the special needs of Benin and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

9. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Benin;

(b) To ensure that the necessary financial and budgetary arrangements are made to continue the organization of the international programme of assistance to Benin and the mobilization of that assistance;

(c) To keep the situation in Benin under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other Intergovernmental organizations and the international financial institutions concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the status of the special programme of economic assistance for Benin;

(d) To arrange for a review of the economic situation of Benin and the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country in time for the matter to be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Botswana

Of the original 16 projects identified as required to meet the emergency and strategic needs of Botswana, 13 had been completed since the United Nations special economic assistance programme there began in 1977,<sup>(5)</sup> according to the inter-agency mission which visited the country from 10 to 13 March 1981. Sent in pursuance of a December 1980 request by the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> the mission reported<sup>(2)</sup> that one of the projects completed in 1981, the oil storage programme, was to be expanded due to growth in estimated petroleum needs. The three projects remaining to be completed were: take-over of the rail system and fleet from Zimbabwe Railways; completion of the last 300 kilometres of the Botswana-Zambia road, at a cost of \$31.3 million; and construction of a new national airport and the improvement of four airfields.

The mission also reviewed and updated 12 rehabilitation and development projects, related

to rural rehabilitation, control of foot-and-mouth disease, and the development of transport and communications within the context of regional programmes of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (p. 497). It reported excellent progress during 1981 in implementing the last two groups of projects. However, progress had been slower on the rural projects, primarily concerned with the areas bordering Zimbabwe.

The Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes, in his oral report to the Economic and Social Council in July, said an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease among Botswana cattle had been brought under control in November 1980 and the Government was taking intensive measures to prevent further outbreaks. The closure of some overseas markets to Botswana beef had resulted in serious economic loss. On 6 October, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes told the General Assembly's Second Committee that international assistance was needed for the economic rehabilitation of the border areas severely affected by the recent war.

The Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> endorsed the revised programme of assistance to Botswana contained in the mission's report, drawing particular attention to the transport and communications projects as well as those for rehabilitation of the border areas. It appealed to States and organizations to expand their assistance.

The Assembly adopted this text without vote, following its approval in like manner by the Second Committee on 24 November. The draft, submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations, was based on a similar text introduced by Mozambique and sponsored by 26 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(\*)</sup>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Denmark, Ethiopia, Gambia, Jamaica, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Uganda, Zaire, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.78.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S'-G and review mission, A/36/264-S/144491.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/98, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 277); <sup>(4)</sup>36/222, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1977, p. 219.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 42, 43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/222

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 24 November (meeting 43): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.111), based on informal consultations on 26-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.78): agenda item 72 (b).

## Assistance to Botswana

The General Assembly,

Recalling Security Council resolutions 403(1977) of 14 January 1977 and 406(1977) of 25 May 1977, concerning the complaint by the Government of Botswana regarding acts of aggression committed against its territory by the illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia,

Recalling a/so Security Council resolution 460(1979) of 21 December 1979, in which all Member States and specialized agencies were called upon to provide urgent assistance to Zimbabwe and the front-line States,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 32/97 of 13 December 1977, 33/130 of 19 December 1978 and 34/125 of 14 December 1979, in which the Assembly, *inter alia*, recognized the special economic hardship confronting Botswana as a result of diverting funds from current and planned development projects to effective arrangements for security against attacks and threats by Southern Rhodesia, and endorsed the assessments and recommendations contained in the notes of the Secretary-General dated 28 March 1977 and 26 October 1977 and in his reports of 7 July 1978 and 28 August 1979.

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General of 23 June 1981, to which was annexed the report of the mission which he sent to Botswana in response to General Assembly resolution 35/98 of 5 December 1980.

Noting the need of the Government of Botswana to rehabilitate and develop effective road, rail and air communications, both internally and with the rest of the world, in view of the uncertain political situation in the region, Botswana's vulnerability as a land-locked country and its dependence on externally controlled railway systems for the transport of its principal exports and imports,

Noting with appreciation Botswana's desire to establish its own railway system,

Noting a/so the urgent need to complete speedily the projects that have been identified in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General,

1. Notes with satisfaction the efforts of Botswana in implementing its development projects;

2. Endorses fully the revised programme of assistance contained in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General and calls the attention of the international community to the outstanding needs for assistance identified therein;

3. Notes that, while the response from some Member States and international organizations to the appeals of the Secretary-General has been encouraging, there is an urgent need to maintain the flow of contributions to carry out the remainder of the emergency programme, the implementation of parts of which remains a critical necessity;

4. Draws the attention of States and international and intergovernmental organizations particularly to the projects in the field of transport and communications, as well as to the priority requirements to rehabilitate the border areas most adversely affected by the war, in accordance with the recommendations contained in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General;

5. Reiterates its appeal to all States and intergovernmental organizations to provide generous assistance to enable Botswana to carry out the remainder of its planned development projects, as well as those made necessary by the current political and economic situation;

6. Appeals to all Member States, regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental bodies to provide financial, material and technical assistance to Botswana to enable it to carry out its planned development programme without interruption;

7. Urges Member States and organizations which are already implementing or are negotiating assistance programmes for Botswana to expand them, wherever possible;

8. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the World Bank and the

International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the assistance they are rendering to Botswana, for which the General Assembly has requested the Secretary-General to implement a special programme of economic assistance, and to report on the results of that assistance and on their decisions to the Secretary-General in time for consideration by the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

9. Appeals to the international community to contribute to the special account established by the Secretary-General for the purpose of facilitating the channelling of contributions to Botswana;

10. Requests the appropriate specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General for the purpose of facilitating the channelling of contributions to Botswana;

11. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Botswana;

(b) To keep the situation in Botswana under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental organizations and international financial institutions concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the current status of the special programme of economic assistance for Botswana;

(c) To arrange for a review of the economic situation of Botswana and the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country in time for the matter to be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

## Cape Verde

One of the least developed countries, Cape Verde continued to face serious economic problems following 12 consecutive years of drought, according to the economic review mission which visited the country from 10 to 13 March 1981<sup>(2)</sup> in pursuance of a December 1980 General Assembly request.<sup>(3)</sup> Irregular rainfall had caused an extensive crop failure and a serious food deficit estimated at 60,900 metric tons. As agricultural production did not cover basic food needs even in good years, it would be necessary to rely on commercial imports and food and financial aid for many years to come. Since independence in 1975, international assistance had been essential to Cape Verde's survival and continued assistance remained vital.

The mission reviewed 92 projects included in the special economic assistance programme and found that 24 had been fully financed, partial funding had been secured for 20 and no international support had been forthcoming for 35 projects; the Government had withdrawn 13 projects and identified 9 new ones for which it was seeking assistance. Among the new projects were integrated river-basin development (\$5.5 million), establishment of a metal-works industry (\$2.5 million), renovation of a ship-repair workshop (\$1.2 million) and a land redistribution scheme (\$7.5 million).

The Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes, in his oral report to the



Economic and Social Council in July, said the Government was anxious to conclude agreements on long-term food-aid commitments to meet the structural food deficit, in order to minimize the need for annual appeals for emergency assistance.

In October, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes told the General Assembly's Second Committee that, in view of the country's budget deficit and trade imbalance in 1981, private transfers and foreign aid, mainly grants, would be required. There had been no positive response to the Government's effort to make long-term arrangements on food.

Also addressing the Second Committee in October, Cape Verde said that its five-year plan (1982-1986) and its long-term objectives placed special emphasis on agriculture through exploration for underground water resources. This could lead to the development of 10,000 hectares of irrigated soil, thus permitting an increase in fruit, vegetable and livestock production. The strategy also envisaged an increase in export-oriented industrial activity and in shipping, civil aviation, tourism, the construction industry and communications. Financing of the five-year plan would require \$253 million in international assistance, mainly in the form of grants and concessional loans.

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December<sup>(4)</sup> reiterating its appeal for international assistance for Cape Verde, invited donors to support the country's five-year plan and to contribute food and fodder assistance.

This resolution, submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee, was adopted without vote following similar approval by the Committee on 24 November. The draft replaced an earlier and essentially similar one, introduced by Benin and sponsored by 51 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.52.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G and review mission, A/36/265.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/104, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 278); <sup>(4)</sup>36/21 I, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 40-43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/211

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.83), based on informal consultations on 51-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.52); agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance to Cape Verde

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 32/99 of 13 December 1977, 33/127 of 19 December 1978, 34/119 of 14 December 1979 and 35/104 of 5 December 1980, in which the international community was requested to provide an appropriate level of resources for the implementation of the programme of assistance to Cape Verde as envisaged in the reports of the Secretary-General,

Noting that Cape Verde, one of the least developed as well as the most seriously affected Island country, and a member of the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel, is in need of substantially increased assistance to overcome its economic backwardness,

Stressing the urgent need to implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, in which the programme of assistance to Cape Verde was endorsed,

Recognizing the strenuous efforts deployed by the Government and the people of Cape Verde in the process of their socio-economic development, despite existing constraints,

Recognising also the essential role of both short-term and long-term international assistance in the process of development of Cape Verde,

Gravely concerned that the expected harvest for 1982 has been lost as a result of the failure of the seasonal rains and the recurrence of drought,

Taking into account the results of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, in particular the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries, adopted on 14 September 1981,

Taking into account also the country programme of Cape Verde presented to the Conference, in which a five-year plan as well as long-term planning were delineated,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General, to which was annexed the report of the review mission which visited Cape Verde in implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/104.

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the efforts deployed in the process of mobilizing resources for the implementation of the programme of assistance to Cape Verde;

2. Expresses its gratitude to States, international, regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental organizations for their contribution to the programme of assistance to Cape Verde;

3. Calls the attention of the international community to table 10 in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General, which contains a statement of projects that have not yet been financed;

4. Urges States, international, regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental organizations to extend and intensify substantially their assistance with a view to implementing the programme of assistance to Cape Verde as soon as possible;

5. Invites the international community, in particular donor countries, to take appropriate and urgent measures to support the realization of the Five-Year Plan of Cape Verde, in accordance with the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries;

6. Requests the organizations, organs and bodies of the United Nations system to continue and to increase their assistance to Cape Verde, to co-operate with the Secretary-General in his efforts to mobilize resources for the implementation of the programme of assistance and to report periodically to the Secretary-General on the measures they have taken and the resources they have made available for assistance to that country;

7. Calls upon the international community to continue to contribute generously to all appeals for food and fodder assistance made by the Government of Cape Verde or on its behalf by the specialized agencies and the other competent organizations of the United Nations system to help it cope with the critical situation in the country;

8. Draws once again the attention of the International community to the special account which was established at United Nations Headquarters by the Secretary-General, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 32/99, for the purpose of facilitating the channelling of contributions to Cape Verde;

9. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to continue, through their governing bodies, to consider the special needs of Cape Verde and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

10. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for implementing the programme of development assistance to Cape Verde;

(b) To keep the situation in Cape Verde under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental organizations and the international financial institutions concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the current status of the special programme of economic assistance for Cape Verde;

(c) To arrange for a review of the economic situation of Cape Verde and the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Central African Republic

An acute state of financial imbalance existed in the Central African Republic, which had a substantial budget deficit (\$47.6 million) in 1980, a \$200-million public debt and a large trade deficit, according to a United Nations mission which visited the country from 26 January to 3 February 1981 in response to a request made by the General Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(3)</sup> In its report,<sup>(2)</sup> the mission assessed the country's economic situation and relief and rehabilitation needs, and recommended a programme of international assistance. It found a critical need for capital investment in virtually all economic sectors.

The mission recommended international action to alleviate the financial crisis, including budgetary assistance, public debt moratoria, and food and commodity aid. It also proposed a \$149-million relief and development programme consisting of immediate humanitarian aid (\$11 million), rehabilitation and reconstruction (\$51 million), and medium- and long-term development (\$86 million). Thirty-six projects were identified, primarily in four sectors: agriculture and livestock (\$99 million); health (\$18 million); education and training (\$17 million); and infrastruc-

ture, transport and communications (\$11 million). The largest projects were for integrated development in areas producing cotton and coffee, important export crops.

The Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes, in his oral report to the Economic and Social Council in July, stated that the Central African Republic found it impossible to raise additional loans, even though virtually every sector was in critical need of capital. United Nations bodies were providing assistance but the needs were far beyond their means. Speaking to the General Assembly's Second Committee in October, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes said the recent drought in the country would mean reduced output of coffee and cotton in 1981.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Central African Republic, addressing the Assembly on 7 October, said that external assistance was essential so that his country could carry out the minimum emergency economic programme set by the Military Committee for National Reconstruction. The situation had deteriorated as a result of the inadequacy of financial means and the failure to carry out the programme established by the previous regime. A representative of the Central African Republic later told the Second Committee that his Government invited investment from all friendly countries to make improved use of agricultural and mineral resources through processing and assembly industries.

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> endorsed the mission's recommendations and called on Member States and organizations to expand their assistance, particularly to meet critical needs for food, medicines and hospital and school equipment, and to meet the emergency needs of people in drought-stricken areas. The Secretary-General was requested to organize a special emergency assistance programme with regard to food and health.

This resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 24 November. The draft, submitted by a Vice-Chairman, was based on informal consultations on an earlier draft, introduced by Senegal and sponsored by 51 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup> The adopted resolution included a paragraph not in the earlier draft, by which the Assembly noted with satisfaction the efforts by the Government and people for national reconstruction, rehabilitation and development.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Egypt,

Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.39.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G and mission, A/36/183.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/87, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 286); <sup>(4)</sup>36/206, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 34, 37, 47-43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.29, 103 (7 Oct., 17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/206

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.97), based on Informal consultations on 51-nation draft (A/C.2/38/L.39); agenda item 72 (b).

Assistance for the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of the Central African Republic

The General Assembly.

Recalling its resolution 35/87 of 5 December 1980 in which it affirmed the urgent need for international action to assist the Government of the Central African Republic in its reconstruction, rehabilitation and development efforts,

Noting the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Central African Republic to the General Assembly on 7 October 1981, in which he described the serious economic and financial problems of the country and affirmed that the situation had deteriorated owing to the insufficiency of financial resources and that external assistance was essential.

Noting further the statement made by the representative of the Central African Republic before the Second Committee on 29 October 1981 to the effect that the response of the international community to the urgent appeal of the General Assembly had not been adequate to meet the needs of the situation.

Bearing in mind that the Central African Republic is landlocked and is classified as one of the least developed countries,

Recalling that the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries, adopted unanimously by the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, calls for increased aid to these countries,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General, to which was annexed the report of the inter-agency mission dispatched to the Central African Republic to consult with the Government on the additional assistance needed for the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of the country,

Noting that the budgetary situation in the Central African Republic, according to the report, makes it impossible for the Government to embark on a programme of reconstruction and rehabilitation without sufficient external financial aid,

Particularly concerned that the Government of the Central African Republic is unable to provide the population with adequate health, educational and other essential social and public services because of an acute shortage of financial and material resources,

1. Notes with satisfaction the efforts exerted by the Government and people of the Central African Republic for national reconstruction, rehabilitation and development;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his report on the economic situation of the Central African Republic and the additional assistance required by that country for its reconstruction, rehabilitation and development;

3. Endorses fully the assessment and recommendations of the mission contained in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General;

4. Urgently reiterates its appeal to all Member States to contribute generously, through bilateral or multilateral channels, to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of the Central African Republic;

5. Requests the appropriate organizations and programmes of the United Nations system-in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization-to maintain and expand their programmes of assistance to the Central African Republic, to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General in organizing an effective international programme of assistance and to report periodically to him on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to help that country;

6. Calls upon regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental bodies and non-governmental organizations, as well as international financial institutions-In particular the European Economic Community, the European Development Fund, the African Development Bank, the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa and the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries Fund for International Development, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the Kuwaiti Fund and the Abu Dhabi Fund-to give urgent consideration to the establishment of a programme of assistance to the Central African Republic or, where one is already in existence, to the expansion of that programme;

7. Urges Member States and the relevant United Nations bodies-in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the World Food Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Fund for Population Activities and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization-to provide all possible assistance to help the Government of the Central African Republic to meet the critical humanitarian needs of the population and to provide, as appropriate, food, medicines and essential equipment for hospitals and schools, as well as to meet the emergency needs of the population in the drought-stricken areas of the country;

8. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the special needs of the Central African Republic and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

9. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To organize a special emergency assistance programme with regard to food and health, especially medicaments, vaccines, hospital equipment, generating sets for field hospitals, water pumps and food products, in order to help the vulnerable population, whose steadily deteriorating situation is becoming a matter of increasingly serious concern;

(b) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to the Central African Republic;

(c) To ensure that the necessary financial and budgetary arrangements are made to continue the organization of the international programme of assistance to the Central African Republic and the mobilization of that assistance;

(d) To keep the situation in the Central African Republic under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental organizations and the international financial institutions concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the status of the special programme of economic assistance for the Central African Republic;

(e) To arrange for a review of the economic situation of the Central African Republic and of the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country in time for the matter to be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Chad

In compliance with two resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on 5 December 1980,<sup>(4)</sup> the Secretary-General sent two missions to Chad in 1981, the first to determine urgent humanitarian needs and the second to ascertain needs for reconstruction, rehabilitation and development.

The first mission (5-10 March), reviewing humanitarian needs, reported<sup>(2)</sup> that, as a consequence of civil war in 1979 and 1980, most buildings in the capital, N'Djamena, had been damaged; there was no regular water supply, banking services or communications within the country or to the outside world, and most schools had been closed for three years. Rural areas which the mission visited had been less dramatically affected. Nevertheless, the disruption of normal agricultural activities, the suspension of commerce and the lack of administration and communications had left the people of Chad in dire need.

The mission outlined a programme for immediate emergency aid, with the following objectives: to provide a ferry service across the Chari River at N'Djamena; to generate electricity around the clock; to supply water in the capital and maintain and repair wells and pumps in rural areas; to re-establish telecommunications; to distribute 12,000 tons of food grains and 600 tons of seed; to improve health and medical services; to immunize livestock and provide veterinary services; to refurbish schools and restart certain technical training programmes; to reopen N'Djamena airport to civilian traffic; and to reactivate the economy and resume United Nations programmes, suspended during the hostilities.

Following the first mission to Chad, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) reopened its field office at N'Djamena on 1 May.

In July, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes, in his oral report to the Economic and Social Council, said that, while humanitarian needs had been given high priority, effective relief operations would be greatly handicapped unless assistance was forthcoming to improve transport and communications.

The representative of Chad told the General Assembly in October that, thanks to international assistance, famine and epidemics had been avoided, displaced persons and refugees had found shelter, and water and electrical distribution systems, N'Djamena airport and other means of communication were being rebuilt. In

the framework of a general amnesty granted by the head of State, and thanks to assistance by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and by neighbouring States, citizens who had left areas of combat were returning to their country by the thousands. Chad hoped the international community would contribute to its recovery.

The second mission to Chad (26 October-9 November),<sup>(3)</sup> concerned with longer-term development assistance, reported that large-scale displacement of people, the destruction of physical structures, an almost total lack of maintenance of basic infrastructure, the diversion of resources for military expenditure, the interruption of education and health services, and the dislocation of Government machinery, all associated with the war, had sharply reduced production and adversely affected economic and social conditions. The budget deficit for the last six months of 1981 exceeded expected revenue by 471 per cent. By the end of 1979, the public debt had reached \$171.7 million and there was a yearly service obligation of \$18.4 million, representing about a quarter of export revenue. Gross international monetary reserves at the end of May 1981 amounted to \$4.7 million; that low level, representing about three weeks of imports, handicapped efforts to restore normal economic activity.

The mission reported that some of the emergency measures recommended by the March mission had been or were being implemented. Transport services across the Chari River had been restored by a ferry repaired with UNDP financing; N'Djamena had round-the-clock electricity service, but on a precarious basis; a project to supply potable water to the capital would be reactivated by UNDP as soon as a sub-contractor was found; UNDP was undertaking a preliminary study on re-establishing telecommunications links with the outside world; and N'Djamena airport had been reopened to civilian traffic.

The mission proposed a two- to three-year, \$226-million reconstruction and rehabilitation programme calling for investments and technical assistance to rebuild basic physical infrastructure, to mobilize and support reconstruction and redevelopment efforts within the private sector, to strengthen institutional infrastructure in the social sectors, and to restore Government functions so that it could collect revenues and operate the public sector efficiently. The bulk of the financing would be for human settlements (33 per cent), transport (24 per cent) and industry (18 per cent). Included among the 58 recommended projects were brick production plants (\$14 million), a cement plant (\$15 million), re-

habilitation of 2,500 kilometres of roads (\$35 million), reconstruction of public buildings (\$45 million), urban development (\$16 million) and rehabilitation of the N'Djamena central hospital (\$10 million). Also recommended, as an extension of the emergency aid programme, was an acceleration of food and medical aid and the supply of an additional 50,000 tons of food grains for the 12 months starting in November.

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December adopted without vote,<sup>(5)</sup> appealed for international assistance to enable the Chad Government to aid people affected by the civil war, as well as emergency assistance for reconstruction, rehabilitation and development. The Secretary-General was requested to organize a pledging conference for Chad at Nairobi, Kenya, in March 1982 and an international programme of financial, technical and material assistance. He was asked to contact the Government with a view to appointing a resident co-ordinator who would also be his special representative for reconstruction, rehabilitation, development and emergency relief operations in Chad.

The request to the Secretary-General to organize a pledging conference, along with a paragraph urging Member States and organizations to consider taking part and contributing generously, was added to the resolution on an amendment by Chad and Kenya, adopted by the Assembly by a recorded vote of 112 to none, with 22 abstentions. The amendments replaced a paragraph by which the Assembly would have urged States and organizations in a position to provide assistance to consider taking part in a pledging conference for Chad.

The text without these amendments, submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee, was approved by that Committee without vote on 24 November, on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier draft introduced by Benin and sponsored by 28 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup> The two texts differed with regard to the official to be responsible for operations in Chad: whereas the original text referred to him as a special representative of the Secretary-General, the Vice-Chairman's text stated that he should be a resident co-ordinator who would also be a special representative.

The Federal Republic of Germany said its Government, which had recently announced a \$20-million contribution for financial and technical aid to Chad, felt that March 1982 was too early to hold another pledging conference and would not be able to make an additional pledge then.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Cape Verde, Central African Repub-

lic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Pakistan, Thailand, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Zaire, A/C.2/36/L.48.

Reports: S-G and missions, <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/261, <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/739.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/92 A & B, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 287); <sup>(5)</sup>36/210, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/795; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/107.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 37, 47-43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.30, 103 (7 Oct., 17 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.79 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/210

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.100), based on informal consultations on 26-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.48); amended in Assembly by Chad and Kenya (A/36/L.57): agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance to Chad

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 34/120 of 14 December 1979 and 35/92 A and B of 5 December 1980 on reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of Chad and emergency humanitarian assistance to that country,

Taking into account the report of the Secretary-General on emergency humanitarian assistance to Chad,

Noting with satisfaction that a mission was dispatched to Chad by the Secretary-General to review with the Chad authorities the needs of the country, in accordance with paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 35/92 A,

Deeply concerned about the massive destruction of property and the serious damage to the economic and social infrastructure of Chad during the past fifteen years,

Affirming the urgent need for financial and material support from the international community to the Government of Chad in its efforts for the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of the country and to meet immediate humanitarian needs,

Bearing in mind the concern expressed by Member States about the deterioration of the socio-economic situation as a result of the fighting in Chad and the interest they have shown in its speedy return to normal conditions of life and in its reconstruction and development,

Considering that Chad is in a particularly disadvantageous position as a least developed, land-locked and drought-stricken country,

Noting the urgent appeal made to the international community by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity in resolution AHG/Res.102(XVIII) adopted at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981, and by the Chairman of the delegation of Chad in the General Assembly on 7 October 1981,

Aware of the need to take urgent steps to mobilize financial and material assistance for the reconstruction of Chad,

1. Commends and encourages the efforts exerted by the Government and people of Chad for national reconstruction, rehabilitation and development and for assistance to the victims of the civil war;

2. Expresses its gratitude to Member States, institutions and agencies that have provided assistance to Chad but regrets that all the emergency humanitarian needs listed in the report of the Secretary-General have not yet been met;

3. Appeals to all Member States, governmental and non-governmental organizations, and the specialized agencies and programmes of the United Nations system, in particular the United Nations Children's Fund, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the World Food Programme and the World Health Organisation, to provide the

necessary assistance, as a matter of urgency, to the Government of Chad to enable it to come to the aid of the people affected by the civil war, in conformity with the report of the Secretary-General:

4. Urgently appeals to all Member States, the specialized agencies and other bodies of the United Nations system and international financial and economic institutions to provide generous emergency aid to Chad, through bilateral or multi-lateral channels, to meet its reconstruction, rehabilitation and development needs, in conformity with the report of the review mission that visited Chad from 26 October to 6 November 1981;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to organize a pledging conference at Nairobi in the first half of March 1982, in close co-operation with the Organization of African Unity and the Government of Chad, to help Chad to carry out its reconstruction programme;

6. Urges Member States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to consider taking part in the International Conference on Assistance to Chad and to contribute generously in support of the objective of the Conference;

7. Requests the appropriate programmes and organizations of the United Nations-in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the United Nations Children's Fund-to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General in organizing an effective international programme of assistance and to report periodically to him on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to help Chad;

8. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring the special needs of Chad to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

9. Appeals to the international community to contribute to the special account for Chad which has been established under the auspices of the United Nations Trust Fund for Special Economic Assistance Programmes for the purpose of facilitating the channelling of contributions to Chad;

10. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To organize an international programme of financial, technical and material assistance for Chad so as to enable it to meet its short-term and long-term reconstruction, rehabilitation and development needs;

(b) To have the report of the review mission to Chad disseminated as widely as possible;

(c) To contact the Government of Chad with a view to the urgent appointment of a resident co-ordinator who will also be his special representative for reconstruction, rehabilitation, development and emergency relief operations in Chad;

(d) To ensure that appropriate financial and budgetary arrangements are made for the establishment of an effective international programme of assistance for Chad and for mobilizing that assistance;

(e) To keep the situation in Chad under review and to report to the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982 and to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

#### Comoros

The already formidable difficulties facing the Comoros had been compounded during the past year by the world economic situation, according

to the review mission sent by the Secretary-General in pursuance of a December 1980 request by the General Assembly.<sup>(3)</sup> After visiting the country from 29 May to 10 June 1981, the mission reported<sup>(2)</sup> that foreign exchange earnings from three principal export crops-vanilla, ylang-ylang and copra-had fallen sharply, increasing the trade deficit as the value of imports remained unchanged between 1979 and 1980. Given prevailing farming techniques, the amount of land suitable for agriculture or pasture fell far short of what was needed to produce the food required by the population. Foreign aid covered 42 per cent of the public expenditure deficit in 1980 and the share was expected to reach 54 per cent in 1981. The entire capital budget was financed by foreign loans and grants.

The Government had adopted six main priorities for economic and social development: self-sufficiency in food, improved communications for the islands, energy production and water supply, health and population policy, training, and physical and housing planning. Within the framework of those priorities, the Government and the mission had selected 19 projects to be executed during 1981-1985, costing a total of \$48 million. Emphasis was to be on transport and communications equipment (\$19 million), including the construction of telephone exchanges; agriculture and livestock (\$11 million); and energy and water (\$10 million).

In his oral report to the Economic and Social Council in July, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes said that, despite the Government's efforts and substantial international assistance, the Comoros economic situation had not improved. The Government's main concern remained its balance-of-payments difficulties. The accumulation of foreign debt and the prospect of increased debt-servicing made it essential for foreign aid, wherever possible, to be in the form of grants rather than loans.

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> noted with concern that assistance had fallen far short of the Comoros urgent requirements. It reiterated its appeal for international financial, technical and material aid to help the Comoros overcome, in particular, its budgetary and balance-of-payments deficits, and urged the international community to take account of the priority the Government gave to infrastructure, transport and telecommunications projects.

This resolution was adopted by the Assembly without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 24 November. The draft was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an essentially similar draft, introduced by Benin and sponsored by 39 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(5)</sup>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Djibouti, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, A/C.2/36/L.53.

Report <sup>(2)</sup>S-G and review mission, A/36/268 & Corr. 1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/97, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 279); <sup>(4)</sup>36/212, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 40, 47, 43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/212

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote. 24 November (meeting 43): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.84). based on informal consultations on 39-nation draft (AX.2/36/L.53): agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance to the Comoros

The General Assembly,

Recalling its previous resolutions on assistance to the Comoros, particularly resolution 31/42 of 1 December 1976, in which it urgently appealed to the international community to assist the Comoros in an effective and continuous manner so as to enable it to face successfully the critical situation resulting from the economic difficulties experienced by that newly independent country,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General, to which was annexed the report of the review mission which he sent to the Comoros,

Taking note of the special problems confronting the Comoros as a developing island country and as one of the least developed countries,

Noting the priority which the Government of the Comoros has assigned to the questions of infrastructure, transport and telecommunications,

Noting further the grave budgetary and balance-of-payments problems facing the Comoros.

-Recalling its resolution 35/97 of 5 December 1980, in which it reiterated its appeal to the international community to assist the Comoros in overcoming its financial and economic difficulties,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the steps he has taken to mobilize assistance for the Comoros;

2. Notes with satisfaction the response by various Member States and organizations to its appeal and that of the Secretary-General for assistance to finance, in whole or in part, a number of projects identified in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General of 3 November 1977 and in subsequent reports;

3. Notes with concern, however, that the assistance thus far provided continues to fall short of the country's urgent requirements and that a substantial amount of assistance is still urgently required to carry out the projects identified in the annexes to the reports of the Secretary-General;

4. Reiterates its appeal to Member States, regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental bodies to provide effective and continuous financial, material and technical assistance to the Comoros to help it overcome its financial and economic difficulties, in particular its budgetary and balance-of-payments deficits;

5. Urges Member States to give special consideration to the inclusion of the Comoros in their bilateral and multilateral programmes of development assistance and, in cases where assistance programmes for the Comoros are already in force, to expand them, wherever possible;

6. Also urges the international community to take fully into account, in providing assistance, the priority which the Comoros gives to projects in the fields of infrastructure, transport and telecommunications;

7. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the special needs of the Comoros and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

8. Appeals to the international community to contribute to the special account which was established at United Nations Headquarters by the Secretary-General, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 32/92 of 13 December 1977, for the purpose of facilitating the channelling of contributions to the Comoros;

9. Requests the appropriate organizations and programmes of the United Nations system to increase their current programmes of assistance to the Comoros, to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General in organizing an effective international programme of assistance and to report periodically to him on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to assist that country;

10. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to the Comoros;

(b) To keep the situation in the Comoros under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental organizations and international financial institutions concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the current status of the special programme of economic assistance for the Comoros;

(c) To arrange for a review of the economic situation of the Comoros and the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country in time for the matter to be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Djibouti

Although the gross domestic product (GDP) of Djibouti had almost tripled in eight years and the balance of payments was in surplus, the limited local production capacity and heavy reliance on imports of most basic goods, including food, meant that the country would continue for some years to require external aid for its development requirements. This was the conclusion of the multiagency mission to review economic assistance to Djibouti, which visited that country from 13 to 18 September 1981 in pursuance of a December 1980 request by the General Assembly.<sup>(3)</sup> In its report,<sup>(2)</sup> the mission noted that a round-table conference of donors, held in Djibouti from 23 to 27 February, had served as an initial step towards the preparation of the first national development plan, and a further meeting was expected in the near future to consider specific investment proposals requiring external financing.

The mission reviewed 69 projects in the special economic assistance programme for Djibouti

and found that 38 had been fully funded, 4 others had been partially financed and the remaining 27 still required funding. A total of \$144 million had been secured for these projects, of which the international community had provided \$118 million. Money was sought for projects to improve Djibouti port, the service economy and transport links, and to help the poor through better facilities and services, as well as for pilot projects, studies and surveys, and technical assistance and training. The mission identified two new projects requiring assistance: urban road repair, and a study to determine the availability of building materials such as plaster and the feasibility of production for local use.

In his oral report to the Economic and Social Council in July, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes stated that the pattern of drought and flood in Djibouti had created serious economic problems. Early in 1981, more than a quarter of the rural population was concentrated in or was visiting relief camps for the distribution of food and water. It was imperative to organize additional economic activities in such areas as agriculture, fisheries and water supply, to expand vocational training and to promote the development of industries in the capital.

Addressing the General Assembly's Second Committee in October, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes said Djibouti's grave economic problems since its independence in 1977 were due to lack of natural resources, the negligible volume of exports and the need to import almost all essentials, including food. Those problems had been exacerbated by a sharp decline in foreign exchange earnings from the operation of its port and by an influx of refugees from neighbouring areas which had been estimated at 15 per cent of the population.

Djibouti informed the Committee that it proposed to vitalize its economy by modernizing its service sector, the most developed sector, and by promoting and developing industry and agriculture.

By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the review mission and renewed its appeal to Member States, United Nations organizations and international economic and financial institutions to assist Djibouti, whenever possible in the form of grants. It also asked that Djibouti's eligibility for inclusion in the list of the least developed countries be considered by the Committee for Development Planning (p. 412).

This resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second Commit-

tee on 24 November. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on a 40-nation draft, introduced by Benin but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup>

In other action, the Assembly called on 16 December for humanitarian assistance to refugees in Djibouti.<sup>(4)</sup> In addition, Djibouti was included among six East African countries for which the Assembly, on 17 December,<sup>(6)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to mobilize international assistance for drought-stricken areas (p. 491).

**Draft resolution withdrawn:** <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Comoros, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire, Zambia, A/C.2/36/L.58.

**Report:** <sup>(2)</sup>S-G and review mission, A/36/281.

**Resolutions:** GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/89, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 280); <sup>(4)</sup>36/156, 16 Dec. 1981 (p. 1043); <sup>(5)</sup>36/216, 17 Dec., text following; <sup>(6)</sup>36/221, 17 Dec. (p. 490).

**Meeting records:** ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR. 7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 40-43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/216

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote. 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.103), based on informal consultations on 40-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.58): agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance to Djibouti

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 32/93 of 13 December 1977, 33/132 of 19 December 1978 and 34/124 of 14 December 1979, in which it, *inter alia*, expressed its deep concern at the serious economic situation prevailing in Djibouti and strongly appealed to Member States and to the international institutions concerned to offer effective and sustained assistance to that country to enable it to deal with the critical situation arising from its economic difficulties and requested the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Djibouti,

Recalling also its resolution 35/89 of 5 December 1980, in which it drew the attention of the international community to the critical economic situation still confronting Djibouti and to the list of urgent short-term and long-term projects submitted by the Government of Djibouti.

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General, to which was annexed the report of the mission which he sent to Djibouti in response to General Assembly resolution 35/89.

Taking note of the critical economic situation of Djibouti and the list of urgent and priority projects, formulated by the Government, that require international assistance,

Noting with concern that the harsh effects of the prolonged drought continue to persist and place serious strains on the fragile economic, social and administrative infrastructure of the country,

Noting the conclusion of the Committee for Development Planning at its seventeenth session, in response to the application of Djibouti for inclusion in the list of the least developed countries, that Djibouti did not satisfy the existing criteria for inclusion in that list.

Noting the statement made before the Second Committee on 6 October 1981 by the Co-ordinator of Special Economic



Assistance Programmes, in which he emphasized the importance of priority projects for diversification of the economy and the urgency of providing increased financial, material and technical assistance to Djibouti.

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the steps he has taken to organize an international economic assistance programme for Djibouti;

2. Endorses fully the assessment and recommendations contained in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General;

3. Notes with appreciation the assistance already provided or pledged to Djibouti by Member States and organizations of the United Nations system;

4. Draws the attention of the international community to the critical economic situation confronting Djibouti, to the assistance immediately needed for the victims of the drought and to the list of urgent short-term and long-term projects submitted by the Government of Djibouti for financial assistance as described in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General;

5. Requests the Economic and Social Council to invite the Committee for Development Planning, in the light of the new data and information provided by the Government of Djibouti, to consider, on the basis of the existing criteria, its eligibility for inclusion in the list of the least developed countries;

6. Renews its appeal to Member States, the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system and international economic and financial institutions to provide Djibouti with ample and appropriate assistance, bilaterally and multilaterally, whenever possible in the form of grants, to enable Djibouti to cope with its special economic hardship;

7. Calls upon the international community to contribute generously to the special account which was established at United Nations Headquarters by the Secretary-General for the purpose of facilitating the channelling of contributions to Djibouti;

8. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the special needs of Djibouti and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

9. Requests the appropriate specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to maintain and increase their current and future programmes of assistance to Djibouti, to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General in organizing an effective international programme of assistance and to report periodically to him on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to assist Djibouti;

10. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Djibouti;

(b) To continue to ensure that adequate financial and budgetary arrangements are made to mobilize resources and to co-ordinate international assistance to Djibouti;

(c) To keep the situation in Djibouti under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental organizations and international financial institutions concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the current status of the special programme of economic assistance for Djibouti;

(d) To arrange for a review of the economic situation of Djibouti and the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country in time for the matter to be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Equatorial Guinea

During the 1970s, the per capita GDP of Equatorial Guinea at current prices was estimated to have fallen by more than 30 per cent, and at constant prices by nearly 80 per cent, according to the United Nations mission which visited that country from 21 to 26 September 1981 to review the special economic assistance programme in pursuance of a December 1980 request by the General Assembly.<sup>(3)</sup> The mission reported<sup>(2)</sup> that the decline was attributed principally to lower production in agriculture, forestry and fisheries, where the value of output fell by 42 per cent at current prices between 1970 and 1979. The adverse trade balance was expected to continue. Meanwhile, the country's foreign debt obligations at the end of 1980 amounted to \$37.2 million, and debt-servicing obligations were estimated at about \$3 million annually for 1982 and 1983. The budget deficit in 1980 might have been as high as \$8.4 million, and although the projection for 1981 showed a small surplus of \$330,000, the projected revenue increases depended heavily on increased cocoa and timber exports.

Of the 57 economic assistance projects apart from food assistance identified by a United Nations mission in 1980,<sup>(5)</sup> 4 had been fully funded, 9 partially funded and 1 withdrawn; of the remainder, 26 had been modified or elaborated. For its programme of rehabilitation, reconstruction and development, the Government had provisionally identified 145 projects for submission to a donors' conference planned for March 1982. These were chiefly in the sectors of transport, water supply and sanitation, health and agriculture. The Government's estimate of immediate food requirements totalled 9,520 metric tons, valued at \$5 million; from mid-1980 to mid-1981, the World Food Programme had given support valued at \$1 million.

In July, in his oral report to the Economic and Social Council, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes said the new Government of Equatorial Guinea, established in 1979, had inherited no foreign exchange reserves and no administrative structure which would facilitate the generation of local revenue; practically no businesses were functioning and no stocks of any kind were available in the country. Schools, hospitals and other basic institutions were either closed or providing inadequate services. Nevertheless, with the exception of Spain, and to a lesser extent France and Gabon, little bilateral assistance had been provided.

Addressing the General Assembly on 28 September, the First Vice-President of the

Supreme Military Council and Commissioner for External Affairs of Equatorial Guinea stated that the Government, faced with the task of reconstructing the economy, wished to diversify agriculture so as to achieve self-sufficiency and expand activities in the fields of livestock, industry, fishing and other sectors of production.

In October, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes told the Assembly's Second Committee that Equatorial Guinea had experienced a serious decline in cocoa and coffee production, affecting the balance of payments; coffee production had fallen from 8,000 tons in 1967 to 150 tons in 1980.

The Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> urged Member States to help meet Equatorial Guinea's economic needs and requested United Nations organizations to provide humanitarian assistance, including food, medicines and hospital and school equipment. It also requested that the Committee for Development Planning be invited to consider the country's eligibility for inclusion in the list of the least developed countries (p. 412).

The Assembly adopted this resolution without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 24 November. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier draft introduced by Egypt, sponsored by 34 nations and revised by them but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup> As adopted, the resolution omitted two paragraphs in the revised version of the earlier draft, expressing appreciation for the mission's report and endorsing its recommendations. In addition, where the earlier draft would have had the Assembly request the Secretary-General to assist the Government in preparing national income and population statistics, the approved text had the Assembly note that the United Nations Development Programme would assist the Government in that task.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Angola, Benin, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Panama, Peru, Sao Tome and Principe, Spain, Thailand, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Venezuela, Zaire, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36 L.33/Rev.1.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G and review mission, A/36/283.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/105, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 288); <sup>(4)</sup>36/204, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 275.

Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.2/36/L.79.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: plenary, A/36/PV.1.5, 103 (28 Sep., 17 Dec.); 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-32, 33, 37, 41, 43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/204

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote. 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.102), based on informal consultations on 34-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.33/Rev.i); agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance for the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of Equatorial Guinea

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/105 of 5 December 1980, in which, inter alia, it recognized the need for the adoption of special measures of assistance to enable Equatorial Guinea to rebuild its economy and to restore to normal the social and public services of the country, and drew the attention of the international community to the critical social and economic situation confronting Equatorial Guinea and to the list of urgent short-term and long-term projects required by the Government to carry out its programme of rehabilitation and reconstruction,

Taking note of the address delivered by the First Vice-President of the Supreme Military Council and Commissioner for External Affairs of Equatorial Guinea to the General Assembly on 28 September 1981, in which he described the grave social and economic problems of his country and expressed the hope that the international community would contribute generously towards satisfying the needs of Equatorial Guinea at the conference of donors to be held at the beginning of 1982.

Noting further that there are no official national income statistics available for Equatorial Guinea and that, since there has been no official census since 1964, official population figures will be forthcoming only after the census proposed for the second quarter of 1982.

Noting from the report of the Secretary-General, to which is annexed the report of the review mission dispatched to Equatorial Guinea, that the economic and financial situation in that country remains grave, that the tight budgetary situation and the large external trade deficit constitute a constraint on the Government's ability to embark on a programme of reconstruction and rehabilitation and that external financial assistance is essential if the Government is to provide the population with health, education and other essential social and public services,

1. Urgently reiterates its appeal to all Member States to contribute generously, through bilateral or multilateral channels, towards satisfying the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development needs of Equatorial Guinea;

2. Requests the Economic and Social Council to invite the Committee for Development Planning, in the light of the new data and information provided by the Government of Equatorial Guinea, to consider, on the basis of existing criteria, the eligibility of that country for inclusion in the list of the least developed countries;

3. Requests the appropriate organizations and programmes of the United Nations system-in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Bank, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities-to maintain and expand their programmes of assistance to Equatorial Guinea, to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General in organizing an effective international programme of assistance, to report periodically to the Secretary-General on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to help that country and to provide all possible assistance to meet the critical humanitarian needs of the population and to provide food, medicines and essential equipment for hospitals and schools;

4. Calls upon regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental bodies and non-governmental

organizations, as well as international financial and development institutions, to give urgent consideration to the establishment of a programme of assistance to Equatorial Guinea or, where one is already in existence, to the expansion of that programme, and to contribute generously towards satisfying the needs of Equatorial Guinea at the forthcoming conference of donors;

5. Notes that the United Nations Development Programme will assist the Government of Equatorial Guinea in preparing new official national income statistics and new population figures so that the Government can bring these data to the attention of the Committee for Development Planning in order to enable the Committee to re-examine the request of Equatorial Guinea for inclusion in the list of the least developed countries on the basis of the existing criteria and those new statistics;

6. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Equatorial Guinea;

(b) To ensure that the necessary financial and budgetary arrangements are made to continue the organization of the international programme of assistance to Equatorial Guinea and the mobilization of that assistance;

(c) To keep the situation in Equatorial Guinea under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental organizations and the international financial institutions concerned and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the status of the special programme of economic assistance for Equatorial Guinea;

(d) To arrange for a review of the economic situation of Equatorial Guinea and the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country in time for the matter to be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Gambia

Expressing concern about the extensive destruction of life and property resulting from recent events in the Gambia, the General Assembly, in a resolution adopted without vote on 17 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> appealed to Member States and organizations to contribute towards the country's rehabilitation and reconstruction. It requested United Nations organizations to increase their assistance and asked the Secretary-General to organize a special programme of financial, technical and material assistance so that the Gambia could meet its urgent rehabilitation and reconstruction needs. He was also requested to dispatch a mission to the Gambia to assess needs.

This resolution was approved without vote by the Second Committee on 24 November. The draft was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier and essentially similar draft, introduced by Benin on behalf of the African Group and sponsored by 34 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator (UNDRO) informed the Committee in November that UNDRO had organized a multiagency mission to assess rehabilitation

and emergency assistance needs in the Gambia, and that States and United Nations organizations had contributed more than \$12 million (p. 483).

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Central African Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.74.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/220, 17 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR. 7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 47-43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103(17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/220

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.104), based on informal consultations on 34-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.74); agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the Gambia

The General Assembly,

Deeply concerned about the extensive destruction of life and property as well as the severe damage to infrastructure which were inflicted on the Gambia as the result of recent events.

Noting that the Gambia is a least developed country with acute economic and social problems arising from its weak economic infrastructure,

Noting further that the Gambia also suffers from many of the serious problems common to countries of the Sahelian region, notably drought,

Convinced that the Government of the Gambia needs urgent international assistance to rehabilitate and reconstruct the damaged economy of the country,

1. Notes with satisfaction the efforts exerted by the Government and people of the Gambia for national rehabilitation and reconstruction:

2. Urgently appeals to all Member States, the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, as well as international development and financial institutions, to contribute generously, through bilateral or multilateral channels, to the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the Gambia;

3. Calls upon regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental bodies and non-governmental organizations, as well as international development and financial institutions, to give urgent consideration to the establishment of a programme of assistance for the Gambia:

4. Requests the appropriate organizations and programmes of the United Nations system—in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development—to increase their current and future programmes of assistance to the Gambia, to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General in organizing an effective international programme of assistance and to report periodically to him on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to assist that country;

5. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Food and Agricul-

ture Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the special needs of the Gambia and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

6. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To organize a special emergency assistance programme of financial, technical and material assistance to the Gambia to enable it to meet its urgent needs for rehabilitation and reconstruction;

(b) To ensure that the necessary financial and budgetary arrangements are made to organize an international programme of assistance to the Gambia and to mobilize that assistance;

(c) To dispatch a mission to the Gambia with a view to holding consultations with the Government on the additional assistance which it needs for rehabilitation and reconstruction and to communicate the report of the mission to the international community;

(d) To apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the assistance being provided and of the progress made in mobilizing assistance to the Gambia;

(e) To keep the situation in the Gambia under review and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

### Guinea-Bissau

Insufficient rainfall in Guinea-Bissau during the 1980/1981 agricultural year, as in the previous three years, had led to crop failures and a structural food deficit, an economic review mission reported following a visit to the country from 6 to 10 April 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> Sent in pursuance of a December 1980 request by the General Assembly,<sup>(4)</sup> the mission found that crops were on average only about 30 per cent of normal. As a result of the accumulated food deficit, food needs for 1981 were estimated at 100,000 metric tons; additional pledges were needed, as the country was unable to afford commercial purchases because of the shortage of foreign exchange and the accumulated arrears in loan payments. The balance-of-payments deficit had steadily increased and by 1981 the value of exports was only 20 per cent of the value of imports. The investment budget was almost totally funded by foreign aid.

Of the 89 previously elaborated projects reviewed by the mission, 24 had been fully financed, 17 had been partially financed, 39 had received no support and 9 had been withdrawn. Thirteen new agricultural, transport, health and industrial projects had been identified by the Government.

On 8 May, the Economic and Social Council added Guinea-Bissau to the United Nations list of the least developed countries.<sup>(3)</sup>

In July, in his oral report to the Economic and Social Council, the United Nations Joint Coordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes said the Government of Guinea-Bissau had recognized that concentration on project

assistance had created major problems as a result of its inability to finance either the domestic or foreign exchange components of development projects. For that reason it had formulated a basic intersector support programme to meet its essential rehabilitation and development requirements.

By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the review mission, called on Member States and organizations to grant food aid, and renewed its appeal for international economic assistance.

This resolution was adopted without vote, after the Second Committee approved it in similar fashion on 24 November. The text, submitted by a Vice-Chairman, emerged from informal consultations based on an earlier and essentially similar draft, introduced by Benin and sponsored by 57 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(6)</sup>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Pakistan, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.59.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G and review mission, A/36/263.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC: 1981/34, 8 May (p. 412). GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/95, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 281); <sup>(5)</sup>36/217, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 40-43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

### General Assembly resolution 36/217

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote. 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.86), based on informal consultations on 57-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.59); agenda item 72 (b).

#### Special economic assistance to Guinea-Bissau

The General Assembly.

Recalling its resolution 35/95 of 5 December 1980, in which it reiterated its appeal to the international community to provide continuous financial, material and technical assistance to Guinea-Bissau to help it overcome its financial and economic difficulties and to permit the implementation of the projects and programmes recommended by the Secretary-General in his report of 21 August 1980 submitted in response to General Assembly resolution 34/121 of 14 December 1979,

Recalling also its resolution 3339(XXIX) of 17 December 1974, in which it invited Member States to provide economic assistance to the then newly independent State of Guinea-Bissau, and its resolutions 32/100 of 13 December 1977 and 33/124 of 19 December 1978, in which it, inter alia, expressed deep concern at the serious economic situation in Guinea-Bissau and appealed to the international community to provide financial and economic assistance to that country,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General of 31 July 1981, to which was annexed the report of the mission

which he sent to Guinea-Bissau in response to General Assembly resolution 35/95.

Recalling that Guinea-Bissau is among the thirty-one least developed countries,

Noting with concern that Guinea-Bissau continues to be beset by a wide range of economic and financial difficulties,

Noting that the Government of Guinea-Bissau, by the application of a policy of economic austerity, was able to reduce the budget deficit in 1980 to a level substantially lower than in the two preceding years, although the country will continue to be dependent on external sources for public capital expenditure,

Also noting with concern the chronic deficit in the balance of payments, the substantial increase in loans and the inordinately low level of foreign exchange reserves,

Noting that Guinea-Bissau again experienced a poor harvest in 1980, owing to irregular and inadequate rainfall, and that the country needs emergency food aid,

Further noting with concern that the response of the international community to date has not been commensurate with the needs of the situation and that many of the projects approved for the special programme of economic assistance by the General Assembly at its thirty-third session have not yet been financed,

Taking note of the results of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, particularly of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the steps he has taken to mobilize assistance for Guinea-Bissau;

2. Endorses fully the assessment and recommendations contained in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General and draws the attention of the international community to the requirements for assistance for the projects and programmes identified therein;

3. Expresses its appreciation to those States and organizations that have provided assistance to Guinea-Bissau in response to appeals by the General Assembly and the Secretary-General;

4. Calls upon Member States and the international organizations concerned to be generous in granting Guinea-Bissau the food aid it needs;

5. Renews its urgent appeal to Member States, regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental bodies to provide continuous financial, material and technical assistance to Guinea-Bissau to help it to overcome its financial and economic difficulties and to permit the implementation of the projects and programmes identified in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General;

6. Appeals to the international community to contribute to the special account established at United Nations Headquarters by the Secretary-General, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 32/100, for the purpose of facilitating the channelling of contributions to Guinea-Bissau;

7. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the special needs of Guinea-Bissau and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

8. Requests the specialized agencies and other competent bodies of the United Nations system to report periodically to the Secretary-General on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to assist Guinea-Bissau;

9. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Guinea-Bissau;

(b) To keep the situation in Guinea-Bissau under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental organizations and international financial institutions concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the status of the special programme of economic assistance for Guinea-Bissau;

(c) To arrange for a review of the economic situation of Guinea-Bissau and the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country in time for the matter to be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

## Lesotho

A continuing balance-of-payments deficit marred the economy of Lesotho, with exports representing only 11.6 per cent of the value of imports despite a substantial rise in diamond exports. This was a finding of the economic review mission which visited Lesotho from 16 to 20 March 1981 in pursuance of a December 1980 request by the General Assembly.<sup>(3)</sup> The Secretary-General sent the mission to review the economic situation and international assistance to that country. The mission reported<sup>(2)</sup> that real gross national product had declined by 3 per cent between 1978/1979 and 1979/1980, due mainly to declines in agriculture, caused by drought, and in construction, retarded by bottle-necks. The 1981/1982 development budget had risen by 62 per cent over the previous year, with much of the focus on infrastructure. The Government planned to reduce the country's dependency on South Africa by creating diversified employment opportunities in Lesotho and achieving self-sufficiency in food.

Based on information supplied by the Government, the mission reported that international assistance provided or pledged in relation to the special economic assistance programme amounted to \$202,583,000 as of March 1981, or \$42,473,000 more than in May 1980. As a result, a substantial part of the programme had been implemented. Out of 43 projects fully or partially funded, 8 of the 22 projects in the emergency component had been completed, as had 3 in the accelerated development component. External assistance was still needed to implement fully the road construction programme, to support the wool and mohair industry, and to complete agricultural, health, educational and small industrial projects. Additional food aid was also sought to enable the Government to expand food-for-work programmes, providing employment on development projects in road construction, afforestation, soil conservation and self-help activities.

In his oral report to the Economic and Social Council in July, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes said the Lesotho Government would especially like,

through food-for-work programmes, to add 1,000 workers to the force of 7,750 engaged in strengthening the feeder-road system. In October, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes told the General Assembly's Second Committee that international assistance would accelerate Lesotho's development and make it less vulnerable to external economic pressures.

The Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> endorsed the assessments of the mission and noted the requirements of Lesotho to carry out the rest of its development programme, implement projects necessitated by the political situation in the region and lessen its dependence on South Africa. Reiterating its appeal for international assistance, the Assembly called on Member States to assist Lesotho in achieving greater self-sufficiency in food production, ensuring a regular supply of oil and developing its road and air communications. The Secretary-General was requested to assist the Government in integrating women more fully into development efforts and to report on the type of assistance required to establish labour-intensive projects so that migrant workers returning from South Africa could be absorbed into the Lesotho economy.

This resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 24 November. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier and essentially similar draft, introduced by Benin on behalf of the African Group and sponsored by 21 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Ireland, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Sweden, Zambia, A/C.2/36/L.73.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G and review mission, A/36/266-S/14497.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/96, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 281); <sup>(4)</sup>36/219, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 41-43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/219

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.105), based on informal consultations on 21-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.73): agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance to Lesotho

The General Assembly,

Recalling Security Council resolution 402(1976) of 22 December 1976, in which the Council, inter alia, expressed concern at the serious situation created by South Africa's closure of certain border posts between South Africa and Lesotho aimed at coercing Lesotho into according recognition to the bantustan of the Transkei,

Commending the decision of the Government of Lesotho not to recognize the Transkei, In compliance with United Nations decisions, particularly General Assembly resolution 31/6 A of 26 October 1976,

Fully aware that the decision of the Government of Lesotho not to recognize the Transkei has imposed a special economic burden upon its people,

Strongly endorsing the appeals made in Security Council resolutions 402(1976) of 22 December 1976 and 407(1977) of 25 May 1977, in General Assembly resolutions 32/98 of 13 December 1977, 33/128 of 19 December 1978, 34/130 of 14 December 1979 and 35/96 of 5 December 1980, and by the Secretary-General, calling upon all States, regional and intergovernmental organizations and the appropriate agencies of the United Nations system to contribute generously to the international programme of assistance to enable Lesotho to carry out its economic development and enhance its capacity to implement fully resolutions of the United Nations,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General, to which was annexed the report of the mission which he sent to Lesotho, in response to General Assembly resolution 35/96, to review the economic situation as well as progress in the implementation of the special programme of economic assistance for Lesotho,

Noting the priority which the Government of Lesotho accords to raising levels of food production through increased productivity, thus lessening the country's dependency on South Africa for food imports,

Aware that the high prices paid by Lesotho for its imports of petroleum products as a result of the oil embargo on South Africa have become a serious impediment to the development of the country,

Recognizing, in connection with such embargoes, the obligation of the international community to help countries such as Lesotho that act in support of the Charter of the United Nations and in compliance with General Assembly reso-

Recalling its resolutions 32/160 of 19 December 1977 and 33/197 of 29 January 1979 concerning the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa and, in this regard, noting Lesotho's geopolitical situation, which necessitates the urgent development of air and telecommunication links with neighbouring countries of Africa and the rest of the world,

Taking account of Lesotho's need for a national network of roads, both for its planned social and economic development and to lessen its dependence on the South African network, to reach various regions of the country affected by the imposition of travel restrictions by South Africa,

Taking note of Lesotho's special problems associated with the employment of large numbers of its able-bodied men in South Africa,

Taking note also of the priority which the Government of Lesotho has accorded to the problem of absorbing into the economy the young generation, as well as migrant workers returning from South Africa,

Welcoming the action taken by the Government of Lesotho to make more effective use of women in the development process by promoting their participation in the economic, social and cultural life of the country,

Taking account also of Lesotho's position as a land-locked, least developed and most seriously affected country,

Recalling its resolution 32/98, in which it, inter alia, recognized that the continuing influx of refugees from South Africa imposed an additional burden on Lesotho,

1. Expresses its concern at the difficulties that confront the Government of Lesotho as a result of its decision not to recognize the so-called independent Transkei;

2. Endorses fully the assessment of the situation contained in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General;

3. Takes note of the requirements of Lesotho, as described in the report of the Secretary-General, to carry out the remainder of its development programme, to implement

projects necessitated by the present political situation in the region and to lessen its dependence on South Africa;

4. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the measures he has taken to organize an international economic assistance programme for Lesotho;

5. Notes with appreciation the response made so far by the international community to the special programme of economic assistance for Lesotho, which has enabled it to proceed with the implementation of parts of the recommended programme;

6. Reiterates its appeal to Member States, regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental bodies to provide financial, material and technical assistance to Lesotho for the implementation of several projects and programmes which are still unfunded, as identified in the report of the Secretary-General;

7. Calls upon Member States and the appropriate agencies, organizations and financial institutions to provide assistance to Lesotho so as to enable it to achieve a greater degree of self-sufficiency in food production;

8. Also calls upon Member States to give all possible assistance to Lesotho to ensure an adequate and regular supply of oil to meet its national requirements;

9. Further calls upon Member States to assist Lesotho in developing its internal road and air systems and its air communication with the rest of the world;

10. Commends the efforts of the Government of Lesotho to integrate women more fully into its development efforts and requests the Secretary-General to consult with the Government on the type and amount of assistance it will require to achieve this objective;

11. Recalls the meeting of donors held in Lesotho from 5 to 9 November 1979, takes note of the agricultural sector conference held in Lesotho from 20 to 24 October 1980 and urges Member States and the appropriate agencies and organizations to provide assistance to Lesotho in accordance with the outcome of those meetings;

12. Draws the attention of the international community to the special account which was established at United Nations Headquarters by the Secretary-General in accordance with Security Council resolution 407(1977), for the purpose of facilitating the channelling of contributions to Lesotho;

13. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring further to the attention of their governing bodies the special needs of Lesotho and to report to the Secretary-General by 15 August 1982 on the steps they have taken;

14. Requests the appropriate specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General in organizing an effective international programme of assistance to Lesotho and to report periodically to him on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to assist that country;

15. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Lesotho;

(b) To consult with the Government of Lesotho on the question of migrant workers returning from South Africa and to report on the type of assistance which the Government requires in order to establish labour-intensive projects to deal with their absorption into the economy;

(c) To ensure that adequate financial and budgetary arrangements are made to continue the organization of the international programme of assistance to Lesotho and the mobilization of assistance;

(d) To keep the situation in Lesotho under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental

organizations and international financial institutions concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the current status of the special programme of economic assistance for Lesotho;

(e) To arrange for a review of the economic situation of Lesotho and the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country in time for the matter to be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Liberia

On 28 September 1981, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Liberia, in a statement to the General Assembly, said the Government which had come to power in April 1980 had inherited a bankrupt treasury with an overdraft of \$11 million and an external debt of more than \$700 million. The country was beset by a 90 per cent illiteracy rate, cultural alienation, an inadequate health delivery system, a 53 per cent unemployment rate, and corruption bequeathed by the former regime. However, the new authorities had rescheduled the external debt, formulated a development plan and, with the assistance of the International Monetary Fund, worked out a stabilization programme to set the basis for economic recovery.

In a letter of 20 October to the President of the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(2)</sup> Liberia presented economic and social statistics in support of a request that it be included in the United Nations list of the least developed countries (LDCs) (p. 412).

By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly urgently appealed for international assistance for the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of Liberia. It urged Member States and United Nations organizations to provide food, medicines and hospital and school equipment, and to continue economic assistance until the situation returned to normal. The Secretary-General was requested to organize an international programme of financial, technical and material assistance for the country's reconstruction, rehabilitation and development, and to dispatch a mission to Liberia to consult the Government on its needs. The Assembly asked that the Committee for Development Planning (CDP) be invited to consider Liberia's eligibility for inclusion in the list of LDCs.

This resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 24 November. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier draft introduced by Gabon, sponsored by 28 nations and revised by its sponsors but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup> The adopted text differed from the revised 28-nation draft in requesting assistance to Liberia until the situation returned to normal rather than requesting a

special measure of assistance pending examination of its situation by CDP. The text also incorporated an oral amendment by the Vice-Chairman who submitted it, revising the title from "Assistance to Liberia" to "Assistance for the development of Liberia".

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Benin, Central African Republic, China, Comoros, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Morocco, Mozambique, Pakistan, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Thailand, Uganda, United States, A/C.2/36/L.38/Rev.1.

Letter: <sup>(2)</sup>Liberia, 20 Oct., E/1981/115.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/207, 17 Dec., text following.

Meeting records; GA: plenary, A/36/PV.16, 103 (28 Sep., 17 Dec.) 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 36, 37, 47-43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/207

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairmen (A/C.2/36/L.99), based on Informal consultations on 26-nation draft (A/C.2/38/L.38/Rev.1), orally revised by Vice-Chairman; agenda item 72 (b).

Assistance for the development of Liberia

The General Assembly.

Having examined the letter dated 20 October 1981 from the Permanent Representative of Liberia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Economic and Social Council, analysing the critical condition of the economy of Liberia,

Deeply concerned about the weak and underdeveloped state of the economic and social infrastructure of Liberia, which is a serious obstacle to the economic development of the country and to the raising of the living standards of its population,

Noting the statements made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Liberia to the General Assembly on 26 September 1980 and on 28 September 1981, in which he described the unsatisfactory conditions prevailing in his country, including extremely high rates of illiteracy and infant mortality and unacceptably low levels of income among the vast majority of the population,

Affirming the urgent need for international action to assist the Government of Liberia in its efforts for the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of the country,

1. Urgently appeals to all Member States, the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system and international financial and development institutions to contribute generously, through bilateral or multilateral channels, to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of Liberia:

2. Requests the Secretary-General to organize an international programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Liberia to enable it to meet its long-term needs with respect to reconstruction, rehabilitation and development:

3. Requests the appropriate organizations and programmes of the United Nations system-in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and the United Nations Children's Fund-to expand their programmes of assistance to Liberia, to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General in organizing an effective international programme of assistance and to report periodically to him on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to help that country:

4. Calls upon regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental bodies and non-governmental

organizations, as well as the international financial and development institutions, to give urgent consideration to the establishment of a programme of assistance to Liberia or, where one is already in existence, to the expansion of that programme:

5. Urges Member States and relevant United Nations bodies-in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the World Food Programme, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities-to provide all possible assistance to help the Government of Liberia to meet the critical humanitarian needs of the population and to provide, as appropriate, food, medicines and essential equipment for hospitals and schools;

6. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the special needs of Liberia and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

7. Invites the Government of Liberia to provide the Committee for Development Planning, on the basis of the existing criteria, with up-to-date statistical data and information pertinent to the examination of the country's economic situation, with a view to considering the possibility of its inclusion in the list of the least developed countries;

8. Requests the Economic and Social Council to invite the Committee for Development Planning, in the light of the new data and information provided by the Government of Liberia, to consider, on the basis of the existing criteria, the eligibility of that country for inclusion in the list of the least developed countries;

9. Requests Member States and the organizations of the United Nations system to accord Liberia, in view of its critical economic situation, assistance that is adequate to the needs of the country until the situation returns to normal;

10. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To dispatch a mission to Liberia with a view to holding consultations with the Government on the additional assistance which it needs for the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of the country and to communicate the report of the mission to the international community, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly;

(b) To ensure that adequate financial arrangements are made for the organization of an effective international programme of assistance to Liberia and for the mobilization of international assistance;

(c) To inform the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the assistance granted to Liberia;

(d) To keep the situation in Liberia under review and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

Mozambique

While the economic situation of Mozambique had improved, a United Nations economic mission reported in 1981, the balance-of-payments deficit would remain for the year at the level of the past five years, when it had ranged between \$150 million and \$200 million annually. Visiting the country from 18 to 25 June in pursuance of a December 1980 request by the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> the mission reported<sup>(2)</sup> that imports would be almost double the value of exports in 1981. The deficit was increasingly covered by external



support and indebtedness, the latter amounting to \$445 million by the end of 1980. Following small national budget surpluses in the previous two years, a \$77-million deficit was expected for 1981. Mozambique expected to finance about 19 per cent of the 1981 State investment budget of \$664 million from external assistance.

The mission identified \$811 million in transport and telecommunications projects, including \$336 million for port development, \$286 million for railways, \$116 million for roads, \$65 million for a national microwave telecommunications system and \$8 million for airport lighting and navigational aids. In addition, despite normal rains during the 1980/1981 season, the effects of earlier droughts had not been eliminated and Mozambique would need 215,000 metric tons of grain in the 12 months beginning 1 May 1981.

In his oral report to the Economic and Social Council in July, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes said the independence of Zimbabwe in April 1980 had enabled Mozambique to make significant economic progress. Agricultural production, particularly for export, had increased in 1980 and prospects for 1981 were encouraging, while several industries had recorded increases in output of 10 to 15 per cent in 1980 and were projected to have even higher growth rates in 1981. However, there was still a foreign exchange shortage, food production was insufficient for local needs and transit traffic from Zimbabwe through Mozambican ports had not materialized to the extent expected.

In the Council's discussion, the German Democratic Republic stated that it had sent harvesting combines and tractors to Mozambique, installed an electrical transmission line and transformer stations, and assisted in restoring and modernizing coal mining and processing.

Mozambique told the General Assembly's Second Committee in October that it badly needed international assistance to rehabilitate its transport system, which was of vital importance to Botswana, Malawi, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe. A Transport and Communications Commission of Southern Africa, established at Maputo, Mozambique, by the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (p. 497), was responsible for planning regional transport and communications projects and co-ordinating activities so as to maximize the efficiency of the regional system.

The Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> endorsed the recommendations of the mission and appealed for assistance in foodstuffs, medicines and technical co-operation for disaster preparedness and prevention. Expressing regret that assistance had fallen short of needs, it urged

Member States and organizations to strengthen their aid programmes and provide assistance in the form of grants wherever possible.

This resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 24 November. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier and essentially similar draft, introduced by Benin and sponsored by 42 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup>

In the Committee's debate on economic assistance, the USSR observed that it had begun geological prospecting work and the construction of agricultural machinery repair plants in Mozambique, and Soviet experts worked in many sectors of the Mozambican economy.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Denmark, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Portugal, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Sweden, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.57.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G and review mission, A/36/267-S/14627.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/99, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 283); <sup>(4)</sup>36/215, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 40-43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/215

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.88), based on informal consultations on 42-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.57); agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance to Mozambique

The General Assembly,

Recalling the decision of the Government of Mozambique to implement mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia in accordance with Security Council resolution 253(1968) of 29 May 1968,

Recognising the substantial economic sacrifices made by Mozambique in the implementation of its decision to enforce United Nations sanctions and to close its borders with Southern Rhodesia,

Recalling Security Council resolution 386(1976) of 17 March 1976, in which the Council appealed to all States to provide, and requested the Secretary-General, in collaboration with the appropriate organizations of the United Nations system, to organize with immediate effect, financial, technical and material assistance to enable Mozambique to carry out its economic development programme normally and to enhance its capacity to implement fully the United Nations mandatory sanctions,

Noting with deep concern the loss of life and destruction of such essential infrastructure as roads, railways, bridges, petroleum facilities, electricity supply, schools and hospitals identified in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General of 16 August 1979,

Recalling further its resolutions 31/43 of 1 December 1976, 32/95 of 13 December 1977, 33/126 of 19 December 1978, 34/129 of 14 December 1979 and 35/99 of 5 December 1980, in which it urged the international community to

respond effectively and generously with assistance to Mozambique.

Noting that the independence of Zimbabwe provides both an opportunity and a challenge for the international community, particularly for those neighbouring States whose economies have been so closely linked to that country,

Bearing in mind the fact that the drought which affected six out of the ten provinces of Mozambique has attained the dramatic proportions of a natural calamity,

Having examined the document on the drought in Mozambique, which contains an assessment of the immediate requirements for urgent assistance from the international community,

Noting that a mission of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Food Programme and the World Meteorological Organization visited Mozambique in July 1980 in order to assess the emergency food situation in terms of the partial loss of cereals due to the drought which had devastated part of the country,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General of 21 August 1981 and noting with concern that the economic and financial position of that country remains grave and beset by budgetary and balance-of-payments deficits and that, in the absence of increased international assistance, the Government will have to reduce major imports that are essential for its development programmes and for restoring industrial production to pre-sanctions levels,

1. Strongly endorses the appeals made by the Security Council and the Secretary-General for international assistance to Mozambique;

2. Endorses fully the assessment and major recommendations contained in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General of 21 August 1981;

3. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the measures he has taken to organise an international economic assistance programme for Mozambique;

4. Expresses its appreciation also for the assistance provided thus far to Mozambique by various States and regional and international organizations;

5. Regrets, however, that the total assistance provided to date falls far short of Mozambique's pressing needs;

6. Draws the attention of the international community to the additional financial, economic and material assistance identified in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General as urgently required by Mozambique;

7. Urges Member States and organizations which are already implementing or are negotiating assistance programmes for Mozambique to strengthen them, wherever possible;

8. Appeals to the international community to provide the urgently needed external assistance in foodstuffs and medicines and technical co-operation for disaster preparedness and prevention;

9. Calls upon Member States, regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations to provide financial, material and technical assistance to Mozambique, wherever possible in the form of grants, and urges them to give special consideration to the early inclusion of Mozambique in their programmes of development assistance, if it is not already included;

10. Appeals to the international community to contribute to the special account of Mozambique established by the Secretary-General for the purpose of facilitating the channeling of contributions to Mozambique;

11. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the special needs of Mozambique and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

12. Requests the appropriate organizations and programmes of the United Nations system-in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Children's Fund-to maintain and increase their current and future programmes of assistance to Mozambique and to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General in organizing an effective international programme of assistance, and to report periodically to the Secretary-General on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to assist Mozambique;

13. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Mozambique;

(b) To keep the situation in Mozambique under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental organizations and international financial institutions and other bodies concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the current status of the special programme of economic assistance for Mozambique;

(c) To arrange for a review of the economic situation of Mozambique and the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country in time for the matter to be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Sao Tome and Principe

A United Nations economic mission to Sao Tome and Principe reported in 1981<sup>(2)</sup> that the country's gross domestic product had grown in real terms by approximately 8 per cent a year between 1976 and 1979, when it reached \$22 million. However, a sharp decline in the price of cocoa, the commodity responsible for more than 90 per cent of export earnings, had caused those earnings to fall from \$26 million in 1979 to \$16 million in 1980, even though cocoa exports had risen from 6,630 metric tons in 1978 to 7,335 tons in 1980. After visiting the country from 30 March to 3 April 1981 in pursuance of a December 1980 request by the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> the mission also found that continued drought and other difficulties, including an outbreak of African swine-pest in 1979 that had made it necessary to kill all the pigs, had increased dependence on food imports, which were expected to reach 34 per cent of total imports in 1981.

Of 52 projects in the special economic assistance programme reviewed by the mission, 10 had been fully funded, 6 partially funded and 14 withdrawn; 7 new projects had been added. The new projects, for which no cost estimates were available, involved construction of a national library, a teacher-training school, a central warehouse, health facilities, a new commercial port at Sao Tome and fire/crash facilities at the Sao Tome airport, as well as the provision of audio-visual equipment.

In his oral report to the Economic and Social Council in July, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes stated that, because of low export earnings, increased prices for its imports and the high import component of development projects, Sao Tome and Principe was not in a position to finance the remaining portion of the special economic assistance programme. Only a few countries were providing it with bilateral assistance.

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> endorsed the recommendations of the mission and expressed regret that assistance had fallen short of needs. It renewed its appeal for international assistance so that the Government could launch an effective economic and social development programme. It also requested that the Committee for Development Planning be invited to consider Sao Tome and Principe for inclusion in the list of the least developed countries (p. 412).

This resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 24 November. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman based on informal consultations on an earlier and essentially similar draft,<sup>(1)</sup> introduced by Benin and sponsored by 28 nations but subsequently withdrawn.

The United States, associating itself with the consensus on the resolution, disagreed with the Secretary-General's statement of financial implications indicating that an additional \$11,900 might be needed to implement it.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Madagascar, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Swaziland, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.47.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G and review mission, A/36/262.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/93, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 284); <sup>(4)</sup>36/209, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/795; S-G statements, A/C.2/36/L.79, A/C.5/36/69.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 37, 40-43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.66 (8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/209

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote. 24 November (meeting 43): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.101), based on informal consultations on 26-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.47): agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance to Sao Tome and Principe

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 31/187 of 21 December 1976, in which, inter alia, it expressed deep concern at the serious economic and social situation in Sao Tome and Principe as a result of the total lack of infrastructure for development and appealed urgently to the international community to assist

the Government of Sao Tome and Principe to enable it to establish the necessary social and economic infrastructure for development.

Recalling also its resolutions 32/96 of 13 December 1977, 33/125 of 19 December 1978, 34/131 of 14 December 1979 and 35/93 of 5 December 1980, in which It reiterated its appeal to the international community to provide financial, material and technical assistance to Sao Tome and Principe,

Bearing in mind its resolution 31/156 of 21 December 1976, in which it urged all Governments, in particular those of the developed countries, to lend their support, in the context of their assistance programmes, for the implementation of the specific action envisaged in favour of developing island countries, and its resolution 32/185 of 19 December 1977, in which it urged all organizations in the United Nations system to implement, within their respective spheres of competence, appropriate specific action in favour of developing island countries, as well as its resolution 34/205 of 19 December 1979, which sets out a specific action programme in favour of developing island countries,

Recalling its resolutions 32/160 of 19 December 1977 and 33/197 of 29 January 1979 on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa,

Having considered the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Committee for Development Planning on its seventeenth session concerning identification of the least developed countries,

Noting the renewed request of Sao Tome and Principe that its exceptional economic circumstances should again be reviewed by the Committee for Development Planning,

Taking account of the statement made by the representative of Sao Tome and Principe before the Second Committee on 29 October 1981 to the effect that there are no recent official national income statistics available for Sao Tome and Principe and that available published data are out of date and do not reflect the current situation in that country,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on economic assistance to Sao Tome and Principe, to which was annexed the report of the review mission dispatched to that country,

Aware that the economic and social development of Sao Tome and Principe has been seriously hindered not only by inadequate health, educational and housing facilities but also by inadequate infrastructure, and that urgent improvement in these sectors is a prerequisite for the country's future progress,

Taking note of the current development priorities of the Government of Sao Tome and Principe, notably in agriculture and livestock, fisheries, manufacture, mining, transport and other infrastructure, as well as in education, training, health and housing,

Noting that substantial International assistance is needed to improve the infrastructure in sea, air and land transport in Sao Tome and Principe.

Noting also paragraph 2 of decision 80/30 of 26 June 1980 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme,

Noting with concern that a large number of the projects and programmes identified in the report of the Secretary-General have not yet been financed,

Concerned about the conclusion of the report that, unless there is a significant increase in the volume of international assistance, the Government of Sao Tome and Principe will not be able to finance a development programme,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the steps he has taken to mobilize assistance to Sao Tome and Principe;

2. Endorses fully the assessment and recommendations contained in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General;

3. Expresses its appreciation to Member States and international organizations for the assistance provided to Sao Tome and Principe, both in food aid and development assistance;

4. Regrets, however, that the assistance so far provided falls far short of the needs of Sao Tome and Principe;

5. Also regrets that no resources have been provided to Sao Tome and Principe for the implementation of the action programme in favour of developing island countries;

6. Renews its appeal to Member States, regional and inter-regional organizations and other intergovernmental bodies to provide financial, material and technical assistance to Sao Tome and Principe to permit the implementation of the projects and programmes identified in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General, as well as that of the action programme in favour of developing island countries, to enable the Government to launch an effective programme of economic and social development;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to assist the Government of Sao Tome and Principe to prepare new official national income statistics on the country so that the Government can bring these data to the attention of the Committee for Development Planning in order that it might, on the basis of existing criteria and of these new statistics, re-examine the request of Sao Tome and Principe for inclusion in the list of the least developed countries;

8. Requests the Economic and Social Council to invite the Committee for Development Planning, in the light of new data and information provided by the Government of Sao Tome and Principe, to consider, on the basis of the existing criteria, the eligibility of that country for inclusion in the list of the least developed countries;

9. Requests Member States and the organizations and programmes of the United Nations system to accord Sao Tome and Principe special measures of assistance similar to those called for in paragraph 4 of its resolution 34/123 of 14 December 1979;

10. Urges the United Nations Development Programme, the appropriate specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to respond favourably to requests from the Government of Sao Tome and Principe for technical assistance to help in formulating development projects and to assist in the implementation of its development programme;

11. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the special needs of Sao Tome and Principe, and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

12. Requests the appropriate specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to report periodically to the Secretary-General on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to assist Sao Tome and Principe;

13. Appeals to the international community to contribute to the special account which was established by the Secretary-General, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 32/96, for the purpose of facilitating the channeling of contributions to Sao Tome and Principe;

14. Requests the Secretary-General;

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Sao Tome and Principe;

(b) To ensure that adequate financial and budgetary arrangements are made to continue the organization of the international programme of assistance to Sao Tome and Principe and the mobilization of assistance;

(c) To keep the situation in Sao Tome and Principe under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental organizations and international financial institutions concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the current

status of the special programme of economic assistance for Sao Tome and Principe;

(d) To arrange for a review of the economic situation of Sao Tome and Principe and the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country in time for the matter to be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

## Uganda

Civil disturbances that had followed the overthrow of the Uganda Government in 1979 receded by the end of 1981, permitting the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to shift the emphasis of its activities in that country from short-term rehabilitation and reconstruction to longer-term institution-building and pre-investment.

According to an April 1982 report by the Administrator of UNDP to the Programme's Governing Council,<sup>(3)</sup> during the first part of 1981 the UNDP Resident Representative continued to be responsible for co-ordination of relief activities under a Relief Co-ordination Unit established by the Secretary-General. In March, when the Administrator visited the country to consult with the new President on development priorities and technical co-operation needs,<sup>(2)</sup> public order had not been restored in much of the country, and drought and disruption of transport and marketing facilities had led to serious food shortages in some areas. By August the situation had improved and good harvests had reduced but not eliminated the need for food relief. For the year as a whole, more than 60 per cent of UNDP programme expenditure had been for rehabilitation and reconstruction.

On 24 June,<sup>(6)</sup> the Governing Council, referring to what it called the special situation faced by Uganda due to mismanagement of the economy during the 1970s, compounded by war damages and severe drought, requested the Administrator to assist Uganda in its rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts and in the organization of a donor conference to mobilize international support for those efforts.

In July, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes told the Economic and Social Council in his oral report that the Uganda Government had undertaken major economic reforms as a prelude to reconstruction and development. It had raised producer prices for its major export crops—coffee, tea and cotton—and had allowed the national currency to float as a means of correcting price distortions, a black market and smuggling. However, more than 250,000 drought-stricken people in the north depended on international food aid, and hundreds of thousands had fled following fighting in the West Nile region. United Nations agencies had delivered food and other relief sup-

plies to the affected areas. Essential needs had generally been met and starvation had been prevented but it had not been possible to provide sufficient supplies for supplementary feeding or to organize acceptable levels of health services or adequate water supplies. Nor had it been possible to send an economic mission to prepare a reconstruction programme, as envisaged by the General Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(4)</sup>

A multiagency mission concerned with the drought in five East African countries reported on conditions in Uganda following a visit there in September (p. 494).

The Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes told the General Assembly's Second Committee on 6 October that Uganda had concluded an agreement with the International Monetary Fund which would help it to overcome the foreign exchange crisis and had arranged for a reconstruction loan from the World Bank. Moreover, the special programme of humanitarian assistance had been terminated owing to improved conditions. Nevertheless, Uganda's economic situation remained critical and the assistance it had received was inadequate.

Uganda informed the Committee that its development programme for the 1980s sought to make all regions self-sufficient in food, achieve an average growth rate of 6.4 per cent in the gross national product, raise life expectancy from 53 to 55 years, double the proportion of the population with access to potable water, increase primary education enrolment to 85 per cent, raise the literacy rate to 75 per cent and link at least 60 per cent of the district headquarters with hard-surface roads.

The Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to dispatch a mission to Uganda to consult on rehabilitation, reconstruction and development needs. It invited the international community to make resources available to implement Uganda's 10-year development plan and to contribute to the country's development needs and emergency requirements, and requested the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue his humanitarian assistance programmes (p. 1032).

This resolution was adopted without vote following similar approval by the Second Committee on 24 November. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier and essentially similar draft, introduced by Benin and sponsored by 26 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(6)</sup>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan,

Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.60.

Reports: UNDP Administrator, <sup>(2)</sup>DP/564, <sup>(3)</sup>DP/1982/19.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/103, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 290); <sup>(5)</sup>36/218, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(6)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1): 81/17, 24 June.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 37, 40-43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary. A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/218

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote. 24 November (meeting 43): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.87), based on informal consultations on 26-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.60); agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance to Uganda

The General Assembly,

Recalling Its resolution 34/122 of 14 December 1979, in which it, *inter alia*, expressed its deep concern at the tragic loss of life, widespread destruction of property and severe damage to the economic and social infrastructure of Uganda and urgently appealed to the international community to contribute generously to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development needs of the country, and its resolution 35/103 of 5 December 1980,

Taking into account the ten-year development plan of Uganda presented to the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries and the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries adopted by the Conference,

Recognizing that Uganda is not only land-locked but also one of the least developed and most seriously affected countries.

Recalling the donors' meeting on assistance to Uganda, held in Paris from 8 to 8 November 1979 under the auspices of the World Bank,

Noting with concern that severe drought has destroyed the livelihood of several hundred thousand people and that urgent assistance is required for the rehabilitation of essential community facilities and services in the affected areas,

Noting the appeals of the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for emergency humanitarian assistance to Uganda,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General submitted in response to General Assembly resolution 35/103,

Reaffirming the urgent need for international action to assist the Government of Uganda in its efforts for national reconstruction, rehabilitation and development and for resettling the large numbers of returning refugees and displaced persons into the permanent fabric of society,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the steps he has taken to mobilize assistance for Uganda;

2. Further expresses its appreciation to those States and organizations that have provided assistance to Uganda;

3. Requests once again the Secretary-General to dispatch a mission to Uganda to consult with the Government on its most urgent reconstruction, rehabilitation and development needs and to submit the report of that mission, through the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982, to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

4. Further requests the Secretary-General to ensure that adequate financial and budgetary arrangements are made for the organization of an effective international programme of assistance to Uganda and for the mobilization of international assistance;

5. Invites the international community, in particular the organizations of the United Nations system and donor countries, to make available the necessary resources to implement the ten-year development plan for Uganda, in accordance

with the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries;

6. Urgently renews its appeal to all Member States, specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system and international economic and financial institutions to contribute generously, through bilateral or multilateral channels, to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development needs of Uganda and to its emergency requirements;

7. Urges Member States and international economic and financial institutions once again to respond generously to the appeal made at the donors' meeting held in Paris;

8. Renews its appeal to the international community to contribute to the special account which was established at United Nations Headquarters for the purpose of facilitating the channelling of contributions to Uganda;

9. Invites the appropriate organizations and programmes of the United Nations system-in particular the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund, the United Nations Development Programme, the World Food Programme, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the International Labour Organisation, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization and the World Bank-to maintain and increase their current and future programmes of assistance to Uganda and to report periodically to the Secretary-General on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to assist that country;

10. Invites the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund, the United Nations Development Programme, the World Food Programme, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the International Labour Organisation, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization and the World Bank to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the special needs of Uganda and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

11. Requests the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue his humanitarian assistance programmes in Uganda;

12. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Uganda;

(b) To keep the situation in Uganda under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental organizations and international financial institutions concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the current status of the special programme of economic assistance for Uganda.

## Zambia

The poor performance of the Zambian economy in the 1970s continued in 1980, according to the report of a mission which visited there from 25 to 30 June 1981<sup>(2)</sup> in response to a December 1980 request by the General Assembly.<sup>(3)</sup> The balance of payments had deteriorated sharply in 1980, partly due to high petroleum and maize prices, and external payments arrears had risen to almost \$600 million. Economic prospects were not significantly better in 1981, but an upturn was expected towards the end of the year. Al-

though Zambia had had to import 207,000 metric tons of maize in 1979/1980, a small surplus of 90,000 tons was expected in 1980/1981. Though still suffering from the effects of its closure of the border with Southern Rhodesia between 1973 and 1979 in response to United Nations sanctions, Zambia had good prospects of economic recovery and reconstruction, the mission concluded.

Investments of about \$130 million were needed in the transport sector and a 10-year government plan envisaged an investment of \$466 million in agriculture. For rehabilitation in border areas, \$4 million was needed for water projects, and funding was also required to replace police and customs speedboats, vehicles and utility equipment. Important sections of the road network needed repair, land-mines had to be removed and damaged bridges reconstructed. The mission listed 28 projects previously identified for which assistance was still being sought and 59 new ones for which the Government was seeking international support. Some of the major new projects called for improving traditional agriculture, research and development for grain legumes and livestock, training at the Zambia Institute of Animal Health, strengthening the Prescribed Minerals and Materials Commission, rural water-supply development, civil aviation training and airport development, and improvement of science and mathematics teaching in schools.

In July, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes, in his oral report to the Economic and Social Council, stated that by early 1981 the Zambian economy had begun to lose ground. The balance-of-payments deficit and the budget deficit had increased and external payment arrears had again begun to accumulate. Despite the short-term setback, however, a foundation for economic recovery appeared to have been established during the 1978 and 1979 stabilization programme.

Speaking to the General Assembly's Second Committee on 6 October, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes said it was expected that 70 per cent of the investment called for in Zambia's three-year investment programme would be financed through grants and soft loans, since the Zambian economy could not service inflows of funds on commercial terms.

Zambia told the Committee that it needed more external resources for economic development. Its gross domestic product had declined considerably since 1973, with mining, manufacturing, construction and agriculture showing a downward trend. Despite its agricultural recov-

ery in 1980/1981, the country was not self-sufficient in all agricultural products. Government programmes to increase food production called for massive external financial assistance. Zambia also had to develop and maintain transport routes to the outside world as well as agricultural feeder routes.

By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the mission, drew the attention of the international community to the additional assistance required by Zambia, particularly for transport, and called on Member States and organizations to assist. It also requested the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue assistance to refugees in the country (p. 1032).

This resolution was adopted without vote following similar approval by the Second Committee on 24 November. The draft was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier and essentially similar draft, introduced by Benin and sponsored by 37 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(5)</sup>

In the Committee's debate on economic assistance, the USSR said Soviet doctors and teachers had been sent to Zambia to provide professional training, and the Soviet Red Cross and Red Crescent had sent drugs, food and industrial products.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, China, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Kenya, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Sweden, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.56.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G and review mission, A/36/270-S/14673 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/94, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 285); <sup>(4)</sup>36/214, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 40-43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 38/214

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote. 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.85), based on informal consultations on 37-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.56); agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance to Zambia

##### The General Assembly,

Recalling previous United Nations resolutions concerning the question of assistance to Zambia, in particular Security Council resolution 329(1973) of 10 March 1973 and Economic and Social Council resolutions 2012(LXI) of 3 August 1976 and 2093(LXIII) of 26 July 1977, which commended the decision of the Government of Zambia in 1968 to implement progressively United Nations mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia in accordance with Security Council resolution 253(1968) of 29 May 1968.

Recalling also Security Council resolution 455(1979) of 23 November 1979 and General Assembly resolution 33/131 of 19 December 1978, in which the Assembly strongly endorsed

the appeals made by the Council and the Secretary-General for International assistance to Zambia,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General, to which was annexed the report of the review mission which he sent to Zambia in response to General Assembly resolution 35/94 of 5 December 1980,

Regretting that the international community has not thus far provided assistance to Zambia on a scale commensurate with the costs, as called for in Security Council resolutions 253(1968) of 29 May 1968, 277(1970) of 18 March 1970 and 329(1973) of 10 March 1973,

1. Endorses the assessment and recommendations contained in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General;

2. Expresses its appreciation for the assistance provided thus far to Zambia by various States and regional and international organizations;

3. Draws the attention of the international community to the additional financial, economic and material assistance required by Zambia, as identified in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General, and to the particular need for assistance in the transport sector;

4. Calls upon Member States, regional and interregional organizations and other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to provide financial, material and technical assistance to Zambia, wherever possible in the form of grants, and urges them to give special consideration to the early inclusion of Zambia in their programmes of bilateral or multilateral development assistance, if it is not already included;

5. Requests the appropriate organizations and programmes of the United Nations system-in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Children's Fund-to maintain and increase their current and future programmes of assistance to Zambia, in order to enable it to carry out its planned development projects without interruption;

6. Further requests the appropriate specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to report periodically to the Secretary-General on the steps they have taken and the resources they have made available to assist Zambia;

7. Invites the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the special needs of Zambia and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

8. Requests the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue his humanitarian assistance programmes on behalf of refugees in Zambia, and urges Member States and the international community to provide him speedily with the necessary means to carry out those programmes, as indicated in the Secretary-General's report;

9. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Zambia;

(b) To ensure that adequate financial and budgetary arrangements are made for continuing the organization of the International programme of assistance to Zambia and the mobilization of resources;

(c) To keep the economic situation in Zambia under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental organizations and international financial institutions concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the current status of the special programme of economic assistance for Zambia;

(d) To arrange for a review of the economic situation of Zambia and the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country in time for the matter to be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

### Zimbabwe

Following its independence in April 1980, Zimbabwe experienced a minor economic boom, particularly in manufacturing, according to an economic mission which visited the country from 11 to 18 June 1981<sup>(2)</sup> in response to a December 1980 request by the General Assembly.<sup>(3)</sup> However, Zimbabwe's balance-of-payments deficit on current account had risen from \$112 million in 1979 to \$265 million in 1980, and the situation was likely to remain adverse because of declining prices of gold (a major export) and because the congested rail and road system was unable to handle all potential exports, especially of maize. The central Government's budget deficit had reached \$772 million in 1980/1981 and was expected to reach \$997 million in 1981/1982.

Substantial international assistance was required to rebuild and develop Zimbabwe's rural areas, repair roads and bridges, and develop water resources, the mission reported. In March 1981, the Government had convened the Zimbabwe Conference on Reconstruction and Development, at which it had presented to international donors its external resource needs amounting to \$2,816 million for reconstruction and development through 1984, including \$1,878 million for rural development and the remainder for the foreign exchange component of an infrastructure and modern sector investment programme. As of three months after the Conference, more than two thirds of the needed amount had been pledged by donors, with \$936 million remaining uncovered.

In July, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes, in his oral report to the Economic and Social Council, stated that Zimbabwe was facing a serious shortage of foreign exchange and a large and growing government deficit. Gross foreign exchange reserves amounted to less than three months' imports, and the rate of inflation, around 15 per cent a year, was increasing. Additional locomotives were urgently needed to enable Zimbabwe to move its record export crops to port, including 1.2 million tons of surplus maize.

Zimbabwe told the General Assembly's Second Committee in November that its economic performance had been spectacular. The 10 per cent growth in real terms in 1980 indicated the success of the Government's rehabilitation, reconstruction and resettlement programmes. Its "Growth with equity" policy,

announced in February, had laid the foundation for a revolutionary society based on socialist, democratic and egalitarian principles. However, because of a concerted policy by South Africa to sabotage the Zimbabwean economy, exports and imports were not moving efficiently, causing a severe strain on the country's foreign exchange.

By a resolution of 17 December, 4, the Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the mission and emphasized that the social and economic reconstruction of Zimbabwe would require massive external assistance.

This resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 24 November. The draft was submitted by a Vice-Chairman based on informal consultations on an earlier draft, introduced by Mozambique and sponsored by 23 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(4)</sup>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Ethiopia, Gambia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.80.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G and review mission, A/36/271 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/100, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 251); <sup>(4)</sup>36/223, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.35 (14 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 42, 43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

### General Assembly resolution 36/223

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote. 24 November (meeting 45); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.112), based on informal consultations on 23-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.80): agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance to Zimbabwe

The General Assembly,

Recalling the statement made before the General Assembly at its eleventh special session, on 26 August 1980, by the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, in which he outlined his Government's economic development priorities and invited the international community to render assistance in dealing with serious economic and social problems in Zimbabwe,

Recalling Security Council resolution 460(1979) of 21 December 1979 and General Assembly resolution 35/100 of 5 December 1980, in which the international community was called upon to provide urgent assistance for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Zimbabwe,

Taking into account the economic policy statement of Zimbabwe, "Growth with equity", on the basis of which a three-year plan was prepared, outlining short-term, medium-term and long-term national measures being undertaken to establish an egalitarian socialist society under conditions of growth with equity,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on assistance to Zimbabwe, prepared in response to General Assembly resolution 35/100.

1. Endorses the assessments and recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General on assistance to Zimbabwe;

2. Expresses its appreciation to those Member States and regional and international organizations that have extended economic assistance to Zimbabwe through bilateral and multilateral arrangements;



3. Emphasizes that the social and economic reconstruction of Zimbabwe is an on going exercise that will continue to require a massive injection of external assistance;

4. Invites appropriate organizations and programmes of the United Nations system-in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the International Labour Organisation-to bring to the attention of their governing bodies, for their consideration, the urgent and special needs of Zimbabwe and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1982;

5. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources for an effective programme of financial, technical and material assistance to Zimbabwe;

(b) To ensure that adequate financial and budgetary arrangements are made to continue the mobilization of international assistance to Zimbabwe;

(c) To keep the situation in Zimbabwe under constant review, to maintain close contact with Member States, the specialized agencies, regional and other intergovernmental organizations and international financial institutions concerned, and to apprise the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, of the current status of the special programme of economic assistance for Zimbabwe;

(d) To arrange for a review of the progress made in organizing and implementing the special programme of economic assistance for that country in time for the matter to be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Latin America and the Caribbean area

Multiagency missions organized by the United Nations went in September 1981 to four Caribbean island States-Dominica (see below), Grenada (p. 526), Saint Lucia (p. 527) and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (p. 528) -that had been struck by hurricanes in 1980 and 1981. The missions assessed the damage and the state of the islands' economies, and identified reconstruction and development projects deserving of international assistance. In addition, the General Assembly urged States to continue contributing to the reconstruction and development of Nicaragua (p. 526).

#### Dominica

The economy of Dominica had not recovered from the effects of disasters and events which occurred in 1979 and 1980, the United Nations Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes stated in an oral report to the Economic and Social Council on 14 July 1981. He referred to devastation caused by hurricanes "David", "Frederic" and "Allen", and an outbreak of leaf-spot disease affecting the main export crop, bananas. Those disasters had followed a long period of increased unemployment, deteriorating public finances and serious economic recession. Although immediate international humanitarian assistance had been pro-

vided, the Government was again faced with a substantial deficit. Pledges of further assistance were insufficient to enable the country to carry out a normal development programme and to recover from the effects of the previous years' disasters.

By a resolution of 20 July,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted without vote, the Council urged Member States and organizations to continue to assist in the rehabilitation, reconstruction and development of Dominica. It requested the Secretary-General to keep the Council and the General Assembly informed. The resolution was introduced by Barbados and also sponsored by the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Brazil, Ethiopia, Kenya and Mexico.

The United States, supporting the resolution, said it was particularly interested in disaster reconstruction in the Caribbean and had provided \$5.7 million in assistance to Dominica in 1980, including food and other farm products and construction personnel. In the Council's discussion, Barbados appealed for international assistance for Dominica, noting that the economic development and social stability of the island were at stake.

A multiagency economic mission visited Dominica from 22 to 27 September in response to a December 1980 request by the General Assembly.<sup>(3)</sup> The mission reported, in a document which the Secretary-General transmitted to the Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> that the country had faced increasing economic and social difficulties over the previous decade, well before hurricane "David" wrought extensive damage in 1979. These included a fall in agricultural production leading to declining real output between 1970 and 1975, deteriorating infrastructure, social and political instability, and high unemployment. Recovery since the hurricanes had been slow, with real gross domestic product in 1981 not significantly different from the 1976 level, and a current account deficit on international transactions that had doubled in 1979 and again in 1980. The Government had had to concentrate almost exclusively on relief and rehabilitation, diverting resources from development.

The mission concluded that Dominica had a continuing need for substantial amounts of international grant assistance. It identified a \$94-million programme of new projects, including \$43.3 million for transport, \$31.5 million for agriculture, \$7.6 million for housing and industry, \$6.1 million for health and sanitation, and \$5.5 million for education and training.

Summarizing the country's needs, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes told the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 6 Octo-

ber that Dominica required international assistance to rehabilitate and reconstruct roads, organize a road maintenance and repair system, rehabilitate agriculture and diversify agricultural production. Funds were also needed for housing, education, health and water supply. Aid must be provided chiefly in the form of grants or soft loans.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G and mission, A/36/282.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/49, 20 July, text following;

<sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/102, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 980).

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR. 35, 36, 37, 38 (14-20 July).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/49

Adopted without vote Meeting 38 20 July 1981

7-nation draft (E/1981/L.51); agenda item 4.

Sponsors: Bahamas. Bangladesh. Barbados, Brazil. Ethiopia. Kenya, Mexico.

International assistance for the rehabilitation, reconstruction and development of Dominica

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 34/19 of 9 November 1979 and 35/102 of 5 December 1980, in which the Assembly expressed deep concern at the magnitude of the damage caused in Dominica by hurricanes "David" and "Frederic" in 1979 and hurricane "Allen" in 1980, and urged the Governments of Member States and international organizations to continue to provide, with the utmost urgency, assistance for the rehabilitation, reconstruction and development of Dominica, as called for in resolution 418(PLEN.13) adopted on 19 October 1979 by the Committee of the Whole of the Economic Commission for Latin America,

Bearing in mind the oral report of the Secretary-General on assistance to Dominica,

Concerned at the continuing gravity of the economic situation in Dominica,

1. Expresses its appreciation for the assistance provided so far to Dominica by various States and regional and international organizations;

2. Urges Governments of Member States and international organizations to continue to provide, with the utmost urgency, assistance for the rehabilitation, reconstruction and development of Dominica;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to keep the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly informed of the results achieved in the implementation of the present resolution.

#### Grenada

The almost complete dependence of Grenada on foreign trade with industrial countries made it subject to the effects of inflation and recession in those countries, a multiagency economic mission which visited Grenada from 26 to 30 September 1981 concluded. In its report,<sup>(1)</sup> prepared in pursuance of a 1979 General Assembly resolution<sup>(2)</sup> and transmitted to the Assembly by the Secretary-General, the mission found that the country's relative remoteness, compounded by the infrequency and unreliability of transport, added to its inaccessibility. Grenada had suffered from a serious deterioration in its terms of trade during 1980 and 1981, with a trade deficit estimated at \$33 million in 1980. Further, it was situated in an area prone to frequent natural dis-

asters. In August 1980, hurricane "Allen" had caused more than \$6 million in damage, and unusual wind and rain storms had struck in early 1981.

The mission outlined a \$96.2-million programme of assistance to meet Grenada's development needs. Massive assistance, totalling \$72.1 million, was required in the transport sector over the following three years, including \$33 million for an international airport, \$16.6 million for an emergency road programme and \$10.3 million for port development. Some \$8.8 million was required for health and housing, \$6.9 million for education, \$4.2 million for agriculture and forestry, and \$4.2 million for industrial development. These needs were in addition to amounts already being provided or pledged.

The Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes told the Assembly's Second Committee on 6 October that, because of the natural disasters, Grenada's output of bananas, cocoa and nutmeg had fallen sharply. Moreover, prices of its major exports had weakened in 1980 and 1981. However, as a result of financial reforms and strict control of expenditure, the regular budget had been brought into balance in 1980/1981 and 1981/1982. Nevertheless, assistance was needed to complete the new airport, repair damaged roads, rehabilitate the banana industry, launch a housing programme, reform the secondary school system and meet health needs.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G and mission, A/36/279.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 34/118, 14 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 513).

#### Nicaragua

Faced with no reserves of foreign exchange, no State resources and the need to provide food assistance for half the population, the Government of Nicaragua, after coming to power in 1979, had launched an economic rehabilitation programme with international assistance, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes told the General Assembly's Second Committee in October 1981. Bilateral credits and loans had increased from \$185 million in 1980 to \$316 million in 1981. However, grants had amounted to only \$42 million in 1981, less than half the amount of the previous year. For the period 1979-1983, organizations of the United Nations system had approved \$62 million in assistance. Despite this response, assistance was insufficient and Nicaragua continued to require grants and soft loans.

Details of international assistance to Nicaragua were provided in a November 1981 report

by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> submitted in response to an Assembly request of December 1980.<sup>(3)</sup>

By a resolution of 17 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> adopted without vote, the Assembly urged Governments and bodies of the United Nations system to continue contributing to Nicaragua's reconstruction and development, and recommended that the country continue to receive treatment appropriate to its special needs until the economic situation returned to normal. It requested a further report in 1982.

The Second Committee approved this resolution on 24 November, also without vote. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on a previous draft, introduced by Mexico and sponsored by 39 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup> The adopted text differed from the initial draft by having the Assembly recommend that Nicaragua receive treatment appropriate to its special needs rather than "special treatment".

Referring to this provision in introducing the initial draft resolution, Mexico said that, if Nicaragua ceased to enjoy special treatment, the technical assistance it was to receive in 1982 from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) would suffer. Adoption of the resolution would permit an increase of almost 40 per cent in the indicative planning figure used to determine the amount of UNDP assistance to Nicaragua.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bangladesh, Belize, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, A/C.2/36/L.54.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/280.

Resolutions: CA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/84, para. 5, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 542); <sup>(4)</sup>36/213, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: CA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 40, 43 (6 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/213

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.106), based on informal consultations on 39-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.54); agenda item 72 (b).

#### Assistance to Nicaragua

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 34/8 of 25 October 1979 and 35/84 of 5 December 1980 concerning assistance for the reconstruction of Nicaragua,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on assistance to Nicaragua,

Noting with satisfaction the support which Member States, the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system have given to the efforts of the Government of Nicaragua for the reconstruction of the country,

Considering that, despite the efforts of the Government, the economic situation of Nicaragua has not yet returned to normal and continues to require the assistance of the international community,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his efforts regarding assistance to Nicaragua;

2. Urges all Governments to continue contributing to the reconstruction and development of Nicaragua;

3. Requests the bodies of the United Nations system to continue and increase their assistance in this sphere;

4. Recommends that Nicaragua should continue to receive treatment appropriate to the special needs of the country until the economic situation returns to normal;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the progress made in the implementation of the present resolution.

#### S a i n t L u c i a

The difficulties facing a small island economy, compounded by damage caused by hurricane "Allen" in August 1980, were highlighted in a report<sup>(1)</sup> prepared by a multiagency economic mission which visited Saint Lucia from 1 to 9 September 1981 in pursuance of a December 1980 request by the General Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup> The report stated that the country's dependence on exports and tourism caused it to be immediately affected by recessions in industrial countries. Further, because of Saint Lucia's small size, there was a chronic shortage of stocks and inventory in all fields. In addition, hurricane "Allen" had caused direct damage estimated at \$52 million as well as a loss in future income. Saint Lucia had succeeded in rapidly building and diversifying its economy by developing tourism in the 1960s and attracting manufacturing enterprises in the 1970s, but per capita incomes had been falling since 1979.

The mission identified a five-year, \$73-million programme of assistance involving specific projects for low-cost housing and hurricane repair (\$20 million); industry and employment \$21 million); agriculture, especially feeder roads (\$17 million); and health, education, transport and tourism.

Addressing the Assembly's Second Committee on 6 October, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes said that, although Saint Lucia had received significant amounts of international emergency assistance, much of the repairs and rehabilitation had been carried out by the Government and by parastate organizations at the expense of development projects. As a result of the extraordinary expenses it had had to incur, the Government was in a difficult financial situation and needed assistance to rehabilitate and develop agriculture, repair roads, rebuild and upgrade schools and hospitals, build and improve housing, and complete work on airports and docks.

Also speaking in the Committee, Saint Lucia expressed disappointment at the delay in submitting the report and at some of its contents, stating that the document had given cursory treatment to the economic effects of the hurricane while overestimating the country's per capita gross domestic product and distorting its recovery capacity. Moreover, the report had failed to mention the long rehabilitation period required for bananas and coconuts, the principal export crops. Saint Lucia would not submit a draft resolution on its assistance needs in 1981 but would inform the Committee in 1982 on the state of affairs.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G and mission, A/36/273 & Corr.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 35/101, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 561).

Meeting record: GA, 2nd Committee. A/C.2/36/SR.30 (5 Nov.).

#### Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

Natural disasters in 1979, 1980 and 1981 ended a period of rapid economic growth in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, according to a multiagency economic mission which visited the country from 16 to 22 September 1981. The mission, sent at the Government's request, reviewed the economic situation and identified projects in a \$23.5-million programme to meet the country's short-term needs and to assist in rehabilitation and reconstruction; its report was transmitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General.

The mission noted that the country's agriculture and infrastructure had suffered from a volcanic eruption in 1979, hurricanes in 1979 and 1980, and heavy rains in May 1981. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines had had a consistently large adverse trade balance, with an estimated deficit in 1980 of \$31.8 million. It urgently required assistance for the rehabilitation and extension of feeder roads, agricultural extension services and fisheries (\$7 million); for transport (\$3 million), including airport improvement; for industry and tourism (\$1.6 million), notably the arrowroot starch industry; for health and sanitation (\$4.2 million), including redevelopment of Kingstown hospital; and for education and training (\$7.6 million), including school construction and equipment and the establishment of five multi-purpose workshops.

The Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes told the Second Committee in October that international relief efforts had not been enough to meet immediate needs following the series of natural disasters, with the result that the Government had had to divert nearly \$2 million from other programmes to help with rehabilitation.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G and mission, A/36/278.

#### Other regions

##### Lebanon

Deterioration of the political and security situation in Lebanon during 1981 had had an adverse effect on the economy, the Secretary-General reported to the General Assembly in September. <sup>(2)</sup> Responding to an Assembly request of December 1980 for information about progress in implementing its call for reconstruction and development aid to that country, <sup>(3)</sup> he stated that the internal events had slowed work on various projects and set back prospects for starting a full-fledged reconstruction and development programme. In the public sector, the main impediment was the lack of funds and other resources, accentuated by the fact that disturbed security conditions inhibited the collection of government revenues and the delivery of international aid. While some investment in industry and agriculture had taken place in the private sector, investors preferred to put money in the safer sections of trade or real estate.

Despite the worsened conditions, the report said, United Nations agencies had intensified their activities in Lebanon. In May, the Government had requested various items and commodities to meet the needs of 25,000 families in various parts of the country. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations had responded quickly by making available the required quantities of cereals, cooking oils and canned meat, borrowed from World Food Programme stocks in the country. By March 1981, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) had committed \$9.7 million to be spent in the 1977-1981 period, of which a third was for agriculture and other substantial shares were for health and education. The United Nations Children's Fund was co-operating with the Government in establishing basic services units in various parts of the country, aiding orphaned and handicapped children and providing services to Palestinian children and mothers. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees sought to encourage displaced persons to return to their villages and to facilitate their settlement through economic and social projects.

Southern Lebanon continued to suffer from water and electricity shortages, inadequate communications, and economic and social backwardness, the report stated. Prior to the cease-fire of 24 July (p. 289), continuous air attacks and shellings had temporarily driven people from their homes, destroyed bridges and damaged the Zahrani oil refinery and other installations. The presence of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon had brought a considerable measure of security to its area of operations and, through its

humanitarian activities, it had helped people in villages to lead a more or less normal life. Those activities included health promotion, water distribution, assistance in repairing houses and school buildings, and restoration of small roads.

In April, the observer for Lebanon described to the Economic and Social Council steps his Government was taking to restore the economy by establishing a port commission to oversee the rebuilding of Beirut harbour, beginning work to enlarge and update Beirut International Airport, expanding electrical power generation capacity, restoring water supply and sewerage systems, improving technical education facilities, and rebuilding and establishing schools, hospitals and other social institutions. The Government was also exploring ways to finance a reconstruction programme, had created a housing bank to finance building projects and had been instrumental in setting up an economic policy co-ordination committee. Lebanon urgently needed funds for its reconstruction programme.

Because statistical data were lacking, the UNDP Governing Council, on 26 June,<sup>(5)</sup> deferred its determination of the indicative planning figure which was to project the level of UNDP assistance to Lebanon for the 1982-1986 development cycle. Referring to the country's difficult situation and the urgent need for its development, the Council decided to consider the matter in 1982 with a view to increasing UNDP assistance.

In October, the United Nations Co-ordinator of Assistance for the Reconstruction and Development of Lebanon, introducing the Secretary-General's report to the General Assembly's Second Committee, stated that the emphasis in United Nations activities in 1981 had shifted from emergency relief to reconstruction and development. He cited two projects which had yielded concrete results: UNDP assistance to help Lebanon's Council for Development and Reconstruction with regard to long-term planning, and a reconstruction and development programme in southern Lebanon that was fully under way, unhampered by the disturbed conditions there.

Lebanon informed the Committee in November that, in addition to the large-scale rehabilitation programme for southern Lebanon, its Government was giving substantial support to a programme to reconstruct the private sector. Despite the emigration of large numbers of skilled personnel, activities in industry and housing had gradually expanded, banks had provided credit for reconstruction, and Lebanon had largely retained its dominant position in commercial and financial services.

By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue

and intensify his efforts for Lebanon's reconstruction and development, and invited United Nations organizations to expand and intensify their assistance programmes. It requested the Secretary-General to provide assistance to the Resident Co-ordinator at Beirut, the official responsible for on-the-spot co-ordination of United Nations activities in Lebanon.

This resolution was adopted without vote following similar approval on 24 November by the Second Committee. The draft was introduced by a Vice-Chairman based on informal consultations on a previous and essentially similar draft, introduced by Kuwait and sponsored by 28 nations but subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup> Presenting the original proposal, Kuwait observed that, despite the unstable situation, the Lebanese Government had not ceased preparing and implementing reconstruction programmes.

Supporting the resolution, the United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Economic Community members, said they had increased the funds available for food aid and emergency relief for Lebanon. The United States said it was helping Lebanon rebuild its infrastructure and stabilize its economy. The USSR associated itself with the consensus on the understanding that it would be implemented within the existing budget.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Ecuador, France, India, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, United States, Uruguay, Yemen, A/C.2/36/L.37.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/272 & Corr.1.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/85, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 448); <sup>(4)</sup>36/205, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(5)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1): 81/18, 26 June.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.8 (24 Apr.). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR. 6, 7, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 34, 36, 37, 42, 43 (2 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/205

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/737) without vote, 24 November (meeting 43); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.96), based on informal consultations on 26-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.37); agenda item 72 (b).

Assistance for the reconstruction  
and development of Lebanon

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 33/146 of 20 December 1978, 34/135 of 14 December 1979 and 35/85 of 5 December 1980 on assistance for the reconstruction and development of Lebanon,

Recalling also Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/15 of 29 April 1980,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on assistance for the reconstruction and development of Lebanon,

Taking note of the statement made by the United Nations Co-ordinator of Assistance for the Reconstruction and Development of Lebanon before the Second Committee on 2 October 1981,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the steps he has taken to mobilize assistance for Lebanon;

2. Commends the continuous efforts of the United Nations Co-ordinator of Assistance for the Reconstruction and Development of Lebanon in the discharge of his duties;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to continue and intensify his efforts to provide all possible assistance within the United Nations system to help the Government of Lebanon in its reconstruction and development plans and in their implementation;

4. Invites the specialized agencies and the organs and other bodies in the United Nations system to expand and intensify programmes of assistance within the framework of the needs of Lebanon;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to provide, in the manner he deems appropriate, all possible assistance to the Resident Co-ordinator, so that he may engage in co-ordinating the continuing United Nations activities in Lebanon, with a view to ensuring their harmony and success;

6. Also requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the progress achieved in the implementation of the present resolution.

#### Tonga

International assistance and remittances from abroad had long been covering Tonga's severe trade deficit, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of Special Economic Assistance Programmes told the General Assembly's Second Committee on 6 October 1981. Increased inflows of foreign capital were needed to maintain the investment rate. High unemployment had caused many Tongans to emigrate, with a resulting loss of skills. The Government wished to broaden its sources of assistance, especially to improve transport, in order to reduce its heavy dependence on a few bilateral programmes. With a view to organizing an assistance programme, as requested by the Assembly in 1979,<sup>(1)</sup> the United Nations had been in touch with the Tonga Government to arrange for a technical mission to visit in the near future.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 34/132, 14 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 514).

Meeting record: GA, 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.7 (6 Oct.).

#### Chapter IV

### International trade and finance

A marked downturn in the growth of international trade, coupled with a sharp increase in the prices of goods traded, formed the backdrop of discussions on trade and finance in the United Nations during 1981. The Trade and Development Report, 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the first of an annual series by the secretariat of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), showed that the volume of international trade had increased by only 1.5 per cent in 1980—a considerable slow-down compared with a 7 per cent average between 1960 and 1979—and projected an equally disappointing outcome in 1981. At the same time, continued inflation raised prices by 20 per cent in 1980, as measured by indices of the unit value of world exports. Payments imbalances widened to worrisome levels, as they were associated with a high degree of monetary instability, especially with regard to exchange and interest rates.

The Report illustrated the particularly severe impact on oil-importing developing countries. Their terms of trade—the ratio between export and import prices—had deteriorated throughout the 1970s, owing to the steady rise in world prices of manufactures in relation to those of primary products other than petroleum, and two

major increases in petroleum prices. More recently, higher interest payments—expected to rise to \$44 billion in 1981—had contributed to the deteriorating balance-of-payments situation. An even more important factor had been a sharp rise in interest rates in capital markets. As a result, outstanding external debt of the developing countries was approaching \$400 billion. The Report pointed to a paradox in international economic relations: developing countries were required to honour their debt obligations while creditor nations could hinder them from doing so by restricting imports.

Presented to the Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD in September, the Report also assessed current economic trends in general, with emphasis on the development prospects of developing countries at a time of world economic recession (p. 385).

The problems of international trade and finance were discussed during 1981 at two regular sessions of the Trade and Development Board at Geneva: the first and second parts of its twenty-second session, from 9 to 20 March and on 12 May, and the first and second parts of its twenty-third session, from 28 September to 12 October and from 4 to 6 November. During the first of these sessions, a sessional committee of the

whole met from 10 to 19 March. At the second session there were two such committees: Sessional Committee I met from 28 September to 8 October and Sessional Committee II (on trade relations among countries having different economic and social systems) from 28 September to 6 October. The Board reported to the General Assembly on the results of its work.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Board's Working Party on the Medium-term Plan and the Programme Budget met twice at Geneva in 1981, devoting its third session (4-11 May) to the proposed budget for 1982-1983<sup>(3)</sup> and its fourth session (26 October-3 November) to the medium-term plan for 1984-1989 (p. 534) and UNCTAD technical co-operation activities.<sup>(4)</sup>

To consider protectionism and structural adjustment and for annual reviews of patterns of production and trade, the Board decided in March to establish a sessional committee in 1982 (p. 541). It also established an Intergovernmental Group of Experts on Restrictive Business Practices, which, at its first session in November, called on countries to institute effective controls over such practices and proposed several UNCTAD activities in this regard, including studies and information dissemination ((p. 544).

The Board was unable to reach agreed conclusions on the effects of recent multilateral trade negotiations and decided to continue to return to the matter in 1982 (p. 539). It continued work on a draft resolution to encourage trade among countries having different economic and social systems (p. 540).

The Board's Special Committee on Preferences, at its tenth session (Geneva, 11-22 May), carried out its sixth periodic review of the generalized system of preferences (GSP), under which participating developed countries granted preferential treatment to imports from specified developing countries (p. 546).

During 1981, the International Trade Centre at Geneva, under the joint sponsorship of UNCTAD and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), continued its technical co-operation activities, serving as the focal point for United Nations assistance to developing countries in the formulation and implementation of trade promotion programmes (p. 547). UNCTAD carried out its own technical co-operation activities in trade facilitation, helping countries to simplify procedures and documents (p. 549).

As at 31 December 1981, 75 States had signed and 19 had formally adhered to the 1980 Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities (p. 550). For the Agreement to enter into force, it had to be ratified, accepted or approved by at least 90 States. The General Assembly, in December 1981, urged early signature

and ratification.<sup>(9)</sup> The Fund's Preparatory Commission held its second session (Geneva, 9-13 February) and two working parties began drafting texts to enable the Fund to begin operations (p.550).

As part of UNCTAD activities in relation to individual commodities (p. 551), an agreement on tin was concluded in June 1981 (p. 553) and the International Cocoa Agreement, concluded in November 1980, entered into force provisionally in August 1981 (p. 554). The GATT Arrangement regarding International Trade in Textiles was extended in December 1981 until 31 July 1986, following a General Assembly appeal in December<sup>(10)</sup> for reduced trade barriers in the textile and clothing trade (p. 555). A United Nations conference met in January and May to begin negotiating an international agreement on jute (p. 553).

Consumer protection measures (p. 556), proposed in a report of the United Nations Secretary-General and covering areas such as government policy, consumer education, food, pharmaceuticals, restrictive business practices and practices of transnational corporations, were commended to Governments by the Economic and Social Council in July.<sup>(6)</sup>

With regard to financial and monetary questions (p. 557), UNCTAD continued work on the debt problems of developing countries (p. 559). However, controversy continued over its role in regard to reform of the international monetary system, and an expert group set up in 1980 to study the matter<sup>(12)</sup> did not meet in 1981 (p. 561).

The General Assembly, in November,<sup>(7)</sup> affirmed the need to encourage steps to mobilize personal savings in developing countries. A proposal for a world development fund to channel financial resources to developing countries for purposes not adequately covered by existing institutions was discussed in a report of the Secretary-General (p. 560); the Assembly requested further study of the idea.

A Working Group on International Monetary and Financial Issues, convened in October, recommended a set of national and international measures to stimulate world economic recovery and bring about international monetary stability (p. 561).

The Economic and Social Council, in July, requested preparation of a feasibility study on a proposed international centre for public accounting and auditing.<sup>(5)</sup> At the Council's request, the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on International Co-operation in Tax Matters concluded that it could take on additional functions as an alternative to a suggestion for the establishment of an international tax co-operation council (p. 563).

The Trade and Development Board endorsed

a resolution by its Committee on Invisibles and Financing related to Trade on ways of retaining more insurance business in the national markets of developing countries (p. 564).

Measures for rationalizing the machinery of UNCTAD, including a new mechanism for regular informal consultations among its member States, were approved by the Board in March (p. 535). The General Assembly chose a location for the sixth session of the Conference, scheduled for 1983.<sup>(8)</sup>

Some \$19 million was spent in 1981 on the technical co-operation activities of UNCTAD, geared to strengthening the external sector of developing countries, fostering economic co-operation among them and enhancing their effective participation in international negotiations (p. 535).

On other subjects, the Board authorized a social and economic survey of Namibia (p. 1170), requested the continuation of similar studies on South Africa (p. 200), asked for continued assistance to national liberation movements in southern Africa (p. 209) and authorized an economic survey of the Palestinian people (p. 322).

The Board set in motion a programme on technology transfer in specific industries (p. 754) and in the energy sector (p. 699), and asked for a report on national laws and regulations governing technology transfer (p. 757). Meanwhile, an UNCTAD conference sought agreement on a code of conduct for technology transfer (p. 755). The Board authorized the convening of a group of experts on the feasibility of measuring human resource flows between countries—an aspect of the brain drain (p. 757)—as well as continued work on industrial collaboration arrangements in relation to trade (p. 590). It requested a study on the exchange of skills as an element of technical co-operation among developing countries (p. 464). Several UNCTAD bodies continued work on shipping questions (p. 566).

The Board took note on 29 September of the 1981 report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (p. 1251). Statistics on international trade continued to be collected and published under the direction of the United Nations Statistical Commission (p. 1070).

The General Assembly, following its annual review of the Board's report, adopted a resolution in December dealing with various aspects of UNCTAD activities, including multilateral trade negotiations, GSP, the international monetary system, debt problems of developing countries, commodity matters and measures to rationalize UNCTAD machinery.<sup>(11)</sup> The Assembly also requested support for ongoing studies on problems facing Zaire with regard to transport, transit and access to foreign markets (p. 620).

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Trade and Development Report, 1981 (TD/B/863/Rev.1), Sales No. E.81.II.D.9.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB, A/36/15 & Corr.1; Working Party on Medium-term Plan and Programme Budget, <sup>(3)</sup>TD/B/850, <sup>(4)</sup>TD/B/882.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(5)</sup>1981/53, 22 July (p. 563); <sup>(6)</sup>1981/62, 23 July (p. 557). GA: <sup>(7)</sup>36/42, 19 Nov. (p. 559); <sup>(8)</sup>36/142 (p. 537), <sup>(9)</sup>36/143 (p. 551), <sup>(10)</sup>36/144 (p. 556), <sup>(11)</sup>36/145 (p. 533), 16 Dec.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(12)</sup>1980, p. 620.

Other publications: Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Fifth Session, Manila, 7 May-3 June 1979, vol. II: Statements by Heads of Delegation, Sales No. E.79.II.D.15; Trade and Development: An UNCTAD Review, No. 3, Winter 1981, Sales No. E.82.II.D.3; Register of Research on Trade and Development Issues, 1981 Edition (UNCTAD/ST/TCS/1), Sales No. E.82.II.D.7; Handbook of International Trade and Development Statistics, Supplement 1981, Sales No. E/F.82.II.D.11.

## International trade

### Programme and finances of UNCTAD

#### Programme policy decisions

The General Assembly, on 16 December 1981, adopted a resolution on UNCTAD<sup>(2)</sup> by which it took note of the report of the Trade and Development Board on its 1981 sessions and dealt with a number of specific questions considered by the Board.

The Assembly welcomed, endorsed or took note of the Board's resolutions on the following subjects: assistance to national liberation movements in South Africa (p. 209) and Namibia (p. 1170); an economic survey of the Palestinians (p. 322); protectionism and structural adjustment (p. 541); trade relations among countries having different economic and social systems (p. 541); co-operative exchange of skills between developing countries (p. 464); and technology transfer (p. 754). The Assembly took note of the agreement concerning rationalization of UNCTAD machinery (p. 535). The resolution also dealt with the annual trade and development report (p. 385), plans for an UNCTAD study on inflation (p. 393), and UNCTAD work on multilateral trade relations (p. 539), GSP (p. 546), the international monetary system (p. 561), debt problems of developing countries (p. 559), economic co-operation among developing countries (ECDC) (p. 382), registration of vessels (p. 566), transport conventions (p. 569), and commodities (p. 555).

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 118 to none, with 23 abstentions, following its approval by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 11 December by a recorded vote of 100 to none, with 23 abstentions.



tions. Separate votes were taken in Committee on paragraphs 9 and 11, dealing with the convening of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental High-level Group of Experts on the Evolution of the International Monetary System (p. 561). and with action relating to the debt problems of developing countries (p. 559).

The text, submitted by a Committee Vice-Chairman, was based on informal consultations on an original draft sponsored by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries.<sup>(1)</sup> The two drafts differed in regard to their provisions on assistance to African liberation movements, an economic survey of the Palestinians, the study on inflation, protectionism and structural adjustment, multilateral trade relations, debt problems, technology transfer, ECDC and registration of vessels. The paragraphs on commodities and on rationalization of UNCTAD machinery were not in the Group of 77 draft.

Introducing the original text in the Committee, Algeria expressed regret that certain decisions concerning the UNCTAD programme had not been supported by all delegations, including those dealing with assistance to national liberation movements, national laws and regulations on technology transfer (p.753), ECDC and vessel registration.

The United States, which abstained in the vote on the resolution, regretted that the Group of 77 had departed from the UNCTAD tradition by pressing for a vote on questions on which no consensus had been achieved and considered it wrong for the Assembly to re-examine matters already dealt with in UNCTAD.

Reservations were also voiced with regard to the provisions on: assistance to national liberation movements (Israel, United States); multilateral trade relations (United States); the international monetary system (European Community (EC) members, Japan, Sweden, United States); debt problems of developing countries (EC members, United States); ECDC (Israel, United States); and transport conventions (EC members, Japan).

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.65.

Resolution: (2)GA, 36/145, 16 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 40, 47, 48 (24 Sep.-11 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/145

118-0-23 (recorded vote) Meeting 100 16 December 1981  
Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.3) by recorded vote (100-0-23). 11 December (meeting 48); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.154), based on informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.65); agenda item 69 (c).

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development  
The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of

Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII), of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation.

Recalling a/so its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Deeply concerned about the continuing economic crisis, particularly in the developing countries, and the very limited progress in the areas of development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling resolution 127(V) of 3 June 1979 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development on economic co-operation among developing countries, in particular paragraph 13, and in this context the convening of the meeting to be held in 1982 of governmental experts of developing countries in economic co-operation among developing countries to finalize and approve the rules for the launching of negotiations to establish the global system of trade preferences,

1. Takes note of the report of the Trade and Development Board on its twenty-second and twenty-third sessions;

2. Takes note of Trade and Development Board resolution 238(XXIII), of 9 October 1981, entitled "Assistance to national liberation movements recognized by regional intergovernmental organizations: Namibia and South Africa";

3. Also takes note of Trade and Development Board resolution 239(XXIII) of 9 October 1981, entitled "Assistance to national liberation movements recognized by regional intergovernmental organizations: Palestine";

4. Takes note with appreciation of the initiative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in preparing, on an annual basis, a trade and development report to assist the Trade and Development Board in its consideration of the world economic situation and of medium-term and longer-term structural changes;

5. Takes note with interest of the intention of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to provide an in-depth study of the world inflationary phenomenon in response to General Assembly resolution 34/197 of 19 December 1979 and of the agreement that the Trade and Development Board would consider the report at its twenty-fifth session;

6. Welcomes Trade and Development Board resolution 226(XXII), of 20 March 1981, entitled "Protectionism and structural adjustment" by which the Board decided to establish a sessional committee at its twenty-fourth session, and annually thereafter at its first regular session:

(a) To conduct the annual review of the patterns of production and trade in the world economy, as provided for in section A of resolution 131 (V) of 3 June 1979 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development;

(b) To continue to review, along with the subsidiary bodies of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development concerned, developments involving restrictions of trade, as provided for in section B of Conference resolution 131 (V), with a view to examining and formulating appropriate recommendations concerning the general problem of protectionism;

7. Stresses the need to review developments in international trade, including those arising from the implementation of the results of the multilateral trade negotiations, and, in this context, emphasizes that the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development has an important role to play in considering multilateral trade in general and in formulating principles and policies relating thereto, and notes that proposals in this context are to be further examined at the twenty-fourth session of the Trade and Development Board;

8. Reaffirms the importance of the generalized, non-reciprocal and non-discriminatory system of preferences for expansion and diversification of the export trade of developing countries and for acceleration of the rates of their

economic growth and, to that end, of the preference-giving countries' Implementing fully the agreement reached at its ninth session by the Special Committee on Preferences of the Trade and Development Board;

9. Recalls Its resolution 35/60 of 5 December 1980, notes with concern the delay in convening the second session of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental High-level Group of Experts on the Evolution of the International Monetary System, requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to convene the second session of the Group as early as possible in 1982, urges all States members of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to participate and requests that the report of the Group, together with the comments of the Trade and Development Board thereon, should be made available to the General Assembly at Its thirty-seventh session;

10. Urges developed countries to seek to continue to adopt retroactive adjustment of terms, or equivalent measures, in accordance with Trade and Development Board resolutions 165(S-IX) of 11 March 1978 and 222(XXI) Of 27 September 1980 on the debt and development problems of developing countries, and strongly urges donor countries which have not already done so to implement fully and immediately section A of Board resolution 165(S-IX);

11. Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to continue, in accordance with Trade and Development Board resolution 165(S-IX), to keep under close review the application of the detailed features set out in Board resolution 222(XXI) for further action relating to the debt problems of the developing countries, and urges the implementation of Board resolution 222(XXI), bearing in mind, as set out in paragraph 15 of that resolution, the agreement to review, at the twenty-sixth session of the Trade and Development Board, the arrangements agreed to in section B of that resolution;

12. Welcomes Trade and Development Board resolution 243(XXIII) of 9 October 1981, on trade relations among countries having different economic and social systems and all trade flows resulting therefrom, and invites the Trade and Development Board to continue Its efforts with a view to arriving at comprehensive decisions in this area at its twenty-fifth session;

13. Endorses Trade and Development Board resolution 242(XXIII) of 9 October 1981, by which the Board requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in consultation with the appropriate bodies, to prepare an action-oriented study on the co-operative exchange of skills, and to submit the study, through the Trade and Development Board, to the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries at its third session;

14. Welcomes Trade and Development Board resolutions 230(XXII) of 20 March 1981 and 241 (XXIII) of 9 October 1981, by which the Board decided to convene meetings of governmental experts to identify and examine in-depth problems and issues concerning the transfer, application and development of technology in the food processing, capital goods, industrial machinery and energy sectors, and urges all Governments and competent international organizations to participate actively in these meetings in co-operation with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and other appropriate United Nations bodies;

15. Recalls resolution 127(V) of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and, in that context, requests the secretariat of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to intensify and complete its work in the priority areas indicated in resolution 1 (I) of 9 May 1977 of the Committee on Economic Co-operation among Developing Countries, and especially in the areas of trade information systems regarding the foreign trade of developing countries, state trading organizations of developing countries, multinational production and marketing enterprises, a global system of trade preferences among developing countries and

monetary and financial co-operation among developing countries, which will underpin the process of economic co-operation among those countries;

16. Calls upon all countries that have not yet done so to consider becoming contracting parties to the United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences, adopted on 6 April 1974, and to the United Nations Convention on International Multimodal Transport of Goods, adopted on 24 May 1980;

17. Notes the adoption by the Trade and Development Board of the report of the Committee on Shipping on Its third special session, which contained a resolution calling for the convening of an Intergovernmental preparatory group on conditions of registration of vessels;

18. Takes note of the programme of work of the Committee on Commodities, endorsed by the Trade and Development Board at Its twenty-second session, in pursuance of resolutions 93(IV) of 30 May 1976 and 124(V) of 3 June 1979 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, on the Integrated Programme for Commodities;

19. Also takes note of the agreement reached on a series of measures designed to rationalize permanent machinery of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, contained in Trade and Development Board resolution 231 (XXII) of 20 March 1981, and urges its full implementation.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

#### Medium-term plan for 1984-1989

The UNCTAD section of the United Nations medium-term plan for 1984-1989, drafted by the UNCTAD Secretary-General,<sup>(\*)</sup> was examined by the Trade and Development Board's Working Party on the Medium-term Plan and the Programme Budget at its fourth session, held at Geneva from 26 October to 3 November 1981.<sup>(3)</sup>

Within the wide range of issues before UNCTAD, covering virtually the whole institutional framework of international economic relations, the draft plan emphasized three areas subsequently identified by the Board as the main issues to be considered by the 1983 session of the Conference (p. 536): commodities (p. 550), trade policy (p. 539), and financial and monetary matters (p. 557).

In the Working Party, regional groups expressed differing views regarding the relative importance of various issues identified in the plan, and also regarding the extent to which the draft plan should be revised. Consequently, it recommended that the Board inform the relevant United Nations organs that it had been unable to establish agreed relative priorities for the various subprogrammes. It also recommended that the UNCTAD Secretary-General be authorized to revise the draft plan in the light of the Working Party's discussions. The Board adopted these recommendations on 4 November.<sup>(2)</sup>

Proposed medium-term plan: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCTAD S-G, TD/B/WP/17 & Add.1.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB, A/36/15; <sup>(3)</sup>Working Party on Medium-term Plan and Programme Budget, TD/B/882.

#### Technical co-operation

The technical co-operation activities of UNCTAD in 1981 were aimed at strengthening the external sector of developing countries, especially the least developed, land-locked and island developing countries, with a view to achieving better planning, monitoring and control. They also sought to foster economic co-operation among developing countries (ECDC) (p. 383), introduce improved trade mechanisms, procedures and supporting services, and enhance the effective participation of developing countries in international deliberations and negotiations.

Projects dealt with trade policies and planning of the external sectors, including assistance in regard to multilateral trade negotiations (p. 540) and trade among countries having different economic and social systems (p. 541); money, finance and development (p. 558); trade in manufactures and semi-manufactures; the generalized system of preferences (p. 547); trade in commodities and support to the Integrated Programme for Commodities; support to economic integration groupings; special problems of least developed, land-locked and island developing countries; economic and commercial aspects of maritime transport (p. 567), including international multimodal transport; technology transfer (p. 754); insurance and reinsurance (p. 564); and trade facilitation and documentation (p. 549). Under the United Nations regular programme of technical co-operation, advisory services were provided in support of ECDC, mainly for short-term assistance to economic integration movements on trade expansion programmes, techniques of trade liberalization, monetary and payment arrangements, and investment programmes. Another activity of UNCTAD in 1981 was the organization of regional workshops on commodities.

Total project expenditures incurred by UNCTAD in 1981 amounted to \$19,416,000 exclusive of expenditures by the International Trade Centre, which provided technical co-operation for trade promotion (p. 547). The programme was characterized by: a continuing high proportion of intercountry projects (about 75 per cent); a close relationship between the research, policy analysis and negotiating functions of the secretariat and the substantive content of technical co-operation activities; and the prominence of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in its financing (85.5 per cent) (p. 431).

Information on UNCTAD technical co-operation activities was submitted by the secretariat to the Trade and Development Board in July 1981<sup>(2)</sup> and by the United Nations Secretary-General to the UNDP Governing Council in April 1982.<sup>(1)</sup> These activities and their financing were reviewed at the October/November session of the Working Party on the Medium-term Plan and the Programme Budget.<sup>(3)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, DP/1982/22 & Add.1; <sup>(2)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/WP/16 & Corr.1. & Corr.1/Rev.1; <sup>(3)</sup>Working Party on Medium-term Plan and Programme Budget, TD/B/882.

#### Organizational questions

##### Rationalization of institutional machinery

The Trade and Development Board agreed on 20 March 1981 to a series of measures designed to rationalize the machinery of UNCTAD, including the Conference, the Board and its committees and the services of the secretariat. The resolution setting out these measures<sup>(5)</sup> was the outcome of a review initiated by the Conference in 1979,<sup>(6)</sup> conducted from November 1979 to February 1980 by the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Committee on the Rationalization of UNCTAD's Machinery<sup>(7)</sup> and completed by the Board.

The Board identified seven main tasks for sessions of the Conference: to promote, direct and facilitate the work of UNCTAD machinery; to achieve solutions in negotiations facing deadlock within UNCTAD; to review developments and long-term trends in international trade and related areas of international economic co-operation; to act on recommendations by the UNCTAD machinery; to generate new ideas; to set guidelines and launch programmes; and to assess progress in implementing Conference decisions. Two alternatives were suggested with a view to utilizing the presence of ministers at the Conference:

(a) the first week or days might be devoted to meetings of high-level officials who would prepare a document identifying issues requiring ministerial decision, on which the ministers

would negotiate; (b) the Board might prepare a negotiating document for ministers to bear in mind when addressing the Conference.

The Board decided with regard to its own functions that: it should deal with issues that had reached an impasse in other UNCTAD bodies; its co-ordinating functions should be strengthened so that it could give its subsidiary bodies more effective guidance and ensure the coherence of their activities; it should decide how to achieve effective evaluation of UNCTAD activities; and it should devote most of the time at its two annual sessions to deliberation and negotiation on a few carefully selected substantive issues.

New arrangements were envisaged for strengthening the negotiating role of the Board's main committees and for grouping meetings of different committees when they dealt with inter-related questions, scheduling them when possible in a six-month period prior to a Board session. They were asked to consider reducing the number of their subsidiary bodies. The Working Party on the Medium-term Plan and the Programme Budget was requested to prepare recommendations for the Board in 1982 on ways of improving its effectiveness.

The Board decided to build an informal consultative mechanism consisting of monthly meetings among States, or between them and the UNCTAD Secretary-General, to obtain information and discuss substantive matters on the agenda of forthcoming meetings, exchange views on problems arising from negotiations in UNCTAD and prepare organizational aspects of meetings.

It was decided to make less use of groups of experts chosen in their personal capacity and greater use of experts nominated by Governments. The UNCTAD Secretary-General was requested to strengthen research on long-term issues and develop new ideas for consideration by intergovernmental UNCTAD bodies. He was also asked to issue to Governments at Geneva, at least twice a year, a list of personnel vacancies and to report on the feasibility of producing a daily bulletin on the public meetings of UNCTAD. Other measures concerned the calendar of UNCTAD meetings and documentation, translation and interpretation (p. 538).

Along with this resolution, the Board adopted two decisions on the calendar of its meetings 'and on supplementary conference services (p. 538).

In October, the UNCTAD Secretary-General informed the Board <sup>(2)</sup> that, as it had requested in March, periodic listings of personnel vacancies would be circulated to UNCTAD member States beginning in November. Regarding the proposal

for a daily bulletin on UNCTAD meetings, after receiving the secretariat's feasibility report and financial implications,<sup>(3)</sup> the Board decided on 7 October not to pursue the matter.

The General Assembly in its resolution of 16 December on UNCTAD,<sup>(4)</sup> took note of the agreement reached on measures to rationalize the UNCTAD machinery and urged its full implementation. This provision was added to the earlier version of the draft resolution, submitted by Algeria for the Group of 77 and later withdrawn<sup>(1)</sup> which made no reference to the topic.

In the debate in the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on development and international economic co-operation, Australia thought that UNCTAD should allow more scope for informal discussion so that possible common ground could be explored before group positions hardened. Endorsing the Board's resolution on rationalization of machinery, Mongolia said the role of UNCTAD should be strengthened on the basis of universality and the rational use of the main committees, which would obviate the need to convene so many groups of experts. The United States said it had been dismayed to see a majority, over the opposition of a minority, decide to force resolutions through the Board, a development that could damage the credibility of those measures and of the Board.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.65.

Note: <sup>(2)</sup>UNCTAD S-G, TD/B/L.595 & Add.1.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/L.596.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/145, para. 19, 16 Dec. (p. 534); (S)TDB (report, A/36/15), 231 (XXII), 20 Mar.

Yearbook references: <sup>(6)</sup>1979, p. 571; <sup>(7)</sup>1980, p. 635.

#### Preparations for the 1983 session of the Conference

On the recommendation of the Trade and Development Board, the General Assembly decided without vote on 16 December 1981 to convene the sixth session of UNCTAD at Libreville, Gabon, in May/June 1983, preceded by a two-day meeting of senior officials there.<sup>(3)</sup> The draft resolution, sponsored by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77, was approved without vote by the Second Committee on 2 November.

In 1979 Cuba had offered to serve as host to the session, and later that year the Assembly had requested the Board to recommend the place, date and duration of the session, bearing Cuba's offer in mind.<sup>(2)</sup> In March 1981, the Board deferred a decision after Cuba repeated its offer and the United States said it would not attend a session at Havana. <sup>(1)</sup>

In October, the President of the Board announced that the Latin American Group had decided that the seventh session of the Conference should be held in a Latin American country

and wished the sixth session to be held in Africa. The Board endorsed this decision on 8 October, (" on the understanding that the final decision on a Latin American venue would be taken at the right time and in the right place. It noted with interest the desire of Cuba to host the seventh session. The Board agreed in principle to recommend to the Assembly that the sixth session be held in a member State of the African Group, with the venue to be decided by the Board in November in the light of any offer received by then.

Before placing the decision before the Board, the President said that, during his unofficial negotiations, there had been unanimous agreement by all parties on two basic principles: the legal right of any United Nations Member State to host a United Nations conference such as UNCTAD, and the need to preserve the universality and world-wide character of UNCTAD, giving all members an equal chance to take part. After the decision was taken, Cuba said that it rejected United States attempts to dictate the venue for international meetings and that its offer to host the seventh session of UNCTAD must be given preference. The President said he had not felt that the United States had tried to impose any opinions; it had agreed without hesitation that every Member State had the right to host a United Nations conference such as UNCTAD.

On 5 November <sup>(4)</sup> the Board, in the light of an offer by Gabon dated 22 October, recommended to the Assembly that the session be held at Libreville (the offer was withdrawn in 1982). The Board also decided that the agenda should be selective, supported by concise, action-oriented documents, and that the session should be so organized as to ensure the attendance of ministers and other high-level policy-makers and to permit all delegations to contribute effectively to decision-making.

Endorsing this recommendation and decision in December, the Assembly requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to inform it in 1982 of the state of preparations for the session.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>34/196, para. 26, 19 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 578); (3)36/142, 16 Dec. 1981, text following. <sup>(4)</sup>TDB: 245(XXIII), 5 Nov.

Decision: <sup>(5)</sup>TDB: 237(XXIII), 8 Oct.

Meeting records: CA: 2nd Committee. A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 40, 42 (24 Sep.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/142

Adopted without vote Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.3) without vote. 20 November (meeting 42): draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.66); agenda item 69 (C).

#### Sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 1995(XIX) of 30 December 1964, as amended, 3201 (S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974 and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975.

Recalling a/so its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recalling further its resolution 34/196 of 19 December 1979, in which it requested the Trade and Development Board, at its twenty-first session, to recommend the place, date and duration of the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development,

Bearing in mind its resolution 31/140 of 17 December 1976 on the pattern of conferences and also bearing in mind the communication dated 22 October 1981 received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development from the Government of Gabon,

Taking note of Trade and Development Board decision 237(XXIII) of 8 October 1981, by which the Board endorsed the decision taken by the Latin American countries to hold the seventh session of the Conference in one of those countries on the understanding that the final decision on the venue in Latin America would be taken at the right time and in the right place, and noting with interest the desire of Cuba to act as host to the seventh session of the Conference,

Taking note further of Trade and Development Board resolution 245 (XXIII) of 5 November 1981, in which the Board recommended that the sixth session of the Conference should be held at Libreville in May/June 1983,

1. We/comes the offer of the Government of Gabon to act as host to the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at Libreville;

2. Decides to convene the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at Libreville in May/June 1983, to be preceded by a two-day meeting of senior officials at Libreville;

3. Endorses the decision of the Trade and Development Board that the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development should have a selective agenda supported by concise action-oriented documents and should be so organized as to ensure the attendance of ministers and other high-level policy makers and to permit all delegations to contribute effectively to its decision-making process;

4. Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to inform the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session of the state of preparedness for the sixth session of the Conference.

#### Calendar of UNCTAD meetings for 1981-1982

In 1981, the calendar of UNCTAD meetings for the year in progress and subsequent years was reviewed by the Trade and Development Board on four occasions.<sup>(1)</sup>

On 20 March, <sup>(3)</sup> the Board approved a revised calendar of meetings for the remainder of 1981 and a tentative schedule for 1982. On 12 May, it noted that the United Nations Tin Conference, 1980, would be reconvened in June 1981 (p. 553); agreed that exceptions to the principle that no more than two simultaneous UNCTAD meetings should be held could be authorized if it appeared necessary in the light of the timing of the Board's sessions; and agreed that arrangements to facilitate the observance of Islamic holidays which fell during an UNCTAD meeting

would be the subject of agreement among delegations.

A revised calendar of meetings for the remainder of 1981 and for 1982 and a tentative schedule for 1983 were approved on 9 October.<sup>(4)</sup> On 6 November, the Board made adjustments to the 1982 calendar,<sup>(5)</sup> including provision for the Meeting of Governmental Experts of Developing Countries on Economic Co-operation among Developing Countries (p. 383) and the Intergovernmental Group of Experts on an Export Credit Guarantee Facility (p. 562).

To make meetings more productive and allow sufficient time for preparations, the Board, in its resolution of 20 March<sup>(2)</sup> on rationalization of UNCTAD machinery (p. 535), adopted the following principles concerning the calendar of meetings: no more than two simultaneous UNCTAD meetings should be held, save in exceptional cases and upon explicit request by the bodies concerned; once a calendar was approved, every effort should be made to adhere to it; a stable schedule of meetings should be re-established, and steps should be taken for the most efficient use of the time allocated for meetings.

The Board also took action on the calendar of its own meetings (see below).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB: 231 (XXII), 20 Mar.

Decisions: TDB: <sup>(3)</sup>235(XXII), 20 Mar.; <sup>(4)</sup>244 (XXIII), 9 Oct.; <sup>(5)</sup>246(XXIII), 6 Nov.

#### Conference and meeting services

Improved documentation, translation and interpretation services for UNCTAD meetings were requested by the Board in its resolution of 20 March 1981<sup>(2)</sup> on rationalization of UNCTAD machinery (p. 535). The Board decided that meetings should not normally be held if documents were not available, that attempts should be made to identify redundant documentation and that documents should be action-oriented and concise. Pre-session documents should reach Governments six weeks in advance of a meeting; during sessions, documents should be translated expeditiously and delivered simultaneously in all relevant languages. Weekend and night meetings should be held only exceptionally; if they were unavoidable, interpretation and translation services should be available. The Board requested that, over time, sufficient conference rooms in the Palais des Nations at Geneva should be equipped for six-language interpretation.

Also on 20 March, the Board requested that supplementary conference services for UNCTAD continue to be provided, to the extent possible within existing resources, and decided to review the situation in 1982. <sup>(3)</sup> These services, as de-

scribed in a report to the Board by the UNCTAD Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> had been instituted in April 1980 by the United Nations Office at Geneva to improve the availability of in-session documentation for UNCTAD meetings, especially those held at night. The report concluded that a possible alternative arrangement, involving a task force of translators assigned specifically to UNCTAD meetings, would be much more costly.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCTAD S-G, TD/B/840.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15, 231(XXII), 20 Mar. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>TDB, 233(XXII), 20 Mar.

#### Relations with intergovernmental organizations

The Trade and Development Board in 1981 designated four additional intergovernmental organizations at their request, to participate in the work of UNCTAD: the Arab Monetary Fund, the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration, and the Ministerial Conference of West and Central African States on Maritime Transport, designated on 17 March, and the Arab Fund for Technical Assistance for African and Arab Countries, designated on 12 May.<sup>(1)</sup> This brought the number of intergovernmental organizations participating in the work of UNCTAD to 87.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB A/36/15.

#### Trade and Development Board

Calendar of Board meetings. The Trade and Development Board, on 20 March 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to report on possible ways for it to comply with a General Assembly instruction of November 1980<sup>(2)</sup> that all subsidiary organs of the Assembly should complete their reports to the Assembly by 1 September and report any subsequent activity in addenda. Taking into account the possible conflict between that instruction and the timing of its two regular annual sessions, the Board asked him, if necessary, to explore the matter with the United Nations Secretary-General, bearing in mind the schedule of other United Nations meetings at Geneva.

The Board, on 7 October,<sup>(1)</sup> decided that in 1982 it would hold its twenty-fourth session in March and its twenty-fifth session at the beginning of September, and that in 1983 it would hold one session before the sixth session of the Conference, scheduled for May/June 1983 (p. 536), and one session after the Conference. The matter raised by the Assembly would be referred to the Conference at its sixth session.

In the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, during the debate on development and international economic co-operation, the Philippines suggested that the Board might meet at the ministerial level in 1982.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 35/10 A, A, para. 4, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p.1225). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>TDB, 232(XXII), 20 Mar. 1981.

Report of the Board. The Economic and Social Council, on 21 October, 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> authorized the United Nations Secretary-General to transmit directly to the General Assembly the report of the Trade and Development Board, covering its two 1981 sessions. <sup>(1)</sup> The Assembly took note of the report in its resolution of 16 December on UNCTAD.<sup>(2)</sup>

Report: (1)TDB, A/36/15.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/145, para. 1, 16 Dec. (p. 533). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/193, para. (b) 21 Oct. (p. 1091).

## Trade policy

### Multilateral trade relations

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD CONSIDERATION. The Trade and Development Board, at both of its 1981 sessions, <sup>(3)</sup>continued its examination of the results of the multilateral trade negotiations (Tokyo Round) concluded in 1979 within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT),<sup>(6)</sup> and the implementation of those results. As in 1980,<sup>(7)</sup> the Board was unable to reach agreed conclusions. Accordingly, it remitted the matter to its March 1982 session.

A note by the UNCTAD secretariat,<sup>(2)</sup> prepared for the Board at its March 1981 session, reviewed 1980 developments. It indicated that the tariff concessions agreed upon in the negotiations had generally been implemented, and that agreements on some non-tariff measures and arrangements on particular products were all being applied following the entry into force on 1 January 1981 of agreements on customs evaluation and government procurement. The major unresolved issue was that of the multilateral safeguard system, which defined circumstances under which countries could take emergency action of a non-discriminatory character to restrict imports of particular products when they caused or threatened serious injury to domestic producers.

During the Board's discussion in March, the Group of 77, pointing to the numerous unresolved issues, expressed dissatisfaction with the results of the negotiations and argued that the matter should remain on the Board's agenda. Group D (centrally planned economies) agreed that the subject should be kept open. However, Group B (developed market economies) believed that consideration of the subject as a separate agenda item should be concluded. The Board decided to consider the item further in October.

In August the UNCTAD secretariat submitted a report <sup>(4)</sup> which focused on the difficulties of as-

sessing the negotiations. It noted that the formal conclusion of the Tokyo Round had been only one stage of a continuing process. Moreover, action to implement the various arrangements and agreements at national and regional levels differed and, in some instances, was unclear. Until implementing procedures in the signatory countries were completed, it was not possible fully to evaluate the results. Nevertheless, the net effect of the tariff cuts on developing countries appeared to have been negative in terms of potential trade expansion. The negotiations had afforded a good opportunity to review the rules of the international trading system but, apart from certain changes, little had been done to pave the way for a unified, universal system.

Presenting this evaluation to the Board in October, a representative of the UNCTAD Secretary-General identified four changes in the international trading system since the start of the Tokyo Round in 1973: the importance of fixed measures of protection, especially customs duties, had declined, while the incidence of those which remained tended to be greater on imports from developing countries; greater reliance was placed on mechanisms of flexible protection, under which restrictions or other measures could be applied when specific conditions existed; the interpretation of criteria and terms had been influenced by a tendency towards what had been termed "managed" trade; and unconditional most-favoured-nation treatment had ceased to be the guiding principle of international trade relations. Basic contradictions in the system had to be resolved if international trade was to continue to grow and provide the means of accelerating economic development.

Gabon submitted a draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 calling for an annual review by the Board of developments in the international trading system covering, in particular, the rules and principles governing its functioning. On the basis of that review, the Board would formulate suggestions and take decisions on improvements in the system. The draft was supported by Group D and China, but Group B asked that the matter be deferred to the next session pending a study of certain aspects of the proposed review, including its scope and its relationship to other UNCTAD work. In view of the lack of agreement, the Board decided on 9 October that the question of multilateral trade negotiations, together with the draft resolution and the statement by the representative of the UNCTAD Secretary-General, should be remitted to its March 1982 session.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In its resolution of 16 December on UNCTAD,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly stressed the need to review developments

in international trade, including those arising from implementation of the results of the multilateral trade negotiations; emphasized the importance of the UNCTAD role in considering multilateral trade and formulating principles and policies relating thereto; and noted that proposals in that context were to be further examined by the Board in 1982. The corresponding paragraph of an earlier draft,<sup>(1)</sup> submitted by Algeria for the Group of 77, contained different language referring to the need for continuous assessment of the operation of the international trade system with a view to achieving improved efficiency, equitability and transparency in its operation.

In the debate in the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on development and international economic co-operation, several countries spoke of prospects for a ministerial meeting of the Contracting Parties to GATT, projected for 1982. Australia welcomed plans for the meeting but said it was by no means certain that the real problems of primary producers in the non-industrialized world would be addressed. Austria and Portugal hoped the meeting would deal with the current protectionist trend. Finland, on behalf of the Nordic States, hoped the meeting would result in a commitment to resist protectionism, solve problems remaining from the multilateral trade negotiations, promote new trade liberalization measures, and take account of the growing role of developing countries in international trade and the need to promote their integration into the multilateral trade system. The Philippines suggested that the meeting be held in a developing country instead of Geneva, its usual location.

Canada said the GATT system was sufficiently flexible and pragmatic to adapt to the needs of developing countries and would be strengthened by their participation in greater numbers. The United States believed that GATT should be the body which played a fundamental role in the formulation of trade policies and principles. The USSR said the UNCTAD secretariat must carry out strictly the 1980 Board decision calling for a global evaluation of the multilateral trade negotiations,<sup>(7)</sup> which the capitalist States were trying to obstruct.

Work on implementation of the Tokyo Round agreements continued during 1981 under the auspices of GATT (p. 1482).

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.65.

Note: (2)UNCTAD secretariat TD/B/838 & Corr.1.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>TDB, A/36/15; <sup>(4)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/861.

Resolution: (5)GA. 36/145, para. 7, 16 Dec. (p.533).

Yearbook references: <sup>(6)</sup>1979,p. 1328; (7)1980 p. 628.

#### Technical co-operation

The UNCTAD programme of support to developing countries in the area of multilateral trade negotiations\ continued throughout 1981, responding to requests from developing countries for technical assistance aimed at increasing their ability to benefit from their participation in negotiations and consultations with developed countries and at formulating their trade policies in the context of the new legal structure emanating from the negotiations and related developments. These activities included: collection, processing and refining of data on imports by the 11 main developed country markets and on trade barriers affecting access of developing countries' products to those markets; analysis of issues relating to acceptance of instruments emerging from the multilateral trade negotiations and implementation of the results of those negotiations; consultations with and advice to Governments on trade policy issues in the period following the negotiations; and provision of technical support to seminars held to evaluate the results of the negotiations and current developments in trade relations.

The Trade and Development Board, on 20 March, requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General and invited the United Nations Development Programme to continue the programme of assistance to developing countries in the consultations and negotiations on unresolved issues of the multilateral trade negotiations of particular interest to them.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15), 229(XXII), 20 Mar.

#### Trade among countries having different economic and social systems

In a report of August 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNCTAD secretariat described the continued expansion of trade among countries having different economic and social systems. In 1980, the total trade of the socialist countries of Eastern Europe as a group had increased in value by 14.2 per cent, a higher growth rate than in 1978 and 1979. Their trade had been particularly dynamic with the developing countries, rising by 33.7 per cent in 1980 compared with 1979, a much higher rate than in the case of their trade with the developed market-economy countries (14.4 per cent) and trade among themselves (9.9 per cent).

In July and August 1981, the UNCTAD secretariat issued studies on trends, policies and prospects in trade and economic co-operation between Peru and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe;<sup>(4)</sup> trade and economic relations between some Asian developing countries and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe;<sup>(5)</sup> and trade policies, developments and institutional framework of the German Democratic Republic.<sup>(6)</sup>



Following a review by its Sessional Committee II of trends and policies in this area, the Trade and Development Board, on 9 October, October,<sup>(3)</sup> requested States to continue efforts to expand trade relations among countries having different economic and social systems, bearing in mind the necessity to promote the economic development of developing countries.

The Board continued efforts to draft a comprehensive resolution on this subject, but a number of points remained unsettled. A Group of 77 spokesman stated that it had proved impossible to reach consensus on the question of financial assistance by the socialist countries of Eastern Europe to developing countries. The Board decided to continue consideration of the draft in 1982 on the basis of an incomplete text worked out in a contact group of Sessional Committee II and annexed to its resolution of 9 October. This draft contained provisions calling for the further expansion of East-West trade and trade between developing countries and socialist countries of Eastern Europe, as well as for intensified secretariat work in this area, including technical co-operation (see below).

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 16 December on UNCTAD,<sup>(2)</sup> welcomed the Board's 9 October resolution and invited it to continue efforts with a view to arriving at comprehensive decisions in 1982.

In the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, during the debate on development and international economic co-operation, Bulgaria described the normalization of commercial ties between East and West as the basis for the development of just and democratic international trade relations for the greater well-being of all countries. The Byelorussian SSR said UNCTAD must examine not only trade between socialist and developing countries but also East-West trade. The German Democratic Republic stated that protectionist practices by certain capitalist industrialized countries were adversely affecting trade between States with different social systems. Hungary said it attached great importance to trade relations, not only with its socialist partners but with the developed capitalist and developing countries.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/859.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/145, para. 12, 16 Dec. (p. 534);

<sup>(3)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15), 243(XXIII), 9 Oct.

Studies: UNCTAD secretariat. <sup>(4)</sup>TD/B/856 & Corr.1, <sup>(5)</sup>TD/B/857 & Corr.1, <sup>(6)</sup>TD/B/858.

Technical co-operation. A comprehensive programme of technical co-operation for the development of trade between socialist countries of Eastern Europe and developing countries, organized jointly by the UNCTAD secretariat and the United Nations Development Programme, was

expanded in 1981 following its inauguration in 1980. Prepared and carried out in collaboration with United Nations regional commissions and the International Trade Centre (p. 547), the programme took the form chiefly of interregional, regional and national seminars and workshops, which enabled more than 200 officials and business representatives from 50 developing countries to deepen their knowledge of policies and practices of trade with the Eastern European countries and the opportunities for developing trade and economic co-operation between the two groups of countries.

In its resolution of 9 October 1981<sup>(1)</sup> on trade among countries having different economic and social systems (see above), the Trade and Development Board stressed the importance of continuing UNCTAD technical assistance in trade between developing countries and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe with a view to ensuring support for technical assistance projects, particularly by expanding and improving advisory services to developing countries.

Resolution: (1)TDB (report, A/36/15), 243(XXIII), 9 Oct.

#### Trade restrictions

##### Protectionism and structural adjustment

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD ACTION. On 20 March 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> the Trade and Development Board decided to establish a sessional committee, beginning in 1982, to carry out work in two areas which the Conference, in 1979, had asked the Board to keep under review in relation to protectionism and structural adjustment in international trade.<sup>(8)</sup> The committee was to meet during the Board's first regular session of each year: (1) to carry out an annual review of patterns of production and trade in the world economy, with a view to identifying elements and problems relevant to the attainment of optimum economic growth, including the development and diversification of the economies of developing countries and an effective international division of labour; and (2), along with other UNCTAD bodies, to review developments involving trade restrictions with a view to examining and formulating recommendations on protectionism. The UNCTAD Secretary-General was requested to submit studies on both aspects.

The Board also considered a report on protectionism in the services sector, with particular reference to air transport (p. 568).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In its resolution of 16 December 1981 on UNCTAD,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly welcomed the Board's resolution. This text omitted a phrase in the original draft, submitted by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 but later withdrawn,<sup>(\*)</sup> stating that the Board's

resolution had been adopted in the light of increased protectionist measures by developed countries adversely affecting the trade and development of developing countries.

Also on 16 December, the Assembly adopted without vote a decision <sup>(7)</sup> referring to its 1982 session a draft resolution by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77, dealing with trade restrictions by developed countries, structural adjustment and the international division of labour, and the reviews to be conducted by the Trade and Development Board.<sup>(2)</sup> The draft was annexed to the decision, which was approved without vote on 10 December by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on an oral proposal by its Chairman. Also transmitted to the 1982 session by this decision was a synoptic table containing suggestions by some developed countries for changes in the draft.

The Group of 77 text was a revised version of a 1980 draft by that Group<sup>(3)</sup> which the Assembly had transmitted to its 1981 session.®) Re-introducing it in 1981, Algeria stated that minor changes had been made to bring the 1980 text up to date. The recommendation to transmit the text to the 1982 session was taken after a Vice-Chairman of the Committee announced that the Group of 77 had been unable to secure consensus on the text because of the large number of amendments and the shortage of time.

Concerning trade restrictions, this text would have the Assembly urge developed countries to adhere to standstill provisions they had accepted by refraining from introducing new tariff and non-tariff barriers affecting developing country exports, and to reduce tariff escalation so as to improve market access for processed and manufactured products. Developed countries would also be called on to eliminate tariff and non-tariff barriers, particularly quantitative restrictions and other measures having an equivalent effect on developing country exports.

The United States supported the call for adherence to standstill provisions, while the European Community (EC) preferred to have the Assembly welcome commitments in this regard made by countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Finland and EC suggested that the calls to reduce tariff escalation and eliminate trade barriers be deleted. The United States, on the other hand, suggested that developed countries be called on to seek ways to move towards reducing quantitative restrictions and other measures having equivalent effect, particularly in relation to products exported by developing countries, and to co-operate in exploring whether there remained areas of tariff escalation where reductions might improve access to products of export interest to

developing countries. Sweden suggested that developed countries be asked to seek to reduce barriers rather than eliminate them.

With regard to structural adjustment and the international division of labour, the Group of 77 text stated that the international community, in particular the developed countries, should facilitate structural adjustment by efforts for accelerated and sustained growth of the developing countries, including economic development and diversification and an effective international division of labour involving both interindustry and intra-industry specialization, enabling developing countries to increase their share of world trade, processed goods and manufacturing. Developed countries would be called on to implement long-term industrial structural adjustment policies with a view to facilitating the establishment of an equitable and effective international division of labour.

The United States suggested three changes: to remove the phrase "in particular the developed countries" from the statement that the international community should facilitate structural adjustment; to remove "of the developing countries" from the goal of accelerated and sustained growth; and to revise the paragraph on an international division of labour by stating that developed countries should allow market-place decisions to proceed without interference with a view to facilitating the establishment of an efficient international division of labour. Finland objected to the reference only to developed countries.

Concerning the reviews by a sessional committee of the Trade and Development Board, the Group of 77 text would have the committee undertake sectoral reviews within the framework of the annual review of patterns of production and trade, continuously review developments involving trade restrictions against developing country exports and ensure that the latter review also dealt with the evolution of industrial capacity in developed countries in order to recommend measures that would avoid protectionist demands there.

The United States suggested, in place of this paragraph, that States be called on to review developments involving trade restrictions affecting developing country exports, including restrictions by other developing countries, while examining structural adjustments in developing countries which would facilitate the transition from import substitution to export promotion to take advantage of improved market access. In the view of EC, the Assembly should simply note the mandate already given by the Board to the sessional committee.

The dangers of protectionism were cited by a number of speakers in the Second Committee's

discussion of development and international economic co-operation. Among developing countries, Costa Rica remarked that free trade in goods and services was essential to the developing countries' indigenous development processes and their capacity to repay loans. The Philippines hoped the report on this subject to be prepared by UNCTAD would quantify the adverse effects of protectionism on the economies of developing countries. Protectionism, said Uruguay, destroyed workers' income, sacrificed consumers' interests and gave rise to inefficiency which caused greater stagnation and further deterioration of the economic situation.

Tunisia remarked that a number of developing or recently industrialized countries had been forced to review their investment or equipment programmes because of protectionist measures adopted by developed countries. The United Republic of Cameroon viewed protectionism as a major obstacle to the agricultural and industrial development of the third world.

The Lao People's Democratic Republic said the protectionist policies of developed countries against the products of developing countries led the latter to wonder whether the current international economic system did not condemn them to perpetual exploitation by the capitalist nations. Zimbabwe attributed the unfair economic situation to application of the capitalist theory of comparative advantage, whereby developing countries exported commodities and imported manufactures made from those commodities; as a result, the terms of trade had declined at an unprecedented rate.

Afghanistan asked developed countries and the most advanced developing countries to do away with protectionist policies and grant non-reciprocal tariff concessions to the least developed and land-locked countries. The Gambia saw a need to remove artificial trade barriers in developed countries and to liberalize their trade policies so that they could expand their imports from developing countries. The Republic of Korea pledged to pursue vigorously its policy of import liberalization and said it was prepared to give preferential treatment to the products of other developing countries. Singapore said developed countries should focus on restructuring their economies so that free market forces would enable non-competitive industries to be phased out.

Portugal remarked that it had been victimized by protectionism and believed that an open multilateral trading system was essential to development. Romania stated that easier access to the markets of developed countries for the developing countries' exports had become a necessity. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC mem-

bers, said that, in analysing patterns of world trade, UNCTAD should take a practical view of trade trends and production patterns and their impact on international trade, taking account of the parallel and complementary work undertaken by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

Some States noted that higher tariffs were not the only symptoms of the new protectionism. Australia observed that, although tariffs were out of favour as a means of controlling trade, new and more subtle barriers and distortions had evolved outside GATT, ranging from dubious anti-dumping pleas to so-called orderly marketing arrangements and various forms of voluntary restraint. Austria thought UNCTAD should pay increasing attention to the new and more flexible restrictions to international trade.

Many Eastern European countries ascribed much of the blame to the policies of some developed market-economy countries. Albania remarked that, when developing countries tried to increase their exports, especially of finished products, they were confronted with the protectionism of capitalist countries, which tried to entrench themselves in developing countries in order to sell their goods. Bulgaria said the increase in protectionist measures, tariff barriers and political discrimination by some developed market-economy countries had a devastating impact on the economies of developing countries. The German Democratic Republic endorsed the call for effective measures against protectionism, stating that protectionist practices were adversely affecting trade between States with different social systems. Hungary said it stood for co-operation instead of restrictions and expected its capitalist partners to do likewise.

The Ukrainian SSR charged that protectionist measures adopted by Western developed countries affected an ever-increasing number of products, were applied in a discriminatory manner and were sometimes imposed by methods that amounted to economic blackmail. The USSR said discriminatory restrictions by some Western States against the socialist countries reduced the latter's foreign exchange earnings and their ability to trade with and assist developing countries.

The Byelorussian SSR, Romania and the USSR favoured a central role for UNCTAD in regard to protectionism.

Draft resolutions not adopted: Algeria, for Group of 77, (1) A/C.2/36/L.65 (withdrawn), (2) A/C.2/36/L.120 (deferred); (3) Venezuela, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.2, transmitted by Secretariat note.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: (4) GA: 36/145, para. 6, 16 Dec. (p. 533); (5) TDB (report, A/36/15) ¶ 226 (XXII).

Decisions: GA: (6) 35/418, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 631); (7) 36/429 16 Dec. 1981 text following.

Yearbook reference: (8)1979., p. 560

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 45, 47 (24 Sep.-10 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.)

General Assembly decision 36/429

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee(A/36/694/Add.3) without vote, 10 December (meeting 47); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda 69 (c).

#### Protectionism and structural adjustment

At its 100th plenary meeting, on 16 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, decided to refer to its thirty-seventh session for consideration the following draft resolution, together with the synoptic table containing the comments thereon:

#### "Protectionism and structural adjustment

"The General Assembly,

'Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1-May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation, 31/163 of 21 September 1976 and 33/196 of 29 January 1979.

'Bearing in mind the relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, particularly resolution 96(IV) of 31 May 1976, entitled 'A set of interrelated and mutually supporting measures for expansion and diversification of exports of manufactures and semi-manufactures of developing countries',

"Recalling also resolution 131 (V) of 3 June 1979 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, entitled 'Protectionism and structural adjustment',

'Taking note of resolution 226(XXII) of 20 March 1981 of the Trade and Development Board, entitled 'Protectionism and structural adjustment',

"Recognizing that international trade should play an essential role in economic growth and development, particularly that of developing countries, and that the expansion of international trade on an equitable basis should be beneficial to all countries,

"Noting with concern the increase in many developed countries of subsidies to inefficient and internationally less competitive lines of production which are of particular export interest to developing countries,

"Noting a/sso that increasing domestic subsidies to agricultural productions in developed countries, a matter which is not sufficiently negotiated in the multilateral trade negotiations, disrupts international trade and seriously affects production in and export from developing countries.

"Recognizing also that a healthy world economy would require, *inter alia*, the establishment of long-term industrial structural adjustment policies and measures to facilitate a greater transfer of Industrial capacities from developed to developing countries, In order to attain equitable and effective international division of labour, as well as the promotion of a substantial increase in the share of developing countries in the industrial production and exports of manufactures and semi-manufactures, in the light of the targets Set out in the Lima Declaration and Plan of Action on Industrial Development and Co-operation,

"Noting the deep concern of all countries about intensified protectionist pressures and that of the developing countries in particular about the serious consequences which the increase in recent years of protectionist measures in developed countries may have for them by affecting their exports, particularly in sectors in which the comparative advantage has shifted in their favour and opened up important perspectives for growth in their economies,

"Recognizing further that the current economic problems of developed countries cannot be solved by concealed or open

protectionism and that trade-restrictive measures could touch off chain reactions involving a widening series of actions by an increasing number of countries,

"Noting with deep concern that such measures, by delaying the process of necessary structural Change in the developed countries and consequently limiting the market access for agricultural, manufactured and semi-manufactured exports of developing countries, have adverse effects on the economies of developing Countries.

"Realizing that increasing protectionist measures have, *inter alia*, aggravated inflation in the developed countries which is, in turn, transferred to the developing,

"Emphasizing the importance of structural adjustment for the elimination of protectionism and for the promotion of greater international trade, taking into account the interests of developing countries and with a view to the early attainment of their development objectives,

"1. Urges developed countries to implement fully and to adhere strictly to the standstill provisions they have accepted by refraining from introducing new tariff and non-tariff barriers affecting the exports of developing countries and to reduce substantially tariff escalation so as to provide improved access to exports of manufacture, semi-manufactures and processed primary products from the developing countries;

"2.. Calls upon developed countries to eliminate promptly their existing tariff and non-tariff barriers, particularly quantitative restrictions and other measures having an equivalent effect on the exports of developing countries;

"3. Agrees that structural adjustment should be a constant and global process which the international community, in particular the developed countries, should facilitate by conscious efforts aimed at ensuring accelerated and sustained overall growth of the developing countries, including the development and diversification of their economies and an effective international division of labour involving both inter-industry and intra-industry specialization, enabling developing countries to secure an increase in their share of world trade, of processed goods and of manufacturing;

"4. Calls upon developed countries to implement long-term industrial structural adjustment policies with a view to facilitating the establishment of an equitable and effective international division of labour;

"5. Welcomes the decision of the Trade and Development Board to establish a Sessional Committee at the twenty-fourth session of the Board in accordance with its resolution 226(XXII) to deal with the problems of protectionism and structural adjustment;

"6. Calls upon that Sessional Committee to undertake sectoral reviews within the framework of the annual review referred to in resolution 131 (V) of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development with a view to the effective and full implementation of section A, paragraph 3. of that resolution, and invites the Conference, on the basis of such annual reviews, to formulate general recommendation which national Governments would take into account in implementing section A, paragraph 3. of resolution 131 (V) and to review continuously developments involving restrictions of trade affecting exports of developing countries with a view to examining and formulating appropriate recommendations, and to ensure that this comprehensive review also deals with the monitoring of the evolution of the industrial capacity in the developed countries in order to recommend the measures necessary to prevent protectionist demands in those countries."

#### Control of restrictive business practices

As requested by the General Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(4)</sup> the Trade and Development Board, on 20 March 1981, established an Inter-governmental Group of Experts on Restrictive

Business Practices.<sup>(5)</sup> The functions of this Group were defined in the Set of Multilaterally Agreed Equitable Principles and Rules for the Control of Restrictive Business Practices,<sup>(2)</sup> approved by a United Nations conference and adopted by the Assembly in 1980.<sup>(9)</sup> The Group was to provide a forum for consultation on matters related to the Principles and Rules, undertake studies and research, collect and disseminate information, and make general recommendations to States.

The Group of Experts held its first session at Geneva from 2 to 11 November 1981.<sup>(5)</sup> It adopted a resolution by which it expressed concern about the persistent resort to the use of restrictive business practices by enterprises, including transnational corporations (TNCs), in international trade transactions, and called on countries to institute effective controls of such practices and to refrain from legislation and administrative measures that did not adequately take into account the objectives of the Principles and Rules. It also called on countries, particularly developed countries, to take into account, in their control of restrictive business practices, the development, financial and trade needs of developing countries, particularly the least developed. Moreover, it stressed that States should meet their commitment to the Principles and Rules and annually communicate information to UNCTAD.

The Group requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General, in co-operation with other United Nations agencies and financing programmes, to provide technical assistance, advisory services and training programmes on restrictive business practices and to approach States for financial and other contributions for such activities. It invited the United Nations Development Programme to ensure that adequate resources were allocated for the purpose. The Group called for studies by the UNCTAD secretariat on collusive tendering, tied purchasing and restrictive practices in relation to plant and equipment design and manufacture, as well as a revised draft of a model law or laws to help Governments control restrictive business practices. It requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to achieve more expeditious dissemination of information on major developments, such as by issuing newsletters.

The UNCTAD secretariat issued two studies in 1981 on aspects of restrictive business practices. The first, requested by the Conference in 1979,<sup>(8)</sup> concerned exclusive dealing arrangements in an abuse of a dominant position of market power.<sup>(6)</sup> The study pointed out that such arrangements, involving an undertaking not to sell to or purchase from outsiders, were a common feature in both international and domestic trade. When engaged in by an enter-

prise in a dominant position of market power, exclusive dealing arrangements could involve a wide range of restrictions aimed at reinforcing exclusivity, thereby preserving particular trade patterns by making it difficult for newcomers to enter the market. The study concluded that both developed and developing countries should devote more attention to controlling exclusive dealing arrangements, in view of their likely adverse effects on international trade.

The second study concerned marketing and distribution arrangements in respect of import and export transactions.<sup>(7)</sup> It stated that international trading channels were characterized by oligopolistic structures for nearly all products. State-owned or -controlled enterprises were increasingly important in world trade, not only in Eastern European countries but also in developed market-economy countries and developing countries, accounting for roughly 30 per cent of world trade. Most of the remaining trade was by TNCs, with roughly half being intra-firm transactions. The study suggested that further research be conducted on the extent to which State trading enterprises had been created and/or engaged in restrictive business practices in response to the existence of dominant market power in the supply or purchase of particular goods and services, and the extent to which restrictive business practices were likely to affect new entrants, particularly from developing countries, in the international trade in selected products.

An UNCTAD secretariat note<sup>(1)</sup> summarized information from States on the steps taken to meet their commitment to the Principles and Rules. In addition to dissemination of the text to enterprises and the public, there had been co-operation between a number of national authorities, in both developed and developing countries, in the control of restrictive business practices, including the provision of bilateral technical assistance. A number of developing countries had introduced legislation for the control of restrictive business practices and, in some cases, the Principles and Rules had been submitted to legislative bodies studying possible new enactments.

In the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the General Assembly's Second Committee, China urged that a plan be prepared for step-by-step elimination of restrictive business practices by developed countries directed basically against goods exported by developing countries, such as textiles.

Note: (1) UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/RBP/2 & Add. 1-4. Publication: (2) The Set of Multilaterally Agreed Equitable Principles and Rules for the Control of Restrictive Business Practices (TD/B/RBP/CONF/10/Rev.1), Sales No. E.81.II.D.S.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>Group of Experts, TD/B/884.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 35/63, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 630); <sup>(5)</sup>TDBc (report, A/36/15), 228(XXII), 20 Mar. 1981.

Studies: UNCTAD secretariat, <sup>(6)</sup>TD/B/RBP/6, <sup>(7)</sup>UNCTAD/ST/MD/25.

Yearbook references: <sup>(8)</sup>1979, p. 563; <sup>(9)</sup>1980, p. 626.

#### Generalized system of preferences

The sixth periodic review of the operation and effects of the generalized system of preferences (GSP), which entered its second decade of application in 1981, was carried out by the Trade and Development Board's Special Committee on Preferences at its tenth session, held at Geneva from 11 to 22 May.<sup>(2)</sup>

Under GSP, according to studies prepared for the Committee by the UNCTAD secretariat,<sup>(1)</sup> 19 developed market-economy countries, including the members of the European Communities, granted preferential tariff treatment to imports, mainly of manufactures and semi-manufactures, originating from developing countries. Preferential tariff treatment and/or other economic and foreign trade measures of a preferential nature were also granted under GSP by six socialist States of Eastern Europe. Negotiated and implemented under the auspices of UNCTAD, GSP was initially established for a 10-Year period ending in 1981 and was extended in 1980 for another 10 years.

A secretariat report<sup>(3)</sup> concluded that, while a number of improvements had been made since the last review in 1980, they had had no noticeable effect on GSP. However, it continued to play a positive role in improving market access for developing countries. Imports by 16 preference-giving members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development from beneficiaries which had actually received preferential treatment in 1979 (1978 for Canada and the European Economic Community) had amounted to \$17.6 billion, representing a 24.5 per cent increase over the preceding year. Nevertheless, the sizeable trade still subject to duties pointed to the need for further improvements, in particular through expansion of project coverage, removal of limitations, and simplification and harmonization of origin rules and other administrative requirements.

During the review by the Committee on Preferences, as summarized by its Chairman in the Committee's report, the preference-giving countries indicated that they had taken steps to extend the duration of their schemes, or were planning to do so, and reiterated their commitment to improve the schemes. They gave figures to substantiate the rise in preferential trade and explained the reasoning behind the restrictive measures taken, including the so-called graduation arrangements under which preferential

treatment was phased out with respect to beneficiaries considered competitive to leave room for less-developed beneficiaries.

The preference-receiving countries, while appreciating the steps to prolong GSP and the various minor improvements made in the schemes, felt that too little had been done in that respect and that the achievement of the objectives of GSP remained as far off as ever. They felt that the devices used by preference-giving countries to restrict, limit or eliminate particular products or beneficiaries from preferential treatment ran counter to the agreement that the schemes should be constantly improved. They found graduation to be particularly unacceptable, pointing to the need for notification and consultations prior to modification or withdrawal of preferential treatment.

The Trade and Development Board took note on 9 October of the report of the Committee on Preferences and endorsed a resolution on technical co-operation adopted by the Committee (p. 547).

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 16 December on UNCTAD,<sup>(4)</sup> reaffirmed the importance of the generalized, non-reciprocal and non-discriminatory system of preferences for expanding and diversifying the export trade of developing countries and for accelerating their economic growth and, to that end, of the preference-giving countries' implementing fully the agreement reached by the Committee on Preferences in 1980.<sup>(6)</sup>

In a resolution of 17 December on the work of the World Food Council,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly recommended that GSP be expanded to cover a wider range of processed and semi-processed products and, whenever possible, agricultural commodities. It also recommended expanded technical assistance for the use of GSP (p. 547).

In the Second Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, Bulgaria said it levied no taxes on imports from the least developed countries (LDCs). Japan noted that it had decided to prolong its GSP scheme for a further 10 years and that special preferential measures for LDCs had been in effect since April 1980.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Operation and Effects of the Generalized system of Preferences (TD/B/C.5/79), Sales No. E.82.II.D.10.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on Preferences, TD/B/853; <sup>(3)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/C.5/73.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/145, para. 8, 16 Dec. (p. 533); <sup>(5)</sup>36/185, para. 9, 17 Dec. (p. 724).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 625.

#### Rules of origin

At its eighth session, held at Geneva from 27 April to 1 May 1981, the Working Group on

Rules of Origin continued work on harmonization and simplification of the rules of origin, used to ensure that preferential tariff treatment under GSP was given only to goods originating in preference-receiving countries.<sup>(3)</sup>

In its agreed conclusions, the Working Group stated: that fresh initiatives were necessary to achieve progress in its task; that priority in those initiatives should be given to the percentage criterion (used to define what proportion of imported materials or domestic content a qualifying product might contain); that further discussion should be held in regard to the request by preference-receiving countries for full and global cumulative treatment (under which such countries would be regarded as one area for purposes of determining the origin of goods); and that renewed consideration might be given to further harmonization and improvement of the consignment rule (which requires that goods passing through third countries must not enter into commerce there).

The Working Group transmitted to the UNCTAD Special Committee on Preferences a revised text proposed for the notes accompanying the customs document known as the certificate of origin. The text took account of changes in the rules and also included the rules applied by the Eastern European preference-giving countries. The idea of the Working Group was that, if the proposals were approved, the certificate of origin with its revised notes would be accepted as of 1 January 1982.

On 14 May,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee on Preferences took note of the Working Group's agreed conclusions and recommended to the Trade and Development Board that the Group should be reconvened. The Committee, after hearing different views about the proposed changes in the certificate of origin, suggested that they be referred back to the Group. The Board, on 9 October, scheduled a further session of the Group for May 1982.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15), 244(XXIII), 9 Oct.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on Preferences, TD/B/853; <sup>(3)</sup>Working Group, TD/B/C.5/76.

#### Technical co-operation

Assistance to developing countries for the fuller utilization of GSP continued to be provided in 1981 under a joint project between UNCTAD and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).<sup>(2)</sup> An advisory mission visited China in September and a national seminar was conducted in Costa Rica in December. Japan financed a seminar on GSP in January, attended by officials from 17 developing countries in Asia and the Pacific. The project prepared or updated handbooks on national and regional preference

schemes and carried out studies at the request of developing countries.

UNDP allocated \$150,000 for the project in 1981, and another \$58,057 was contributed by seven preference-giving countries and the European Economic Community. UNDP agreed to extend its financial support until 31 December 1983 at the rate of \$180,000 a year, after the Special Committee on Preferences, on 22 May 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> recommended that UNDP continue financing the project over a multiyear period at levels that would permit it to maintain its essential functions as a focal point for disseminating information on GSP schemes. The Trade and Development Board endorsed this resolution on 9 October.<sup>(1)</sup>

In a resolution of 17 December on the work of the World Food Council,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly recommended that technical assistance activities providing information on the use of GSP-including assistance in research, development and marketing-should be enlarged and improved to enable developing countries to take full advantage of the trade preferences offered under the scheme.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB, A/36/15; <sup>(2)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/C.5/82.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>Committee on Preferences (report, TD/B/853), 7(X), 22 May; <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/185, para. 9, 17 Dec. (p.724).

## Trade promotion and facilitation

### International Trade Centre

During 1981, the International Trade Centre (ITC) at Geneva, under the joint sponsorship of UNCTAD and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), continued its technical co-operation activities, serving as the focal point for United Nations assistance to developing countries in the formulation and implementation of trade promotion programmes. The Centre recorded a modest increase in project implementation (measured by disbursements), though considerably below the targets set in its medium-term programme for 1981-1983 (p. 549).<sup>(2)</sup>

The Centre gave priority to integrated assistance projects (35 in 1981), mainly national in scope. These projects sought to provide a balanced mix of assistance for institution building, trade promotion, strategy formulation, market information, training of personnel, and marketing and import techniques, with particular attention to the needs of the least developed countries (LDCs).

Programme implementation declined in Africa (15 national and 4 regional projects), expanded in Asia and the Pacific (23 national and 9 regional projects) and maintained its momen-

tum in Europe, the Mediterranean and the Middle East (13 national projects) as well as in Latin America (11 national and 14 regional projects).

Approximately 30.8 per cent of the ITC programme was devoted to export-market development; 21.9 per cent to manpower development for trade promotion; 18.7 per cent to strengthening national infrastructures for trade promotion; 13.4 per cent to specialized national trade-promotion services; 4.7 per cent to technical co-operation with LDCs; 4 per cent to import operations and techniques; 2.5 per cent to multinational trade promotion; 2.1 per cent to technical co-operation with national chambers of commerce; and 1.9 per cent to trade promotion oriented to rural development.

The Centre continued to assist in identifying products offering favourable export prospects, undertook research on export markets and helped formulate market development plans. This assistance was provided through market surveys and marketing publications, advisory missions of market development officers, and the dissemination of trade information and statistics. Market research surveys were undertaken on several agro-based products and manufactures, and 13 monographs on trade channels were issued for products in individual markets.

Dissemination of trade statistics through the Import Tabulation System was expanded in 1981; 110 organizations in 70 developing countries regularly received the updated version in microfiche form. Consultants were sent to 12 developing countries, particularly for the building of statistical data bases, national registers of exporters and computerized dissemination systems. A workshop on data processing for trade promotion, organized in October in co-operation with the Instituto Mexicano de Comercio Exterior, enabled 30 participants from developing countries to exchange experience in the development of computer-based information systems.

Under the import-export contact programme, more than 3,000 profiles containing information on suppliers and projects in developing countries were processed in 1981. These profiles were gradually becoming the core of a computerized world-wide supply/demand information system.

Some 5,241 participants from developing countries took part during 1981 in ITC training activities, which numbered 255 events-20 of them interregional-including seminars, workshops, courses and study missions. The Centre co-operated with training institutions in developing countries and began a global search in both developed and developing countries for institutions willing and able to undertake consultancy or sub-contracting assignments on behalf of

training institutions in developing countries. A revised training materials development programme was launched. In 1981, for the first time, ITC organized courses for chamber of commerce officials in co-operation with chambers of commerce in Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Italy and Spain. Local training resources were strengthened through instructors' workshops.

Multinational trade-promotion activities grew substantially in 1981; by October, 11 intercountry projects were in operation. In this field, ITC initiated activities to promote the sale of jute and jute products, including the design and production of an international jute emblem. It prepared market potential reports on four national markets for the International Tea Promotion Association and co-operated with other commodity bodies.

Technical co-operation in connection with import operations and techniques was pursued with 44 countries or country groupings. The Centre's special programme of technical, co-operation with LDCs conducted research on export prospects, consulted on national programme development, helped with product research, provided trade information and documentation services, and offered training in trade promotion. Trade-promotion activities in the context of technical co-operation among developing countries were expanded. In co-operation with the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, a workshop was held at Bangkok, Thailand, in December, on trade promotion oriented to rural development. In Africa, a study was undertaken to assess the export potential of the rural sector in Ethiopia, Senegal and Swaziland and to develop indicative export plans for rural products.

The Centre's 1981 regular budget of \$8.3 million, covering headquarters operations, was contributed in equal portions by UNCTAD and GATT. Of its \$15.7-million technical co-operation expenditure in 1981 (compared to \$14.9 million in 1980), 70.7 per cent, or \$11.1 million, was financed by trust fund contributions; the remainder (\$4.6 million) was financed by UNDP. These figures excluded support costs accruing to ITC, which were applied to headquarters-based activities not included in the regular budget.

In November 1981, ITC headquarters staff consisted of 106 Professional and 129 General Service employees, including those financed from the regular budget and extrabudgetary resources and by developed countries, and excluding project-financed staff.

ACTION BY THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AND JAG. The Joint Advisory Group on the International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT (JAG) held



the first part of its fourteenth session at Geneva from 30 March to 3 April, following the tenth session of its Technical Committee (Geneva, 9-13 February<sup>(3)</sup>). The Committee and JAG reviewed the ITC technical co-operation programme and the ITC medium-term programme for 1981-1983 (see below). The Group also considered the Centre's relationship with UNDP (see below).

In its review of ITC activities, the Committee called attention to the fact that the implementation rate (proportion of programme disbursements to available resources) had apparently fallen from 73.8 per cent in 1980 to 70.6 per cent in 1981. It saw a need to expand the specialized trade-promotion services, to concentrate on fewer countries in the import operations and techniques programme, to increase the number of experts from developing countries and socialist countries of Eastern Europe, and to increase assistance to LDCs. For its part, JAG called for greater efforts to achieve a geographically more equitable distribution of resources, with particular attention to raising the share of the least developed, land-locked and island developing countries.

The Committee and JAG generally endorsed recommendations contained in an ITC/UNDP evaluation report on the ITC programme to assist national trade-promotion infrastructure.

The Trade and Development Board took note of the JAG report on 29 September.<sup>(4)</sup>

A proposal to have a single annual meeting of experts and policy officials instead of two separate annual meetings by JAG and its Technical Committee was made by a Working Party established by JAG in April 1981 to recommend proposals for improving current arrangements involving the two bodies. The Working Party on Future Arrangements for the Joint Advisory Group and its Technical Committee, which met at Geneva on 25 and 26 June,<sup>(5)</sup> suggested that its proposal be tried for at least two years and then be reviewed.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ITC and UNDP, ITC/AG(XIV)/72/Rev.1; <sup>(2)</sup>ITC secretariat, ITC/AG(XV)/79 & Add.1; (3)JAG and Technical Committee, ITC/AG(XV)/75 (transmitted by UNCTAD secretariat note, TD/B/867); <sup>(4)</sup>TDB, A/36/15; <sup>(5)</sup>Working Party on JAG and Technical Committee, ITC/AG(XV)/77.

Publication: International Trade FORUM, vol. XVII, Nos. 1-4 (quarterly).

#### Medium-term programme for 1981-1983

The second medium-term programme of ITC, proposed by the Centre's secretariat for 1981-1983,<sup>(1)</sup> contained no new programme areas but introduced some new priorities, such as technical co-operation with state trading or-

ganizations, economic co-operation among developing countries (ECDC) and joint ventures for export promotion. In regard to ECDC, emphasis was to be placed on computerized supply/demand information and trade documentation relating to expansion of trade between developing countries, supply/demand surveys for promotion of interregional trade and technical assistance for the establishment of multinational marketing enterprises of developing countries.

At its March/April 1981 session, <sup>(2)</sup>JAG considered the second medium-term programme a useful framework for the development of ITC activities over the coming three years, although several representatives viewed the estimated cost (\$75 million) as an ambitious goal. Implementation of the programme, JAG recognized, would call for a greater number of trust fund donors and a greater utilization by developing countries of UNDP resources for trade-promotion assistance.

Proposals: <sup>(1)</sup>ITC secretariat, ITC/AG(XIV)/71.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>JAG, ITC/AG(XV)/75 (transmitted by UNCTAD secretariat note, TD/B/867).

#### Relationship with UNDP

In April 1981, JAG discussed but reached no conclusion on the question of whether ITC should formally become an executing agency of UNDP.<sup>(1)</sup> The issue had been discussed in June and September 1980 by the Working Party on the Feasibility and Merits of a Change in ITC's Status vis-à-vis UNDP, which made no recommendation though it agreed that ITC met the criteria for executing agency status. JAG decided to reconsider the matter in 1982. During 1981, ITC activities financed by UNDP totalled \$4.6 million; the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development remained the executing agency for ITC-implemented projects.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>JAG, ITC/AG(XV)/75 (transmitted by UNCTAD secretariat note, TD/B/867).

#### Trade facilitation

In 1981, 45 missions to 27 countries were carried out by United Nations advisers under the Special Programme on Trade Facilitation (FALPRO), financed by bilateral donors and UNDP either directly or through ITC or national projects. These technical co-operation activities included advice to Governments on the simplification and harmonization of trade procedures and documents, assistance to national trade-facilitation committees, training through national seminars, and co-operation with regional commissions and subregional economic groupings for the development of harmonized solutions.

## Commodities

### Common Fund for Commodities

Preparatory work began in 1981 towards the start of operations of the Common Fund for Commodities, a new mechanism intended to stabilize the commodities market by helping to finance buffer stocks of specific commodities as well as commodity development activities such as research and marketing. However, the Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities,<sup>(1)</sup> adopted in June 1980 by a conference of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD),<sup>(5)</sup> had been adhered to by only 19 States at the end of 1981, 71 short of the number required to bring it into force. By November 1981, pledges of voluntary contributions to the Fund's second account, through which commodity development measures other than stocking were to be financed, totalled about \$225 million, as against the target of \$280 million.

PREPARATORY COMMISSION ACTIVITIES. The second session of the Preparatory Commission for the Common Fund for Commodities was held at Geneva from 9 to 13 February.<sup>(2)</sup> Two working parties were established on 13 February to prepare drafts on various subjects for the Commission's consideration.

Working Party I was assigned to deal with administrative, legal and procedural matters, including rules of procedure of the Fund's Governing Council and Executive Board, the delegation of powers by the Council to the Board, rules and regulations for the conduct of business of the Fund and for the Consultative Committee, the administrative budget, staff regulations, organizational structure, relationship agreements with co-operating institutions and a headquarters agreement. At its first session (Geneva, 4-8 May), the Group prepared draft rules of procedure for the Council and the Board, and the rules and regulations for the conduct of business of the Fund.

Except for a few outstanding matters, the texts prepared by Working Party I were finalized by the Commission at its third session, held at Geneva from 21 to 25 September.<sup>(3)</sup>

Working Party II was asked to deal with operational and financial matters: the rules and regulations for the operations of the Fund's two accounts, including borrowing, and the Fund's financial regulations.

At its first session (Geneva, 27-31 July), Working Party II was mainly concerned with issues relating to the drafting of rules and regulations for operations of the first account, through which the Fund would finance international buffer stocks and internationally co-ordinated

national stocks of commodities. There was a general consensus on the need for a model association agreement, a model guarantee instrument and agreement, and a model pledge instrument. Agreement was reached on several components of an interest-rate policy on loans and deposits. Currency provisions for loans, deposits, guarantee capital and guarantees were also considered. The question of maximum financial requirements under each association agreement and of deposits by an Associated International Commodity Organization were examined. There was general agreement on the need for a mechanism to adjust rapidly the level of guarantee capital and guarantees in the event of a modification of maximum financial requirements. Rules and regulations for internationally co-ordinated national stocks were also examined.

At its second session (Geneva, 14-18 December), Working Party II continued work on drafting rules and regulations for the first account.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities, Sales No. A/C/E/R/S.81.II.D.8.

Reports: Preparatory Commission Chairman, <sup>(2)</sup>CF/PC/3, <sup>(3)</sup>CF/PC/5.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>Preparatory Commission (report, CD/PC/3), 3(II), 13 Feb.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 621.

### Signatures and ratifications of the 1980 Agreement

As at 31 December 1981, the Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities had been signed by 75 States and the European Economic Community (EEC), and 19 States had formally adhered by ratifying, accepting or approving it. Of these, 57 States (italicized in the lists below) and EEC signed the Agreement and all 19 adhered during 1981. For the Agreement to enter into force, it had to be adhered to by at least 90 States, whose total subscriptions of shares had to comprise no less than two thirds of the directly contributed capital allocated to all States entitled to sign the Agreement.

The States which had both signed and adhered to the Agreement as at 31 December 1981 were:

Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Malawi, Norway, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United Kingdom.

In addition, the Agreement had been signed by the following:

Afghanistan, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ireland, Italy, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Republic of

Korea, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly urged early signature and ratification of the Agreement. It requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to report to the Preparatory Commission on progress towards entry into force of the Agreement, and decided to consider that progress in 1982 if by that time the Agreement had not entered into force. States were also urged to ensure faster progress in negotiations on international commodity agreements (p. 552).

The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, which approved the draft, submitted by its Chairman, in like manner on 27 November.

In the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, Austria, China, Mexico and the United Republic of Cameroon were among the countries urging prompt adherence to the Agreement. Costa Rica said the fact that the Agreement had not been ratified by the required number of countries was an example of how the trade and export earnings of commodity-producing countries continued to be dependent on the actions of industrialized countries. The Philippines warned that the Agreement might not enter into force unless countries made a concerted effort to ratify it.

For the EEC members, the United Kingdom said they had all signed the Agreement, were completing ratification procedures and had announced contributions to the second account. The United States said it would ratify the Agreement when enough properly structured agreements on specific commodities had been signed; the United States was generally in favour of the free play of market forces but had co-operated with international organizations in preparing agreements covering a wide range of commodities when it felt they were fair to both producers and consumers.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/143, 16 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 44 (24 Sep.-27 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/143

Adopted without vote Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.3) without vote, 27 November (meeting 44); draft by Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.50/Rev.1); agenda item 69 (c).

Signature and ratification of the Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of

Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation.

Recalling that the United Nations Negotiating Conference on the Common Fund under the Integrated Programme for Commodities successfully concluded its work on 27 June 1980 by adopting the Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities.

Recalling a/s/o that the Agreement has been open for signature and deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval at United Nations Headquarters since 1 October 1980,

Recalling further its resolution 35/60 of 5 December 1980. In paragraph 2 of which the General Assembly urged all Governments to complete expeditiously the procedures required for signature, ratification, acceptance or approval of the Agreement,

Mindful of the objectives of the Common Fund for Commodities, namely:

(a) To serve as a key instrument in attaining the agreed objectives of the Integrated Programme for Commodities as embodied in resolution 93(IV) of 30 May 1976 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development,

(b) To facilitate the conclusion and functioning of international commodity agreements, particularly concerning commodities of special interest to developing countries,

Noting that the Agreement shall enter into force on 31 March 1982 if, by that date, instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval have been received from at least ninety States whose total subscriptions of shares comprise not less than two thirds of the directly contributed capital of the Common Fund, as laid down in article 57 of the Agreement,

Noting further that so far seventy-four States have signed the Agreement and only fourteen States have ratified, accepted or approved it.

Welcoming the pledges already announced for voluntary contributions to the second account of the Common Fund,

Expressing concern at the slow pace of progress in the signature and ratification of the Agreement,

Concerned also about the slow progress in the negotiations on international commodity agreements and expressing the need to promote the objectives of the Integrated Programme for Commodities through, inter alia, more rapid progress in concluding the negotiations on international commodity agreements,

1. Stresses the need for the early entry into force of the Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities;

2. Urges States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Agreement without delay;

3. Expresses the hope that States which have signed but have not yet ratified the Agreement will expedite the necessary action to that effect;

4. Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to submit a report on the progress being made towards the entry into force of the Agreement to the Preparatory Commission for the Common Fund for Commodities for bringing the Common Fund into operation;

5. Decides to consider at its thirty-seventh session, if by that time the Agreement has not entered into force, the progress made towards the entry into force of the Agreement, taking into account the work of any meetings of States under article 57 of the Agreement as well as any related developments;

6. Also urges States to ensure more rapid progress in concluding the negotiations on international commodity agreements.

#### Individual commodities

Principal achievements in 1981 under the UNCTAD Integrated Programme for Commodities

ties<sup>(1)</sup> were the conclusion in June of a new International Tin Agreement (p. 553), the entry into force in August of the International Cocoa Agreement (p. 554) and the convening of the 1981 United Nations Conference on Jute and Jute Products (p. 553). Other commodities dealt with were cotton and hard fibres (see below), meat (p. 554), tropical timber (p. 554) and vegetable oils and oilseeds (p. 555). The UNCTAD Committee on Tungsten met in December (p. 554).

The General Assembly, in a resolution of 16 December on the Common Fund for Commodities,<sup>(\*)</sup> expressed concern about the slow progress in negotiations on international commodity agreements and cited the need to promote the objectives of the Integrated Programme through faster progress in that regard. It urged States to ensure more rapid progress in concluding such negotiations.

A number of speakers commented on commodity trade during the Second Committee's discussion of development and international economic co-operation. Among developing countries, Afghanistan hoped preferential conditions would be granted to the products of the least developed countries. China called for acceleration of negotiations on individual commodities, remarking that inflation had caused great losses to developing countries which depended mainly on the export of raw materials and primary products. The Gambia saw the need to establish a linkage between the prices of the commodities exported by developing countries and those of goods they imported from developed countries. Mexico said that both producers and consumers, especially those most influential in world commodity trade, should participate in multilateral commodity agreements in order to give them more validity and wider application.

Canada was of the view that problems affecting individual commodities should be examined on a case-by-case basis in producer-consumer groups. Norway, speaking for the Nordic States, viewed progress on commodity agreements as unsatisfactory and hoped new impetus could be given to negotiations for individual agreements, without which the Common Fund would be unable to function properly. The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community members, said they had always played an active role in negotiating commodity agreements, were prepared to carry on work on other commodities and believed UNCTAD should intensify its work on the structure and operation of commodity markets.

Aside from the commodities being dealt with by UNCTAD, the World Food Council and the General Assembly took action during the year

with regard to agricultural products and their bearing on food problems (p. 717).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/C.1/223.  
Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/143, para. 6, 16 Dec. (p. 551).

#### Fibres

**Cotton.** The first part of the Sixth Preparatory Meeting on Cotton was held at Geneva from 27 April to 1 May 1981 to continue consideration of elements of an international agreement.<sup>(\*)</sup> At previous preparatory meetings, the greatest divergence of views had been on the question of price stabilization. To break the deadlock on that issue, three Nordic countries—Finland, Norway and Sweden—submitted a proposal envisaging mandatory consultations in specified market instability situations, possibly resulting in recommended guidelines for voluntary national action to bring about better market balance.

The "Izmir Group" of 18 developing cotton-producing countries—which, at a seminar held at Izmir, Turkey, in March 1980, had adopted a declaration on negotiations for an international agreement<sup>(2)</sup>—indicated their willingness to consider the Nordic proposal, as did the socialist countries of Eastern Europe. The United States (the largest cotton exporter) and the majority of developed consuming countries, however, were unable to accept the Nordic outline, principally because of their opposition to the price stabilization proposals.

Owing to the continuing divergence of views, it was decided that the Sixth Preparatory Meeting should be resumed at an appropriate stage and that meanwhile the UNCTAD Secretary-General should convene consultations between interested cotton-producing and -consuming countries in an effort to ensure the success of the resumed Meeting.

Report: ("Preparatory Meeting, TD/B/IPC/COTTON//21. Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 624.

**Hard fibres.** The Fifth Preparatory Meeting on Hard Fibres, held at Geneva from 25 May to 5 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> recorded little progress towards an international agreement to govern international trade in abaca, coir, henequen and sisal.

Producing countries submitted a position paper envisaging an agreement or agreements with comprehensive objectives and functions. This provided for a hard fibres organization or organizations that would be responsible for international action on the fibres and their products, taking full advantage of the Common Fund for Commodities (p. 550) and other available sources of finance. Most major consuming countries, however, envisaged a more restricted agreement.

No further progress was made towards resolving any of the three questions on which a diver-

gence of views had emerged: whether country-specific projects with a capital investment component should be included in the technical improvement programme to be organized under the agreement; what role the envisaged organization or organizations should play in project financing; and what price stabilization measures, if any, should be included. With regard to the institutional question, producing countries expressed the view that a discussion of institutions was premature as long as basic agreement on substance had not been reached.

The Meeting, having concluded that some key issues could not be resolved at that stage, invited the UNCTAD Secretary-General to consult with the hard fibre-producing and -consuming countries with a view to convening a further meeting when prospects for a successful outcome existed.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Preparatory Meeting, TD/B/IPC/HARD FIBRES/24.

Publication: *Fibres and Textiles: Dimensions of Corporate Marketing Structure* (TD/B/C.1/219), Sales No. E/F/S/R.81.II.D.1.

**Jute.** The first and second parts of the 1981 United Nations Conference on Jute and Jute Products were held at Geneva from 12 to 30 January and 11 to 22 May to negotiate an international agreement on jute.

By the end of the first part of the Conference, unresolved issues included the objectives of the agreement, the functions of the proposed international jute organization, the location of its headquarters, voting, finances and the final provisions. On 30 January, the Conference accepted as a basis for further negotiations a proposal by its Chairman containing compromise proposals on the main outstanding issues. It requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to reconvene the Conference not later than June with a view to finalizing the agreement and asked the Chairman to consult with participating exporting and importing countries with a view to facilitating a successful conclusion.

By the conclusion of the second part of the Conference, agreement had been reached on the principal functions of the new organization, including: improvement of the quality and competitiveness of jute and jute products and expansion of markets for them through research and development projects, market promotion and cost reduction; and collation and dissemination of information on jute and its products, synthetics and related areas. Projects would be funded by the second account of the Common Fund for Commodities (p. 550) and by regional and international financial institutions. The draft agreement contained no provisions for the stabilization of prices and supplies, but provided for

continuing consideration of the question of stabilization as well as issues relating to competition with synthetics and substitutes.

Proposed texts for the remaining articles were prepared by the Chairman as a basis for the third part of the Conference, which was to be convened when he considered that conditions for concluding the agreement had been met. In the mean time, he was to consult with Governments on the outstanding difficulties.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference, TD/JUTE/6, 30 Jan.

#### Minerals

**Tin.** On 26 June 1981, the United Nations Tin Conference, 1980, concluded the Sixth International Tin Agreement.<sup>(1)</sup> The new instrument had the same objectives as the Fifth Agreement, concluded in 1975,<sup>(2)</sup> and was designed primarily to prevent excessive fluctuations in the price of tin, to help increase export earnings from tin and to secure an adequate supply of tin at prices fair to consumers and remunerative to producers. Like previous agreements, it provided for a buffer stock and the application of export controls when necessary to reinforce buffer stock operations under specified circumstances, in order to adjust supply to demand.

The distinctive features of the Sixth Agreement were: the size of the buffer stock was raised by 10,000 metric tons, to 50,000 tons; for the first time, financing of the buffer stock—estimated by the Conference Chairman to require about \$750 million for a full stock—was to be shared equally between exporters and importers; trigger points were fixed at which export controls were to be applied; and no automatic termination was foreseen if the requirements for definite entry into force had not been met 12 months after its provisional entry into force. The new Agreement also contained provisions for the eventual negotiation of an association agreement with the Common Fund for Commodities (p. 550) and provisions on consultation whereby the International Tin Council, as the administrative organ, would consult at the request of any member on factors affecting supply and demand.

The Agreement was to enter into force once it was adhered to by Governments of countries accounting for at least 80 per cent of total production and the same share of total consumption. If those requirements were not met by 1 July 1982, the Agreement would enter into force provisionally if Governments of countries accounting for at least 65 per cent of total production and the same share of consumption had adhered, either definitively or provisionally. As at 31 December 1981, the Agreement had been ratified by Malaysia (the largest producer) and signed by Indonesia and Norway.

The third and fourth parts of the 1980 Tin Conference, convened under UNCTAD auspices, took place at Geneva from 9 to 26 March and from 9 to 26 June 1981.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Sixth International Tin Agreement (TD/TIN.6/14/Rev.1), Sales No. E.82.II.D.16.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1975, p. 457.

**Tungsten.** At its thirteenth session, held at Geneva from 7 to 11 December 1981, the UNCTAD Committee on Tungsten reviewed proposals for stabilizing the tungsten market through an international agreement to be negotiated at a conference.<sup>(1)</sup> All producing countries present except one (United States) and some consuming countries proposed to proceed to the negotiating phase for a stabilization agreement, whereas other consumers and the one producer felt that this was premature.

The Committee also discussed market developments in various countries and world-wide, and received proposals for improving the statistics available to the Committee, which it agreed to take up at its next session. It requested the UNCTAD secretariat to prepare an analysis of the functioning and application of price indicators, and an analysis of the range of tungsten products, specifications and grades required by the international market, with a view to identifying marketing and pricing differences and, if appropriate, the feasibility of rationalizing that range of products.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Tungsten, TD/B/C.1/225.

#### Other products

**Cocoa.** The International Cocoa Agreement, concluded in November 1980 by the United Nations Cocoa Conference,<sup>(\*)</sup> entered into force provisionally on 1 August 1981.

As at 31 December 1981, 14 States had adhered to the Agreement by ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to it; another 25 States and the European Economic Community had undertaken to apply it provisionally, and 2 others (Colombia, Zaire) had signed without ratifying (all during 1981). Those which had definitively adhered were:

Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Dominica, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Jamaica, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, USSR.

States applying the Agreement provisionally were:

Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Sao Tome and Principe, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(1)</sup>1980, p. 622.

**Meat.** The Third Preparatory Meeting on Meat, held at Geneva from 30 November to 4 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> concluded that it was necessary to develop a co-ordinated international programme covering research and development, market promotion and other developmental measures for trade in livestock and meat. The Meeting agreed that project profiles of development measures presented by African and Latin American Governments, costed at \$70.8 million for Africa and \$58.9 million for Latin America, should be expanded into full projects by the secretariats of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), with a view to sponsorship by the FAO Intergovernmental Group on Meat for financing by the second account of the Common Fund for Commodities (p. 550) and other international financing institutions.

The project profiles endorsed by the Meeting had been prepared on the basis of project proposals submitted by individual countries. They were discussed and revised at regional seminars organized in 1981 by the UNCTAD secretariat and the respective United Nations regional commissions and held at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (25-28 May) for the African region, at San Jose, Costa Rica (9-12 June) for Central American countries, and at Santiago, Chile (15-18 June) for South American countries.

The three seminars also recommended that a programme of developmental measures on hides and skins, also for second account financing, be elaborated as a part of the preparatory work on meat. As an alternative approach, they suggested that the UNCTAD Committee on Commodities decide on giving hides and skins the same status as the 18 commodities covered by the Integrated Programme for Commodities. The Preparatory Meeting on Meat endorsed the latter approach and recommended that the Committee consider it at its next session.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Preparatory Meeting, TD/B/IPC/MEAT/14.

**Tropical timber.** Work towards an international arrangement or arrangements on tropical timber continued in 1981 in a preparatory meeting and two intergovernmental groups of experts. The Fifth Preparatory Meeting on Tropical Timber (second part), which met at Geneva from 7 to 18 July, <sup>(3)</sup> agreed on criteria for the selection of research and development projects and called for studies on market intelligence and on reforestation and forest management.

With regard to research and development, the Meeting agreed that the task of proposing a list of projects, evaluating cost estimates and proposing priorities should be given to an expert body. Accordingly, the Intergovernmental Group of

Experts on Research and Development for Tropical Timber, convened for the purpose at Geneva from 16 to 20 November,<sup>(2)</sup> organized 42 research and development project profiles into five broad programmes and suggested a percentage share of resource allocation for each: wood utilization (40 per cent); natural forest development (30 per cent); reforestation development (15 per cent); harvesting, logging and manpower development, and institutional framework and national planning (two programmes, 15 per cent). The projects, at an estimated cost of \$106 million, had been prepared by three regional seminars (for Africa, Asia and Latin America) which met at Geneva during the Group's session. The second account of the Common Fund for Commodities (p. 550) was envisaged as the main source of financing.

Concerning market intelligence, the Preparatory Meeting considered possible measures to strengthen ongoing activities, including the establishment of alternative mechanisms for an early-warning system, and requested a study suggesting proposals to achieve an optimum flow of market information. The study was examined by the Intergovernmental Group of Experts on Improvement of Market Intelligence on Tropical Timber, which met at Geneva from 23 to 27 November.<sup>(1)</sup> The Group agreed on a proposal for a mechanism of monitoring, evaluation and meetings between producers and consumers on the market situation and short-term prospects. The experts also identified the types of data and indicators to be provided by countries under an international agreement on tropical timber.

In the area of reforestation and forest management, the Preparatory Meeting asked for a paper on reforestation needs for industrial tropical timber.

The United Nations Environment Programme and FAO completed in 1981 a world-wide assessment of tropical forests (p. 831).

Reports: ("Group on market intelligence, TD/B/IPC/TIMBER/34; <sup>(2)</sup>Group on research and development, TD/B/IPC/TIMBER/33; <sup>(3)</sup>Preparatory Meeting, TD/B/IPC/TIMBER/32.

Vegetable oils and oilseeds. The Fourth Preparatory Meeting on Vegetable Oils and Oilseeds, held at Geneva from 2 to 5 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> approved programmes on research and development for coconuts, ground-nuts and their products, encompassing production and productivity improvement, processing improvement and product development, information and documentation. The Meeting agreed that these programmes were suitable for submission to financing institutions, particularly the second account of the Common Fund for Commodities (p. 550). It also agreed that no new international body was needed to supervise implementation of

the programmes, but that the FAO Intergovernmental Group on Oilseeds, Oils and Fats would be an appropriate body to sponsor them.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Preparatory Meeting, TD/B/IPC/OILS/16.

#### TNCs and commodity trade

The Trade and Development Board decided twice, on 20 March and 9 October 1981, to remit to its following session consideration of a draft resolution on transnational corporations (TNC) and international commodity trade.<sup>(1)</sup> The draft had been submitted by Group D (centrally planned economies) to the fifth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in 1979. Group B (developed market economies) took the view the draft should be remitted to the Commission on Transnational Corporations.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

#### Committee on Commodities

The Trade and Development Board, on 20 March 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> took note of the report of the Committee on Commodities on its ninth session (Geneva, 29 September-7 October 1980).<sup>(6)</sup> The Board endorsed the Committee resolution urging the early entry into force of the Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities (p. 550) and the 1979 International Natural Rubber Agreement,<sup>(5)</sup> as well as a resolution setting out the Committee's work programme relating to negotiations on individual commodities and other aspects of the Integrated Programme for Commodities.

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 16 December 1981 on UNCTAD,<sup>(3)</sup> took note of the Committee's work programme. The original draft resolution, submitted by Algeria for the Group of 77 and later withdrawn,<sup>(1)</sup> contained no reference to the Committee.

On 7 October, the Trade and Development Board decided to reschedule sessions of the Committee and its Permanent Sub-Committee on Commodities from November 1981 to February 1982. This decision was incorporated into the revised calendar of UNCTAD meetings (p. 538) which the Board approved on 9 October.<sup>(4)</sup>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.65.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/145, para. 18, 16 Dec. (p. 534). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>TDB, 244(XXIII), 9 Oct.

Yearbook references: <sup>(5)</sup>1979, p. 586; <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 622.

## Manufactures

#### Revision of the Multifibre Arrangement

The General Assembly, by a resolution adopted without vote on 16 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> appealed to countries-particularly developed

countries-participating in the negotiations then under way on extension of the Arrangement regarding International Trade in Textiles, generally known as the Multifibre Arrangement, to show the necessary political will and mutual accommodation to achieve an expansion of trade in textiles and clothing, a reduction of barriers to such trade and its progressive liberalization, while ensuring its equitable development and avoiding disruptive effects. The Assembly recalled that one of the principal aims of the Arrangement was to further the economic and social development of developing countries and to secure a substantial increase in their export earnings from textiles.

The Second (Economic and Financial) Committee approved the resolution without vote on 10 December. The text, proposed by a Vice-Chairman, was based on informal consultations on a draft sponsored by Algeria for the Group of 77, introduced by the Philippines and subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup>

The resolution differed from the Group of 77 draft in that the adopted text omitted a request to the UNCTAD Secretary-General and the Director-General of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to assist participating countries, particularly developing countries, in connection with the negotiations on the Arrangement. In addition, the adopted text added a phrase calling for the avoidance of disruptive effects in individual markets and on individual lines of production in both importing and exporting countries.

Jordan, though joining in the consensus on the resolution, said it would not be bound by the results of the negotiations, being neither a participant in them nor a member of GATT.

In the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, the Philippines mentioned that trade in textiles and clothing, though a dynamic element in the development efforts of developing countries, continued to be dominated by the developed countries, which imported from each other 54 per cent of total world imports of textiles, as against 24 per cent from developing countries.

On 22 December at Geneva, the GATT Textiles Committee decided to extend the Arrangement until 31 July 1986 (p. 1484). The Arrangement was originally negotiated under GATT auspices in 1973.<sup>(3)</sup>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.116.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA.36/144, 16 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1973, p. 969.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 44, 47 (24 Sep.-10 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/144

Adopted without vote Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.3) without vote. 10 December (meeting 47); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.152). based on informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.116); agenda item 69 (c).

Arrangement regarding International Trade In Textiles  
The General Assembly,

Noting that the Arrangement regarding International Trade in Textiles, also known as the Multifibre Arrangement, adopted by the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva on 20 December 1973 for a period of four years, was extended by the Protocol of 14 December 1977 and will expire on 31 December 1981,

Convinced that trade in textiles and clothing is a dynamic element in the development efforts of many developing countries,

Believing that the establishment of an orderly and equitable conduct of trade in textiles and clothing is in the interest of all countries,

Noting that negotiations are in progress at Geneva on the revision or modification of the Arrangement,

1. Appeals to all countries participating in the current negotiations on the Arrangement regarding International Trade in Textiles, in particular to developed countries, to show the necessary political will and spirit of mutual accommodation, inter alia, to achieve an expansion of trade in textiles and clothing, a reduction of the barriers to such trade and the progressive liberalization of world trade in textile products, while at the same time ensuring the orderly and equitable development of such trade and avoiding disruptive effects in individual markets and on individual lines of production in both importing and exporting countries;

2. Recalls that one of the principal aims of the Arrangement is to further the economic and social development of developing countries and to secure a substantial increase in their export earnings from textile trade;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the text of the present resolution to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade for the information of the Contracting Parties and other countries participating in the negotiations.

### Consumer protection

The Secretary-General submitted to the Economic and Social Council in June 1981 a report<sup>(3)</sup> proposing consumer protection measures which States might consider adopting, particularly in developing countries. Prepared in accordance with a 1979 Council request,<sup>(4)</sup> the report concluded that a concerted effort was needed by Governments, business communities and labour and consumer groups, and especially by consumers, to cope with problems ranging from defective weights and measures to misleading advertising and restrictive business practices. Consumers needed education and information to uphold their dealings in the market-place. A government role was also vital in legislating and enforcing standards. In developing countries, consumer protection should concentrate on food and pharmaceuticals.

Measures suggested for consideration by States included: adoption of a consumer protection policy; creation of governmental advisory and regulatory machinery; elaboration of standards for product safety and quality of consumer



goods and services; implementation of national standards; national regulation of business practices covering the regulation of sales and accurate description of goods; encouragement of business communities to adhere to voluntary standards; adoption of a policy for improving the distribution system for essential consumer goods and services; measures to enable consumers to obtain redress; provision of consumer education and information programmes; and adoption of legislation against economic crimes and other offences harmful to consumers. The report also proposed measures specifically related to food, water and pharmaceuticals.

Concerning organizational arrangements in the United Nations system, the report concluded that there seemed no need for changes as collaboration among agencies had been working smoothly.

A draft of the Secretary-General's report was reviewed by an ad hoc inter-agency meeting on consumer protection held at Geneva on 1 and 2 April.<sup>(1)</sup> The meeting also discussed preparations for a Regional Consultation on consumer protection, convened at Bangkok, Thailand, from 2 to 8 June. The Regional Consultation made recommendations in the areas of government policy, consumer education and information, food and consumer protection, drugs and consumer protection, restrictive business practices and international trade, as well as practices of transnational corporations and distribution problems in rural areas, including the role of consumer co-operatives. Extracts from the report of the Regional Consultation were transmitted to the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(2)</sup>

On 23 July, the Council adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(3)</sup> by which it recommended that Governments take into account the recommendations contained in the Secretary-General's report in the formulation of consumer protection policy measures, national and international. The Council requested him to continue consultations looking towards the elaboration of guidelines on consumer protection, taking into account the needs of developing countries, and to report in 1983 with proposals, including the possibility of convening an intergovernmental meeting on the guidelines.

The Council's Third (Programme and Coordination) Committee approved the text without vote on 17 July, on the basis of a lo-nation draft introduced by Venezuela, orally revised in informal consultations and further revised by an oral amendment by the USSR, accepted by the sponsors. The original text contained a request, dropped from the revised version, that the Secretary-General convene an intergovernmental working group to elaborate a draft set of basic

principles on consumer protection. The USSR amendment deleted the word "al" before "Governments" in the paragraph recommending that Governments take the Secretary-General's recommendations into account.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Inter-agency meeting, ACC/1981/22; <sup>(2)</sup>Regional Consultation, E/1981/C.3/L.2 (extract); <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, E/1981/75.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(4)</sup>1979/74, para. 3, 3 Aug. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 481); <sup>(5)</sup>1981/62.23 July 1981, text following.

Financial implications: S-G statement, E/1981/C.3/L.18.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/C.3/1981SR.1,2, 3, 8, 13, 17 (2-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.40 (23 July).

Statement: NGO, E/1981/NGO/4.

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/62

Adopted without vote Meeting 40 23 July 1981

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/96, Part I) without vote. 17 July (meeting 17): 10-nation draft (E/1981/C.3/L.7), orally revised, incorporating oral amendment by USSR; agenda item 19.

Sponsors: Barbados, India, Iraq, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, Sudan, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

#### Consumer protection

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling Its resolution 1979/74 of 3 August 1979,

Considering the increasing need for the effective protection of consumers, particularly in developing countries, against practices harmful to the interests of consumers,

Conscious of the need for reliance on an International basic policy framework that provides guidance and encouragement for further efforts in consumer protection on a worldwide scale,

Taking into account that the primary responsibility for consumer protection rests with each State,

Having considered the comprehensive report of the Secretary-General on consumer protection.

Having noted the recommendations of the Regional Consultation on consumer protection organized by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific and held at Bangkok from 2 to 8 June 1981,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General on consumer protection and recommends that Governments should take his recommendations into account in the formulation of consumer protection policy measures at the national and international levels;

2. Requests the Secretary-General, drawing upon the views of individual Member States, United Nations organs, agencies and programmes concerned, and the regional commissions, to continue consultations on consumer protection, within existing resources, with the aim of pursuing, inter alia, the elaboration of a set of general guidelines for consumer protection, taking particularly into account the needs of the developing countries and, in the light of his findings, to submit a report with appropriate proposals, covering, inter alia, the possibility of convening an intergovernmental meeting on the guidelines, to the Council at its second regular session of 1983.

## Finance

The General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Trade and Development Board dealt in 1981 with several aspects of the financial problems of developing countries. A report was presented on the mobilization of personal savings as a source of invest-

ment capital for development (see below). The Assembly urged the adoption of measures to relieve the debt problems of developing countries (p. 559) and a proposal for a world development fund was reviewed (p. 560).

To discuss reform of the international monetary system, the Assembly urged the convening of the second session of an intergovernmental group of experts as early as possible in 1982 (p. 561). A Working Group on International Monetary and Financial Issues, convened in October, recommended measures to bring about international monetary stability (p. 561). Agreement was reached that all members of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development could take part in the Intergovernmental Group of Experts on an Export Credit Guarantee Facility (p. 562).

A proposal for an international centre for public accounting and auditing was also under study (p. 562), to supplement technical assistance already being rendered (p. 563). The Ad Hoc Group of Experts on International Cooperation in Tax Matters, at its first meeting in December, considered proposals for expanding its role (p. 564).

### Development finance and investment

#### Mobilization of savings

In May 1981, the Secretary-General submitted a report<sup>(3)</sup> on the results of the International Symposium on the Mobilization of Personal Savings in Developing Countries, organized by the United Nations and held at Kingston, Jamaica, from 4 to 9 February 1980.<sup>(2)</sup> This was the first of two regional symposia—the other to be held in 1982—of bankers, economists, finance ministry officials and representatives of international organizations, representing the culmination of a United Nations research programme into the savings problems of developing countries. The findings, as finalized by the symposia, were to constitute a working tool for policy-makers and savings and credit officials in developing countries.

The 1980 Symposium made a number of recommendations on the mobilization of personal savings in developing countries, including the following: developing countries should continue efforts to stimulate public and private savings as an essential ingredient for development; Governments should use various tax and other incentives to encourage personal savings, with special emphasis on non-savers and small savers; further attention should be given to encouragement of saving at the grass-roots level and to the role of co-operatives and related institutions; funds accumulated under social security and

similar schemes should be channelled into productive investment; interest rate policy should be aimed at channelling savings into the most appropriate forms; attempts should be made to stimulate the growth of contractual saving adapted to people's needs and possibilities; consideration should be given to special forms of protecting savings against substantial inflation; new sources of information on saving behaviour should be developed; and lending procedures should be improved.

The Economic and Social Council, by a decision of 23 July<sup>(5)</sup> taken without vote on an oral proposal by the President, took note of the Secretary-General's report on the Symposium.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. Also noting the Secretary-General's report as well as suggestions made during its debate, the General Assembly, by a resolution of 19 November,<sup>(4)</sup> affirmed the need to encourage development of indigenous financial institutions and to foster governmental and institutional exchanges of ideas and information on the mobilization of personal savings. It requested the Secretary-General to report to the Economic and Social Council in 1982 on the results of the Second International Symposium on the Mobilization of Personal Savings in Developing Countries, to be held at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, in March 1982.

The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, which approved the text on 30 October in like manner. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on a draft sponsored by Barbados, Costa Rica, Jamaica, Malaysia and Sweden<sup>(1)</sup> which was later withdrawn. The only difference between the two texts was that the original did not refer to the suggestions made during the debate.

During the Committee's discussion, Egypt remarked that, in addition to domestic savings, there should be a continued increase in the flow of capital from developed to developing countries. The USSR observed that the report and recommendations of the 1980 Symposium ignored the rich experience of the USSR and other socialist countries with the mobilization of personal savings, which might prove useful for the developing countries in solving their economic problems.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Barbados, Costa Rica, Jamaica, Malaysia, Sweden, A/C.2/36/L.9.

Publication: <sup>(2)</sup>Savings for Development: Report of the International Symposium on the Mobilization of Personal Savings in Developing Countries, Sales No. E.81.II.A.6.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/239.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/42, 19 Nov., text following. Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/184, 23 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: E/1981/SR.21-34, 40 (2-23 July).  
 GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.4, 7-10, 16, 26-28  
 (25 Sep.-30 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.64 (19 Nov.).  
 Statement: NGO, E/1981/NGO.5.

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/184

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 3.

Results of the 1980 International Symposium on the  
 Mobilization of Personal Savings  
 in Developing Countries

At its 40th plenary meeting, on 23 July 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Secretary-General on the results of the 1980 International Symposium on the Mobilization of Personal Savings in Developing Countries.

General Assembly resolution 36/42

Adopted without vote Meeting 64 19 November 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/691) without vote, 30 October (meeting 28); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.19), based on informal consultations on 5-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.9); agenda item 12.

Mobilization of personal savings

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Bearing in mind the goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, contained in the annex to its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, in particular paragraph 23, which deals with the mobilization of domestic financial resources in developing countries,

Convinced of the necessity and importance of intensifying efforts to mobilize personal savings in developing countries so as to maximize financial resources available for accelerated development,

Emphasizing that, while developing countries will continue to bear the main responsibility for financing their development, external financial resources, particularly official development assistance, constitute an indispensable element of support for the developing countries' own efforts,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the results of the 1980 International Symposium on the Mobilization of Personal Savings in Developing Countries and the suggestions made during the debate;

2. Affirms the need to encourage development of appropriate indigenous financial institutions and to foster governmental and institutional exchanges of ideas and information in the field of mobilization of personal savings;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982 on the results of the Second International Symposium on the Mobilization of Personal Savings in Developing Countries, to be held at Kuala Lumpur in March 1982.

Debt reorganization and servicing

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD CONSIDERATION. A report updating previous reviews on debt-relief measures for developing countries taken by developed donor countries, and analysing the impact of such action on the debt problems of developing countries, was submitted to the Trade and Development Board in July

1981.<sup>(3)</sup> The report noted that in 1977, prior to the Board's adoption in 1978 of a resolution calling for retroactive adjustment of terms of official development assistance (ODA),<sup>(5)</sup> developing countries had owed \$43.7 billion of bilateral ODA to creditor countries. Since then, over 45 developing countries had received benefits under the resolution from developed market-economy countries. The total nominal value of debt relief granted had been \$5.7 billion, including \$3.3 billion in write-offs (of which \$2.7 billion had been owed by least developed countries) and \$2.2 billion in "equivalent action", mainly additional grants and loans commensurate with debt service due.

Total debt outstanding (ODA and non-ODA) at the end of 1980 was estimated at \$446 billion, compared to \$265 billion in 1977.

The report contained four suggestions: the geographical coverage of beneficiary countries should be defined less ambiguously so as to ensure widespread and equitable distribution of benefits; the nature of debt relief should be spelt out in more concrete terms and any relief should be additional to projected aid levels; as rapid implementation was of the essence, the time-frame for action should be clearly defined; and procedures for claiming debt-relief benefits should be clarified.

The Board included this item in the provisional agenda for its first session of 1982, approved on 9 October 1981.<sup>(2)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In its resolution of 16 December 1981 on UNCTAD,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly urged developed countries to seek to continue to adopt retroactive adjustment of ODA terms, or equivalent measures, and strongly urged donor countries to implement fully and immediately the 1978 Trade and Development Board resolution to that effect. It urged implementation of the Board's resolution of September 1980 endorsing detailed features for future action relating to the debt problems of developing countries,<sup>(6)</sup> and requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) to continue to review the application of those features.

Introducing this text, a Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee said the purpose of the request to the UNCTAD Secretary-General was to have him fulfil the mandate given him by the Board in 1978.

The resolution omitted a clause contained in the original draft, submitted to the Second Committee by Algeria for the Group of 77 and later withdrawn,<sup>(1)</sup> by which the Assembly would have urged the UNCTAD Secretary-General and the heads of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to consult further

on procedures for responding to requests from developing countries for analysis of debt problems, as envisaged in the Board's 1980 resolution. This was replaced by a clause urging implementation of the 1980 resolution, bearing in mind the agreement that the Board would review in 1983 the arrangements for future action relating to the debt problems of developing countries.

The paragraph was adopted in Committee by a recorded vote, requested by the United States, of 123 to 1.

Voting against, the United States said UNCTAD should not be entrusted with considering financial questions within the exclusive competence of the World Bank and IMF; moreover, the consultations of the UNCTAD Secretary-General with those organizations had already been completed. The United Kingdom said the European Community members had voted for the paragraph on the basis of the interpretation reached in informal consultations, as stated by the Vice-Chairman. Algeria said the one negative vote was a retrograde step with regard to agreements already reached in UNCTAD.

In the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, the Byelorussian SSR said the external indebtedness of developing countries was growing as a result of drastic price fluctuations in international trade and intensified protectionism by capitalist countries against developing countries' exports. China urged consideration of special measures to help solve the difficulties faced by some developing countries with serious balance-of-payments difficulties; leaving the solution to the international financial market would aggravate those countries' debt situation and contribute to the instability of the financial market. The United Republic of Cameroon regretted that the application of measures to lighten the debt burden of developing countries was restrictive and selective; the measures approved by the Trade and Development Board should be put into effect fully and without discrimination.

Draft resolution withdrawn: ("Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.65.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB, A/36/15; <sup>(3)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/866 & Corr.1.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/145, paras. 10 & 11, 16 Dec. (p. 534). Yearbook references. <sup>(5)</sup>1978, p. 429; <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 616.

#### Proposed development fund

As requested by the General Assembly in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, adopted in December 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted to the Assembly in October 1981 a report outlining elements of a proposed world development fund.<sup>(2)</sup> The report noted the origin of the idea in

the 1980 report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues, chaired by Willy Brandt and generally referred to as the "Brandt Commission". Urging a substantial increase in the volume of resources transferred to developing countries, the Commission thought that, in addition to enlarging the flow of capital through existing channels, there was a good case for creating a new multilateral institution for channelling a significant proportion of resources to developing countries.

Discussing the rationale for a world development fund, the report identified two main factors in support of a new institution as opposed to reform of existing institutions: the need for programme lending, not met by the World Bank and similar institutions which concentrated on project lending; and the need for a new approach to decision-making in multilateral financial institutions, with decisions taken by consensus and no group, debtors or creditors, allowed to dominate. The fund's main purpose and functions would be to promote development and to stimulate the world economy by filling gaps in the international financial system and effect further resource transfers to the poorest member countries, with special emphasis on the general support of development plans (programme lending) and lending for energy and minerals through an institution which would provide the machinery for universal consultation and collaboration on world development, on the basis of equality of its members.

The report mentioned the Commission secretariat's estimate that the fund would need \$120 billion for its first seven years of operation.

The General Assembly took note of the Secretary-General's report on 4 December.<sup>(1)</sup> The decision was taken without vote, following its approval by the Second Committee on 1 December in like manner, on an oral proposal by its Chairman.

Commenting on the proposed fund in the Second Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, Egypt described the idea as promising, stating that the proposals on membership, voting and management would prevent any group of countries from controlling decision-making and ensure that developing countries had a say in decisions. The Philippines said establishment of the fund would be justified only if it was assured of supplementary funds from sources other than those currently being tapped. These countries urged further study of the proposal.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/421, 4 Dec., text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S.G., A/36/572.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/56, annex, para. 110, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 512).

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 45 (24 Sep.-1 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.84 (4 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/421

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.2) without vote. 1 December (meeting 45); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 69 (a).

#### World development fund

At its 84th plenary meeting, on 4 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, took note of the report of the Secretary-General on a world development fund.

#### Access to capital markets

The Trade and Development Board, on 9 October 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> decided to refer to its March 1982 session a proposal by the Group of 77 to have the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) evaluate conditions for the access of developing countries to capital markets, especially in the light of the level of interest rates, and their impact on debt servicing and the balance-of-payments situation of developing countries.

In the General Assembly's Second Committee, Romania regretted that a few developed countries had refused to support the Group of 77 proposal; it said the access of developing countries to capital markets, from which unduly high interest rates currently excluded them, should be a major concern of UNCTAD.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

#### Monetary issues

##### Reform of the international monetary system

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 16 December 1981 on UNCTAD,<sup>(1)</sup> noted with concern the delay in convening the second session of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental High-level Group of Experts on the Evolution of the International Monetary System and requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to convene the Group as early as possible in 1982.. It urged all members of UNCTAD to participate and requested that the Group's report, together with the comments of the Trade and Development Board, should be made available to the Assembly in 1982. The first session of the Group had been held in July/August 1980.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Second Committee approved this paragraph on 11 December by a recorded vote of 100 to 17, with 7 abstentions.

Voting against the paragraph, Japan and Sweden explained that their position had not changed since the 1979 session of UNCTAD, where they had voted against the resolution on monetary reform.<sup>(2)</sup> The United States said the

monetary questions dealt with in UNCTAD should be resolved within that organization and not re-examined in the Assembly; the United States had not attended and would not attend any meeting of the Group of Experts.

Speaking on behalf of the European Community members, which voted against or abstained, the United Kingdom said that, within its mandate, UNCTAD could play a catalytic role in discussions on trade and related problems of economic development while fully respecting the competence of relevant institutions.

Norway, which abstained in the vote on the paragraph, recalled that in 1979 it had supported the establishment of the Ad Hoc Group; it had participated as an observer at the Group's first session and proposed to do the same at the second.

Among those voting for the paragraph, Algeria said the Group of 77 deplored the fact that several countries had voted against, thereby opposing the meetings of a group whose work was fully in keeping with the UNCTAD mandate. Poland, speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, stated that those countries had participated in the Group's meetings and believed its activities were fully consistent with the UNCTAD mandate.

In the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, the Gambia thought that the restructuring of the international monetary system was long overdue; it wished to see greater participation by developing countries in decision-making in the International Monetary Fund and opposed the idea that their participation should be proportionate to their financial contributions.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/145, para. 9, 16 Dec. (p.534).

Yearbook references: <sup>(2)</sup>1979, p. 563; <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 620.

##### Working Group on International Monetary and Financial Issues

A Working Group on International Monetary and Financial Issues, established by the Committee for Development Planning at its March/April 1981 session, met in New York from 5 to 7 October to examine critical issues posed by the world economic situation.

In its report,<sup>(1)</sup> the Working Group observed that there was a need to strengthen the role of international institutions in three critical respects: through a more development-oriented economic adjustment process emphasizing investment, trade and equitable burden-sharing; through recycling capital surpluses into capital-deficit countries and improving distribution among countries; and through greater international

control over the supply and distribution of newly created global liquidity. The Group also called for international support for new initiatives in South-South monetary and financial co-operation. It recommended a set of national and international measures related to these issues, to stimulate world economic recovery and bring about international monetary stability.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Working Group, E/AC.54/1982/2.

### Trade-related finance

Proposed establishment of an export credit guarantee facility

The President of the Trade and Development Board announced on 9 October 1981 that it had been agreed in informal consultations that the Intergovernmental Group of Experts on an Export Credit Guarantee Facility, to be convened in accordance with a 1980 decision by the Board's Committee on Invisibles and Financing related to Trade,<sup>(3)</sup> would be open to participation by all members of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The Board noted the agreement on the same day.<sup>(2)</sup> On 6 November, in reviewing the calendar of UNCTAD meetings (p. 538), the Board decided that the Group would meet from 11 to 22 January 1982.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB, 246(XXIII), 6 Nov.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 632.

### Public finance

Government accounting and auditing

#### Proposed centre

A proposal to establish an international centre for public accounting and auditing, put forward in 1980 by the Fifth Meeting of Experts on the United Nations Programme in Public Administration and Finance,<sup>(4)</sup> remained under study in 1981. The Economic and Social Council, in July, requested preparation of a feasibility study and project proposal.

The views of 43 States on the subject were analysed in a May 1981 report of the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> submitted in accordance with a 1980 Council request.<sup>(2)</sup> Thirty States supported the proposal for a centre to promote the training of public officials of developing countries. Four others (Denmark, Japan, Luxembourg, Norway) were not opposed in principle to the establishment of a centre but expressed concern about duplication of training activities of national institutions, excessive costs and relationships with international and regional institutions. Three States (Finland, Federal Republic of Germany,

United Kingdom) were of the view that the centre should not be established without further study of needs and objectives. Six States (Belgium, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, German Democratic Republic, USSR, United States) expressed opposition to its establishment, believing that existing programmes of the United Nations and the United Nations Development Programme could serve the purpose.

The report mentioned that experts attending a United Nations Workshop on Public Accounting and Auditing (New York, 2-10 March) (p. 563) believed the proposed centre would be of great assistance to developing countries and recommended that it should concentrate on the development of generally accepted principles and standards in accounting and auditing and on the training of trainers.

By a resolution 22 July,<sup>(3)</sup> the Economic and Social Council took note of the Secretary-General's report and requested him to submit in 1982 a feasibility study, including a project proposal for the centre, taking into account work being carried out by existing regional centres and international institutions. The Council recognized that the proposed centre could serve as a focal point for strengthening international technical co-operation in public accounting and auditing, and considered that it would be financed on a voluntary basis.

The resolution was adopted by 49 votes to 1, on the basis of a revised 12-nation draft. The United States, which had requested the vote, said it supported the principle of training public officials in developing countries in accounting and auditing techniques but did not regard establishing a new institution as the best means of achieving that aim; it favoured upgrading and expanding the use of existing facilities and programmes.

India, introducing the original text, said the importance of developing accounting and auditing systems could not be over-emphasized; the developing countries themselves had given the matter high priority at the national level. The proposed centre would be the best means of providing much needed external support and guidance to national and regional institutions. Introducing the revised text, Pakistan explained that it had been altered in informal consultations so as not to prejudice the outcome of the feasibility study.

The Federal Republic of Germany and the USSR said they supported the text on the understanding that the feasibility study would not prejudice the question of establishing a centre and that, if established, it would be financed exclusively on a voluntary basis. The United Kingdom, also supporting the text, requested that the

study analyse the supply-and-demand situation with regard to training in public accounting and auditing, and weigh the costs and benefits of strengthening existing institutions against the alternative of establishing an international centre.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/67.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1980/12, para. 6, 28 Apr. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 567); <sup>(3)</sup>1981/53, 22 July 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 565.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.21-34, 37, 39 (2-22 July).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/53

49-1 Meeting 39 22 July 1981

12-nation draft (E/1981/L.5.50/Rev.1); agenda item 3.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bangladesh, China, Fiji., Ghana, India, Kenya, Nepal, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Venezuela.

International centre for public accounting and auditing  
The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 33/193 of 29 January 1979 on preparations for an International development strategy for the third United Nations development decade, particularly section I, paragraph 3 (c), thereof, concerning the development of institutional and physical infrastructure in the various development sectors in the developing countries, and 32/179 of 19 December 1977, 33/1 44 of 20 December 1978 and 34/137 of 14 December 1979 on the role of the public sector in promoting the economic development of developing countries.

Recalling also its resolutions 1978/6 of 4 May 1978 and 1980/12 of 28 April 1980 on public administration and finance for development in the 1980s, and 1978/60 of 3 August 1978 and 1979/48 of 31 July 1979 on the role of the public sector in promoting the economic development of developing countries,

Further recalling its resolution 1979/47 of 31 July 1979 on public accounting and auditing for national development,

Reiterating the necessity and importance of the role of public accounting and auditing in the effective management of national development plans and programmes in developing countries and the urgency of the need to organize training activities at all levels in order to support national efforts to improve the accounting and auditing systems of those countries,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the proposal for the establishment of an international centre for public accounting and auditing, and of the views expressed thereon by Member States;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982 a feasibility study, including a project proposal for the centre, taking into account work being carried out by existing regional centres and international institutions;

3. Recognises that the proposed centre could serve as a focal point for strengthening international technical co-operation in the field of public accounting and auditing, with a view to:

(a) Promoting the training of trainers and the professionalization of standards for public officials of developing countries, particularly the least developed countries, in the relevant disciplines;

(b) Providing effective support to national, subregional and regional institutes concerned with public accounting and auditing in strengthening their technical and training capabilities;

(c) Promoting co-operation among national and regional supreme audit institutions and accounting agencies of developing countries, with a view to facilitating the exchange of experience and technical expertise and the identification of issues of common interest in the field of training;

(d) Promoting the exchange of experience and information between developed and developing countries in training in the field of public accounting and auditing;

4. Considers that the proposed centre would be financed on a voluntary basis.

#### Technical co-operation

Thirty-one technical co-operation projects in public budgeting, tax administration, financial management and auditing were carried out in 1981 by the United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development. These were part of the Department's development administration programme, which also encompassed public administration (p. 398).

As part of this programme, a Workshop on Public Accounting and Auditing was held at United Nations Headquarters from 2 to 10 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> in response to a 1979 Economic and Social Council resolution.<sup>(2)</sup> Attended by 12 officials from different regions, the Workshop made recommendations on ways of strengthening public financial management through improved practices, national and regional training of personnel, and international efforts to develop accounting and auditing principles and provide training materials. It also suggested activities by the United Nations, including the provision of expertise, the preparation of technical guidelines and the exchange of information.

An Expert Working Group on Network in Public Administration and Finance (Alcalá de Henares, Spain, 9-15 December) focused on the potential for global co-operation and joint activities in this field.

Country projects in Liberia and Madagascar for the management of financial resources commenced in 1981 under a programme of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development designed to assist Governments to monitor external flows of capital and other financial resources.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Workshop on Public Accounting and Auditing, TCD/SEM.81/4.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1979/47, para. 2, 31 July 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 516).

#### Taxation

##### Proposed intergovernmental body

Pursuant to a 1980 request of the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted to the Council in May 1981 a report on his consultations with Governments and international organizations regarding the desirability and feasibility of establishing a direct tax co-operation council.<sup>(1)</sup> He stated that, while there was a consensus among those consulted on the need for a forum in which selected international taxation issues could be discussed by developed

and developing countries, there were varying views about the functions and institutional framework of such a forum. Taking the replies into account, and in the light of budgetary and technical considerations, he suggested that the functions in question could be entrusted to the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on International Co-operation in Tax Matters (see below). If the Council agreed in principle to give the Group additional functions, the Group could be asked to make specific proposals on those functions and the priorities to be accorded to them.

The Council, on 23 July,<sup>(3)</sup> decided without vote, on the proposal of its President, to transmit the Secretary-General's suggestions to the Group and requested the Group to make specific proposals on them.

In the discussion, Bulgaria and the USSR said they would have no difficulty with the call for further study but were opposed to the establishment of a new United Nations body. The Byelorussian SSR reaffirmed its similar position as set forth in the Secretary-General's report. These countries added that matters relating to the payment of taxes by foreign companies were political questions to be considered in bodies such as the Commission on Transnational Corporations and the Council. Canada endorsed the Secretary-General's suggestions.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/74.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1980/13, Para. 4, 28 Apr. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 533). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/183, 23 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.21-34, 40 (2-23 July).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981 /183

Adopted without vote

Draft by President (E/1981/L.55): agenda Item 3.

International co-operation in tax matters

At its 40th plenary meeting, on 23 July 1981, the Council:

(a) Took note of the report by the Secretary-General on the results of consultations with Governments and International organizations concerning the desirability and feasibility of establishing a direct tax co-operation council;

(b) Decided to transmit the suggestions of the Secretary-General contained in chapter III thereof to the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on International Co-operation in Tax Matters, for consideration at its next meeting in December 1981, and to request the Ad Hoc Group to make specific proposals thereon;

(c) Decided to request the Secretary-General to report to the Council at its first regular session of 1982 on the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts.

#### Role of the Group of Experts on tax matters

The Ad Hoc Group of Experts on International Co-operation in Tax Matters, at its first meeting (Geneva, 7-18 December 1981) since it was renamed in April 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> responded to the Economic and Social Council's request for comments regarding its functions as an international forum for taxation issues (see above).

The Group agreed that it could usefully serve as a forum where developed and developing countries could discuss issues relating to direct tax co-operation, exchange experiences in the tax field and formulate policy suggestions for possible use by Governments. In that role, its functions should include: facilitation of international co-operation in preventing tax evasion and avoidance and in dealing with transfer pricing and the allocation of income and expenses; review and updating of the United Nations Model Double Taxation Convention between Developed and Developing Countries, adopted by the Group in 1979; examination of the impact of tax treaties with a view to assessing their effectiveness in improving the flow of investment and achieving their other objectives; efforts to promote an understanding and knowledge of tax treaties; exchanges of experience on fiscal problems; dissemination of information about work in the fiscal field and about technical assistance available; and any additional functions in the area of tax relationships between countries and assistance to tax authorities.

The Group suggested that it should discharge its expanded functions by acting through meetings of the Group as a whole, a steering committee, or standing or ad hoc working parties.

The Group's recommendations were contained in a report on its meeting<sup>(1)</sup> and in a report of the Secretary-General to the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(2)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Group of Experts, ST/ESA/128; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, E/1982/71.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1980/13, 28 Apr. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 533).

Publications: Supplement No. 34 to International Tax Agreements, vol. IX, Sales No. E.80.XVI.4; No. 35, Sales No. E.80.XVI.2; No. 36, Sales No. E.81.XVI.1.

## Insurance

The Trade and Development Board, on 20 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> took note of the report of the Committee on Invisibles and Financing related to Trade on the second part of its ninth session (September/October 1980), devoted to insurance.<sup>(2)</sup> The Board endorsed a resolution by which the Committee proposed steps to retain more insurance business in the national markets of developing countries. The Board also decided that the second part of the Committee's tenth session, in 1982, should be devoted to insurance.

Under its technical co-operation programme, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development supported four country projects and two regional projects on insurance, funded by the United Nations Development Pro-



gramme: in Kenya, for the formulation of legislation; in Liberia, for the training of nationals; in Mali, for a market study with emphasis on marine insurance; in Malta, for the establishment and administration of an insurance department in the Ministry of Finance; support to the West African Insurance Institute, established in 1979 in Monrovia, Liberia, by five English-speaking countries of West Africa; and a training programme for Asian countries consisting of

short-term regional seminars on specialized subjects and longer-term courses on general insurance and insurance management. Two short-term seminars, on motor and life insurance, were held in 1981 under the Asian Project.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 632.

Publications: Crop insurance for developing countries (TD/B/C.3/163/Rev.1) Sales No. E.81.II.D.2; Third World Insurance at the End of the 1970s (TD/B/C.3/169/Add.1/Rev.1), Sales No. E.81.II.D.4.

## Chapter V

### Transport, communications and tourism

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and its subsidiary bodies continued in 1981 to deal with problems of transport, particularly shipping.

The Trade and Development Board approved in October the convening of an intergovernmental group that was to recommend principles for a possible international agreement on problems created by ships flying so-called flags of convenience, also known as open-registry fleets, which often have only tenuous economic links to the State with which they are registered. The action was recommended by the Board's Committee on Shipping, which devoted its third special session to the subject (Geneva, 27 May-6 June) (p. 566).

On other shipping topics, work continued on an international model for marine insurance contracts and a group of experts made recommendations to help developing countries participate more fully in the carriage of bulk cargoes (p. 567). The technical co-operation programme of UNCTAD in the areas of shipping, ports and multimodal transport, aimed at reducing the dependence of developing countries on foreign shipping, amounted to \$3.9 million in 1981 (p. 567). In June, the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNCTAD) authorized UNDP action to aid maritime transport training institutions of multinational scope in developing countries (p. 568).

The UNCTAD secretariat circulated a report in July which found that discriminatory practices hindered the growth of air transport in developing countries (p. 568). The High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries requested in June that developed countries and international financial institutions consider increasing substantially

their support for transport and communications infrastructure (p. 568).

The Economic and Social Council took note in May of work done by its Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and recommended that the Committee's recommendations be published as soon as possible.<sup>(1)</sup> Expert groups of the Committee continued their activities during the year (p. 569).

As recommended by the Council in July,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly, in November,<sup>(3)</sup> proclaimed 1983 World Communications Year, with the theme "Development of communications infrastructures". The International Telecommunication Union was designated lead agency for the observance.

Efforts were undertaken to secure financing for projects being carried out in connection with the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa (1978-1988) (p. 614). The United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy examined the use of energy in the transport sector, an area where the United Nations Industrial Development Organization was also active (p. 705).

In regard to transport and communications in outer space, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its sub-committees continued to draft principles for the use of direct-broadcast satellites (p. 118) and to monitor progress in space transportation systems (p. 117).

The Assembly urged States to give due attention to principles for tourism development set out in the Manila Declaration of the World Tourism Conference, held at Manila, Philippines, in September/October 1980.<sup>(4)</sup>

Resolution: ESC: <sup>(1)</sup>1981/3, 4 May (p. 570); <sup>(2)</sup>1981/60, 23 July (p. 572). GA: <sup>(3)</sup>36/40 (p. 573), <sup>(4)</sup>36/41 (p. 574). 19 Nov.

## Transport

### Maritime transport

#### Shipping

Flags of convenience. The third special session of the Committee on Shipping, held at Geneva from 27 May to 6 June 1981, was devoted exclusively to open-registry fleets, also known as ships flying flags of convenience.<sup>(2)</sup>

The UNCTAD secretariat issued for the Committee in March a report on the extent to which international conventions on safety and social standards were applied and verified under open-registry flags as compared with other flags.<sup>(4)</sup> It identified 10 basic reasons why standards were more likely to be breached under open-registry flags, all stemming from lack of control of open-registry countries over foreign, non-resident owners, managers and crews. The difficulties which open-registry countries encountered in controlling shipping operations under their flags stemmed directly from the lack of economic linkage between a vessel and its flag State. The disorderly development of the world fleet could be largely attributed to the existence of open registries, as tax-sheltered profits had been recycled into new building, leading to over-capacity in the shipping and shipbuilding industries. Further, the benefits which developing labour-supplying countries enjoyed from supplying crews to open-registry ships were unstable.

The Committee, on 6 June, adopted a resolution<sup>(6)</sup> recommending that the current régime of open registries be gradually and progressively transformed into one of normal registries by a process of tightening the conditions under which open-registry countries accepted or maintained ships on their registers, so that they would be capable of identifying owners and operators and making them accountable for all shipping operations, including the maintenance of standards and the welfare of crews. It recommended the convening of an intergovernmental preparatory group during the first half of 1982, to propose a set of basic principles governing the conditions under which vessels should be accepted on national shipping registers, with a view to preparing documents for the holding of a United Nations conference to consider the adoption of an international agreement.

The group would recommend principles for the manning of vessels, the role of flag countries in the management of shipowning companies and vessels, equity participation in capital, and identification and accountability of owners and

operators. It would also recommend measures to protect the interests of labour-supplying countries and any additional measures needed for ensuring full jurisdiction of the flag State over vessels flying its flag.

This resolution was adopted by a roll-call vote of 49 to 18 (Australia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States), with 3 abstentions.

The Committee annexed to its report two draft resolutions submitted by France and the Federal Republic of Germany, each providing for the establishment of an UNCTAD intergovernmental working group with more limited terms of reference. The proposal by France called for the group to examine measures to improve the conditions under which the responsibilities of shipowners and managers could be engaged; the Committee would consider the group's conclusions so that an international instrument could be drawn up to provide for greater co-operation between port and flag States. The proposal by the Federal Republic of Germany would have the group submit non-mandatory guidelines relating to the conditions under which vessels should be registered and operated in order to facilitate the effective control of States over ships flying their flags and to increase the participation of their economies, in particular those of developing countries, in international shipping.

The Trade and Development Board, on 9 October, adopted the Committee's report and approved the convening of the Intergovernmental Preparatory Group on Conditions for Registration of Ships.<sup>(3)</sup> The meeting was scheduled for April 1982.<sup>(8)</sup>

Explaining to the Board its negative vote in the Committee on Shipping, Liberia said the resolution represented an intransigent and uncompromising attitude which could lead only to deadlock, confrontation and recrimination at a time when the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (p. 127) was drafting a convention that would deal with the matter. The Group of 77, however, reiterated its view that the resolution had set in motion a practical mechanism for dealing with the open-registry system. Group D (centrally planned economies) said it had voted in favour because it considered that open registries had been a main factor in disrupting the shipping market and the orderly development of merchant fleets.

The adoption of the report by the Board was noted by the General Assembly in a resolution of 16 December 1981 on UNCTAD.<sup>(7)</sup> The subject was not mentioned in the original draft resolu-

tion,<sup>(1)</sup> submitted by Algeria for the Group of 77 and later withdrawn in favour of a text submitted on the basis of consultations by a Vice-Chairman of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee.

During the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, the United Republic of Cameroon said the decision to convene a preparatory group on the registration of vessels was important to developing countries since it would foster the establishment of genuine merchant fleets in those countries.

An annual review by the UNCTAD secretariat of the ownership of flag-of-convenience fleets, issued in November,<sup>(2)</sup> indicated that the beneficial ownership and control of those fleets continued to be dominated by the United States, Hong Kong, Greece and Japan, in that order. Together they beneficially owned 73.9 per cent and managed 67.2 per cent of the world's dead-weight tonnage.

Draft resolution withdrawn: (1)Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.65.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on Shipping, TD/B/855; <sup>(3)</sup>TDB, A/36/15; UNCTAD secretariat, <sup>(4)</sup>TD/B/C.4/220, <sup>(5)</sup>TD/B/C.4/231.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: (6)Committee on Shipping, 43(S-III), 6 June; (7)GA, 36/145, para. 17, 16 Dec. (p. 534). Dec.: <sup>(8)</sup>TDB, 244(XXIII), 9 Oct.

Publication: Review of Maritime Transport, 1979 (TD/B/C.4/198/Rev.1), Sales No. E.81.II.D.11.

**Shipping insurance.** At its eighth session, held at Geneva from 12 to 30 October 1981, the Working Group on International Shipping Legislation continued elaborating a set of standard clauses as a non-mandatory international model for marine insurance contracts, covering both marine hull and cargo insurance. It adopted and annexed to its report<sup>(2)</sup> composite texts on a set of "all risks" clauses and a set of "named perils" clauses for marine hull insurance contracts, and a set of "all risks" clauses for marine cargo insurance contracts. With regard to a collision liability clause, it drafted alternative provisions to reflect different national approaches and preferences. Agreement was reached on a general average and salvage clause for cargo insurance. The Group agreed to formulate restricted risk coverage clauses at the following session as an alternative to the "all risks" cover.

The work programme of the 1981 session was approved on 20 March 1981<sup>(1)</sup> when the Trade and Development Board endorsed a December 1980 resolution of the Working Group proposing that it be authorized to continue work on both aspects of shipping insurance. Acting on a further recommendation of the Group, adopted on 30 October 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the Board, on 6 November,<sup>(4)</sup> scheduled the ninth session of the Group for 1982.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB, A/36/15; <sup>(2)</sup>Working Group on International Shipping Legislation, TD/B/C.4/232.

Resolution and decision: Res.: (3)Working Group on International Shipping Legislation, 5(VIII), 30 Oct. Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>TDB, 246(XXIII), 6 Nov.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 633.

**Bulk cargoes.** The Group of Experts on Problems Faced by the Developing Countries in the Carriage of Bulk Cargoes, established in 1980 by the Committee on Shipping,<sup>(3)</sup> met twice in 1981 at Geneva, from 2 to 6 March<sup>(1)</sup> and from 30 November to 4 December,<sup>(2)</sup> to consider whether barriers existed to the participation of developing countries in the dry bulk trades in iron ore, phosphate, bauxite and alumina. On the basis of responses by major importers and exporters to a questionnaire, the Group, in its final report, agreed that shipping was heavily controlled by buyers, but disagreed as to whether developing countries faced barriers to participation. The Group made seven recommendations to the Committee on Shipping but its members expressed divergent views as to whether those recommendations would be sufficient to solve the problems of developing countries with regard to the bulk cargo trade.

The recommendations called for: the inclusion in sales and purchase contracts of a clause pledging favourable consideration for ships of developing countries; dissemination of information on shipping requirements; offering shipowners of developing countries a chance to participate in regular bulk trade plying a specified route; the establishment of regional and interregional pools for better utilization of transport capacity; the enactment of maritime legislation governing joint ventures; long-term shipping arrangements as a means of providing collateral for long-term financing; and government financing or guarantees for national merchant fleets.

Reports: Group of Experts, (1)TD/B/C.4/221, <sup>(2)</sup>TD/B/C.4/234.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 632.

Publication: Control by Transnational Corporations over Dry Bulk Cargo Movements (TD/B/C.4/203/Rev.1), Sales No. E.81.II.D.3.

**Technical co-operation.** In 1981, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) operated a \$3.9 million technical co-operation programme in the areas of shipping, ports and multimodal transport, of which the United Nations Development Programme contributed \$3.3 million. The aim of the programme was to reduce the dependence of developing countries on foreign shipping and foster the development of trade through lower transport costs and adequate shipping services.

A number of regional and national projects were executed in the interrelated fields of shipping, ports and protection of shippers' interests. UNCTAD provided assistance and direct support

to national port authorities in several countries. National personnel were trained through fellowships, seminars and courses, and training material on ports was developed. A pilot project to strengthen local training institutions through the preparation of training courses and materials, training of instructors and course developers, and promotion of co-operation among training institutions was carried out in India, the Ivory Coast and Kenya. During the year, the UNCTAD sectoral adviser in shipping provided advice and direct assistance to 20 countries preparing development programmes.

Committee on Shipping. The Trade and Development Board, on 20 March 1981, took note of the report of the Committee on Shipping on its ninth session in, September 1980<sup>(3)</sup> and endorsed its resolutions on port problems and technical assistance and training, and its decisions on port congestion surcharges and international maritime legislation.<sup>(2)</sup>

At consultations with regional co-ordinators held on 17 November 1981, an item concerning a review of the Committee's work programme was added to the provisional agenda of the Committee's 1982 session.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/C.4/INF.33.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB, A/36/15.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 632.

### Training institutions

The High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries (p. 463, in a decision of 7 June 1981 on transport and communications among developing countries (see below), requested the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to take steps in identifying and strengthening national maritime transport training facilities which had multinational Scope<sup>(1)</sup>

In response, the Governing Council, on 26 June,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the UNDP Administrator, in co-operation with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization and other agencies, to enhance the capabilities of maritime transport training institutions with multinational scope in the developing countries through interregional and regional programmes and by assisting them with training specialists, training equipment and fellowships in maritime transport.

Decisions: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on TCDC (report, A/36/39), 2/5, para. 2, 7 June; <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1, 81/33, 26 June).

### Air transport

In accordance with a 1979 UNCTAD request relating to protectionism in the services sector,<sup>(3)</sup>

the UNCTAD secretariat submitted to the Trade and Development Board in July 1981 a report on the effects of discriminatory and unfair civil aviation practices on the growth of air transport in developing countries. The report found that, although the institutional framework for civil aviation provided for equitable relations between States, discriminatory and unfair practices existed in relations between developed and developing countries. In addition, structural disadvantages in many developing countries restricted the development and growth of their airlines.<sup>(2)</sup>

The report identified 13 aspects of particular concern to developing countries: preferential treatment in regard to traffic rights and exchange of routes; greater transparency in bilateral agreements; equal access to fuel; development and promotion of air transport and tourist industries of developing countries; control of airport user charges with a view to eliminating discrimination; financial guarantees by regional and international financial and development institutions for the purchase of aircraft; careful weighing of the balance between fare discounting and airline profitability; examination of the merits of end-to-end and combination fares; removal of restrictions on access to computerized information and reservation systems; closer connections between the airlines of developing countries and hotels abroad; joint purchase of spare parts and the setting up of joint training and maintenance centres; joint management and operating companies; and, in some cases, leasing of traffic rights in order to gain experience without financial risk.

The Board decided on 9 October to consider the question further in 1982.<sup>(1)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB, A/36/15; <sup>(2)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/860.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1979, p. 572.

### Co-operation among developing countries on transport and communications

The High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries (p. 463) on 7 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> invited developing countries to intensify and accelerate regional and subregional co-operation in transport and communications, and requested the United Nations development system to consider increasing substantially its support in that area. The Committee recommended that United Nations regional commissions and other bodies of the development system give special consideration to non-conventional means of transport and to the needs of geographically disadvantaged countries. Developed countries and the governing bodies of international financial institutions were invited to consider increasing their financial and

material support for transport and communications infrastructure projects and programmes. The Committee also requested the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme to strengthen national maritime transport training facilities with multinational scope (p. 568).

The Committee for Development Planning, in the report on its March/April 1981 session to the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(2)</sup> stressed the need for major action on transport and communications, especially in Africa south of the Sahara and in South Asia. The Committee noted that high transport costs impeded the growth and limited the markets of isolated industrial plants. It viewed subregional and regional planning and co-operation as a solution (p. 383).

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on TCDC (report, A/36/39) 2/5, 7 June.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27.

#### Treaties

The General Assembly, in a resolution of 16 December on the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development,<sup>(\*)</sup> called on countries to consider becoming parties to the 1974 United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences<sup>(2)</sup> and the 1980 United Nations Convention on International Multimodal Transport of Goods.<sup>(3)</sup>

As at 31 December 1981, neither Convention had received sufficient adherences to bring it into force. Fifty-one States owning 20 per cent of the relevant world tonnage had adhered to the Convention on liner conferences (shipping cartels). Six States had signed the Convention on multimodal transport but none had ratified.

In the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, Japan said the adoption of the resolution did not prejudice its Government's position on the Convention on multimodal transport. The United Kingdom reiterated the reservations of the European Community members in regard to both Conventions.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/145, para. 16, 16 Dec. (p. 534).

Yearbook references: <sup>(2)</sup>1974, p. 460; <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 1020.

Publications: United Nations Conference on a Convention on International Multimodal Transport, held at Geneva from 12 to 30 November 1979 (first part of the session) and from 8 to 24 May 1980 (resumed session), vol. I: Final Act and Convention on International Multimodal Transport of Goods (TD/MT/CONF/17), Sales No. E.81.II.D.7 (vol. I); vol. II: Draft Convention on International Multimodal Transport as at the Closure of the First Part of the Session of the Conference and Reports of the Conference (TD/MT/CONF/17/Add.1), Sales No. E.81.II.D.7 (vol. II).

#### Transport of dangerous goods

The Economic and Social Council, by a resolution of 4 May 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> took note of recommendations made in December 1980<sup>(6)</sup> by its Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous

Goods concerning the listing, classification, packaging and transport of products. This work was part of the Committee's ongoing task of harmonizing codes and regulations relating to the transport of explosives, liquefied gases, radioactive materials and other hazardous substances. The Council also took note of a report of the Secretary-General on the Committee's work in 1980<sup>(2)</sup> and of the Committee's recommendation to postpone further consideration of the question of a multimodal world-wide convention on the transport of dangerous goods. The Secretary-General was requested to publish and circulate the Committee's recommendations (p. 570), and Governments and organizations were invited to comment on them and to take account of them when developing national and international codes and regulations.

The Council decided on 6 May,<sup>(4)</sup> on the Committee's recommendation, to rearrange the 1981 calendar of meetings of the Committee's two subsidiary bodies. On 24 July 1981, in approving a calendar of economic and social meetings in 1982-1983,<sup>(5)</sup> the Council scheduled a session of the Committee and four sessions of its subsidiary bodies in 1982.

The Council's actions in May were taken without vote. The decision was orally proposed by the Council President, while the draft resolution was introduced in the Council's First (Economic) Committee by the United States, also on behalf of Canada, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. The Committee approved the text on 23 April, also without vote.

The Committee of Experts did not meet in 1981. The Group of Rapporteurs, at its twenty-seventh session, held at Geneva from 3 to 14 August, discussed revisions to the general recommendations on packing,<sup>(\*)</sup> for which it adopted new specifications and testing procedures and agreed to a revised form of coding and simpler presentation of the text. The aim was to complete the revised chapter on packing in 1982.

In continuation of the revision of the recommendations on multimodal tank transport, a working group met at Munich, Federal Republic of Germany, on tank containers for refrigerated liquefied gases. It produced a draft for a new section covering such containers. Work was also started on intermediate bulk containers.

The Committee's Group of Experts on Explosives also met in 1981 (p. 571).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Group of Rapporteurs, ST/SG/AC.10/C.2/9; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, E/1981/35.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC: 1981/3, 4 May, text following.

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(4)</sup>1981/129, 6 May, text following; <sup>(5)</sup>1981/192, para. (a) (ii), 24 July (p. 1089).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 1023.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.4 (23 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.13, (4, 6 May).

## Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/3

Adopted without vote Meeting 13 4 May 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/63) without vote, 23 April (meeting 4); 4-nation draft (E/1981/C.1/L.2); agenda Item 15.

Sponsors: Canada, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

Work of the Committee of Experts on  
the Transport of Dangerous Goods

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolutions 468 G (XV) of 15 April 1953, 645 G (XXIII) of 26 April 1957, 994 (XXXVI) of 16 December 1963, 1110 (XL) of 7 March 1966, 1488 (XLVIII) of 22 May 1970, 1744 (LIV) of 4 May 1973, 1973 (LIX) and 1974 (LIX) of 30 July 1975, 2050 (LXII) of 5 May 1977 and 1979/42 of 11 May 1979,

Recognizing the importance of the work of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods on the harmonization of codes and regulations relating to the transport of dangerous goods and on the question of an international convention on the transport of dangerous goods.

Noting the programme of work for the period 1981-1983 proposed by the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods in paragraphs 199 to 212 of the report on its eleventh session, and noting the report of the Secretary-General bringing to the attention of the Council the report of the Committee of Experts,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the work of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods;

2.. Takes note of the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods on its eleventh session respecting the listing, classification, packaging and transport of additional products, and other matters amending its recommendations;

3. Takes note with interest of the recommendation of the Committee of Experts to postpone at this time further consideration of the question of a multimodal world-wide convention on the transport of dangerous goods;

4. Notes with satisfaction the expression of appreciation of the Committee of Experts concerning the support it has received from the Economic Commission for Europe at Geneva during the past nineteen years;

5. Takes note of the Committee of Experts' desire for improved administrative and secretarial support for its activities;

6. Requests the Secretary-General, in the light of the contents of the report of the Committee of Experts:

(a) To incorporate in the revised recommendations prepared by the Committee of Experts the amendments set forth in the reports of the Committee of Experts on its tenth and eleventh sessions, together with the consequential changes necessary to eliminate inconsistencies;

(b) To publish the recommendations as soon as possible, without financial implications for the programme budget for 1980-1981, as decided by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session;

(c) To circulate the recommendations as soon as possible to the Governments of Member States, the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency and other international organizations concerned;

(d) To work closely with the Committee of Experts and the Economic Commission for Europe in improving administrative and secretarial support, both for the Committee's meetings and the regular publication of its recommendations;

7. Invites the Governments of Member States, the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency and other international organizations concerned to transmit to the Secretary-General such comments as they may wish to make on the amended recommendations;

6. Urges the Governments of Member States and international organizations concerned to take account of the recommendations of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods when developing both national and international codes and regulations.

## Economic and Social Council decision 1981/129

Adopted without vote

Draft orally proposed by President: agenda item 15.

Meetings of the Committee of Experts on the Transport  
of Dangerous Goods and its subsidiary bodies

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council decided:

(a) That the Group of Rapporteurs of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods should meet for two weeks in August, instead of for one week in March and one week in August 1981, as previously scheduled, and that the Group of Experts on Explosives should meet in October, instead of August 1981;

(b) To consider the calendar of meetings for 1982 of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and its subsidiary bodies at the second regular session of 1981 in the context of its overall consideration of the calendar of conferences and meetings for 1982 and 1983.

## Publication of recommendations

The Economic and Social Council decided on 6 February 1981<sup>(2)</sup> that it should be informed of the status of publication of the recommendations of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods. In its resolution of 4 May on the Committee's work,<sup>(1)</sup> the Council requested the Secretary-General to publish the revised recommendations as soon as possible, without financial implications for the United Nations programme budget for 1980-1981.

Also on 4 May, the Council invited the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions urgently to examine the question of the earliest possible publication.<sup>(3)</sup> The Council adopted the decision, without vote, as recommended by its First Committee, which approved the text in like manner on 23 April on an oral proposal by its Chairman following a suggestion by the United Kingdom.

In the Council's discussion, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States expressed concern at the delay in publication.

For financial reasons, the recommendations had not been published as of the end of 1981.

## Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC: 1981/3, para. 6 (b). 4 May (see above).

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1981/105, 6 Feb. (p. 1091); <sup>(3)</sup>1981/111, 4 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.SR.4 (23 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.13 (4 May).

## Economic and Social Council decision 1981/111

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/83), without vote, 23 April (meeting 4); oral proposal by Chairman on suggestion by United Kingdom; agenda Item 15.

Publication of the revised recommendations of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods  
At its 13th plenary meeting, on 4 May 1981, the Council decided to invite the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions urgently to examine the question of the earliest possible publication of the revised recommenda-

tions of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, requested by the Council in its resolutions 1979/42 of 11 May 1979 and 1981/3 of 4 May 1981, bearing in mind the previous recommendations of the Advisory Committee and the decision of the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session on resources and publishing the recommendations.

#### Explosives

The Group of Experts on Explosives, a subsidiary body of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, held its twenty-first session at Geneva from 12 to 16 October 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> The Group drafted new entries for the United Nations recommendations on the transport of dangerous goods, including one on pyrotechnic articles, and amended others. It discussed the classification of ammonium perchlorate and water-wetted explosives. A definition of "unit load" was provisionally adopted, referring to separately packaged items secured together, as on a pallet or in a sling. Test methods and criteria for explosives were discussed with a view to the compilation of a manual. The Group expressed concern that decisions on the classification of explosives taken by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and the European Economic Community were diverging from the United Nations recommendations.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Group of Experts, ST/SG/AC.10/C.1/6.

## Communications

#### Designation of the World Communications Year (1983)

On the recommendation of the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly, in November 1981, proclaimed 1983 as World Communications Year: Development of Communications Infrastructures. The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) was named lead agency for the observance.

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** The recommendation that the Assembly proclaim 1983 as World Communications Year, provided that all preliminary arrangements for its financing from voluntary contributions had been finalized, was made by the Economic and Social Council in a resolution of 23 July 1981.<sup>(6)</sup> The Council invited the ITU Secretary-General to continue preparations and the mobilization of resources for the Year, and to co-operate closely with United Nations organizations and agencies, especially the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the Universal Postal Union. Governments were invited to continue to participate actively in and

to contribute to the programme of activities for the Year.

The Council adopted the text, without vote, on the recommendation of its Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee, which similarly approved the draft on 15 July. The resolution was introduced by Ghana and also sponsored by Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria and Yugoslavia. It incorporated a paragraph proposed by Senegal and accepted by the sponsors, by which the Council invited the ITU Secretary-General to co-operate with United Nations organizations and agencies.

During informal consultations, two further revisions were agreed upon. First, instead of having the Council decide that 1983 would be the appropriate year for the celebration of World Communications Year, the Council proposed that 1983 should be the year for its celebration. Second, the phrase "development of communications infrastructures" was added to the title and to paragraph 2, and proclamation of the Year was made conditional on financing from voluntary contributions.

The ITU Secretary-General told the Council that the basic objective of the Year would be to encourage countries to review their communications development policies and speed up the development of their communications infrastructure. A World Telecommunication Exhibition (TELECOM-83) at Geneva and related self-financing activities would further the study of communications infrastructure issues, investment needs, transfer of information and application of appropriate technology.

In April, the United Nations Secretary-General submitted to the Economic and Social Council and the ITU Administrative Council a report<sup>(3)</sup> summarizing comments from seven Governments on a provisional programme of activities for the Year, sent to Member States in response to a 1980 request of the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(5)</sup> The report also contained a provisional programme for the observance, drafted at an inter-agency meeting at Geneva on 6 February 1981. In a telegram of 22 June,<sup>(4)</sup> the ITU Secretary-General submitted comments by that organization's Administrative Council reiterating its support for the Year.

A revised action programme for the Year was annexed to a July report to the Economic and Social Council submitted by the ITU Secretary-General.<sup>(2)</sup> It outlined general principles and proposals for national, regional and international action, including the organization of seminars and symposia, the production of radio and television programmes and publications, and the development of pilot projects. The report stated

that over 50 countries in all regions had appointed national correspondents to start national committees as soon as the Year was proclaimed. Financing was to be provided by voluntary contributions from Governments, foundations, non-governmental organizations and industry. This money, paid into an ITU-administered Special Fund for the World Communications Year, would be used to implement pilot projects, assist national and regional committees, finance promotional expenditure and pay for a secretariat at Geneva. Another annex to the report listed pledges totalling \$1.5 million from 13 States and 2 international organizations as at 30 June.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** Endorsing the Economic and Social Council proposal, the General Assembly, on 19 November, adopted without vote a resolution by which it proclaimed the year 1983 World Communications Year: Development of Communications infrastructures.<sup>(7)</sup> It designated ITU as the lead agency, responsible for co-ordinating interorganizational aspects of the programmes and activities of other agencies. States were requested and non-governmental organizations and users of communications services were invited to participate. United Nations organizations and agencies were invited to co-operate closely with the ITU Secretary-General. Governments and organizations were invited to contribute through the Special Fund co-ordinated by ITU. The Assembly appealed to government authorities and organizations to make circuits available for reporting on the Year's activities through existing means of information, including radio and television broadcasts, and requested the ITU Secretary-General to report in 1982 on preparations.

The resolution was adopted on the recommendation of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, which approved it without vote on 30 October as revised in writing and orally on behalf of its 22 sponsors. The oral changes included the insertion of "voluntary" before "resources" in a preambular reference to the mobilization of resources for the Year. The text and its revisions were introduced by Nigeria, which stressed the need for additional voluntary contributions.

The USSR explained that it had joined in the consensus on the text because the developing countries attached so much importance to the Year, and it welcomed the agreement that all projects would be financed from voluntary contributions; but it would not have voted for the appeal to make circuits available for reporting, as that matter lay within the exclusive competence of national authorities. Sierra Leone said the observance should help focus attention on the needs of the poorer nations for the development of communications. The United States observed that organizations with headquarters in

the United States had already pledged more than \$800,000 for activities relating to the Year.

The ITU Secretary-General, in a note transmitted to the Assembly in October by the United Nations Secretary-General, reported that, with voluntary contributions amounting to \$3,612,000 and further pledges announced, the Year could be launched without ITU having to resort to regular budgetary resources.<sup>(1)</sup> The amount included \$687,000 in cash from 16 countries and \$2,550,000 in kind. An ITU representative informed the Second Committee that the intention was to use the contributions in kind for experimental telecommunications projects in rural areas and the installation of infrastructure in countries that had none.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>ITU S-G, transmitted by S-G note. A/36/585.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ITU S-G, E/1981/70/Add.2; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, E/1981/70, and <sup>(4)</sup>comments of ITU Administrative Council, Add.1 (transmitted by telegram, 22 June).

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(5)</sup>1980/69, para. 3, 25 July 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1024); <sup>(6)</sup>1981/60, 23 July 1981, text following.

<sup>(7)</sup>GA: 36/40, 19 Nov., text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee E/1981/C.3/SR.1-3, 5-8, 70, 73 (2-15 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.40 (23 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.4, 7-10, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23-25, 27, 28 (25 Sep.-30 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.64 (19 Nov.).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1961/60

Adopted without vote Meeting 40 23 July 1981

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/96 (Part 0) without vote. 15 July (meeting 13); a-nation draft (E/1981/C.3/L.6). amended by Senegal (E/1981/C.3/L.8) and orally revised; agenda item 18.

Sponsors: Ghana, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahirly, Madagascar, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Yugoslavia.

#### World Communications Year: Development of Communications Infrastructures

The Economic and Social Council,

Recognizing the fundamental importance of communications infrastructures in all countries as essential elements in their economic and social development,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 32/160 of 19 December 1977 on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa, which proposed the designation of one year during the Decade as World Communications Year,

Recalling a/so General Assembly resolution 35/109 of 5 December 1980 on the World Communications Year, by which the Assembly endorsed the arrangements made by the Council concerning the Year.

Recalling further Council resolution 1980/69 of 23 July 1980, whereby the Council requested the Secretary-General to continue consultations with Governments and to submit revised proposals on programmes for the Year, and designated the International Telecommunication Union as the lead agency for the Year and requested it to submit a report on the state of preparations for the Year,

Convinced that a World Communications Year would provide the opportunity for all countries to undertake an in-depth review and analysis of their policies on communications development and to stimulate the accelerated development of communications infrastructures,

Having taken into account the guidelines for future international years,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General containing the proposed programme of activities, the comments of the Administrative Council of the International Telecommunication Union thereon and the report of the lead agency on the state of preparations for the Year and, in particular, on the



financial resources that had already been pledged for the Year and programmes that might be of interest to developing countries,

Welcoming the progress made by the United Nations system and Governments in preparations for the Year,

1. Proposes that 1983 should be the World Communications Year;

2. Recommends that the General Assembly, at its thirty-sixth session, should proclaim the year 1983 as "World Communications Year: Development of Communications Infrastructures", provided that all preliminary arrangements for its financing from voluntary contributions have been finalized before the adoption of the final decision;

3. Invites the Secretary-General of the International Telecommunication Union to continue preparations and the mobilization of resources for the Year;

4. Invites further Secretary-General of the International Telecommunication Union, in preparing for the World Communications Year, to co-operate closely with the competent organizations and agencies in the United Nations system, especially the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the Universal Postal Union, taking full account of their respective terms of reference, in order to avoid overlapping and duplication;

5. Invites also Governments to continue to participate actively in and to contribute to the programme of activities for the Year.

General Assembly resolution 36/40

Adopted without vote Meeting 64 19 November 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/691) without vote, 30 October (meeting 281); 22-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.6/Rev.1), orally revised; agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania.

#### World Communications Year: Development of Communications Infrastructures

The General Assembly.

Recalling its resolution 32/160 of 19 December 1977 on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa, in which it requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the International Telecommunication Union and other specialized agencies concerned, to propose for consideration, as appropriate, one year during the Decade as a World Communications Year, in view of the importance of transport and communications to other regions of the world,

Recalling also its resolution 35/109 of 5 December 1980 on the World Communications Year, by which it endorsed the arrangements made by the Economic and Social Council concerning the Year,

Recalling further Economic and Social Council resolution 1961/60 of 23 July 1961, in which the Council proposed that the year 1963 should be proclaimed World Communications Year: Development of Communications Infrastructures.

Taking into account the guidelines for future international years adopted in General Assembly decision 35/424 of 5 December 1980.

Having examined the note by the Secretary-General of the International Telecommunication Union concerning the mobilization of voluntary resources for the World Communications Year,

Recognizing the fundamental importance of communications infrastructures as an essential element in the economic and social development of all countries,

Convinced that the World Communications Year will provide the opportunity for all countries to undertake an in-depth review and analysis of their policies on communications development and stimulate the accelerated development of communications infrastructures,

1. Endorses the proposal made by the Economic and Social Council in paragraph 1 of its resolution 1981/60 and

proclaims the year 1983 World Communications Year: Development of Communications Infrastructures, with the International Telecommunication Union serving as the lead agency for the Year and having responsibility for co-ordinating the inter-organizational aspects of the programmes and activities of other agencies;

2. Requests all States to participate actively in the attainment of the objectives of the World Communications Year;

3. Invites the competent organizations and agencies of the United Nations system to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General of the International Telecommunication Union, within their respective terms of reference, for the implementation of the programme for the World Communications Year;

4. Invites non-governmental organizations and users of communications services to participate actively in the World Communications Year and to secure the fullest possible co-ordination of their programmes for the Year, particularly at the national level;

5. Invites Governments and interested organizations to make voluntary contributions to the World Communications Year through the Special Fund for the World Communications Year co-ordinated by the International Telecommunication Union, in order to ensure increased financing of projects at the national, regional and global levels;

6. Appeals to governmental authorities and appropriate organizations to make circuits available for reporting on the activities of the World Communications Year through existing means of information, including radio and television broadcasts, in collaboration with those authorities;

7. Requests the Secretary-General of the International Telecommunication Union to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, through the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982, on the state of preparations for the World Communications Year.

#### Preparations for the Year

An inter-agency committee for the World Communications Year, meeting at Geneva on 3 December 1981, adopted an action plan for 1982 which included the distribution of publications and information material and the organization of meetings.<sup>(1)</sup> The committee approved the principle of early establishment in each country of a committee to co-ordinate national preparations and implementation of the programme for the Year, and adopted measures designed to make the national committees widely representative. It prepared a guide containing information on the general guidelines, organization and financing of the Year, approved the presentation of a register of activities and reviewed a list of proposed pilot projects.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ITU S-G, transmitted by S-G note, A/37/232.

## Tourism

Implementation of the 1980 Manila

Declaration of the World Tourism Conference

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 19 November 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> welcomed the Manila Declaration on World Tourism, adopted in October 1980 by the World Tourism Conference and providing guidelines for the harmonious, bal-

anced and equitable development of national and international tourism. The Assembly urged States to give due attention to the principles of the Declaration in formulating their tourism policies, plans and programmes. It requested the World Tourism Organization (WTO)—which organized the Conference at Manila, Philippines, from 27 September to 10 October 1980—to continue its efforts for the development and promotion of tourism, especially in the developing countries, bearing in mind the Declaration's guidelines. Organizations interested in tourism were requested to assist in implementing the Declaration. The Assembly decided that WTO might participate on a continuing basis in the Assembly's work in areas of concern to WTO and requested its Secretary-General to report to the Assembly in 1983 on implementation of the Declaration.

The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, which approved it on 11 November in the same manner.

The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Committee following informal consultations on a draft introduced by the Philippines, also sponsored by Bolivia, Jamaica, Kenya,<sup>(1)</sup> Panama and Thailand and later withdrawn. According to that draft, the Assembly would have affirmed the principles and concepts of the Manila Declaration rather than welcomed it. It would have urged States to give due attention to those principles and align their tourism policies, plans and programmes in consonance with the Declaration and within the framework of the WTO work programme. It would have decided that WTO "shall" participate in the work of the Assembly, whereas the adopted text specified that it "may" participate in the Assembly's work in areas of concern to it. Finally, the request for a report would have been addressed to the United Nations Secretary-General in collaboration with the WTO Secretary-General, instead of directly to the latter.

Poland, speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, reiterated their reservations with regard to the Manila Declaration. In the Committee's debate, Hungary said that, in conformity with the Declaration, it supported the idea that tourism should develop in a climate of peace and security.

The President of the Manila Conference, addressing the Second Committee, described the Declaration as an expression of the hopes and aspirations of mankind for a better world through a balanced and equitable development of world tourism. Among its concepts were that

tourism could be a vital force for peace, could contribute to the establishment of a new international economic order, and could flourish only if it was based on equity, sovereign equality, non-interference in internal affairs and co-operation among all States. It pointed out that economic returns could not be the only criterion for encouraging tourism; its cultural and moral dimensions must be fostered. It stated that the right to the use of leisure, and in particular the right to access to holidays and to freedom of travel and tourism, were recognized as an aspect of human fulfilment.

The Manila Declaration, with supplementary recommendations, was transmitted to the Assembly in May, annexed to a report on the Conference by the WTO Secretary-General, submitted under cover of a note by the United Nations Secretary-General.<sup>(2)</sup> The report suggested that investments for creating collective recreational facilities, improving tourist areas and sites and renovating historical and cultural monuments might be given priority. The emphasis on international tourism, it stated, had prevented the necessary attention from being devoted to the 80 per cent of tourist movements occurring at the national level; the development of overall tourism movements had therefore been somewhat unbalanced.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Bolivia, Jamaica, Kenya, Panama, Philippines, Thailand, A/C.2/36/L.8.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>WTO S-G, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/236.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/41, 19 Nov., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 20, 21, 23, 27, 35 (25 Sep.-11 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.64 (19 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/41

Adopted without vote Meeting 64 19 November 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/691) without vote. 11 November (meeting 35); draft by Vice-Chairmen (A/C.2/36/L.29), based on informal consultations on 6-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.8); agenda item 12.

#### World Tourism Organization

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 32/157 of 19 December 1977 and 33/122 of 19 December 1978, concerning the World Tourism Organization.

Recalling a/so its resolution 34/134 of 14 December 1979, concerning the convening of the World Tourism Conference in September and October 1980 at Manila by the World Tourism Organization.

Recalling further its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, by which it proclaimed the Third United Nations Development Decade and adopted the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Decade,

Taking note of paragraph (c) of Economic and Social Council decision 109(LIX) of 23 July 1975, in which the Council designated the World Tourism Organization to participate, on a continuing basis, in the work of the Council,

Noting with satisfaction the report of the Secretary-General of the World Tourism Organization on the World Tourism Conference, prepared in conformity with General Assembly resolution 34/134.

Noting with appreciation the statement made by the Minis-

ter of Tourism of the Philippines and President of the World Tourism Conference before the Second Committee, on 8 October 1981, on the results of the Conference, as embodied in the Manila Declaration on World Tourism adopted by the Conference,

Recognizing the new dimension and role of tourism as a positive instrument towards the improvement of the quality of life for all peoples, as well as a vital force for peace and international understanding,

1. Welcomes the Manila Declaration on World Tourism, which provides guidelines for the harmonious, balanced and equitable development of national and international tourism;

2. Urges States to give due attention to the principles of the Manila Declaration while formulating and implementing, as appropriate, their tourism policies, plans and programmes, in accordance with their national priorities and within the framework of the programme of work of the World Tourism Organization;

3. Requests the World Tourism Organization to continue its efforts towards the future development and promotion of tourism, especially in the developing countries, bearing in mind the implementation of the principles and guidelines contained in the Manila Declaration;

4. Requests international, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations directly or indirectly interested in tourism to extend their assistance, in consultation and co-operation with the World Tourism Organization, towards the implementation of the Manila Declaration;

5. Decides that the World Tourism Organization may participate, on a continuing basis, in the work of the General Assembly in areas of concern to that Organization;

6. Requests the Secretary-General of the World Tourism Organization to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, through the Economic and Social Council, a report on the progress made in the implementation of the Manila Declaration.

## Chapter VI

# Industrial development

The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) continued in 1981 its efforts to assist developing countries raise their share of world industrial production to the target of 25 per cent by the year 2000. Its activities were geared to implementation of the instrument containing this goal—the Lima Declaration and Plan of Action on Industrial Development and Co-operation,<sup>(s)</sup> adopted in 1975 at the Second General Conference of UNIDO (Lima, Peru).

Activities in 1981—described in a report by the UNIDO Executive Director to the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO<sup>(4)</sup>—focused on priority areas identified by the Board in May 1980,<sup>(10)</sup> as a follow-up to decisions of the Third General Conference (New Delhi, India, January/February 1980) : <sup>(9)</sup> energy-related and other industrial technology, industrial production, human resources development, special measures for the least developed countries (LDCs) and the System of Consultations on development of selected industrial sectors. Technical assistance delivery (p. 585) amounted to \$88.5 million, the highest since the inception of UNIDO.

The 45-nation Industrial Development Board held its fifteenth session at UNIDO headquarters, Vienna, Austria, on 7 May and from 15 to 30 May,<sup>(1)</sup> when it reaffirmed the priorities set at its previous session. Its Permanent Committee met twice at Vienna, for its fifteenth (7-15 May)<sup>(2)</sup> and sixteenth (16-21 November)<sup>(3)</sup> sessions. The work of UNIDO was reviewed by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, each of which adopted a resolution on various aspects of its operations—the Council in July<sup>(5)</sup>

and the Assembly in December.<sup>(7)</sup> The Assembly also added the three newest United Nations Members, Antigua and Barbuda, Belize and Vanuatu, to the lists of States eligible for membership in the Board.<sup>(6)</sup>

UNIDO expenditures in 1981 totalled \$134 million—including \$67 million supplied by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) for field programmes and \$35.9 million from its regular budget, a part of the United Nations budget (P. 580). The voluntarily financed United Nations Industrial Development Fund (UNIDF) provided \$10.4 million of the total (p. 582).

As at 31 December 1981, 66 States had ratified the new Constitution of UNIDO, adopted in 1979 with the aim of transforming it into a specialized agency (p. 583). Entry into force of the Constitution was to take place after 80 States had adhered.

In June 1981, the UNDP Governing Council increased its allocation for the Special Industrial Services programme, but financial constraints did not permit it to double the level of resources as the Board had requested (P. 587). The UNDP allocation for UNIDO Senior Industrial Development Field Advisers (SIDFAs) was also increased and the Economic and Social Council, on the Governing Council's recommendation, asked for efforts to have UNIDO pay a larger share of the cost (p. 587).

The Board established a 1982-1983 programme for the System of Consultations, and Consultation meetings were held in 1981 on the food processing, petrochemical and capital goods industries (p. 588). Their aim was to

bring together government officials and others on problems relating to the development of specific industries in developing countries.

UNIDO continued its studies on structural changes in industry, including the redeployment of industries to developing countries (p. 590). The Permanent Committee, in November, was unable to reach agreement on a proposal by the UNIDO Executive Director for establishing an international bank for industrial development (p. 591). Consideration was given to ways in which UNIDO might improve its activities in assisting countries to prepare industrial development projects (p. 594). The Board reaffirmed the priority to be given to projects in LDCs (p. 595).

Technical co-operation projects aided developing countries to build up their major industrial sectors (p. 595). In addition, UNIDO convened expert meetings to explore possibilities in regard to new technologies, notably genetic engineering, micro-electronics and lighter-than-air craft (p.593).

On other matters, the General Assembly, on the Board's recommendation, decided to allocate adequate resources for the Industrial Development Decade for Africa (1980-1990) (p. 621), and called for increased assistance to Palestinians (p. 273) and Namibians (p. 1178). UNIDO continued to promote the most efficient industrial use of water (p. 684) and energy (p. 705), the transfer of industrial technology to developing countries (p. 755) and the participation of women in industrial development (p. 986). The United Nations Statistical Office provided advice to Governments on participation in the 1983 World Programme of Industrial Statistics (p. 1068).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; Permanent Committee, <sup>(2)</sup>ID/B/268 & Corr.1 (May), <sup>(3)</sup>ID/B/270 (Nov.); <sup>(4)</sup>UNIDO Executive Director, ID/B/280.

Resolutions: (5)ESC, 1981/75, 24 July (p. 577); GA, <sup>(6)</sup>36/181(p.584); <sup>(7)</sup>36/182 (p. 578), 17 Dec.

Yearbook references: <sup>(8)</sup>1975, p. 473; 1980; <sup>(9)</sup>p.644, <sup>(10)</sup>p.653. Publications: World Industry in 1980: Regular issue of the biennial Industrial Development Survey (ID/269), Sales No. E.81.II.B.3. Industry and Development, No. 6, Sales No. E.81.II.B.4. UNIDO Newsletter, Nos.. 155-164.

## Programme and finances of UNIDO

### Programme policy decisions

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD ACTION. On 20 May 1981, the Industrial Development Board (2) reaffirmed the priorities for 1981-1983 which it had established in May 1980<sup>(7)</sup> when deciding on follow-up action to decisions taken in February 1980 by the Third General Conference of UNIDO.<sup>(6)</sup> The priority areas were energy-

related and other industrial technology, industrial production, human resources development, special measures for LDCs and the UNIDO System of Consultations.

The Board requested the General Assembly, when allocating resources, to take into account the consensus on the 1982-1983 budget reached on 15 May 1981 by the Board's Permanent Committee (P. 581). The Committee agreed that the provision of adequate resources was particularly necessary in support of priority areas and stressed the importance of UNIDO operational activities.<sup>(3)</sup>

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. By a resolution on industrial development co-operation adopted on 24 July, the Economic and Social Council endorsed the Board's conclusions reaffirming its priorities for 1981-1983 and recommended that the General Assembly ensure adequate resources for those activities (p. 581).

Referring to specific UNIDO activities, the Council reiterated the importance of redeployment of industrial capacities to developing countries and of facilitating the restructuring of world industrial production (p. 591); recommended consideration of a proposal for an international bank for industrial development (p. 591); requested proposals on energy-related technology (p. 706) and follow-up to the 1981 United Nations Conference on LDCs (P. 406); supported a strengthening of the System of Consultations (p. 588); urged contributions to UNIDF (p. 582) and ratification of the UNIDO Constitution (p. 584); requested the allocation of adequate resources for the Industrial Development Decade for Africa (p. 622); and favoured an increased share for UNIDO in the cost of SIDFAs (p. 588).

The Council adopted this resolution, sponsored by Venezuela on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries, by 43 votes to none, with 5 abstentions, following its approval on 21 July by the First (Economic) Committee, as orally revised during informal consultations, by 41 votes to none, with 5 abstentions. The changes affected the provision on the 1982-1983 budget and, to a lesser extent, the paragraphs on the proposed international bank for industrial development and on energy-related technology.

Reservations were expressed with regard to the provisions on industrial redeployment (European Community (EC) members), resources for UNIDO (Belgium, Federal Republic of Germany), the proposed international bank for industrial development (Federal Republic of Germany), the SIDFA programme (United Kingdom), energy-related technology (Federal Republic of Germany) and the Industrial Development Decade for Africa (Belgium).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 17 December on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly took note of the Industrial Development Board's report, decided to ensure adequate resources for priority activities of UNIDO (p. 581) and made recommendations on various aspects of the UNIDO programme.

Like the Council, the Assembly requested the UNIDO secretariat to develop its programme on industrial redeployment; supported the strengthening of the System of Consultations; urged contributions to UNIDF and ratification of the UNIDO Constitution so as to convert it into a specialized agency; and requested the Board to consider the proposal for an international bank for industrial development. The Assembly also requested increased technical co-operation and other programmes on energy-related industrial technology, as well as increased technical co-operation with LDCs (p. 595); asked the Board to begin functioning as the Preparatory Committee for the Fourth General Conference of UNIDO, scheduled for 1984 (p. 585); and decided to allocate adequate funds in connection with the current Industrial Development Decade for Africa (p. 622).

The resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 7 December. The original draft,<sup>(1)</sup> sponsored by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77, was withdrawn and replaced by a text submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Committee on the basis of informal consultations on the Algerian text.

The adopted text included a preambular paragraph not in the original, by which the Assembly endorsed the Board's consensus on follow-up to the decisions of the UNIDO Third General Conference. There were also differences in the provisions on redeployment of industrial capacities, the System of Consultations, resources for UNIDO, UNIDF, the proposed international bank for industrial development and energy-related technology. As a result of further informal consultations, the Vice-Chairman revised his draft orally to delete a paragraph by which the Assembly would have urged the early implementation of all decisions in the Economic and Social Council resolution of 24 July.

Following approval of the resolution in Committee, comments or reservations were expressed in regard to the provisions on industrial redeployment (Eastern European States, United States), the System of Consultations (Eastern European States, EC members), UNIDF (Eastern European members), the proposed international bank for industrial development (EC members), the UNIDO budget (Eastern European States, EC

members, United States) and the Industrial Development Decade for Africa (Eastern European States).

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.82.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(3)</sup>Permanent Committee, ID/B/268 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1981/75, 24 July, text following; <sup>(5)</sup>GA, 36/182, 17 Dec. text following.

Yearbook references: 1980, <sup>(6)</sup>p. 644, <sup>(7)</sup>p. 653.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/829; S-G statements, A/C.2/36/L.138, A/C.5/36/101.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.8-10, 13, 17 (8-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 42, 46 (24 Sep.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/75

43-0-5 Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/111), by vote 41-0-5, 21 July (meeting 17); draft by Venezuela, for Group of 77 (E/198/C.1/L.10). orally revised: agenda Item 14.

#### Industrial development co-operation

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New international Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362 (S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling also the Lima Declaration and Plan of Action on Industrial Development and Co-operation, adopted at the Second General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, which laid down the main measures and principles for industrial development and co-operation within the framework of the establishment of the new international economic order,

Recalling the New Delhi Declaration and Plan of Action on industrialization of Developing Countries and International Co-operation for their Industrial Development, adopted at the Third General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, which spelt out a strategy for the further industrialization of developing countries for the 1980s and beyond, as well as a plan of action for the restructuring of world industry within the framework of the establishment of the new international economic order,

Recalling further Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/61 of 24 July 1980 and General Assembly resolutions 35/66 on industrial development co-operation and 35/56 on the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, adopted on 5 December 1980,

Conscious of the role of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as the central co-ordinating organ within the United Nations system for the promotion of industrial development co-operation and for the fulfilment of the agreed measures and the attainment of the agreed targets in both the Lima Declaration and Plan of Action and the New Delhi Declaration and Plan of Action,

Bearing in mind that, within the framework of the new international economic order, far-reaching changes in the structure of the world economy involve the restructuring of world industry, taking fully into account the capabilities and potentials of the developing countries,

Stressing the importance of the industrialization of developing countries in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Reiterating the need for a substantially increased transfer of financial resources to developing countries for their accelerated industrialization,

Bearing in mind the necessity of maintaining the momentum of technical assistance delivery achieved by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization in recent years,

Having considered the report of the Industrial Development Board on its fifteenth session, the annual report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization for 1980 and his report concerning action taken with regard to the Industrial Development Decade for Africa, 1980-1990,

1. Endorses the conclusions reached by the Industrial Development Board at its fifteenth session reaffirming that activities in the areas of industrial technology, energy-related industrial technology, industrial production, the development of human resources and special measures for the least developed countries and the System of Consultations should be given priority for 1981-1983, as established at the fourteenth session of the Board;

2. Reiterates the importance of redeployment, as described in paragraph 73 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 35/56, and considers that the secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization should undertake to continue studies in this field;

3. Requests the secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization to continue to improve and further develop its programme on industrial redeployment along the lines approved by the Board at its thirteenth and fifteenth sessions, as well as by the General Assembly in resolution 34/98 of 13 December 1979 entitled "Industrial development co-operation and Third General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation" and in resolutions 35/56 on the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade and 35/66 on industrial development co-operation;

4. Reiterates the importance of facilitating the restructuring of world industrial production through, inter alia, the full implementation of resolution 131. (V) of 3 June 1979 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development;

5. Reaffirms recognition by the Industrial Development Board of the importance of financial flows to industrial development in developing countries;

6. Recommends that the Permanent Committee of the Industrial Development Board should consider carefully, at its sixteenth session, the proposal by the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization for an international bank for industrial development, with a view to taking a decision on it;

7. Requests the Executive Director to submit specific proposals in panning future activities in the sector of energy-related technology on the basis of agreements reached at the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, to be held at Nairobi in August 1981;

8. Further requests the Executive Director to participate effectively in the deliberations and follow-up activities of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, to be held in Paris in September 1981;

9. Strongly supports the strengthening of the System of Consultations in the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as a forum for developed and developing countries in their contacts and consultations directed towards the industrialization developing countries and, in order to secure the increased participation of the least developed countries in future consultations, requests the General Assembly to ensure the participation of fifty representatives of such countries in 1982-1983 by financing from sources to be determined by the Assembly;

10. Urges all States, in particular the developed countries, to contribute to the United Nations Industrial Development Fund or to raise their contributions, taking into account the need for the maximum flexibility, with a view to reaching annually the agreed desirable funding level of \$50 million;

11. Thanks the one hundred and fourteen States which have signed the new Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and the forty-six States which have ratified it as at 6 July 1981, and urges all Member

States which have not yet done so to hasten the process of signature and ratification, so as to complete it, if possible, before the end of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly;

12. Declares the Industrial Development Decade for Africa to be one of the most important programmes of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and requests the General Assembly to allocate adequate financial resources, as from the next biennium, to assist the rapid industrialization of Africa within the scope of the Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, adopted at the second extraordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Lagos on 28 and 29 April 1980, with particular reference to the least developed countries;

13. Recommends that the General Assembly, at its thirty-sixth session, should ensure adequate resources for priority activities on the basis of the consensus reflected in paragraphs 134 to 140 of the report of the Permanent Committee of the Industrial Development Board on the work of its fifteenth session, bearing in mind that the provision of adequate resources is particularly necessary in support of priority areas in the activities of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization;

14. Invites the Secretary-General to make every effort to increase the share of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization in the cost of the programme of Senior Industrial Development Field Advisers, as recommended by the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme at its twenty-eighth session.

General Assembly resolution 36/182

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.4) without vote. 7 December. (meeting 46): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.141), orally revised, based on informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.82); agenda item 69 (d).

#### Industrial development co-operation

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362 (S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, in which, inter alia, it stressed the importance of industrialization in the development of developing countries,

Recalling also the Lima Declaration and Plan of Action on Industrial Development and Co-operation, adopted at the Second General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, in which were laid down the main measures and principles for industrial development and co-operation within the framework of the establishment of the new international economic order,

Recalling further the New Delhi Declaration and Plan of Action on Industrialization of Developing Countries and International Co-operation for their Industrial Development, adopted at the Third General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, in which a strategy was spelt out for the further industrialization of developing countries for the 1980s and beyond, as well as a plan of action for the restructuring of world industry within the framework of the establishment of the new international economic order,

Endorsing the consensus reached at the fourteenth session of the Industrial Development Board on the follow-up to the decisions and recommendation of the Third General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization.

Reaffirming its resolution 35/66 of 5 December 1980 and Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/75 of 24 July 1981, both on industrial development co-operation, as adopted,

Bearing In mind the Lagos Plan of Action for the implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its second extraordinary session, held at Lagos on 28 and April 1980,

Conscious of the role of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as the central co-ordinating organ within the United Nations system for the promotion of industrial development co-operation and for the fulfilment of the agreed measures and the attainment of the targets agreed upon In both the Lima Declaration and Plan of Action and the New Delhi Declaration and Plan of Action,

Bearing in mind that, within the framework of the new international economic order, far-reaching changes in the structure of the world economy involve the restructuring of world industry, taking fully into account the capacities and potential of the developing countries,

Reiterating the need for a substantially increased transfer of financial and technical resources to developing countries for their accelerated industrialization.

Welcoming the efforts made by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization in the field of technical assistance and stressing the need for a further increase in the flow of such assistance to developing countries,

Having considered the report of the Industrial Development Board on its fifteenth session,

#### Report of the Industrial Development Board on its fifteenth session

1. Takes note of the report of the Industrial Development Board on its fifteenth session;
2. Reiterates the importance of redeployment of industrial capacities as described In paragraph 73 of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade and considers that the secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization should undertake to continue studies in this field;
3. Requests the secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization to continue to improve and further develop Its programme on industrial redeployment along the lines approved by the Industrial Development Board at its thirteenth and fifteenth sessions, as well as by the General Assembly in resolution 34/98 of 13 December 1979, entitled 'Industrial development co-operation and Third General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization', and in its resolutions 35/56 and 35/66;
4. Strongly supports the strengthening of the System of Consultations, in the light of experience gained and of the relevant decisions of the Industrial Development Board, giving particular attention to measures that could increase the industrial capacities of developing countries, and requests the Board to consider, at its sixteenth session, the possibility of including in the biennium 1982-1983 Consultation meetings in-addition to those listed in paragraph 171 of the report of the Board on the work of its fifteenth session;
5. Urges all States that have not yet done so to ratify the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as soon as possible in order to allow the conversion of the organization into a new specialized agency in 1982;
6. Reiterates also the importance of facilitating the restructuring of world industrial production through, *in alia*, the implementation of its resolution 35/66 and of resolution 131 (V) of 3 June 1979 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development;
7. Decides to ensure that adequate resources are made available to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization for priority activities on the basis of the consensus

reflected in recent sessions of the Permanent Committee of the Industrial Development Board and of the Board itself;

8. Also urges all States, in particular the developed countries, to contribute to the United Nations Industrial Development Fund or to raise their contributions, taking into account the need for maximum flexibility, with a view to reaching the agreed desirable funding level of \$50 million annually;

9. Requests the Industrial Development Board at its sixteenth session to continue to consider carefully the proposal of the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization for an International bank for industrial development with a view to taking a decision on it, and requests the Executive Director to continue his efforts on the subject in accordance with the relevant decision of the Permanent Committee at its sixteenth session;

10. Requests the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, at the request of the developing countries, to increase technical co-operation and programmes and projects in energy-related industrial technology on the basis, *in alia*, of agreements reached at the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy;

11. Also requests Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization to increase technical co-operation and the programmes and projects for the least developed countries on the basis of their requests and as envisaged in the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries;

12. Decides to ensure that adequate resources shall be made available to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization to assist developing countries in the preparation of the industrial programmes and projects referred to in paragraphs 10 and 11 above;

13. Requests the Industrial Development Board at its sixteenth session, to be held in May 1982, to begin functioning as the Preparatory Committee for the Fourth General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, to be convened in 1984, and accordingly to formulate an agenda and other proposals and submit recommendations to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

14. Welcomes the offer of the Government of Kenya to act as host to the Fourth General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization;

## II

### Industrial Development Decade for Africa

1. Takes note of the note by the Secretary-General of 5 October 1981 on the implementation of the Industrial Development Decade for Africa;
2. Declares the Industrial Development Decade for Africa to be one of the most important programmes of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization;
3. Requests the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization to provide adequate resources, including human resources, for the co-ordination unit for the Industrial Development Decade for Africa;
4. Decides to allocate adequate financial resources to assist in the rapid industrialization of Africa within the time-frame and scope of the Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, with particular reference to the least developed countries, as from the 1982-1983 biennium;
5. Also requests the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to continue and intensify contacts with the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system in order to contribute to the success of the Industrial Development Decade for Africa, and to submit, through the Industrial Development Board at its sixteenth session and the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982, a comprehensive report on the Decade to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

## Medium-term plan for 1984-1989

Twice during 1981, at its May<sup>(1)</sup> and November<sup>(2)</sup> sessions, the Permanent Committee of the Industrial Development Board examined a draft of the UNIDO section of the United Nations medium-term plan for 1984-1989, as submitted by the Executive Director. The draft was to be reviewed and finalized in the light of comments and observations by Committee members, and then submitted in 1982 to the General Assembly through the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC).

Reports: Permanent Committee, <sup>(1)</sup>ID/B/268 & Corr.1, <sup>(2)</sup>ID/B/270.

## Programme evaluation

Two review meetings on implementation, chaired by the UNIDO Executive Director and attended by all divisional directors and managers of major programmes, were held during 1981, as in previous years. These meetings, at which UNIDO programmes were assessed one by one, remained the principal mechanism within the secretariat for reviewing the performance of UNIDO. In addition, three outside experts were requested to review progress on several headquarters programmes and offer advice on future activities. Headquarters staff participated in approximately 40 in-depth project reviews and evaluations. Further, as requested by CPC, the United Nations Secretariat, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UNIDO initiated the first phase of an in-depth evaluation of UNDP-financed and UNIDO-executed technical co-operation field projects covering manufactures.

The UNIDO secretariat submitted two reports on evaluation to the Permanent Committee. The first<sup>(3)</sup> described follow-up to a 1980 evaluation report on projects of assistance to industrial research and service institutes, and plans for an inter-agency evaluation of industrial training. The second, a progress report on systems design for internal evaluation,<sup>(4)</sup> said the secretariat intended to proceed in stages with the establishment of the proposed system.

After reviewing these reports, the Permanent Committee recommended on 8 May<sup>(2)</sup> that the Industrial Development Board request the Executive Director to install effective internal evaluation by the spring of 1982, within the resources budgeted for an evaluation unit. The Committee's report, containing this recommendation, was approved by the Board on 19 May.<sup>(1)</sup>

During the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, Austria regarded efforts to establish an internal evaluation system as particularly im-

portant in view of the budgetary constraints imposed on UNIDO.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(2)</sup>Permanent Committee, ID/B/268 & Corr.1; UNIDO secretariat, <sup>(3)</sup>ID/B/C.3/105, <sup>(4)</sup>ID/B/C.3/108.

## Finances of UNIDO

## Expenditures in 1981

UNIDO spent \$134 million in 1981, of which 66 per cent was for technical co-operation programmes (p. 585) and the rest for headquarters activities. The largest source of funds was UNDP, which supplied \$67 million for field programmes; a total of \$36 million was derived from the United Nations regular budget (see table below).

Measured in expenditure terms, the major categories of activities were: industrial operations, \$99.8 million (74.7 per cent); industrial studies, \$8.8 million (6.6 per cent); conference services, public information and external relations, \$7.8 million (5.8 per cent); administrative and common services, \$7.6 million (5.7 per cent); policy co-ordination, \$7.1 million (5.3 per cent); executive direction and management, \$1.4 million (1 per cent); and policy-making organs, \$1 million (0.7 per cent) (see table on next page).

1981 EXPENDITURES OF UNIDO, BY SOURCE OF FUNDS  
(in millions of US dollars)

Source	Amount
Technical co-operation programme	
Regular programme	3.5
UNDP/Indicative planning figures and cash counter-part	64.0
UNDP/Special Industrial Services (SIS)	1.6
UNDP/Special Programme Resources and special measures	1.5
United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development	1.7
SIS Trust Fund	0.1
Trust funds	4.8
United Nations Industrial Development Fund	10.4
Non-UNIDO funds	0.9
Subtotal	88.5
Headquarters	
Regular budget	35.9
Overheads	9.3
Subtotal	45.2
Total	133.7

## Programme budget for 1982-1983

The appropriation for UNIDO in the United Nations programme budget for 1982-1983, as adopted by the General Assembly on 18 December 1981,<sup>(7)</sup> amounted to \$72,942,200. This included \$319,100 added by the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee<sup>(2)</sup> to the original budget estimates to strengthen the



System of Consultations, as called for by the Assembly on 17 December (p. 588).

The Permanent Committee of the Industrial Development Board,<sup>(4)</sup> after considering the proposed budget, adopted several conclusions on 15 May. While recognizing the budgetary restraints under which the United Nations had to operate, the Committee recognized the desirability of expanding some UNIDO activities, especially for technical assistance, and recommended that the budget ensure the provision of adequate resources to enable UNIDO to implement its mandate. The Committee further noted that the expansion of programmes or the addition of new programmes could be carried out by savings in other activities, by improvements in staff productivity and by reallocation of resources between sections of the United Nations budget.

The Industrial Development Board,<sup>(3)</sup> on 19 May, adopted its Committee's report, including its recommendation to submit to the Assembly the Committee's conclusions on the budget. In this regard, the United States said it did not interpret those conclusions as authorizing real growth in the UNIDO budget and it could not support reallocation of United Nations resources in favor of UNIDO. The Group of 77 reiterated the consensus reached in the Committee that reallocations in favor of UNIDO could take place, that expanding some UNIDO activities was desirable and that adequate resources were particularly necessary in priority areas.

The Economic and Social Council, in its resolution of 24 July on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(5)</sup> recommended that the Assembly ensure adequate resources for priority activities on the basis of the consensus reached in the Permanent Committee.

The original draft of this resolution, as proposed by Venezuela on behalf of the Group of 77, would have had the Council call for the allocation of "additional" adequate resources. Also, the final version omitted a clause mentioning that a sum not exceeding \$3 million would provide additional technical assistance delivery of \$25 million in the next biennium.

Following adoption of the resolution, Belgium stated that it was advisable to respect the zero-growth rate recommended by the Secretary-General for the United Nations budget for 1982-1983 and that any supplementary resources for priority sectors established by UNIDO should be offset by reductions elsewhere in the UNIDO programme. The Federal Republic of Germany opposed the provision of additional appropriations for UNIDO.

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(6)</sup> decided to ensure that adequate

1981 UNIDO EXPENDITURES ON TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION  
AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

(In thousands of US dollars)

Type of activity	Technical co-operation	support
Policy-making organs	—	996
Executive direction and management*	—	1,395
Policy co-ordination		
Programme development and evaluation	25	1,270
Inter-agency programme co-ordination	—	402
Negotiations	71	2,137
Field reports monitoring	40	529
Non-governmental organizations	—	316
Least developed countries	32	520
New York Liaison Office	—	361
Programme formulation and direction	—	565
Economic co-operation among developing countries	330	532
Subtotal	498	6,638
Industrial operations		
Investment co-operative programme	2,004	1,193
Industrial planning	4,267	626
Institutional infrastructure	12,693	1,051
Factory establishment and management	4,539	774
Training	6,230	980
Feasibility studies	4,311	538
Agro-Industries	8,329	1,051
Metallurgical Industries	6,210	636
Engineering Industries	14,322	790
Chemical industries	21,283	1,340
Project personnel recruitment**	—	1,491
Purchase and contract	—	1,141
Programme formulation and direction	702	1,317
Subtotal	66,890	12,928
Industrial studies		
Global and conceptual studies	40	1,185
Regional and country studies	133	1,444
Sectoral studies	2	1,347
Development and transfer of technology	361	1,178
Industrial information	31	1,629
Programme formulation and direction	446	1,051
Subtotal	1,013	7,834
Conference services, public information and external relations	—	
Industrial Development Board secretariat	—	264
Governments and intergovernmental organizations relations	17	362
Public information	—	573
Programme formulation and direction	—	257
Conference service	—	6,292
Subtotal	17	7,748
Administrative and common services	—	
Financial service	—	2,069
Personnel service	—	2,110
General services	—	1,632
Programme direction	—	1,837
Subtotal	—	7,648
Unspecified	34	
Total	88,452	45,187

\*Includes UNIDO representation at Geneva.

\*\*Includes Technical Assistance Recruitment Service at Geneva and New York.

resources were made available to UNIDO for priority activities on the basis of the consensus reflected in the Board and its Permanent Committee. The original draft of this resolution introduced by Algeria for the Group of 77,<sup>(1)</sup> used the word "additional" rather than "adequate" in reference to resources and would have had the Assembly decide that those resources should be provided at the current session.

After approval of this resolution by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, Poland, speaking also on behalf of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, stated that the operational activities of UNIDO should be funded on a voluntary basis and that the UNIDO secretariat should take firm measures to streamline the use of existing financial resources. The United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Community members, said their position on the UNIDO budget remained unchanged. The United States said its interpretation of the resolution was that it did not authorize any real growth in UNIDO programmes.

Concern about the financing of UNIDO was voiced by some developing countries during the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation. Kenya said the concept of a zero-growth budget was dangerous and should be dropped as unrealistic. Opposition to zero growth was also expressed by India, Morocco, Mozambique and the Sudan. Pakistan said it agreed with the Group of 77 that the arbitrary constraints of a zero-growth budget should not be applied indiscriminately to relatively new organizations such as UNIDO. Suriname believed the zero-growth principle would hold back the expansion of UNIDO programmes and impede the industrialization of developing countries.

Hungary, while convinced of the decisive role that UNIDO had to play, opposed the steady increase in its budget and favoured its financing through voluntary contributions.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.82.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>5th Committee, A/36/829; <sup>(3)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(4)</sup>Permanent Committee, ID/B/268 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/75, para. 13, 24 July (p. 578).

GA: <sup>(6)</sup>36/182, sect. I, para. 7, 17 Dec. (p. 579);

<sup>(7)</sup>36/240 A, 18 Dec. (p. 1278).

#### UN Industrial Development Fund

In 1981, 127 projects were approved by UNIDO, at a total cost of \$16.5 million, to be financed by the United Nations Industrial Development Fund (UNIDF). Expenditures of UNIDF during the year were \$10.4 million. Seminars, workshops, study tours and expert group meet-

ings financed from this source dealt with such areas as agricultural machinery, food processing, micro-electronics, energy conservation, environmental control in the chemical and pharmaceutical industries, a proposed international centre for genetic engineering and biotechnology, the telecommunications industry and regional industrial development.

Forty-three training programmes in 21 fields benefited 732 participants, including 70 women and 232 participants from the least developed countries. Subjects included industrial information, industrial planning, cement and foundry industries, fertilizer and rice processing industries, wood-based panelling and furniture industries, the maintenance and repair of biochemical equipment, pharmaceutical production in multi-purpose plants, electric welding, diesel engine production, petrochemicals, pesticides and printing.

A total of \$14,282,245 was paid by 84 countries in voluntary contributions to the Fund in 1981, and 73 countries pledged a total of \$9,418,835 for 1982, as at 31 December 1981 (see table on next page).

On 21 and 22 May, the Industrial Development Board<sup>(2)</sup> considered a report by the Executive Director on the Fund's activities in 1978-1980<sup>(3)</sup> and approved the proposed programme for 1982. Noting with concern the constraints and difficulties under which UNIDF had operated since its inception, the Board urged all States, particularly the developed countries, to contribute or to raise their contributions with a view to reaching the desirable annual funding level of \$50 million.

This appeal for increased funding so as to reach the \$50 million target was echoed by the Economic and Social Council on 24 July<sup>(4)</sup> and the General Assembly on 17 December<sup>(5)</sup> in their resolutions on industrial development co-operation. The phrase "taking into account the need for maximum flexibility", which appeared in the Board's and the Council's texts, was omitted from the original draft resolution in the Assembly, sponsored by Algeria for the Group of 77,<sup>(1)</sup> but was restored in the adopted text as submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee following informal consultations on the original draft.

Following approval of this text in Committee, Poland, speaking on behalf of Eastern European States and Mongolia, said they participated in UNIDF but could not agree to the target for voluntary contributions.

In the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, Australia announced that it would make a contribution to UNIDF for the first time. Austria ex-

pressed concern at the insufficient flow of resources to the Fund. Malaysia said developing countries must contribute 'generously. Poland expressed gratitude that its contribution to UNIDF had been effectively utilized. Romania, Sri Lanka and Zambia called for contributions to UNIDF, particularly by developed countries, so that it could reach its annual target of \$50 million. India regretted that the target had not been reached, while Suriname deplored the low level of resources pledged to the Fund.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.82.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(3)</sup>UNIDO Executive Director, ID/B/266.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1981/75, para. 10, 24 July (p. 578);

<sup>(5)</sup>GA, 36/182, sect. I, para. 8, 17 Dec. (p. 579).

### Organizational questions

#### Signatures and ratifications of the UNDO Constitution

The Constitution to establish UNIDO as a specialized agency, adopted by a United Nations conference in 1979,<sup>(4)</sup> had been signed by 121

States and ratified, accepted or approved by 66 of those States as at 31 December 1981. Under its article 25, the Constitution was to take effect after at least 80 States which had deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession agreed among themselves that it would enter into force.

The following States had adhered to the Constitution as at 31 December (the 38 States in *italics* acted during 1981):

Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Tamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zambia

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT FUND, 1981 and 1982

(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment	1982 pledge	country	1981 payment	1982 pledge	Country	1981 payment	1982 pledge
Afghanistan	1,500	1,500	Hungary	60,072	65,714	Romania	33,333	36,364
Algeria	80,500	88,000	India	989,714	1,000,000	Rwanda	3,200	—
Austria	713,131	735,483	Indonesia	50,000	50,000	Samoa	300	—
Bahrain	5,000	5,000	Iraq	300,000	338,983	Saudi Arabia	1,020,000	1,000,000
Bangladesh	4,079	2,000	Italy	2,930,000	1,694,915	Saychelles	1,000	1,000
Barbados	1,000	—	ivory Coast	(472)	—	Singapore	1,000	—
Belgium	592,106	—	Jamaica	4,000	4,000	Somalia	—	2,400
Benin	—	2,000	Japan	516,861	87,058	Sri Lanka	—	3,000
Bhutan	1,000	1,000	Kenya	3,902	2,724	Sudan	—	15,000
Bolivia	—	1,000	Kuwait	50,000	75,000	Suriname	—	2,000
Botswana	3,769	—	Lao People's	—	1,500	Swaziland	—	1,069
Brazil	105,108	15,000	Democratic	—	—	Sweden	720,160	—
Bulgaria	58,685	88,028	Republic	—	1,500	Switzerland	200,244	—
Burma	—	1,000	Lesotho	2,000	2,000	Syrian Arab	—	—
Chile	6,000	10,000	Libyan Arab	—	—	Republic	5,567	—
China	359,017	359,017	Jamahiriya	85,000	—	Thailand	22,993	23,144
Colombia	4,854	5,700	Luxembourg	8,406	7,733	Togo	7,742	3,534
Congo	1,818	—	Madagascar	9,756	—	Trinidad and	—	—
Costa Rica	1,100	—	Malawi	2,809	2,700	Tobago	20,000	20,000
Cuba	64,956	30,054	Malaysia	20,000	20,000	Tunisia	—	25,200
Cyprus	—	1,124	Malta	11,236	1,500	Turkey	206,612	123,967
Czechoslovakia	187,504	171,821	Mauritius	1,274	—	USSR	689,655	701,262
Democratic Yemen	2,645	3,306	Mexico	13,914	14,373	United Kingdom	342,404	—
Djibouti	—	2,000	Mongolia	4,724	2,222	United Republic	—	—
Ecuador	6,004	—	Morocco	11,006	9,736	of Cameroon	3,448	4,240
Egypt	74,643	63,589	Mozambique	4,000	—	United Republic	—	—
Fiji	1,100	1,000	Nepal	700	—	of Tanzania	2,424	2,424
Finland	209,440	—	Nigeria	75,000	—	upper Volta	6,465	—
France	387,931	796,460	Oman	12,000	12,000	Uruguay	15,000	—
German Democratic	—	—	Pakistan	50,505	50,505	Venezuela	21,000	21,000
Republic	152,358	139,130	Panama	2,000	1,000	Viet Nam	—	1,000
Germany, Federal	—	—	Paraguay	6,000	—	Yemen	2,011	—
Republic of	2,118,508	1,139,449	Philippines	46,100	22,500	Yugoslavia	365,625	—
Ghana	7,273	—	Poland	94,127	180,723	Zambia	—	11,500
Greece	18,000	25,000	Portugal	14,825	15,000	Zimbabwe	—	5,000
Guatemala	5,000	5,000	Qatar	25,000	30,000			
Guyana	3,574	1,184	Republic of Korea	30,000	30,000	Total	14,282,245	9,418,835

The following 55 States had signed but not formally adhered to the Constitution as at 31 December (the 14 States in *italics* acted during 1981):

Australia, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Comoros, Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mongolia, Morocco, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Saint Lucia, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire.

The Industrial Development Board, on 30 May, urged all member States which had not done so to hasten the process of signature and ratification.<sup>(1)</sup> The Economic and Social Council, in its resolution of 24 July on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(2)</sup> thanked the 114 States which had signed and the 46 which had ratified as at 6 July, and urged States which had not done so to hasten the process so as to complete it, if possible, before the end of the 1981 session of the General Assembly. The Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on the same subject,<sup>(3)</sup> urged States to ratify as soon as possible in order to allow the conversion of UNIDO into a specialized agency in 1982.

During the Second Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, a number of States urged the prompt ratification of the Constitution or expressed gratification that States were ratifying it. Among them were Australia, Austria, Indonesia, Kenya, Pakistan, Portugal, Romania, Sri Lanka, Viet Nam and Zambia.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>IDB, A/36/16.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/75, para. 11, 24 July (p. 578);

<sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/182, sect. I, para. 5, 17 Dec. (p. 579).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1979, p. 618.

#### Administration and management

The Executive Director of UNIDO, in a note on interim arrangements regarding greater autonomy for UNIDO,<sup>(1)</sup> informed the Industrial Development Board in May 1981 that additional authority on personnel matters had been delegated to UNIDO by United Nations Headquarters in regard to vacancy announcements, assignment of UNIDO staff and decisions to grant new appointments or reinstate former staff members.

On 30 May, the Board<sup>(2)</sup> took note of the degree of autonomy in personnel management granted by the Secretary-General to the Executive Director and requested the latter to continue his contacts with the Secretary-General in order

to develop further the autonomy of UNIDO in administrative matters, in preparation for its conversion into a specialized agency. As recommended by the Permanent Committee on 15 May,<sup>(3)</sup> the Board requested the Executive Director to give particular attention to the need for equitable geographical distribution of secretariat posts in the recruitment of personnel, in particular for high-level posts.

In the General Assembly's Second Committee, Poland, speaking on behalf of Eastern European States and Mongolia, said there was need for a discussion on how to increase the secretariat's effectiveness and to make UNIDO activities more action-oriented and objective by strictly applying the principle of equitable geographical distribution, with particular reference to the socialist countries.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>UNIDO Executive Director, ID/B/263/Rev.1 & Rev.1/Add.1 & Rev.1/Add.1/Corr.1.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(3)</sup>Permanent Committee, ID/B/268 & Corr.1.

#### Revision of the lists of States eligible for membership in the industrial Development Board

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 17 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> included Antigua and Barbuda, Belize and Vanuatu—the three States admitted to United Nations membership in 1981 (p. 348)—in the lists of States eligible for membership in the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO (see APPENDIX III).

This resolution was adopted without vote, following its approval in like manner by the Second Committee on 20 November, on a draft submitted by a Vice-Chairman.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/181, 17 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, a/c.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 42 (24 Sep.–20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/181

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add. 4) without vote. 20 November (meeting 42): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.76); agenda item 69 (d).

#### Revision of the lists of States eligible for membership in the industrial Development Board

The General Assembly.

Recalling section ii, paragraph 4, of its resolution 2152(XXI) of 17 November 1966 on the United Nations industrial Development Organization.

Decides to include Vanuatu in list A and Antigua and Barbuda and Belize in list C of the annex to its resolution 2152(XXI).

#### Relations with other organizations

The Industrial Development Board,<sup>(1)</sup> on 25 May 1981, accepted the applications of two intergovernmental organizations for association with the activities of UNIDO: the Central African States Development Bank and the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration. The Board further granted consultative status to a non-

governmental organization, the World Association for Element Building and Prefabrication.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>IDB, A/36/16.

Co-ordination in the UN system. Two inter-secretariat agreements on co-operation with other bodies in the United Nations system were concluded by UNIDO in 1981: a strategy paper with the World Health Organization, on the development of medical equipment and laboratory services, entered into force on 19 January; and a memorandum of understanding with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), on the co-operative arrangement on investment follow-up for projects in the industrial sector, was concluded in May.

A UNIDO secretariat report to the Permanent Committee of the Industrial Development Board, <sup>(2)</sup> covering the period from October 1980 to October 1981, described co-operation with other organizations in several areas of activity. On 17 November, after considering this report, the Committee <sup>(1)</sup> noted that better co-ordination would result from a continuing analysis by the secretariat of the relationship of UNIDO activities with those of other international organizations, in accordance with the UNIDO mandate as the central co-ordinator for industrial development in the United Nations system. It recommended that the secretariat be requested to provide further information on co-ordination, in particular with UNDP and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Permanent Committee, ID/B/270; <sup>(2)</sup>UNIDO secretariat, ID/B/C.3/110.

#### Preparations for the Fourth General Conference of UNIDO

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December 1981 on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(\*)</sup> requested the Industrial Development Board to begin functioning at its next session (May 1982) as the Preparatory Committee for the Fourth General Conference of UNIDO, scheduled for 1984. It asked the Board to formulate an agenda and other proposals and to submit recommendations to the Assembly in 1982. The Assembly welcomed Kenya's offer to act as host to the Conference.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/182, sect. I, paras. 13 & 14, 17 Dec. (p. 579).

## Industrial development activities

### Technical co-operation

Expenditures on technical co-operation delivered by UNIDO reached \$88.5 million in 1981. This represented a 16 per cent increase over the

\$76.3 million recorded for 1980.<sup>(1)</sup> The main components were: chemical industries, \$21.3 million (24.1 per cent); engineering industries, \$14.3 million (16.2 per cent institutional infrastructure, \$12.7 million (14.4 per cent); agro-industries, \$8.3 million (9.4 per cent); metallurgical industries, \$8.2 million (9.3 per cent); training, \$6.2 million (7 per cent); factory establishment and management, \$4.5 million (5.1 per cent); feasibility studies, \$4.3 million (4.9 per cent); industrial planning, \$4.3 million (4.8 per cent); and the investment co-operative programme, \$2 million (2.3 per cent) (see table on p. 586).

Field activities involved a total of 1,734 projects: 101 of more than \$1 million in value, 398 between \$150,000 and \$1 million, and 1,235 small-scale projects. About 687 new projects costing \$70.9 million were approved during the year.

In keeping with the recommendations of the Industrial Development Board, the 1981 regular programme, like that of 1980, devoted increased resources to the establishment and strengthening of training facilities in developing countries. Allocations to the least developed countries amounted to about 30 per cent and were designed to accelerate the development of key sectors-agriculture, manufacturing, infrastructure and education-and to increase the linkages between them. Most projects were related to the development of specific industries (p. 595).

Three fourths of UNIDO technical co-operation was financed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and 17 per cent by UNIDO and various trust funds, with the rest coming from the United Nations regular programme of technical co-operation and the Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development (see table on P. 580).

UNIDO continued to be the third largest executing agency responsible for the implementation of projects financed by UNDP. There were 785 UNIDO projects as at 31 December 1981, with a total value of \$305.5 million. In the 14 new country programmes approved by the UNDP Governing Council in June 1981 (P. 436), the share of UNIDO grew from \$35 million (1977-1981) to \$78 million (1982-1986). There were significant increases in the industrial sector for Cuba, Nepal and Viet Nam, and preferred subsectors in these programmes included chemical industries, engineering, agro-industries and institutional infrastructure.

Asia and the Pacific accounted for 32.5 per cent of technical co-operation expenditures in 1981, Africa for 31.1 per cent, the Arab States for 13.2 per cent, the Americas for 11.6 per cent and Europe for 4 per cent. The remaining 7.6 per cent was spent on global and interregional projects (see table on p. 587). Assistance was

(continued on p. 587)

## COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES AIDED BY UNIDO IN 1981

Country or territory	Experts received	Experts provided	Fellowships awarded	Assistance provided (In US dollars)	Country or territory	Experts received	Experts provided	Fellowships awarded	Assistance provided (in US dollars)
Afghanistan	4	—	11	1,000	Lebanon	—	—	1	41,000
Albania	—	—	1	13,000	Lesotho	3	—	—	161,000
Algeria	8	1	1	186,000	Liberia	2	—	3	136,000
Angola	9	—	5	1,662,000	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	146	—	1	3,310,000
Antigua and Barbuda	—	—	—	160,000	Madagascar	7	—	11	1 24,000
Argentina	24	21	18	981,000	Malawi	10	—	6	597,000
Australia	—	7	—	—	Malaysia	—	—	24	136,000
Austria	—	33	—	—	Mali	4	1	7	364,000
Bangladesh	36	—	46	3,119,000	Malta	3	1	4	129,000
Barbados	1	—	1	9,000	Mauritania	5	—	5	618,000
Belgium	—	38	—	—	Mauritius	8	—	2	362,000
Benin	6	—	3	245,000	Mexico	51	2	7	1,243,000
Bhutan	3	—	10	57,000	Mongolia	1	—	5	75,000
Bolivia	1	5	2	54,000	Morocco	6	—	—	134,000
Botswana	2	—	1	114,000	Mozambique	21	—	7	1,053,000
Brazil	16	10	12	1,005,000	Namibia	—	—	5	50,000
Bulgaria	5	6	87	206,000	Nepal	7	1	6	792,000
Burma	4	1	1	2,161,000	Netherlands	—	15	—	—
Burundi	14	—	1	422,000	Netherlands Antilles	—	—	—	80,000
Canada	—	10	—	—	New Zealand	—	5	—	—
Cape Verde	1	—	—	22,000	Nicaragua	14	1	3	551,000
Central African Republic	8	—	2	251,000	Niger	16	—	6	678,000
Chile	2	17	3	156,000	Nigeria	22	—	3	1,867,000
China	32	2	146	3,756,000	Norway	—	7	—	—
Colombia	1	1	1	89,000	Oman	5	—	—	185,000
Comoros	—	—	—	172,000	Pakistan	20	4	15	986,000
Congo	11	—	2	188,000	Panama	—	—	—	2,000
Cook Islands	—	—	—	10,000	Papua New Guinea	3	—	—	1 78,000
Costa Rica	4	—	—	48,000	Paraguay	—	—	1	5,000
Cuba	6	—	3	727,000	Peru	14	8	15	409,000
Cyprus	4	—	2	219,000	Philippines	17	7	14	1,049,000
Czechoslovakia	3	9	47	369,000	Poland	3	88	33	200,000
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	—	—	—	3,165,000	Portugal	11	4	1	195,000
Democratic Yemen	12	—	11	556,000	Qatar	2	—	—	1 58,000
Denmark	—	12	—	—	Republic of Korea	25	1	10	843,000
Djibouti	4	—	—	—	Romania	7	8	7	174,000
Dominica	—	—	1	16,000	Rwanda	10	—	—	1,193,000
Dominican Republic	18	—	4	306,000	St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla	3	—	2	91,000
Ecuador	18	—	6	676,000	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1	—	1	9,000
Egypt	40	22	91	2,144,000	Samoa	1	—	—	21,000
El Salvador	4	—	—	310,000	Sao Tome and Principe	2	—	—	29,000
Ethiopia	28	—	39	2,558,000	Saudi Arabia	6	—	—	308,000
Fiji	9	—	1	455,000	Senegal	11	3	7	520,000
Finland	—	15	—	—	Seychelles	1	—	—	4,000
France	—	69	—	—	Sierra Leone	10	—	—	1 82,000
Gabon	1	—	—	64,000	Singapore	3	—	—	34,500
Gambia	1	—	—	—	Somalia	6	—	10	686,000
German Democratic Republic	—	2	—	—	Spain	—	19	—	—
Germany, Federal Republic of	—	52	—	—	Sri Lanka	7	9	11	1,062,000
Ghana	1	—	—	103,000	Sudan	17	4	10	830,000
Greece	2	2	1	117,000	Suriname	1	—	1	19,000
Guatemala	5	—	—	241,000	Swaziland	1	—	3	40,000
Guinea	10	—	9	2,678,000	Sweden	—	21	—	—
Guinea-Bissau	1	—	—	35,000	Switzerland	—	10	—	—
Guyana	6	—	1	210,000	Syrian Arab Republic	25	—	16	935,000
Haiti	4	1	2	393,000	Thailand	7	—	14	302,000
Honduras	9	—	1	185,000	Togo	6	2	2	420,000
Hong Kong	6	—	3	118,000	Tonga	2	—	—	9,000
Hungary	4	28	33	126,000	Trinidad and Tobago	6	—	6	400,000
India	33	62	49	6,105,000	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	—	—	—	8,000
Indonesia	39	—	15	1,982,000	Tunisia	7	—	1	170,000
Iran	—	—	1	1,000	Turkey	40	3	30	1,698,000
Iraq	25	—	20	1,425,000	Tuvalu	—	—	—	1,000
Ireland	—	10	—	—	Uganda	1	—	4	348,000
Israel	—	11	—	—	USSR	—	13	—	—
Italy	—	32	—	—	United Arab Emirates	1	—	—	3,000
Ivory Coast	13	—	12	568,000	United Kingdom	—	116	—	—
Jamaica	7	1	6	626,000	United Republic of Cameroon	11	—	7	300,000
Japan	—	13	—	—	United Republic of Tanzania	34	—	44	2,355,000
Jordan	4	—	2	89,000	United States	—	69	—	—
Kenya	33	—	16	1,452,000	Upper Volta	10	—	8	716,000
Kiribati	1	—	—	30,000	Uruguay	18	2	3	557,000
Kuwait	9	—	—	523,000	Vanuatu	3	—	—	119,000
Lao People's Democratic Republic	1	—	—	34,000					

Country or territory	Experts received	Experts provided	Fellowships awarded	Assistance provided (In US dollars)	Geographical region	Country projects	Regional projects	Total
Venezuela	—	1	1	—	Africa	<b>25,965,000</b>	1,589,000	27,554,000
Viet Nam	12	—	12	494,000	Americas	<b>9,435,000</b>	<b>855,000</b>	<b>10,290,000</b>
Yemen	7	—	—	<b>354,000</b>	Arab States	11,207,000	421,000	<b>11,628,000</b>
Yugoslavia	10	<b>26</b>	2	217,000	Asia and the Pacific	<b>27,168,000</b>	<b>1,539,000</b>	<b>28,707,000</b>
Zaire	<b>32</b>	1	15	<b>1,166,000</b>	Europe	<b>3,526,000</b>	<b>46,000</b>	<b>3,572,000</b>
Zambia	16	—	5	1,127,000	Global and interregional projects			6,701,000
Zimbabwe	—	1	—	1,000				
Total	1,314	<b>946</b>	1,147	<b>77,306,500</b>	Total			<b>88,452,000</b>

provided to a total of 147 countries (see table on p. 586).

In the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, Pakistan observed that the UNIDO technical co-operation programme had declined in real terms if the effects of inflation and currency exchange rate fluctuations were taken into account. Turkey warned that a prolonged stagnation of that kind, stemming from budgetary constraints, would ultimately impede the industrialization of developing countries.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(1)</sup>1980, p. 642.

#### Allocations for 1982-1983

Proposed allocations under the UNIDO regular programme of technical co-operation for 1982-1983, as reported by the Executive Director to the Permanent Committee of the Industrial Development Board in February 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> totalled \$6,746,400, the same as for 1980-1981. Funding for regional and short-term advisory services was to be reduced by \$35,000 per year, and the \$70,000 for the biennium was to be spent instead for the least developed countries.

The Permanent Committee, on 8 May, recommended approval of the proposed allocation pattern and also recommended that the Board seek to maintain the real value of the regular programme.<sup>(1)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Permanent Committee, ID/B/268 & Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>UNIDO Executive Director, ID/B/C.3/104.

#### SIS programme

The Special Industrial Services (SIS) programme, a source of funding created to permit action in areas that could not be covered by existing methods of financing, assisted more than 400 projects in 1981, notably in chemical, metallurgical, engineering and agro-industries as well as in factory establishment and management. The programme was designed primarily to enable UNIDO to meet high priority requirements of an urgent nature through the rapid provision of experts to developing countries. Expenditures in 1981, amounting to \$1.6 million, were reduced from the level of \$3.9 million achieved in 1980, mainly in order to prevent total expenditures

during the 1977-1981 programming cycle of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) from exceeding by too much the five-year ceiling of \$17.5 million.

On 19 May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Industrial Development Board, on the recommendation of its Permanent Committee,<sup>(1)</sup> invited the UNDP Governing Council to consider at least doubling the annual level of resources for SIS during the 1982-1986 programme cycle. In June 1981, the Governing Council allocated \$25 million to SIS for 1982-1986, but because of the limitation on UNDP resources only \$20 million was to be used for forward planning purposes. With regard to the 1977-1981 cycle, the Council authorized on 30 June an increase from \$17.5 to \$18.2 million.<sup>(3)</sup>

During the debate in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on development and international economic co-operation, Romania supported a doubling of funds for SIS.

Refort: <sup>(1)</sup>Permanent Committee, ID/B/268 & Corr.1.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>IDB (report, A/36/16), 53(XV), 19 May. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/25, para. 4, 30 June.

#### SIDFA programme

The UNDP Governing Council, on 30 June 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> approved an allocation of \$8,311,000, subject to resource availability, to cover the net cost to UNDP for the services of Senior Industrial Development Field Advisers (SIDFAs) during 1982-1983. It requested the Administrator to seek the agreement of Governments making use of SIDFA services to pay up to a quarter of the cost, either from national indicative planning figures (allocations of UNDP assistance to country programmes) or national sources, or both. It invited the Secretary-General to make every effort to increase the UNIDO share of the programme's cost.

The \$8.3 million allocation, up from \$7,962,000 in 1980-1981, had been recommended by the Administrator in an April 1981 report to the Council.<sup>(2)</sup> He indicated that this would pay for the 33 SIDFAs currently on duty or under recruitment, out of 46 authorized posts. In view of the financial constraints on UNDP, he

proposed that Governments receiving their services meet one quarter (\$40,000) of the estimated annual average cost of one Adviser for 1982-1983.

Prior to the Council's action, the Industrial Development Board,<sup>(1)</sup> on 30 May, invited it to maintain the current level of SIDFA services and to make an effort to increase them. The Board also invited States to provide, on a voluntary basis, additional funds to UNIDO to increase the number of SIDFAs.

The Executive Director of UNIDO had informed the Board in a March report<sup>(3)</sup> of earlier plans to increase the number of SIDFAs to 46 by mid-1981. He noted that UNIDO had allocated \$190,000 from its regular budget for travel costs of SIDFAs in 1981. By the end of the year, the number of filled posts had dropped to 31.

As recommended by the UNDP Council, the Economic and Social Council, in its resolution of 24 July on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(4)</sup> invited the Secretary-General to make every effort to increase the share of UNIDO in the cost of the SIDFA programme. Following adoption of the resolution, the United Kingdom stated that it did not see the provision as implying any additional call on the regular budget.

SIDFAs represented UNIDO in all regions during the year, assisting Governments in regard to industrial programmes and helping with project design and implementation. The programme represented the largest component of UNDP sectoral support, under which certain advisory and other activities of agencies executing UNDP-funded projects were financed (P. 450). At the first Regional SIDFA Meeting for Latin America (Brasilia, Brazil, 9-15 September), recommendations were drawn up to improve UNIDO programmes in the region.

During the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the General Assembly's Second Committee, Austria and Zambia expressed the view that the SIDFA network should be strengthened. Finland, speaking for the Nordic States, believed that UNIDO should finance SIDFAs.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/555; <sup>(3)</sup>UNIDO Executive Director, ID/B/254.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1981/75, para. 14, 24 July (p. 578). Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/39, paras. 3 (b)-5, 30 June.

#### Training of personnel

Expenditure for fellowship and training components of all technical co-operation projects implemented by UNIDO in 1981 amounted to \$9.9 million, against \$11.2 million in 1980. Of the 1981 figure, fellowships and study tours accounted for \$5.6 million, and group training programmes and meetings for \$4.3 million.

The number of individual training programmes started in 1981, amounting to 1,147, was 15.6 per cent higher than in 1980, while the number of placements by host country, amounting to 1,972 increased by 28.2 per cent compared with 1980. Of these, 378 (19.2 per cent) were arranged in developing countries, 250 (21.8 per cent) of the trainees came from least developed countries and 120 (10.5 per cent) were women.

#### Industrial co-operation

##### System of Consultations

Three meetings between representatives of developed and developing countries on the problems of specific industrial sectors were held in 1981 under the UNIDO System of Consultations: on the food-processing (p. 595), petrochemical (p. 597) and capital goods (p. 598) industries. This brought to 14 the number of Consultation meetings organized since the System began operating in 1977.<sup>(5)</sup>

In May 1981, the Industrial Development Board<sup>(2)</sup> authorized Consultation meetings in 1982-1983 on training of industrial man power (first Consultation), industrial financing (first), the iron and steel industry (third), the pharmaceutical industry (second), the agricultural machinery industry (second), and the wood and wood products industry (first). An African Regional Consultation on the Agricultural Machinery Industry, originally scheduled for 1981, was later postponed to 1982. Possible additional meetings for the biennium were to be considered at the Board's 1982 session. In addition, the Board requested the Executive Director to examine the possibility of including in the 1984-1985 programme Consultation meetings on building materials, energy-related industrial technology and equipment, and non-ferrous metals. The Board recommended that participation in the 1982-1983 Consultation meetings by 50 representatives from least developed countries (LDCs) should be financed from sources to be determined by the General Assembly.

The Economic and Social Council, by its resolution of 24 July 1981 on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(3)</sup> strongly supported the strengthening of the System of Consultations and, in line with the Board's recommendation, requested the Assembly to ensure the participation of 50 representatives of LDCs by financing from sources to be determined by the Assembly. As a result of informal consultations, the text was orally revised from its original version, which would have had the Council support the expansion of the System.

The Assembly, by its resolution of 17 December on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(4)</sup>



also strongly supported the strengthening of the System, giving particular attention to measures that could increase the industrial capacities of developing countries, and requested the Board to consider the possibility of holding Consultation meetings additional to those it had authorized for 1982-1983. This paragraph replaced the provision in the initial draft,<sup>(1)</sup> sponsored by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77, by which the Assembly would have urged the strengthening and expansion of the System with a view to increasing the industrial capacities of developing countries.

Poland, speaking in the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee for Eastern European countries and Mongolia, stated that they objected strongly to attempts to involve representatives of private capital in the System on the same footing as government representatives; the System should operate on the basis of Industrial Development Board decisions and should be funded through voluntary contributions. The United States said its position on the analysis and evaluation of the System was unchanged.

In the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, Finland, speaking for the Nordic States, welcomed the establishment of the System on a permanent basis. Pakistan said the System remained divorced from its original purpose of furthering the redeployment of industry to developing countries; only if Governments participated fully in pursuing that objective could the System be effective. Poland regarded the System as an important instrument of restructuring world industry, leading eventually to a just international division of labour.

India, Romania and the United Republic of Cameroon believed the System should be extended; the Philippines thought it should be given additional resources and Viet Nam said it should be strengthened. The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community members, said they were entirely in agreement with the idea of strengthening the System. Favourable comments on the System were also voiced by Austria, Portugal, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Turkey and Zambia.

Bulgaria believed more attention should be paid to improving the quality of the Consultations. The Byelorussian SSR opposed the expansion of the number of Consultation meetings and believed they should be strictly controlled by the Industrial Development Board, even at the regional level, and be devoted to defending the interests of developing countries against infringements by private foreign capital. Hungary believed that too many Consultations had been scheduled for the next cycle and thought it advisable to await the secretariat's evaluation of

their usefulness before extending the System to other sectors. Mongolia warned that establishing a System of Consultations on issues that did not reflect the long-term trends of industrialization in developing countries or respond to their essential needs could fragment the efforts of UNIDO.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.82.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>IDB, A/36/16.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/75, para. 9, 24 July (p. 578);

<sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/182, sect. I, para. 4, 17 Dec. (p. 579).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1977, p. 493.

Draft rules of procedure. On 18 November 1981, the Permanent Committee of the Industrial Development Board<sup>(\*)</sup> approved draft rules of procedure for the System of Consultations by 32 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The draft rules defined the principles, objectives and characteristics of the System, stating that it should seek action-oriented measures towards increasing the share of developing countries in world industrial production and creating new industrial facilities in developing countries contributing to the establishment of a new international economic order. The System would operate at four levels: global, regional, interregional and sectoral. The programme of Consultations would be decided by the Board every two years.

Participants would include government officials as well as representatives of industry, labour, consumer groups and others, as deemed appropriate by each Government. Any participant or observer could introduce proposals or amendments or raise points of order, but only participants could decide on substantive proposals. The meetings would operate on the basis of consensus among participants.

The draft had been submitted to the Board in April in a report by its President,<sup>(2)</sup> but the Board postponed action to permit him to seek consensus.<sup>(1)</sup> When he resubmitted the draft to the Permanent Committee in November, he announced that consensus had not been reached. He added that Group D (centrally planned economy) countries had proposed amendments which reopened some basic concepts underlying the rules and which could not be accepted by Group B (market economy) countries or by the Group of 77. Four of the rules (those summarized in the preceding paragraph) were approved by 31 votes to 5. Group D countries objected that they would enable representatives of transnational corporations to enjoy equal rights with Governments at the Consultation meetings.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(2)</sup>IDB President, ID/B/258; <sup>(3)</sup>Permanent Committee, ID/B/270.

#### Co-operation among developing countries

Solidarity meetings in two developing countries, the Sudan and the Upper Volta, were orga-

nized by UNIDO in 1981 with the aim of fostering the co-operation of interested developing countries in their industrial development. At the Sudan meeting (Khartoum, 23-26 March), attended by representatives of 22 countries and 6 development finance institutions, 54 projects were examined, of which 25 were selected for implementation in 1981-1983. The Upper Volta meeting (Ouagadougou, 1-4 December), attended by representatives of 18 countries and 9 financial institutions and international organizations, resulted in a number of concrete offers of technical assistance.

Other activities included preparations for round-table ministerial meetings, the development of joint programmes for sugar industry equipment (p. 598) and the cement industry (p. 599), and study tours to foster contacts, understanding and mutually useful activities in the context of economic and technical co-operation among developing countries.

#### International trade aspects

The expanding role of enterprise-to-enterprise arrangements affecting industrial co-operation and trade between developed and developing countries were examined in 1981 by a joint body of UNIDO and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The Ad Hoc UNCTAD/UNIDO Group of Experts on Trade and Trade-related Aspects of Industrial Collaboration Arrangements (second session, Vienna, 1-12 June) (1) recognized the need to build up expertise in developing countries which would equip them to enter into beneficial industrial collaboration arrangements on an enterprise-to-enterprise basis, and suggested that intergovernmental agreements might foster long-term co-operation and assist developing countries in industrial development and trade diversification.

The UNCTAD Trade and Development Board took note of the Group's report on 9 October and endorsed its recommendation that the UNCTAD and UNIDO secretariats should continue their work on industrial collaboration arrangements.(2)

Reports: (1) Group of Experts on industrial collaboration arrangements, ID/WG.337/9/Rev.1, transmitted by UNCTAD secretariat note, TD/B/862; (2) TDB, A/36/15.

#### Industrial co-operation contracts

Work continued in 1981 under the UNIDO System of Consultations (p. 588) on model contracts and other forms of standardized clauses and guidelines to facilitate the negotiation of industrial agreements between developed and developing countries. After examining a model form of licensing agreement for the petrochemical industry, devised by the UNIDO secretariat,

the Second Consultation on the Petrochemical Industry (p. 597) recommended in June that a new draft should be prepared, containing alternative texts where divergent views had been expressed. A check-list of points to be covered in contractual agreements in the leather and leather products industry was approved by the Leather and Leather Products Industry Panel (fifth session, Vienna, 25-27 November).(1)

In June, the Working Group on the New International Economic Order, a body of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, continued consideration of a study by the Secretary-General on clauses related to the supply and construction of large industrial works (p. 1260).

Report: (1) Leather and Leather Products Industry Panel, ID/WG.353/5.

#### Industrial redeployment and restructuring

A study entitled Structural Changes in Industry,(2) published by the UNIDO secretariat in August 1981, presented an overview of the findings of the UNIDO research programme on industrial redeployment and restructuring, and formulated proposals for action by developed and developing countries and the international community. Among its conclusions were that: Governments in developed market-economy countries possessed and utilized the means to influence the pace and direction of industrial restructuring; a large number of governmental instruments tended primarily to maintain existing industrial structures and aggravate structural adjustment pressures instead of easing restructuring; measures adopted might have the effect of further distorting allocation of resources, directing them to declining and less competitive industries and thereby reducing the potential for development; and policies affecting co-operation and trade with developing countries seemed to lack consistency by supporting sales of capital goods but restricting the resulting manufactured exports.

The aims and some results of this research programme were described in a February report by the UNIDO Executive Director to the Industrial Development Board.(4) The research programme sought to analyse developments and strategies create a basis for decision-makers seeking modalities of industrial redeployment, and provide a direct service to regional groupings and individual Governments. One of the conclusions of the studies, the report stated, was that there was no substance in the thesis that the de-industrialization of the North was a direct consequence of industrialization of the South.

After examining this report, the Board,(3) on 30 May, decided that the secretariat should con-

tinue to improve and develop its industrial redeployment programme along previously approved lines.

The Economic and Social Council, by its resolution of 24 July on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(5)</sup> requested the UNIDO secretariat to continue studies in this field. It also reiterated the importance of redeployment and of facilitating the restructuring of world industrial production.

Following adoption of the resolution, the United Kingdom stated that the position of the European Community members on redeployment remained unchanged.

The General Assembly resolution of 17 December on industrial development co-operation<sup>(6)</sup> contained provisions on industrial redeployment and restructuring similar to those in the Council resolution. It omitted a clause in the initial draft,<sup>(1)</sup> sponsored by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77, which would have had the Assembly reiterate the importance of an increase in operational programmes on industrial redeployment in the sectors identified for examination in the System of Consultations.

Following approval of the draft in the, Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, Poland, speaking on behalf of Eastern European States and Mongolia, stated that they were not carrying out special measures to transfer part of their industrial sectors to the developing countries, although they were promoting industrial development by other means. The United States said it had reservations on the value of further UNIDO studies on redeployment; the primary role of UNIDO was to provide technical assistance, not to intervene in redeployment, which would be determined by market forces.

In the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, Indonesia remarked that redeployment of industry should take place on the basis of mutual benefit and not be exploited as a way of relocating obsolete and polluting manufacturing plants. The United Republic of Cameroon made a similar point and added that redeployment must not mean access to cheap labour or raw materials. Morocco said redeployment should be accompanied by national technological development. Pakistan believed that redeployment lay at the centre of policies for achieving industrial growth. Uruguay, urging a more equitable redistribution of industrial means of production, said it was willing to receive foreign industries as long as they complied with its laws, which favoured the establishment of industry.

Draft resolution withdrawn: (1)Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.82.

Publication: (2)Structural Changes in Industry (ID/266), Sales No. E.81.II.B.2.

Reports: (3)IDB, A/36/16; (4)UNIDO Executive Director, ID/B/251.

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/75, paras. 2-4, 24 July (p. 578);

<sup>(6)</sup>GA, 36/182, sect. I, 17 Dec. (p. 579).

### Industrial financing

Developing countries' requirements for industrial financing in 1981 totalled approximately \$45 billion, of which foreign financial resources amounted to \$20 billion, according to estimates by UNIDO. The lack of risk capital and the high cost of borrowing for industrial projects continued to be major problems for those countries.

UNIDO acted to stimulate the flow of capital to industrial enterprises through its Investment Co-operative Programme (p. 592) and other activities. Aside from this programme, it concluded an agreement with the proposed Equity Financing Programme of the Inter-American Development Bank to establish a UNIDO "financial promoter" at Washington, D. C., under a cost-sharing arrangement, to increase the flow of industrial risk capital in Latin America. Arrangements were made for officials from Bangladesh to visit and study, under UNIDO guidance, financial institutions in Arab countries in the Gulf region.

### Proposed international bank for industrial development

In a report of April 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the UNIDO Executive Director submitted to the Industrial Development Board a proposal for an international bank for industrial development. Operating on a commercial basis alongside existing financial institutions, the proposed bank would borrow short-term funds from the money and capital markets, transform their maturities and provide long-term loans for industrial projects in developing countries at subsidized interest rates, particularly for the least developed countries. It would be founded on principles of universal participation, mutual benefit for all participating countries and equitable control in decision-making and management, and would be capable of applying innovative techniques of borrowing not currently practised by multilateral financing agencies.

After considering this proposal, the Board, on 20 May, recognized the importance of financial flows to industrial development in developing countries.<sup>(2)</sup> However, as delegations had had little time to study the proposal, the Board called on its Permanent Committee to continue consideration and to take a decision.

The Economic and Social Council, in its 24 July resolution on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(5)</sup> reaffirmed the Board's recognition of the importance of financial flows to industrial

development in developing countries and recommended that the Permanent Committee consider the proposal with a view to taking a decision on it. This last phrase replaced the words "with a view to taking appropriate follow-up steps", contained in the original draft as submitted on behalf of the Group of 77.

In the Council, the Federal Republic of Germany reiterated its opposition to the establishment of a bank. The USSR, speaking in the Council's First (Economic) Committee for the Eastern European States on the Council, objected to the setting up of new machinery or funds within UNIDO.

Failing to reach agreement on the proposal, the Permanent Committee,<sup>(3)</sup> on 17 November, requested the Executive Director to report to the Board in 1982 on any developments as well as information derived from his usual contacts. Group B (developed market economy) countries expressed firm opposition to the proposed establishment of a bank and said they would have preferred ending further consideration so as to avoid false hopes that the Group would be prepared to participate in such an institution. The Group of 77 welcomed the Executive Director's proposal and stated that the Committee's decision provided for further secretariat efforts towards a fruitful dialogue.

On 17 December, in its resolution on industrial development co-operation, the General Assembly requested the Board to give careful consideration to the proposal for an international bank with a view to taking a decision on it, and asked the Executive Director to continue efforts in accordance with the Permanent Committee's decision.<sup>(6)</sup>

The initial draft of this resolution, introduced in the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on behalf of the Group of 77 while the Permanent Committee was in session at Vienna, would have had the Assembly endorse the Board's decision inviting the Committee to consider the Executive Director's proposal with a view to taking a positive decision on the proposal for further work by the secretariat.<sup>(4)</sup> This was replaced in the adopted text by the paragraph referring to further consideration by the Board at its next session, in 1982.

The United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Community (EC) member States, as well as the United States, indicated that their position on the proposal for a bank remained unchanged. The EC view was that UNIDO should not use its limited resources to direct the policy of financial institutions; it might promote industrial investment by helping developing countries prepare viable projects, trying to mobilize additional financing through its investment promotion ser-

vices and continuing to co-operate with the World Bank.

Support for the proposed bank was expressed by Ecuador, India, Kenya, Madagascar and Suriname. Finland, speaking for the Nordic States, said they thought there was a need for new institutional arrangements. Sri Lanka hoped a definite decision would be reached on the matter. Yugoslavia and Zambia said the idea should be carefully studied; Yugoslavia added that there should be no initial prejudice against it.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.82.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(3)</sup>Permanent Committee, ID/B/270; <sup>(4)</sup>UNIDO Executive Director, ID/B/261/Add.7.

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/75, paras. 5 & 6, 24 July (p. 578); <sup>(6)</sup>GA, 36/182, sect. I, para. 9, 17 Dec. (p. 579).

#### Investment promotion

Under the Investment Co-operative Programme of UNIDO, seven Investment Promotion Services, established to promote the flow of external financial, technological and managerial resources to developing countries, were in operation by the end of 1981 at Brussels, Belgium; Cologne, Federal Republic of Germany; New York; Paris; Tokyo; Vienna; and Zurich, Switzerland. New Services in Australia, Italy and the Scandinavian countries, and a second Service in the United States, were under consideration. Negotiations continued on the establishment of Services in Brazil, India and one of the Gulf States, and negotiations opened with Mexico and Turkey.

In 1980 and 1981, the Investment Promotion Services at Brussels, Cologne, New York, Vienna and Zurich promoted 101 industrial investment projects in 13 developing countries, valued at some \$1.7 billion. Projects promoted by the Paris and Tokyo Services were still at the negotiation stage. During 1981, the Services organized 41 country presentation meetings for 15 developing countries, bringing together potential partners in industrial development and investment.

The programme continued to provide support services for technical co-operation projects in the context of financing and industrial investment promotion. Advisory services and assistance were extended to a number of countries, including Bangladesh, Chile, Mali, Panama, Sri Lanka, Suriname, the Syrian Arab Republic and Tunisia.

The World Bank/UNIDO Co-operative Programme carried out 7 missions in 1981 and participated in 11 others to a total of 16 countries, preparing the way for World Bank loans and helping to find other investors for industrial projects.

During debate in the General Assembly's Second Committee on development and international economic co-operation, the Byelorussian SSR expressed concern at the opening of UNIDO centres in capitalist countries, stating that it strengthened the position of those who adapted the industrialization of developing countries to their own interests. Mongolia expressed misgivings about the promotion of investment in developing countries and the setting up of centres for investment aid; it thought such measures might harm countries trying to free themselves from the grip of transnational corporations.

### Industrial technology

During 1981, UNIDO expanded its activities for building and strengthening the technological capabilities and capacities of industry in developing countries. In addition to its work in respect of individual industries (p. 595), it assisted countries in the formulation of technological policies and devoted attention to the selection, acquisition, adaptation, absorption and development of technology, as part of broader United Nations efforts to stimulate the use of science and technology for development (p. 733) and especially to promote technology transfer (p. 753).

### New technologies

A major new programme was established by UNIDO in 1981, dealing with the implications of emerging technological advances for developing countries.

A Group of Experts on the Establishment of an International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (Vienna, 15-16 October) drew up detailed recommendations on the functions, work programme and organization of such a centre,<sup>(2)</sup> whose creation was originally suggested by an earlier UNIDO meeting of experts in this field (Vienna, 4-6 February).

A meeting of experts on the implications of technological advances in micro-electronics for developing countries (Vienna, 10-12 June) recommended continuous international monitoring of trends and of their impact on various sectors, and the development of pilot projects and programmes dealing with applications and computer software. An expert group meeting on the implications of technological advances in lighter-than-air technology systems for developing countries (Vienna, 19-22 October) concluded that a gradual approach was needed in this area, given the current state of technology and limited operational experience with such aircraft.

Reports: ("Exchange of views on genetic engineering, UNIDO/IS.259; <sup>(2)</sup>Group of Experts on genetic engineering and biotechnology, UNIDO/IS.254.

### Information systems

Six countries-Angola, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria and Portugal-were assisted by UNIDO in 1981 to establish or develop documentation and information services for the collection, processing and dissemination of industrial technical information. UNIDO co-sponsored a conference on informatics and industrial development (Dublin, Ireland, March) which highlighted the importance developing countries attached to information science in their industrial development strategies. The activities of the UNIDO Technological Information Exchange System, linking technology transfer registries in developing countries, were reviewed by the heads of participating registries (sixth meeting, Manila, Philippines, 25-28 November) at a meeting which also examined the possibility of extending the System to encompass technological aspects of technology transfer contracts.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: ("Meeting of Heads of Technology Transfer Registries, ID/WG.355/10.

**Industrial and Technological Information Bank.** In its second year of operation, the UNIDO Industrial and Technological Information Bank (INTIB) continued in 1981 to develop access to world-wide data-base systems. By the end of the year, more than 100 data bases related to all aspects of technology were accessible. INTIB prepared a roster of 400 experts to provide it with advice and to develop a market for direct employment of experts under contracts between them and employers in developing countries. Among its publications was a 450-entry directory of industrial information services and systems in developing countries.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Industrial Development Board,<sup>(2)</sup> in May, reaffirmed the important role of INTIB, approved its work programme and decided to consider a comprehensive report on INTIB in 1982. The report, it said, should contain information on volume of work, countries, clients, information sources, sectors covered and links with other information centres. The Board expressed regret that resource constraints had not permitted full implementation of its previous decisions on INTIB.

Support for the provision of adequate resources to INTIB was voiced by Egypt and India during the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee.

Directory: <sup>(1)</sup>UNIDO/IS.205.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>IDB, A/36/16.

Publications: Industrial Development Abstracts, ID/249, ID/277, ID/279.

### Patent information

Under an agreement among UNIDO, the World Intellectual Property Organization

(WIPO) and the Austrian Patent Office, searches were carried out to provide patent information. Users' guides to the International Patent Classification, prepared by WIPO in co-operation with UNIDO, were published in 1981 for the four sectors of the INTIB pilot operation—iron and steel, fertilizers, agro-industries and agricultural machinery.<sup>(\*)</sup>

Publications: <sup>(1)</sup>UNIDO/IS.231-234.

#### Industrial institutions

In 1981, UNIDO assisted national science and technology councils, industrial research and service institutes, industrial information services, institutions for intermediate and village technologies, technological innovation centres and industrial consultancy companies in 15 countries: Angola, Egypt, Indonesia, Kenya, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania and Zaire. A total of 165 such projects were being implemented in 1981, and expenditures on them during the year amounted to \$12.7 million, a 12 per cent increase over the 1980 level.

A meeting on industry-research institute linkage with special reference to instrument design (Sofia, Bulgaria, 20-24 April) discussed the possibility of twinning arrangements between the Bulgarian Institute for Instrument Design and research institutes in developing countries.<sup>(1)</sup> A group meeting on standardization and quality control in the industrialization of developing countries (Arandjelovac, Yugoslavia, 7-12 September) made recommendations for national and international action to strengthen activities in this field.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Meeting on industry-research institute linkage, ID/WG.344/5.

#### Preparation of industrial projects

The Industrial Development Board considered in May 1981<sup>(3)</sup> a proposal for the establishment within UNIDO of an industrial project preparation facility to assist project identification, preparation and evaluation in the least developed countries (LDCs). As outlined in a March 1981 note by the UNIDO Executive Director,<sup>(4)</sup> such a facility, proposed in February 1980 by the Third General Conference of UNIDO,<sup>(5)</sup> would concentrate on carrying out feasibility studies right up to the "bankable" stage, which UNIDO had hitherto done only to a limited extent. It would focus on the development of small-scale agro-industries and mineral processing, and be financed from a revolving fund of \$10 million a year.

The Board agreed that UNIDO should improve its assistance in the preparation of industrial projects, particularly in LDCs, and in developing national capacities to that end. It requested the General Assembly to take measures with regard to the ability of UNIDO to assist developing countries in the preparation of industrial projects.

The Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(4)</sup> decided to ensure that adequate resources would be made available to UNIDO to assist developing countries in the preparation of industrial programmes and projects in energy-related industrial technology (p. 706) and for LDCs (p. 595). This provision replaced a paragraph in the original draft of the resolution, sponsored by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77,<sup>(1)</sup> by which the Assembly would have decided to provide UNIDO with additional resources to continue to assist developing countries in the preparation of industrial programmes and projects.

Through its Co-operative Programme with the World Bank, UNIDO assisted three countries during 1981 in the preparation of investment projects: Mexico (capital goods), Turkey (textiles) and Yemen (stone-quarrying and -cutting, cement and glass).

During the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, India expressed the hope that the Assembly would strengthen the capacity of UNIDO to undertake feasibility and project studies, especially with regard to industrial project preparation.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.82.

Note: <sup>(2)</sup>UNIDO Executive Director. ID/B/261/Add.5.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>IDB, A/36/16.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/182, sect. I, paras. 10-12, 17 Dec. (p. 579).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 652.

#### Industrial management

Technical co-operation expenditures for UNIDO factory establishment and management projects amounted to \$4.5 million in 1981, with the United Nations Development Programme financing some 90 per cent of the total; 67 projects were in various stages of implementation.

Projects providing expert assistance in industrial management were continued in El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guyana, Mauritius, Nicaragua, Somalia, the Sudan and Uruguay. Projects for instituting organizational improvements were initiated or continued in Benin, El Salvador, Malawi, Swaziland, Zaire and Zambia. Computer-based management information systems were introduced through projects in Egypt and the Syrian Arab Republic.

## Social aspects of Industrialization

Recognizing that the purpose of promoting industrialization in developing countries was to improve economic and social welfare, and citing the need to include social dimensions when giving advice on technical assistance and industrial planning, the UNIDO Executive Director, in a March 1981 report,<sup>(2)</sup> sought the guidance of the Industrial Development Board on the inclusion of research on social aspects of industrialization in the 1982-1983 programme budget. He suggested that the research might aim at highlighting industrialization's contribution to social welfare and progress and at underscoring the role of social progress in promoting rapid industrialization in developing countries.

On 20 May, the Board, stressing the positive social aspects for developing countries of accelerated industrialization, expressed the view that the research proposed by the UNIDO secretariat deserved special consideration.<sup>(1)</sup>

During debate in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on development and international economic co-operation, Mongolia expressed the view that UNIDO should not lose sight of the social aspects of industrialization, which should make it possible to raise standards of living and promote social justice by eliminating the exploitation of man by man.

Reports: (1)IDB, A/36/16; (2)UNIDO Executive Director, ID/B/261.Add.3.

## Activities for LDCs

Special measures in support of industrial development of the least developed countries (LDCs) continued to be a priority concern of UNIDO, with emphasis on manufacturing, industrial inputs to agricultural development, and human and physical infrastructure. Technical assistance valued at \$20 million was delivered to LDCs during 1981, about the same level as in 1980. The UNIDO Investment Co-operative Programme assisted these countries in identifying and promoting projects for potential investment, and investment promotion offices in developed countries (p. 592) trained representatives of LDCs in project promotion.

Consultations took place in 1981 between UNIDO and a number of special funds and financial institutions, in search of funds for UNIDO-assisted projects in various LDCs. Industrial surveys were undertaken for seven LDCs, and country industrial development profiles or country industrial briefs were prepared for some LDCs in connection with country programming by the United Nations Development Programme for 1982-1986.

On 20 May, the Industrial Development Board<sup>(1)</sup> reaffirmed the priority of UNIDO activi-

ties for LDCs and requested the secretariat to participate more effectively in the preparation, deliberations and follow-up of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, in September (p. 406).

The Economic and Social Council, in its resolution of 24 July on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(2)</sup> addressed to the UNIDO Executive Director a similar request for effective participation in the Conference deliberations and follow-up.

On 17 December, in its resolution on the same subject, the General Assembly requested the Executive Director to increase technical co-operation and the programmes and projects for LDCs, and decided to ensure that adequate resources would be made available to UNIDO to assist developing countries in the preparation of those programmes and projects.<sup>(3)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>IDB, A/36/16.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/75, para. 8, 24 July (p. 578);

<sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/182, sect. I, paras. 11 & 12, 17 Dec. (p. 579).

## Development of specific industries

Many of the technical co-operation activities, studies and meetings carried out by UNIDO in 1981-including three meetings under the System of Consultations (p. 588)-related to specific industrial sectors or industries. The major sectors were agro-industries (see below), chemical industries (p. 596), engineering industries (p. 598), 597) and metallurgical industries

## Agro-industries

Expenditures for UNIDO technical co-operation in agro-industries amounted to \$8.3 million in 1981, involving 216 projects. Africa accounted for 38 per cent of the expenditure, Asia and the Pacific for 34 per cent, the Americas for 14 per cent, Arab States for 6 per cent, Europe for 2 per cent, and interregional and global projects for 6 per cent. As in the past, activities covered a wide range of light industries.

## Food industry

The First Consultation on the Food-Processing Industry (The Hague, Netherlands, 9-13 November 1981)<sup>(1)</sup> called for the development of policy guidelines for a comprehensive approach to the acquisition of training, technology, financing and marketing, and stressed the importance of long-term arrangements that would increase the participation of food-producing developing countries in processing, create a more equitable distribution of benefits among those

involved in the agor-food chain and link the food-processing industry to other sectors of the economy. It recommended that UNIDO establish a roster and assist in bringing clients in developing countries into contact with appropriate partners.

The UNIDO secretariat prepared for the Consultation its first global study on the food-processing industry, comprising a detailed worldwide assessment of the industry and of developing countries' prospects for rapid progress in that sector.<sup>(2)</sup>

UNIDO technical co-operation activities in the food-processing sector included assistance in the expansion, modernization and integration of complexes for cane sugar and its by-products in Bangladesh, the Dominican Republic and Mauritius; initiation of work on the establishment of a sugar industry development centre in Egypt; and upgrading the production of baker's yeast in Viet Nam, biscuits in Uganda and bacon in Kenya. A study was conducted for the International Pepper Community on developing the pepper-processing and pepper products industry. Latin American countries received UNIDO assistance in improving urban food supply and developing an integrated agro-industry, with the aim of creating employment in rural areas and reducing the exodus of rural populations.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Consultation on Food-Processing Industry. ID/278.

Study: <sup>(2)</sup>ID/WG.345/3/Rev.1.

#### Textile industry

Of the nine current large-scale UNIDO projects in the textile industry, four were completed in early 1981. In addition to the five remaining projects in Bangladesh (two), Egypt, India and the United Republic of Tanzania, there were two medium-scale projects in Ghana and India and one preparatory assistance project in Sri Lanka. A major techno-economic feasibility study was completed in 1981 for the first textile manufacturing complex in Haiti.

#### Vegetable oil industry

A detailed evaluation of the vegetable oil and fat industries in 12 Pacific countries was undertaken in 1981 to promote closer regional co-operation in that sector. A Coconut Technology Consultancy Service was established in the UNIDO secretariat to extend coconut-processing documentation and upgrade selected domestic processes to semi-industrial and industrial levels. UNIDO initiated a study in seven developing countries in order to provide recommendations for international co-operation agreements on local manufacture and distribution of spare parts and equipment for the vegetable oil industry.

#### Wood-using industry

A UNIDO Expert Group Meeting on Timber Stress Grading and Strength Grouping (Vienna, 14-17 December 1981) sought to increase the use of timber in construction by drawing up standard rules and systems to assist designers and specifiers.<sup>(2)</sup> A seminar on wood-based panels and furniture industries (Beijing, China, 20 March-4 April) considered guidelines for the selection of options in establishing such industries in the least developed countries. A large-scale project in Sri Lanka on structural uses of coconut- and rubber-wood was started during the year. A manual on jigs for the furniture industry and a study on technical criteria for the selection of wood-working machines<sup>(3)</sup> were published.

Manual: <sup>(1)</sup>ID/265 & Corr.1.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Meeting on timber, ID/WG.359/7.

Study: <sup>(3)</sup>ID/247.

#### Chemical industries

Technical co-operation expenditures for UNIDO activities in the chemical industries sector amounted to \$21.3 million in 1981, involving 302 projects. Asia and the Pacific accounted for 42 per cent of the expenditure, Africa for 24 per cent, Arab States for 18 per cent, the Americas for 11 per cent, Europe for 3 per cent, and interregional and global projects for 2 per cent. Some 80 new projects were approved for implementation, 4 of which, at a total value of \$2.8 million, were approved for financing by the United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development.

In an innovative approach, UNIDO technical assistance was combined with commercial co-operation when a firm that had contracted with UNIDO to provide advisory and training services to a public sector chemical dyestuff company in Egypt entered into a commercial agreement with the company, guaranteeing increased production and sales.

#### Fertilizer industry

In 1981, UNIDO carried out feasibility studies on establishing small-scale nitrogen fertilizer plants in Argentina and Nepal, and a nitrophosphate plant in Pakistan received technical assistance to increase the product's water solubility and improve the capacity utilization of the plant. Assistance continued to be provided to the Bangladesh Chemical Industries Corporation to increase plant utilization and to establish a central fertilizer training institute at one of its plants. In co-operation with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Arab Industrial Development Organization and the Arab Federation of Chemical Fertilizer Producers, a programme was undertaken for the



development and promotion of fertilizer production and utilization in the Arab region. An expert group (first meeting, Vienna, 7-11 December) met to exchange experiences in the construction and operation of fertilizer plants in developing countries.<sup>(3)</sup>

Developing countries began to use as a negotiating guide two model forms of contract for fertilizer plant construction—a turnkey lump sum contract<sup>(1)</sup> and a cost reimbursable contract<sup>(2)</sup>—which had been developed by UNIDO under its System of Consultations (p.588).

Model contracts: <sup>(1)</sup>UNIDO/PC/25, <sup>(2)</sup>UNIDO/PC/26.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>Expert group on fertilizer plants, UNIDO/PC/30.

#### Petrochemical industry

The Second Consultation on the Petrochemical Industry (Istanbul, Turkey, 22-26 June 1981)<sup>(1)</sup> recommended that UNIDO should: provide information on opportunities for co-operation between industrialized and oil- and gas-producing developing countries for the development of downstream petrochemical industries in other developing countries; examine various forms of long-term arrangements for international co-operation in the sector, to help ensure orderly world-wide development of the industry; and revise a model form of licensing agreement for the petrochemical industry to include alternative texts on some points.

UNIDO submitted to the Consultation a second world-wide study on the petrochemical industry, which analysed patterns of supply and demand in respect of major petrochemical products, projected possible developments up to 1990 and indicated potential opportunities for new production capacities.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Consultation on Petrochemical Industry, ID/273.

Study: <sup>(2)</sup>ID.WG.336/3 & Add.1.

#### Petroleum industry

A workshop on petroleum processing (Vienna, 21-30 April 1981) sponsored by UNIDO, the Fund for International Development of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, the Government of Austria and the State-owned Austrian oil company, enabled technical managers of small, State-controlled refineries in developing countries to exchange information and develop closer co-operation.

#### Pharmaceutical industry

Technical assistance by UNIDO in the pharmaceutical sector exceeded \$3.8 million in 1981. Projects focused on improving the supply of

drugs for health care through provision of technological capabilities for local production of essential pharmaceuticals.

UNIDO assisted in the establishment of simple pharmaceutical formulation and medicinal plant extraction units in Afghanistan, Bhutan, Botswana, Cape Verde, Democratic Yemen, Guinea-Bissau, Nepal, Rwanda and the Upper Volta. Aid was also provided for the establishment of larger pharmaceutical formulation plants in Guinea and the United Republic of Tanzania, a pharmaceutical dosage form production unit in Mozambique, an intravenous equipment plant in Zambia, a multi-purpose plant for the production of 15 essential synthetic drugs in Cuba, and projects involving sophisticated technology for the manufacture of synthetic drugs in Brazil and India.

A round-table meeting of experts on pharmaceuticals (Mohammedia, Morocco, December) agreed that a directory of manufacturers and suppliers of bulk drugs and their intermediates being prepared by UNIDO would assist developing countries in considering a wider range of alternative sources of supply.

At a Workshop on Trade and Technology Policies in the Pharmaceutical Sector (Abidjan, Ivory Coast, 12-23 October), <sup>(1)</sup> organized by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in co-operation with the African Regional Centre for Technology, African participants adopted a Programme of Action for Rational Pharmaceutical Policies, aimed at overcoming technological dependence and ensuring a proper supply of drugs at reasonable prices. The Programme recognized the need to establish regional co-operation machinery, including a pharmaceuticals fund, for the pooled procurement of drugs and development of the pharmaceutical sector.

The United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations submitted to the Commission on Transnational Corporations a study on such corporations in the pharmaceutical industry of developing countries (p. 603). The General Assembly continued to call for the exchange of information on unsafe pharmaceutical products (p. 824).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Workshop on Trade and Technology Policies in Pharmaceutical Sector, UNCTAD/TT/48.

#### Engineering industries

Technical co-operation expenditures for engineering industries activities of UNIDO totalled \$14.3 million in 1981, involving 149 projects. Asia and the Pacific received 62 per cent of total expenditure, Africa 15 per cent, the Americas 11 per cent, Arab States 7 per cent and Europe 5 per cent. The value of projects approved in this sector increased by 50 per cent over the 1980 figure.

In addition to its assistance to established industries, UNIDO convened expert groups to evaluate the potential of some new technologies (p. 593).

#### Capital goods

The First Consultation on the Capital Goods Industry (Brussels, Belgium, 21-25 September 1981)<sup>(1)</sup> recommended that UNIDO make information available to developing countries on long-term technological trends, technological alternatives and their availability and costs, and commercial conditions for their acquisition. It also requested UNIDO to propose measures to improve the flow of technology to developing countries, taking into account the mutual interest of recipients and suppliers of technology and the consequences for employment. Alternative approaches to establishing and expanding the production of capital goods in developing countries were proposed by the UNIDO secretariat in its first global study on the capital goods industry, presented to the Consultation.\*

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Consultation on Capital Goods Industry, ID/276.

Study: <sup>(2)</sup>ID/WG.342/3.

#### Agricultural machinery industry

Technical assistance on production of agricultural equipment at industrial, small-scale and artisan levels was provided by UNIDO in 1981 to Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Ethiopia, Kenya, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Somalia, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania. As in the past, most projects in the least developed countries involved small-scale production and intermediate technology, and aimed at reducing imports of agricultural equipment, including hand tools.

A workshop on maintenance and repair of sugar industry equipment (Havana, Cuba, October), organized by UNIDO, the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Sugar Exporting Countries and the Government of Cuba, agreed on a joint regional programme for the maintenance of such equipment.

#### Electronics industry

Assistance provided by UNIDO in the electronics sector in 1981 was highlighted by the application of mini- and micro-computers to industrial processes and design. Several requests for projects in this field were received and specific services were provided to a number of countries.

During the year, the largest UNIDO engineering project to date, a turnkey training plant for bipolar digital integrated circuits, became operational in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In addition to a programme for promot-

ing the manufacture of telecommunications equipment in Africa, new projects included assistance to the heavy electrical manufacturing industry, electrical maintenance and repair facilities, and creation of electronics industries in China, Cuba, Egypt, Hong Kong, Hungary, Mexico, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Thailand and several Caribbean countries.

A workshop on the selection of technology for assembling electronic and electrical products in developing countries (Utrecht, Netherlands, 4-8 May), held in co-operation with the United Nations Development Programme and the Industry Council for Development, recommended the preparation of guidelines for the establishment of television receiver assembly plants in developing countries.\*

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Workshop on electronic and electrical products, ID/WG/339/16.

#### Metallurgical industries

Technical co-operation expenditures on UNIDO activities in metallurgical industries totalled \$8.2 million in 1981. Asia and the Pacific received 34 per cent. of total expenditures, Africa 27 per cent, the Americas 18 per cent, Arab States 11 per cent and Europe 10 per cent. Some 94 projects were under way during the year, with a focus on development, transfer and application of technology.

Increased efforts were made to identify and implement foundry projects to supply local markets with agricultural implements, tools and spare parts, and to reduce imports. Such projects were under way in the Central African Republic, Democratic Yemen, Hungary, Nepal, the Niger, Sierra Leone and the United Republic of Tanzania. Activities concerned with the establishment and strengthening of metallurgical technology centres, training, and consultancy and quality control services took place in India, Nigeria, Pakistan and Turkey.

The Workshop on the Regional Project for Co-operative Research among Metallurgical Research and Development Centres in Asia and the Pacific (Jamshedpur, India, 7-11 December) resulted in an agreed scheme for future co-region.<sup>(1)</sup> among such institutions in the

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Workshop on metallurgical research and development centres in Asia and Pacific, ID/WG/361/18.

#### Iron and steel

The largest UNIDO project to date, a demonstration plant for the production of sponge iron in India, which was inaugurated on 31 December 1980, operated in 1981 at 10 per cent above its rated capacity of 30,000 tons a year. Assistance

to the iron and steel industry was also given to Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, Mozambique, the Niger, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey.

Jointly organized by UNIDO and the Association of South-East Asian Nations, a workshop on regional steel standardization (Manila, Philippines, 20-23 July) discussed future co-operation in the gradual harmonization of the variety of national standards in use within the region. Two studies were completed in continuation of a project to elaborate scenarios for the development of the world iron and steel industry through 1990.<sup>(1)</sup>

Studies: <sup>(1)</sup>UNIDO/IS.213 & Add. 1.

#### Other industrial categories

##### Building materials and construction industry

In co-operation with Turkey and the Turkish Cement Manufacturers Association, UNIDO organized a High-level Meeting on Co-operation among Developing Countries in the Field of Cement, Lime and Related Industries (Ankara, 14-18 December 1981). <sup>(1)</sup>UNIDO technical assistance included recommendations for technical and managerial improvements at a major national construction company in Algeria, assistance to a cement plant in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and development of the building materials industry in the Syrian Arab Republic.

The first technical co-operation project on earthquake-resistant building construction was initiated in 1981, with the participation of Governments and institutes in Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Romania, Turkey and Yugoslavia. In addition, a comprehensive survey of the construction industry took place in the Sudan under the World Bank/UNIDO Co-operative Programme.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup> Meeting on cement, lime and related industries, UNIDO/PC/39.

##### Small-scale industries

During 1981, UNIDO assisted 38 countries and an intergovernmental organization in the establishment and strengthening of institutions serving small-scale industries and delivering technology to entrepreneurs in less accessible areas. In Egypt, a UNIDO-organized workshop (Alexandria, 23 June-2 July) produced a comprehensive programme for the identification, promotion and financing of small- and medium-scale industrial enterprises in two provinces. Togo received assistance in establishing and operating an industrial estate in an effort to direct industrialization to remote areas. Aid to Zambia in establishing a legal base for a development organization for small-scale industry resulted in the enactment of a small-scale industry act.

To promote co-operation at the plant level, a project was initiated for technology transfer between food-processing plants in the Netherlands and similar plants in China, Mexico, the Sudan and Thailand. Another project involved the study of possibilities for technology transfer from small-scale industries in India to those in Samoa processing coir and its by-products. UNIDO also encouraged co-operation between small-scale enterprises in India and Nepal concerned with non-ferrous metal casting, machine tools, small foundries, welding electrodes and small brick-making industries. An expert group meeting (Manila, Philippines, 2-6 November) reviewed a continuing pilot project in the Philippines which had established a link between industrial research institutions and small- and medium-scale industries, particularly in rural areas.

## Chapter VII

### Transnational corporations

United Nations activities in 1981 concerning transnational corporations (TNCs) were concentrated in the Commission on Transnational Corporations, with its two subsidiary working groups, and the Secretariat's Centre on Transnational Corporations. The Centre's work was reviewed by the Commission at its seventh session, from 31 August to 11 September at Geneva.<sup>(1)</sup>

Drafting continued of a code of conduct relating to TNC activities (p. 600). The Commission's Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct held three sessions, in January, April

and May.<sup>(3)</sup> Agreement was reached concerning provisions on requirements for disclosure of information and on TNC activities in southern Africa, among others.

The other working group of the Commission—the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting—held two sessions in 1981, in January and March,<sup>(2)</sup> to continue the preparation of reporting standards on TNC operations (p. 601). It focused on lists of financial and non-financial items to be included in reports of transnational enterprises.

The Centre carried out its work programme, as mandated by the Commission, in the areas of information, research and technical co-operation (p. 602). It continued to develop its comprehensive information system on TNCs and to study their operations in a number of industries and sectors.

Acting on the Commission's recommendation, the Economic and Social Council, in November, called for the termination of all collaboration by TNCs with South Africa (p. 189).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49 & Add.1;

<sup>(2)</sup>Working Group on accounting and reporting, E/C.10/81; <sup>(3)</sup>Working Group on Code of Conduct, E/C.10/79.

### Draft code of conduct on TNCs

In 1981, the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct continued work on the formulation of an international code relating to the activities of TNCs and the treatment to be accorded them by Governments. It held its twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth sessions at United Nations Headquarters from 5 to 23 January, from 6 to 17 April and from 18 to 29 May, respectively.

The May session was authorized by the Economic and Social Council on 6 February.<sup>(5)</sup> This was done at the Group's request, as conveyed in a letter of 30 January from its Chairman to the Council President.<sup>(\*)</sup>

In 1981, the Working Group dealt mainly with the section on activities of TNCs. It discussed paragraphs dealing with non-interference in intergovernmental relations and reached agreement on some paragraphs concerning ownership and control, as well as on those dealing with disclosure of information to the public and to authorities of countries in which TNCs operated. Two alternative formulations were drafted for a paragraph referring to the Set of Multilaterally Agreed Equitable Principles and Rules for the Control of Restrictive Business Practices adopted by the General Assembly in 1980.<sup>(4)</sup> The Group agreed on a provision stating that the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, adopted by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office in 1977, should apply in the field of employment, training, conditions of work and life, and industrial relations.

It provisionally agreed on a paragraph dealing with the activities of TNCs in southern Africa. This text stated that TNCs should progressively reduce their business activities and make no further investment in South Africa, cease business in Namibia and refrain from collaboration with the South African régime. Also, TNCs operating in southern Africa should respect national laws

and regulations adopted in pursuance of Security Council decisions on southern Africa, and should contribute to the elimination of racial discrimination practices.

In the chapter on treatment of TNCs, the Working Group discussed but did not reach agreement on provisions dealing with their general treatment by the countries in which they operated, nationalization and compensation, and jurisdiction. It agreed to a paragraph on the right of States to regulate the entry and establishment of TNCs and to prohibit or limit their presence in specific sectors.

The Group drafted seven out of eight paragraphs dealing with intergovernmental co-operation and held a general discussion on the section of the code dealing with its implementation. In addition, at the Group's request, the Chairman prepared formulations covering the preamble, objectives, definitions, scope of application, and certain paragraphs in the section on the treatment of TNCs.

At the beginning of its May session, the Working Group decided to continue drafting provisions with a view to reaching, as far as possible, complete agreement on them. By the end of its fifth year of work on the code, the Group had drafted about 50 provisions, of which fewer than 20 had clauses in brackets, indicating lack of agreement on them. It still had to draft texts on the introductory part of the code (preamble, objectives and definitions), scope of application and the section on implementation. It requested authorization for three two-week sessions in 1982 to complete its work.

The report submitted by the Working Group to the Commission in 1981<sup>(3)</sup> contained the text of the provisions concluded by that time, as well as formulations by the Chairman on other provisions.

In September,<sup>(2)</sup> the Commission took note of the Group's report and reaffirmed that the code of conduct had the highest priority among its tasks. As requested, it recommended that the Economic and Social Council authorize three further sessions and it requested the Group to finalize its work and submit the results at the Commission's 1982 session. The Commission reaffirmed that the code should be universally adopted and decided to take all necessary measures to that end during its 1982 session.

The Commission's recommendations on the Working Group's 1982 calendar of meetings were approved by the Council on 2 November.<sup>(6)</sup>

During the Council's debate on TNCs, the USSR said that, at a time when developing countries were being deprived of income because capitalist Powers were trying to impose foreign private enterprise free from the jurisdiction of

countries in which they operated, it was extremely important to work towards a code of conduct; the USSR regretted that progress was being blocked by Western countries. The German Democratic Republic felt that the code should be an instrument for regulating and controlling TNC activities, not for creating a climate for direct private investment.

The United States, expressing the view that foreign investment led to increased employment and enhanced international trade, supported work on a code, which it believed should take into account the activities of State-owned as well as private enterprises.

Letter:<sup>(1)</sup> Working Group Chairman, 30 Jan., E/1981/17.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49; <sup>(3)</sup>Working Group, E/C.10/79.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution:: <sup>(4)</sup>GA: 35/63, para. 1, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 630).

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(5)</sup>1981/103, 6 Feb. 1981 (p. 605);

<sup>(6)</sup>1981/198, para. (b), 2 Nov. (p. 605).

Financial implications: S-G statement, E/1981/L.12.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.1, 3 (3,6 Feb.).

#### Definition of TNCs

At the April 1981 session of the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct (p. 600), the Chairman submitted a working paper which included a suggested definition of the term "transnational corporation" for inclusion in the introductory part of the code.<sup>(2)</sup> The Group did not deal with the matter in 1981.

At its August/September session,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission on TNCs postponed consideration of the item until 1982 and decided to discuss it at that time in the context of the Working Group's report.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49; (2)Working Group, E/C.10/79.

#### Standards of accounting and reporting

The Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting, which began work in 1980,<sup>(5)</sup> held its third and fourth sessions in 1981 at United Nations Headquarters, from 19 to 30 January and from 16 to 27 March, respectively. The Group pursued its basic objective of setting up international accounting and reporting standards to improve the availability and comparability of information on TNC operations, giving priority to disclosure of information on the nature, scope and effects of TNC activities in both home and host, particularly developing, countries. It submitted a report to the Commission on TNCs covering its work in 1980 and 1981.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Group agreed on the principle of appropriate disclosure to meet users' needs for better understanding, analysis and evaluation of

the performance of TNCs. Accordingly, it devoted its time to elaborating minimum lists of financial and non-financial information items to be included in general purpose reports of transnational enterprises as a whole and of individual member enterprises.

The Group discussed in detail the type of information that should be included in each main component of annual financial reports- balance sheet, income statement, statement of allocation of net profits or net income, and statement of changes in financial position. Disclosure of accounting policies was considered essential for understanding the content of financial statements. The Group considered that certain items of both financial and non-financial information should be reported not only in the aggregate but also by geographical area and line of business. In addition, it agreed on the definition of certain general and financial terms that TNCs should adopt in preparing their reports. The Group decided that reports should disclose all items which were material enough to affect evaluations or decisions by users, whether or not such items were included in a minimum list.

The Group agreed that lists of items for disclosure need not follow a pre-determined format. It was also agreed that the applicability of the lists to financial enterprises such as banks and insurance firms would be considered subsequently. In this connection, it asked the Centre on TNCs to produce a background study on information disclosure by banking and financial institutions.

The Group accepted the principle that financial information on group enterprises- those consisting of several member enterprises- should be presented in consolidated form. Consolidation was understood to involve the application of accounting principles and practices to eliminate transactions, investments and other balances, and profits or losses arising from transactions among members of the group, so that information was presented as if the group were a single enterprise.

The Group also dealt with financial information regarding individual enterprises, again with a view to setting out a minimum list with definitions. Due to the wide variation of national laws and regulations, it was agreed that such lists should apply to the extent and in the manner required by those laws.

Also discussed was non-financial information to be disclosed with regard to the enterprise as a whole, on topics such as labour and employment, production, investment programme, organizational structure, environmental measures and technology transfer.

By the end of the March session, the Group had yet to discuss a 1977 report by an earlier

group of experts on international harmonization and standardization of the accounting and reporting practices of TNCs,<sup>(4)</sup> and recommendations of the Secretary-General on an international system of standardized accounting for TNCs; to review materials from international accountancy bodies and other interested groups; and to consider further steps in the field of international standards and reporting, particularly in regard to the United Nations information system on TNCs (see below), the draft code of conduct (p. 600) and improvement of the information provided by TNCs in their reports. In order to complete its mandate, the Group requested authorization for two further sessions in 1982, each of two weeks' duration, to complete its work.

Accordingly, the Commission on TNCs recommended in September that the Group be authorized to hold two sessions in 1982.<sup>(2)</sup> The Economic and Social Council decided on 2 November 1981<sup>(1)</sup> to authorize the sessions, with the objective of having the Group submit its final recommendations to the Commission in 1982.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC. 1981/198, para. (c), 2 Nov. (p. 605).

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49; <sup>(3)</sup>Working Group, E/C.10/81.

Yearbook references: <sup>(4)</sup>1977, p. 532; <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 669.

### Activities of the UN Centre on TNCs

The United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations, the main Secretariat unit for matters relating to TNCs, in 1981 continued to develop a comprehensive information system (see below), conducted and supervised technical co-operation activities (p. 604) and carried out research (p. 603). It assisted the working groups involved in formulation of a code of conduct (p. 600) and international standards of accounting and reporting (p. 601). It co-operated with other organizations and units inside and outside the United Nations system, in particular with joint units operated by the Centre and the United Nations regional commissions (p. 603).

Taking note of a report on the Centre's activities since mid-1980,<sup>(2)</sup> the Commission, in September, requested more information on the financial implications of the Centre's work.<sup>(1)</sup> A report on the work accomplished between mid-1981 and mid-1982 was submitted to the Commission for its 1982 session.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Centre was financed from the United Nations regular budget, under which \$7,294,600 was appropriated for 1980-1981.<sup>(4)</sup> In addition, it received \$1,191,918 during 1981 in contributions from six Governments to the Trust Fund for the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations: Finland, \$23,041; Italy, \$338,240; the

Netherlands, \$79,613; Norway, \$185,185; Sweden, \$365,839; and Switzerland, \$200,000. Pledges to this Fund for 1982 (as at 31 December 1981) were made by Finland (\$33,708) and Norway (\$168,067).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49; S-G, <sup>(2)</sup>E/C.10/77, <sup>(3)</sup>E/C.10/1982/3.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA.36/234 A, sect. 9, 18 Dec. (p. 1284).

### Information system

The Centre on TNCs continued in 1981 to expand its comprehensive information system, with special attention given to legal information, macro-economic information, studies of TNC activities in sectors of special significance to developing countries and corporate profiles on individual corporations. In a report to the 1981 session of the Commission on TNCs,<sup>(11)</sup> the Centre outlined the structure and development of the information system and its priorities and progress, surveyed its main features, and described the sources and nature of information, co-ordination with other United Nations agencies' systems, co-operation with regional joint units and information dissemination.

Priority was given to collection and analysis of legal information, particularly on policies, laws and regulations, and agreements between TNCs and host-country entities. Studies on legal topics produced in 1981 included a survey of national legislation relating to TNCs in 20 countries<sup>(8)</sup> and technical papers on management contracts,<sup>(6)</sup> petroleum and mining agreements<sup>(9)</sup> and turnkey contracts.<sup>(10)</sup>

Several industry studies analysed the role of TNCs in particular production sectors—copper,<sup>(1)</sup> bauxite/aluminium,<sup>(\*)</sup> food and beverage processing,<sup>(3)</sup> fertilizers,<sup>(4)</sup> power equipment<sup>(5)</sup> and agricultural equipment.<sup>(7)</sup> The Centre initiated a programme for improving national capability for collecting and analysing information on TNCs in host developing countries.

A study was prepared on the possible role of the information system in improving the exchange of information on banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceuticals (p. 824).

The Commission, after considering the Centre's reports at its August/September session,<sup>(12)</sup> noted the improved performance of the information system. It stated that further attention should be given to legal information, including national legislation and different forms of contracts; macrodata; studies of TNC activities in sectors of special significance to developing countries; and corporate profiles on individual corporations. It stressed the need for the development of national information systems, to be linked to the Centre's system with the assistance of the Centre.

Publications: <sup>(1)</sup> Transnational Corporations in the Copper Industry (ST/CTC/21), Sales No. E.81.II.A.3; <sup>(2)</sup> Transnational Corporations in the Bauxite/Aluminium Industry (ST/CTC/20), Sales No. E.81.II.A.5; <sup>(3)</sup> Transnational Corporations in Food and Beverage Processing (ST/CTC/19), Sales No. E.81.II.A.12; <sup>(4)</sup> Transnational Corporations in the Fertilizer Industry (ST/CTC/25), Sales No. E.82.II.A.10; <sup>(5)</sup> Transnational Corporations in the Power Equipment Industry (ST/CTC/22), Sales No. E.82.II.A.11; <sup>(6)</sup> Management Contracts in Developing Countries: An Analysis of Their Substantive Provisions-A Technical Paper (ST/CTC/27), Sales No. E.82.II.A.21; <sup>(7)</sup> Transnational Corporations in the Agricultural Machinery and Equipment Industry (ST/CTC/24), Sales No. E.83.II.A.4; <sup>(8)</sup> National Legislation and Regulations Relating to Transnational Corporations (ST/CTC/26), Sales No. E.83.II.A.7; <sup>(9)</sup> Main Features and Trends in Petroleum and Mining Agreements-A Technical Paper (ST/CTC/29), Sales No. E.83.II.A.9; <sup>(10)</sup> Features and Issues in Turnkey Contracts in Developing Countries-A Technical Paper (ST/CTC/28), Sales No. E.83.II.A.13. Reports: <sup>(11)</sup> Centre on TNCs, E/C.10/80; <sup>(12)</sup> Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49.

## Research

The research programme of the Centre, concerned with the economic, political, social and legal effects of TNCs in home and host countries, presented six reports to the Commission in 1981 on the following subjects: TNC activities in southern Africa (p. 189), the direct effects of TNCs on the balance of payments,<sup>(4)</sup> TNCs in the pharmaceutical industry of developing countries,<sup>(5)</sup> aspects of the social and political effects of the operations and practices of TNCs,<sup>(6)</sup> TNCs and transborder data flows,<sup>(7)</sup> and the Centre's ongoing and future research.<sup>(8)</sup> In addition, two studies completed previously, on sub-contracting<sup>(1)</sup> and transnational banks,<sup>(2)</sup> were issued as publications.

The Centre continued work on a comprehensive integrated study on TNCs in world development, the centre-piece of its research activities during the 1981-1982 biennium, to be submitted to the Commission in 1983. In addition, several case studies were under way with the aim of strengthening the negotiating capacity of host countries. Research was also being conducted in connection with the information system on TNCs (p. 602).

In September,<sup>(9)</sup> the Commission requested the Centre to continue its useful research, and reaffirmed that research should be action-oriented and should contribute to formulation of the code of conduct (p. 600) and to strengthening the negotiating capacity of host, particularly developing, countries. The Commission commended the Centre's periodical, *The CTC Reporter*,<sup>(3)</sup> as a useful means for disseminating information on research related to TNCs.

In the Economic and Social Council's discussion of TNCs and the work of the Centre, the USSR said the Centre had placed undue emphasis on the "positive" contribution of TNCs to the

development of developing countries, while its reports provided little information on the adverse effects of TNC activities. The United States expressed concern that the Centre might be overstepping its mandate by producing some studies not formally requested by the Commission and suggested that the Commission review the Centre's reports so that bias against TNCs and the United States, evident in the past, could be reduced. However, Nigeria considered this suggestion unacceptable on the ground that it would lessen the Centre's effectiveness.

Publications: <sup>(1)</sup> Transnational Corporation Linkages in Developing Countries: The Case of Backward Linkages via Sub-contracting (ST/CTC/17), Sales No. E.81.II.A.4; <sup>(2)</sup> Transnational Banks: Operations, Strategies and Their Effects in Developing Countries (ST/CTC/16), Sales No. E.81.II.A.7; <sup>(3)</sup> The CTC Reporter, vol. 1, No. 10, Sales No. E.81.II.A.8 & corr.

Reports: Centre on TNCs, <sup>(4)</sup> E/C.10/84, <sup>(5)</sup> E/C.10/85, <sup>(6)</sup> E/C.10/86, <sup>(7)</sup> E/C.10/87 & Corr. 1, <sup>(8)</sup> E/C.10/88; <sup>(9)</sup> Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49.

## Joint units with the regional commissions

The Centre on TNCs submitted in July 1981 its first comprehensive report on the operations of the joint units established between the Centre and the United Nations regional commissions for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe, Latin America and Western Asia.<sup>(1)</sup> The report provided information on the establishment of the five joint units in 1976 and 1977, discussed co-ordination arrangements on policy matters and on their substantive work, described the work they had accomplished and listed the studies completed by each.

The joint units were established as the focal point for the Centre's activities in their respective regions, in particular through case studies which served as input for the studies and analyses carried out by the Centre. They collected and analysed information on matters relating to TNCs in the regions, to complement the Centre's information system (p. 602). Through a questionnaire designed by the Centre, the units provided it with information on individual corporations. The units for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America were co-operating in an inter-regional project on the role of TNCs in export-oriented primary commodities, concentrating on two issues: factors determining the relative bargaining positions of host Governments and TNCs, and the resulting structure of the distribution of gains between host countries and TNCs.

The Commission, in September,<sup>(2)</sup> expressed support for the work of the joint units. It stated that close co-ordination should be maintained between their work and that of the Centre and requested annual reports on them.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup> Centre on TNCs, E/C.10/78; <sup>(2)</sup> Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49.

#### Technical co-operation

During 1981, the technical co-operation activities of the Centre on TNCs continued to expand in both quantity and scope. In response to government requests, the Centre completed or initiated 128 advisory projects in more than 40 developing countries and conducted 19 training workshops for over 500 officials from 59 developing countries. These figures compared with 49 advisory projects and 10 training workshops in 1980. The Centre reported to the Commission on its technical co-operation work from April 1980 to mid-May 1981<sup>(1)</sup> and from mid-May 1981 to June 1982.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Centre was increasingly involved with projects in support of development efforts. It assisted African, Asian and Latin American countries in reviewing or drafting laws and regulations governing direct foreign investment, acquisition of technology, and monitoring and screening procedures. It helped them in examining the legal, financial, economic and operational aspects of draft contracts and arrangements with TNCs in natural resources exploration and in developing processing projects for petroleum, natural gas, copper, coal, iron, gold, diamonds, bauxite, uranium, aluminium, fertilizers and petrochemicals. It also delivered advisory assistance to developing countries in an expanding range of manufacturing and service industries, including automotive, nuclear power, communications, tyres, food processing, hotel and tourism projects.

Of the 19 training workshops conducted in 1981, 12 were national, 5 were regional and 2 were interregional. They dealt with general legal and negotiating issues involving TNCs as well as issues in the following specific sectors and areas: petroleum, mining, banking, fisheries, tourism, contracts and technology transfer. The national workshops were for officials from China, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands Antilles, Singapore, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia. There were regional exercises for the Caribbean (two), Latin America (two) and the Association of South-East Asian Nations.

Voluntary contributions from Governments were the main source of funding for advisory and training projects executed by the Centre. In 1981, income for technical co-operation relating to TNCs amounted to \$2,154,430, of which \$1,341,918 came from seven Governments: Finland, \$23,041; Germany, Federal Republic of, \$150,000; Italy, \$338,240; Netherlands, \$79,613; Norway, \$185,185; Sweden, \$365,839; and Switzerland, \$200,000. The financial share of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (\$654,950) increased to 31 per cent, com-

pared to about 6 per cent in 1980. Expenditures totalled \$1,838,467.

In September 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the Commission reaffirmed the importance it attached to the advisory and training services. It endorsed the Centre's proposal to assist developing country institutions to develop interdisciplinary training programmes on TNC matters and underlined the usefulness of that activity in strengthening self-reliance within and among developing countries. It stressed that full use should be made of experts with extensive experience, especially those from developing countries.

The Commission reaffirmed the importance of voluntary contributions for this programme while expressing hope that financial support from UNDP would continue to increase. It requested the Centre, in its 1982 report on the programme, to give more information on the cost of projects, the experts used, the content and documentation of workshops, and future activities.

Reports: Centre on TNCs, <sup>(1)</sup>E/C.10/82, <sup>(2)</sup>E/C.10/1982/9; <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49.

#### Medium-term plan

The Centre on TNCs submitted to the Commission in July 1981 a draft for the section of the United Nations medium-term plan for 1984-1989 concerned with the Organization's activities on TNCs.<sup>(1)</sup> The document provided a detailed description of the Centre's three sub-programmes: securing an effective code of conduct and other international arrangements and agreements relating to TNCs; enhancing the contribution of TNCs to development and minimizing their negative effects; and strengthening the capability of host developing countries in dealing with matters related to TNCs.

The Commission, in September,<sup>(2)</sup> took note with appreciation of the Secretariat's draft and requested a revision in the light of the Commission's discussions and to ensure that the plan was consistent with the approved objectives of the Centre. Delegations made suggestions to be incorporated into the document for submission to the Committee for Programme and Coordination and the General Assembly in 1982.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Centre on TNCs, E/C.10/91; <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49.

#### Experts and consultants

The General Assembly, acting without vote on 18 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> requested that, in the future, the Secretary-General submit, for consideration in conjunction with the programme budget for the Centre on TNCs, full information on the experts and consultants employed by the Centre financed from both the United Nations



regular budget and from extrabudgetary resources. The recommendation to this effect, on an oral proposal by Peru, was made by the Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee without objection on 19 November.

The Committee's action was taken during its consideration of the proposed United Nations programme budget for 1982-1983. At the request of Peru, the Secretariat submitted to the Committee details on the experts and consultants employed by the Centre.

During the discussion in the Committee, Ecuador, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Panama, Peru and the USSR expressed concern that not enough consultants were hired from Latin America, from developing countries generally or from Eastern Europe. The Director of the Centre responded that more than 40 per cent of the consultants employed by the Centre in 1980-1981 had been from developing countries.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA.36/235, sect. III, 18 Dec., text following.  
Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.32, 46, 47(5-19 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section III  
Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981  
Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 19 November (meeting 47); oral proposal by Peru; agenda Item 100.

Use of experts and consultants by the United Nations  
Centre on Transnational Corporations  
[The General Assembly...]

Requests the Secretary-General to submit, in the future, for consideration in conjunction with the programme budget for the United Nations Centre on Transnational, full information on the experts and consultants employed by the Centre financed both from the regular budget and from extrabudgetary resources;

## Commission on TNCs

### Convening of the 1981 session

The seventh session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations (TNCs) was held at Geneva from 31 August to 11 September 1981. Originally scheduled for 18 to 28 May at United Nations Headquarters, the session was postponed by the Economic and Social Council on 6 February<sup>(1)</sup> to permit the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct to hold an extra session, at the time and place originally planned for the Commission (p. 600).

The Council's decision was taken without vote on a draft by Venezuela, orally revised by the sponsor to specify the dates of the two sessions and the locale for the Commission's session.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC.1981/103, 6 Feb., text following.  
Financial implications: S-G statement, E/1981/L.15.  
Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.1, 3 (3,6 Feb.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/103

Adopted without vote

Draft by Venezuela (E/1981/L.8), orally revised: agenda item 2.

### Changes in the calendar of conferences and meetings for 1981

At its 3rd plenary meeting, on 6 February 1981, the Council, in view of the progress achieved thus far by the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct and its request for additional time to fulfil its mandate and to complete the draft code by the deadline established in Council resolution 1980/60 of 24 July 1980, decided to authorize the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct to hold an additional two-week session from 18 to 29 May 1981 at United Nations Headquarters, before the seventh session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations, and also decided that the Commission on Transnational Corporations would hold its seventh session from 31 August to 14 September 1981 at Geneva instead of from 18 to 28 May in New York.

### Calendar of 1982 meetings

On the recommendation of the Commission on TNCs at its August/September 1981 session, the Economic and Social Council decided without vote on 2 November<sup>(1)</sup> to accept the offer of the Government of the Philippines to host the 1982 session of the Commission at Manila from 30 August to 10 September. The session had been scheduled for 12 to 21 May at United Nations Headquarters. The Council also authorized 1982 sessions of the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct (p. 600) and the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting (p.601).

The Commission's recommendation was orally amended in the Council by Yugoslavia to specify the exact dates of the Commission's session.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC.1981/198.2 Nov., text following.  
Financial implications: S-G statement, E/1981/49/Add.1.  
Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.42, 43(21 Oct., 2 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981 /198

Adopted without vote

Draft by Commission on TNCs (E/1981/49), orally amended by Yugoslavia; agenda Item 12.

### Calendar of meetings of the Commission on Transnational Corporations and its subsidiary bodies for 1982

At its 43rd plenary meeting, on 2 November 1981, the Council, having accepted with appreciation the offer of the Government of the Philippines to act as host to the Commission on Transnational Corporations at its eighth session, decided:

(8) That the eighth session of the Commission be held at Manila from 30 August to 10 September 1982 instead of from 12 to 21 May 1982 at United Nations Headquarters as was previously scheduled;

(b) To authorize the intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct to hold three more sessions before the eighth session of the Commission;

(c) To authorize the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting to hold two more sessions in 1982, with the objective of submitting its final recommendations to the Commission on Transnational Corporations at its eighth session.

### Agenda for the 1982 session

The Economic and Social Council, on 2 November 1981, approved without vote the provisional agenda and documentation for the 1982 session of the Commission on TNCs,<sup>(1)</sup> as recommended by the Commission in September 1981. It contained one new item, on recent developments related to TNCs and international economic relations.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/199, 2 Nov., text following.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.42, 43 (21 Oct., 2 Nov.).

### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/199

Adopted without vote

Draft by Commission on TNCs (E/1981/49); agenda item 12.

Provisional agenda for the eighth session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations

At its 43rd plenary meeting, on 2 November 1981, the Council approved the provisional agenda and documentation for the eighth session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations set out below:

1. Recent developments related to transnational corporations and international economic relations.  
Documentation:  
Report of the Secretariat.
2. Report on the activities of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations:  
(a) Activities of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations;  
(b) Financial implications of the programme elements of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations.  
Documentation:  
Report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations;  
Reports on the activities of the joint units:  
Note on the financial implications of the programme elements of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations.
3. Work related to the formulation of a code of conduct.  
Documentation:  
Report of the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct.
4. Comprehensive information system.  
Documentation:  
Report on the comprehensive information system.
5. International Standards of accounting and reporting.  
Documentation:  
Report of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting.

### 6. Technical co-operation.

Documentation:

Report on the programme of technical co-operation on matters related to transnational corporations;

Financial implications of the technical co-operation programme of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations.

### 7. Studies on the effects of the operations and practices of transnational corporations:

(a) Activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa and their collaboration with the racist minority régime in that area;

(b) The role of transnational corporations in transborder data flows and their impact on home and host countries, particularly on developing countries;

(c) Other studies;

(d) Review of ongoing and future research.

Documentation:

Report on measures taken pursuant to the resolution recommended by the Commission at its seventh session for adoption by the Council [(a)];

Report on transnational corporations and transborder data flows [(b)];

International financial transfers and transnational banks: their role and impact, in particular in developing countries [(c)];

Transnational corporations in the shipping industry: the case of bauxite [(c)];

Measures taken by Governments to strengthen their negotiating capacity: multinational corporations and joint ventures in Latin America [(c)];

Report on ongoing and future research [(d)].

### 8. Work related to the definition of transnational corporations.

Documentation:

Report of the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct.

### 9. Question of expert advisers.

Documentation:

Note by the Secretariat.

### Distribution of documents

In September 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission on TNCs adopted a resolution by which it expressed regret at delays in the distribution of documents. Stating that this had impeded its work, it requested the Secretary-General to ensure that documentation was distributed on time and simultaneously in all official languages.

Report:<sup>(1)</sup> Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49.

## Chapter VIII

# Regional economic and social activities

The five United Nations regional commissions -for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe, Latin America and Western Asia-continued in 1981 to promote development and co-operation among the countries of their regions. Most of them, in both developed and developing regions, devoted increased attention to energy-

its cost, its conservation and the development of indigenous energy resources, both conventional and new.

The Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) (sixteenth session, Freetown, Sierra Leone, 6-10 April) (p. 609), meeting as a Conference of Ministers,<sup>(1)</sup> continued to concentrate on imple-

mentation of the Lagos Plan of Action for the economic development of Africa, adopted by the Organization of African Unity in April 1980. The General Assembly, in December 1981, urged countries to provide resources for implementing the Plan.<sup>(14)</sup>

Emphasis was placed on three areas of African development: transport and communications, industrial development and food. Potential donors and African States were brought together in June at the first of four meetings designed to secure financing for projects under the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa (1978-1988), and preparations began for a second phase of the Decade, with support from the Economic and Social Council in July<sup>(8)</sup> and the General Assembly in December.<sup>(12)</sup> A Conference of African Ministers of Industry approved in November a framework for the Industrial Development Decade for Africa (1980-1990) (p. 621). In December, the Assembly again called on the international community to support Africa's efforts to increase its food production.<sup>(15)</sup>

In connection with the Transport and Communications Decade, the Council, in July,<sup>(9)</sup> and the Assembly, in December,<sup>(10)</sup> urged support for technical assistance to complete studies on the transport and foreign trade problems of Zaïre. The Assembly also called for efforts to seek funding outside the United Nations budget for the continued operation of the five subregional offices of ECA, known as Multinational Programming and Operational Centres.<sup>(13)</sup> On the Council's recommendation in July,<sup>(6)</sup> the Assembly, in December,<sup>(11)</sup> requested a study of the adequacy of conference facilities at ECA headquarters at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) (thirty-seventh session, Bangkok, Thailand, 10-20 March)<sup>(5)</sup> decided that it should be the regional focal point for work in the field of energy (p. 635). The Asian and Pacific Development Centre was inaugurated in August at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, following the approval of its Charter by ESCAP.

Several subsidiary bodies of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) (thirty-sixth session, Geneva, 30 March-8 April)<sup>(2)</sup> expanded their activities in relation to energy (p. 648). An ECE-related body concerned with transboundary air pollution made recommendations on the control of sulphur emissions into the atmosphere.

The Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) (nineteenth session, Montevideo, Uruguay, 4-15 May)<sup>(3)</sup> proclaimed the 1980s as the Latin American Development Decade and approved an extensive Regional Programme of Action, setting goals and suggesting action to achieve them (p. 660). As happened in other re-

gions, a Regional Plan of Action on New and Renewable Sources of Energy was drawn up at an ECLA meeting, in preparation for the United Nations Conference on the subject held in August (p. 689).

The Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA) (eighth session, Sana'a, Yemen, 3-7 May)<sup>(4)</sup> sought resources to expand its work in statistics, industrial development, and science and technology (p. 669). In December, the Government of Iraq made available to the ECWA secretariat a temporary site at Baghdad, pending construction of a permanent headquarters in that city.

Reviewing the work of the regional commissions in July, the Economic and Social Council recommended that the decentralization of economic and social activities to the commissions be accelerated.<sup>(7)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA, E/1981/54; <sup>(2)</sup>ECE, E/1981/53; ECLA, E/1981/56; <sup>(4)</sup>ECWA, E/1981/55; <sup>(5)</sup>ESCAP, E/1981/52.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(6)</sup>1981/65 (p. 634), <sup>(7)</sup>1981/66 (p. 609), <sup>(8)</sup>1981/67 (p. 615), <sup>(9)</sup>1981/68 (p. 621), 24 July. GA: <sup>(10)</sup>36/139, 16 Dec. (p. 621); <sup>(11)</sup>36/176 (p. 635), <sup>(12)</sup>36/177 (p. 616), <sup>(13)</sup>36/178 (p. 632), <sup>(14)</sup>36/180 (p. 612), <sup>(15)</sup>36/186 (p. 626), 17 Dec.

## Regional co-operation and strengthening of regional commissions

The four commissions in developing regions adopted resolutions in 1981 on their role in the ongoing process of restructuring the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system (p. 1092): ECA, on 10 April<sup>(6)</sup> ECLA, on 15 May;<sup>(7)</sup> ECWA, on 6 May; and ESCAP, on 20 March.<sup>(10)</sup> The resolutions were summarized in the Secretary-General's report to the Economic and Social Council on regional co-operation,<sup>(4)</sup> which surveyed major economic and social developments in the regions as well as the work of each commission.

By these resolutions, all four commissions recommended the intensification of inter-agency co-operation and co-ordination at the regional level, and emphasized that adequate resources should be provided to enable them to carry out their increased responsibilities.

In addition, the commissions urged the General Assembly to involve them more fully in the preparation and implementation of United Nations global policy-making and programme planning (ECLA, ECWA, ESCAP); called for further measures in support of economic and technical co-operation among developing countries (ECA, ECWA, ESCAP); and asked that they be enabled

to play a wider role in development assistance activities carried out in their region by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and other multilateral institutions (ECLA, ESCAP). ESCAP suggested that it be delegated greater authority from United Nations Headquarters in respect of programme planning; and ECA requested greater decentralization of activities, accompanied by redeployment of staff from Headquarters, and suggested that the executive secretaries of the commissions be made full members of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination.

In May/June, the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC)<sup>(2)</sup> discussed the distribution of tasks and responsibilities between the regional commissions and other United Nations units, programmes and organs in the fields of water resources (p. 686) and the environment (p. 842). It agreed to consider the matter further in 1982 on the basis of a more detailed report and suggested that the United Nations Secretariat continue to review activities to determine whether tasks were being performed at the appropriate levels.

The executive secretaries of the regional commissions held two joint meetings in 1981, under the chairmanship of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation: in New York in February and at Geneva on 3 and 4 July. In a report on the meetings,<sup>(5)</sup> the Secretary-General said the secretaries were concerned that the numerous reports and reviews on restructuring and decentralization had not resulted in the provision or redeployment of significant resources for the commissions, with the result that restructuring at the regional level was being hampered.

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** On 24 July, in a resolution on regional co-operation<sup>(6)</sup> adopted without vote, the Economic and Social Council recommended that the General Assembly request intergovernmental organizations and Secretariat units to intensify and expedite the decentralization of economic and social activities to the regional commissions. Accordingly, it requested the Assembly to consider accelerating the redeployment to the commissions of staff and financial resources commensurate with the activities transferred to them.

This resolution was recommended by the Council's First (Economic) Committee on 21 July, also without vote. The text was submitted by the Chairman as a result of informal consultations on a draft by Zambia, later withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup> The adopted resolution omitted a paragraph in the Zambian draft requesting the Assembly to direct that the commissions be given greater administrative authority, including authority for

financial and personnel management. The Chairman's draft was approved with an oral amendment by the United Kingdom deleting the word "increasing" from a preambular paragraph which mentioned the desirability of decentralizing administrative and management responsibilities to the commissions as part of the increasing transfer of activities to them.

Also on 24 July, the Council amended the terms of reference of three commissions<sup>(16)</sup> to take account of the admission of additional members: Zimbabwe as a full member of ECA, consequent upon its admission to the United Nations in August 1980;<sup>(13)</sup> Guam as an associate member of ESCAP (p. 648); and the Netherlands Antilles as an associate member of ECLA (p. 668). In addition, it took note of summaries of regional economic surveys<sup>(15)</sup> for Africa (p. 610), Asia and the Pacific (p. 636), Europe (p. 648), Latin America (p. 660) and Western Asia (p. 669)..

Both these decisions were taken, without vote, on the recommendation of the First Committee, where they were similarly approved on 21 July on oral proposals by the Chairman.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** As requested by the General Assembly in 1979,<sup>(12)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted a report in October 1981<sup>(3)</sup> on implementation of the regional co-operation section of its 1977 resolution on restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system<sup>(11)</sup> and other relevant Assembly resolutions. Concentrating on the role and functions of the commissions in the developing regions, the report focused on decisions taken by them in regard to their policy-making and consultative functions, their expanding responsibilities for operational activities for development and their status as executing agencies for development assistance programmes, their action to promote regional and interregional co-operation among developing countries, their financial requirements and budgetary constraints, and actions to streamline their intergovernmental and secretariat machinery.

The report said all the commissions had noted or endorsed the Assembly's view that they were to be the main development centres in their regions, and some had recommended an improved distribution of tasks between their secretariats and those of global organizations, including the identification of research and analysis functions that could best be performed in the regions. With regard to inter-agency co-ordination, the report pointed to the possibility of scheduling joint regional meetings between the commissions and specialized global organizations. It noted the commissions' concern for enhanced participation in United Nations programme planning so as to make the process more responsive to

regional priorities. All the commissions had reaffirmed their responsibility to contribute to global policy-making and to participate in the implementation of global decisions affecting them.

Describing expanded co-operation between the commissions and UNDP, the report suggested that greater use might be made of their functional committees to develop proposals for regional co-operation projects. It also suggested that the commissions should become more responsive to the requirements of regional and subregional economic integration and co-operation schemes, and that special arrangements might be needed to ensure appropriate funding of the commissions' work, including increased reliance on government contributions for projects and meetings, and sufficient budgetary flexibility to enable them to respond to unforeseen needs.

On 17 December, in a resolution on restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system, the Assembly decided to return in 1982 to the implications of restructuring for the regional commissions, in the light of observations by CPC and the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(14)</sup>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Zambia, E/1981/C.1/L.18.  
Reports:<sup>(2)</sup>CPC, A/36/38; S-G, <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/577, <sup>(4)</sup>E/1981/80,  
<sup>(5)</sup>E/1981/80/Add.1.

#### Resolutions and decisions:

resolutions: <sup>(6)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54): 427(XVI),  
10 Apr. <sup>(7)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56): 431(XIX), 15  
May. <sup>(8)</sup>ECWA (report, E/1981/55): 105(VIII), 6 May.  
(9) ESC: 1981/66, 24 July, text following. <sup>(10)</sup>ESCAP  
(report, E/1981/52): 219(XXXVII), 20 Mar. GA:  
<sup>(11)</sup>32/197, sect. IV, 20 Dec. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 441).  
<sup>(12)</sup>34/206, 19 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 527);  
<sup>(13)</sup>S-11/1, 25 Aug. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 461);  
<sup>(14)</sup>36/187, para. 2, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 1093).

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(15)</sup>1981/187, 24 July, text following;  
<sup>(16)</sup>1981/188, 24 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.12,  
13, 15, 17 (13-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/66

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/105) without vote. 21 July  
(meeting 17); draft by Chairman (E/1981/C.1/L.20), based on Informal consultations on draft by Zambia (E/1981/C.1/L.18), orally amended by United Kingdom: agenda item 7.

#### Regional co-operation

The Economic and Social Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on regional co-operation,

Noting with appreciation the statements made to the Council by the executive secretaries of the regional commissions during the general discussion of international economic and social policy, including regional and sectoral developments, held at the second regular session of 1981 of the Council,

Recognizing the need to intensify and expedite the efforts to decentralize economic and social activities to the regional commissions, as envisaged by the General Assembly in its resolution 32/197 of 20 December 1977 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system.

Conscious of the desirability of decentralizing administrative and management responsibilities to the regional commissions as part of the transfer to them of substantive activities,

Aware that the regional commissions for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin American and Western Asia adopted, at their plenary sessions in 1981, resolutions relating to General Assembly resolutions 32/197 of 20 December 1977 and 33/202 of 29 January 1979, and to Assembly decision 35/440 of 16 December 1980,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on regional co-operation:

2. Recommends that the General Assembly, in considering the report of the Secretary-General referred to in its decision 35/440 and the resolutions adopted by the regional commissions pursuant to that decision, should request all intergovernmental organizations and the Secretariat bodies concerned to intensify and expedite the decentralization of economic and social activities to the regional commissions within the overall context of Assembly resolution 32/197 97;

3. Requests the General Assembly accordingly to consider accelerating the redeployment to the regional commissions of staff and financial resources commensurate with the substantive activities which are being transferred to them.

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/187

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/105) without vote. 21 July  
(meeting 17); oral proposal by Chairman: agenda item 7.

#### Summaries of the economic surveys of the regional commissions

At its 41st plenary meeting, on 24 July 1981, the Council took note of:

(a) Summary of the Economic Survey of Europe in 1980: recent economic developments in the region of the Economic Commission for Europe;

(b) Summary of the Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific, 1980: recent economic developments, 1979-1980;

(c) Summary of the Survey of Economic and Social Conditions in Africa, 1979-1980;

(d) Preliminary summary of the Economic Survey of Latin America, 1980;

(e) Summary of the Survey of Economic and Social Developments in the Region of the Economic Commission for Western Asia, 1980.

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/188

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/105) without vote. 21 July  
(meeting 17); draft orally proposed by Chairman: agenda item 7.

#### Membership in the regional commissions

At its 41st plenary meeting, on 24 July 1981, the Council, having considered the report of the Secretary-General on regional co-operation and noting that Zimbabwe had become a full member of the Economic Commission for Africa and that the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific and the Economic Commission for Latin America had admitted Guam and the Netherlands Antilles, respectively, to associate membership in their commissions, decided to amend the terms of reference of the commissions concerned to take account of the admission of the above-mentioned member and associate members.

## Africa

The Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) held its sixteenth session, which was also the seventh meeting of its Conference of Ministers,

at Freetown, Sierra Leone, from 6 to 10 April 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> Zimbabwe attended the session for the first time as the fiftieth member of the Commission (p. 608). The session was preceded by the second meeting of the Technical Preparatory Committee of the Whole (Freetown, 24 March-2 April).<sup>(2)</sup>

Measures to implement the Lagos Plan of Action for the economic development of Africa (p. 611) were a recurrent theme in many of the Conference's 26 resolutions, one of which endorsed a series of measures to deal with the social implications of the Plan (p. 627). The General Assembly, in December, urged countries to provide resources for implementing the Plan.

Negotiations assisted by ECA led to the signing by 11 countries in December of a treaty to establish a Preferential Trade Area for eastern and southern Africa (p. 612). To provide information on the economic and social development of Africa, the Central Co-ordination Office of the Pan-African Documentation and Information System was set up at ECA headquarters at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (p. 612).

The Conference of Ministers of African Least Developed Countries held its first meeting at Addis Ababa in July (p. 613) and worked out a concerted African position for the United Nations Conference on the subject held in September. A Conference of Ministers Responsible for Human Resources Planning, Development and Utilization, held at Monrovia, Liberia, in October, identified project proposals for national action and technical co-operation in human resources development and utilization (p. 629).

African countries and potential donors met in June at the first of four consultative meetings seeking funds for a \$9-billion programme of development \*projects under the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa (1978-1988), and the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council repeated their appeals for financing (p. 614). With encouragement from those bodies, ECA continued to seek resources to carry out an in-depth study of the international trade and transport problems of Zaire (p. 619).

The Conference of African Ministers of Industry (Addis Ababa, November) approved proposals for the formulation and implementation of a programme for the Industrial Development Decade for Africa (1980-1990) (p. 621). The first Regional Conference on the Development and Utilization of Mineral Resources in Africa (Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, February) made recommendations and formulated programmes and projects (p. 623). As work continued on projects to develop African agriculture, the General Assembly called in December for

additional international assistance to support Africa's own efforts to increase food production (p. 624).

Technical co-operation activities carried out by ECA in 1981 were valued at \$11.6 million (p. 613). The United Nations Trust Fund for African Development, which financed a variety of economic and social activities by ECA, received contributions of \$1.9 million from 19 States in 1981 (p. 631). At the Commission's request, the General Assembly asked the Secretary-General in December to seek extra-budgetary funding for the subregional ECA offices, known as Multinational Programming and Operational Centres (p. 631). On the recommendation of the Economic and Social Council, the Assembly requested in December a study of the adequacy of conference facilities at ECA headquarters (p. 634).

Other areas of ECA activity in 1981 included energy (p. 624), science and technology (p. 627), population (p. 627), human settlements and environment (p. 630), women in development (p. 630) and statistics (p. 630).

Seventeen African countries were the object of special economic assistance programmes under which the United Nations identified development and reconstruction projects and sought to mobilize international support for their financing (p. 497). Separate programmes were under way to aid drought-stricken countries of the Sudano-Sahelian region and East Africa (p. 485). An International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (Geneva, 9 and 10 April) was the highlight of 1981 United Nations activities to mobilize international assistance to refugees throughout the continent (p. 1039).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA, E/1981/54; <sup>(2)</sup>ECA Preparatory Committee, E/CN.14/813.

#### Economic and social trends

Africa faced major challenges in the 1980s, especially in the fields of energy, food, drought, balance of payments and domestic economic management, according to a summary of the Survey of Economic and Social Conditions in Africa, 1979-1980<sup>(4)</sup> noted by the Economic and Social Council on 24 July 1981.<sup>(3)</sup> If not properly and promptly attended to, those problems might eventually halt economic growth in the continent and lead to the economic and possibly social collapse of many of the poorer countries. Gross domestic product in developing Africa had risen by about 5 per cent at constant prices in 1979, compared with 5.4 per cent and 4.8 per cent in 1977 and 1978, respectively. However, negative growth in per capita income was projected for the poorest African countries during 1980-1985.

The Committee for Development Planning, in the regional economic analyses included in the report on its March/April 1981 session,<sup>(1)</sup> stated that African countries would have to make drastic changes in agriculture and industry if they were to meet targeted growth rates. In agriculture, emphasis would have to be placed on reduction of food losses, increasing production of cereals, livestock and fish, and improvement of productive structures. In industry, most African countries had to start building their industrial base with appropriate linkages between human resources, natural resources and technology in order to achieve locally generated and sustained growth. Africa also needed to place greater emphasis on training and improvement of managerial skills and administrative mechanisms, as well as regional co-operation in trade and finance.

The ECA Conference of Ministers, on 10 April, recommended that Commission members send each year a paper on national socio-economic conditions for use in preparing future surveys on Africa.<sup>(2)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>CDP. E/1981/27.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 404(XVI), 10 Apr. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/187, para. (c), 24 July (p. 609).

Survey: <sup>(4)</sup>E/CN.14/802 (summary, E/1981/76).

Development policy and  
regional economic co-operation

Implementation of the Lagos Plan of  
Action for economic development of Africa

ECA ACTIVITIES. Proposals by the ECA secretariat for implementing the Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa were examined in 1981 by the Technical Preparatory Committee of the Whole (Freetown, Sierra Leone, 24 March-2 April)<sup>(2)</sup> and the Conference of Ministers. Both decided that the proposals should be improved. The Conference requested on 10 April that a joint document be prepared with the secretariat of the organization of African Unity (OAU), for consideration in 1982.<sup>(4)</sup> It also urged ECA members to bear in mind the Plan's recommendations when drawing up their development plans and projects.<sup>(5)</sup>

A broad programme to deal with the social implications of the Plan was endorsed by the Conference of Ministers on 10 April (p. 627).

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. AS requested by the General Assembly in December 1980, <sup>(6)</sup> the Secretary-General reported to the Assembly in September 1981<sup>(3)</sup> on the contributions which the United Nations system was making to achieve the objectives of the Lagos Plan of Action, adopted by OAU in April 1980 on the basis of a draft submitted by ECA<sup>(9)</sup> The report

described activities in the fields of food and agriculture, industry, human resources development, transport and communications, and science and technology. It concluded that, while implementation of the Plan of Action remained the primary responsibility of African Governments and peoples, the support of the international community was vital in ensuring success.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution on special measures for the social and economic development of Africa in the 1980s,<sup>(8)</sup> adopted without vote on 17 December, the General Assembly invited United Nations organizations to examine ways of increasing resources for the African development decade and to apply special measures in a comprehensive and co-ordinated manner. Donor countries were urged to provide resources for implementing the Lagos Plan of Action and international financial institutions were invited to continue to consider increasing substantially their development assistance to Africa. Non-governmental organizations were invited to submit suggestions about their contributions. The Secretary-General was requested to continue allocating necessary resources to ECA and to report back in 1982.

This resolution was approved without vote by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 10 December. The draft was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on a text by Algeria for the Group of 77 developing countries, later withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup>

The main difference between the two texts was that the approved version omitted two references to "additional resources" contained in the Algerian text, which would have had the Assembly reaffirm the need for United Nations organizations to examine ways and means, including the possibility of additional resources, to devote larger resources to the African development decade, and urge donor countries to provide additional resources. Also, the Algerian text did not have the word "continue" in the paragraphs by which the Assembly invited financial institutions to continue to consider increasing their development assistance and requested the Secretary-General to continue allocating necessary resources to ECA.

On 9 December, in a resolution on co-operation between the United Nations and OAU<sup>(7)</sup> the Assembly reaffirmed the determination of the United Nations to work closely with OAU towards the establishment of the new international economic order, taking full account of the Lagos Plan of Action. It requested the United Nations Department of Public Information and United Nations organizations to intensify information dissemination on African economic and social development.

The Sudan and other speakers in the Second Committee called for increased international support to help Africa achieve the goals of the Lagos Plan of Action. While the Plan encouraged self-reliance, said China, its implementation would require substantial international financial and technological inputs. The USSR said it understood that the resolution would not entail any future additional expenditure of United Nations funds; any additional resources needed would have to be obtained through extrabudgetary funds.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.119.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ECA Preparatory Committee, E/CN.14/813; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/513.

Resolutions: ECA (report, E/1981/54), 10 Apr.: <sup>(4)</sup>405(XVI); <sup>(5)</sup>419(XVI), para. 4. GA: <sup>(6)</sup>35/64, paras. 3 & 7, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 557); <sup>(7)</sup>36/80, paras. 11 & 19, 9 Dec. 1981 (p. 231); <sup>(8)</sup>36/180, 17 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(9)</sup>1980, p. 548.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 45, 47 (24 Sep.-10 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/180

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.1) without vote, 10 December (meeting 47); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.146), based on informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.119); agenda item 69.

#### Special measures for the social and economic development of Africa in the 1980s

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New international Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation and 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recalling a/so its resolution 35/64 of 5 December 1980, in which it advocated the adoption of a wide range of special measures for the social and economic development of Africa in the 1980s,

Recalling further its resolution 35/66 B of 5 December 1980 on the Industrial Development Decade for Africa,

Deeply concerned at the worsening of the current world economic crisis and its devastating effects on the particularly vulnerable economies of the African countries,

Fully aware that the Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its second extraordinary session, held at Lagos on 28 and 29 April 1980, provides a framework of priority actions for achieving the rapid overall economic and social development of Africa,

Recognizing the primary responsibility of the African countries for their development and the importance of the mobilization of their national resources for their socio-economic development,

Convinced of the need for increased and sustained external resources to achieve the aims and objectives of the Lagos Plan of Action,

We/coming the initial measures adopted by the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to implement paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 35/64.

1. Takes note of the interim report of the Secretary-General concerning special measures for the social and economic development of Africa in the 1980s, which indicates the contributions by organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations to the implementation of the Lagos Plan of Action for the implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa;

2. Invites, in this context, the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to examine ways and means of increasing the resources for the execution of the programmes for the development decade for Africa and to apply the special measures in a comprehensive and co-ordinated manner;

3. Urges donor countries to provide the necessary resources for the effective implementation of the Lagos Plan of Action;

4. Invites all international financial institutions, particularly the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development, to continue actively to consider increasing substantially their development assistance to Africa during the decade;

5. Renews its invitation to the non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council to submit to the Secretary-General suggestions for the contribution which they intend to make towards the implementation of the Lagos Plan of Action for transmission to the Council at its second regular session of 1982;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to allocate necessary resources to the Economic Commission for Africa, taking into account its role as the main economic and social development centre within the United Nations system for the African region, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 32/197 of 20 December 1977 and 33/202 of 29 January 1979;

7. Further requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty seventh session, through the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982, a report on the progress made in the implementation of the present resolution.

#### Economic integration

A Preferential Trade Area for 18 countries of eastern and southern Africa, negotiated with assistance from the ECA Multinational Programming and Operational Centre (MULPOC) at Lusaka, Zambia, was established by a treaty signed at Lusaka by 11 countries on 21 December 1981.. On 18 December, 11 States signed at Libreville, Gabon, a declaration of intent to establish an Economic Community of Central African States; two MULPOCs, at Gisenyi, Rwanda, and Yaoundé, United Republic of Cameroon, provided assistance in the negotiations.

#### Pan-African Documentation and Information System

The Central Co-ordination Office of the Pan-African Documentation and Information System (PADIS) was set up at Addis Ababa in 1981, following the establishment of the System in January 1980. Operating under the aegis of ECA, the System was designed to provide statistics and non-numerical information on African social, economic, scientific and technological development; to assist the development of national information handling capabilities; to establish data transmission links within Africa and beyond;



and to design technical specifications and standards for electronic information exchange. The first conference of African computer, documentation and information scientists (Salisbury, Zimbabwe, 19-22 October 1981) marked a preliminary step towards the launching of national and subregional components of PADIS..

On 10 April, the ECA Conference of Ministers called on its members to set up national centres as part of a project to build a continental network and called for support to PADIS from multilateral and bilateral donors.

Resolution:<sup>(1)</sup> ECA (report, E/1981/54), 413(XV), 10 Apr.

#### Public administration

The ECA secretariat in 1981 completed two studies on government structures for accelerated development and a subregional conference on the subject was held for French-speaking Africa. A conference was held in November, in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity, on the role of the public sector in national and subregional development in the context of the Lagos Plan of Action for economic development (p. 611).. National workshops on procurement and supply management were held in several African countries. Advisory missions were undertaken to a number of countries, including the Gambia, Swaziland and Zimbabwe.

#### Least developed countries

On 10 April 1981, the ECA Conference of Ministers called on the international community- particularly developed countries, developing countries in a position to do so and international donor organizations- to provide adequate financial and technical resources to implement the Comprehensive New Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs),<sup>(2)</sup> the second phase of which- the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s- was subsequently adopted in September by the United Nations Conference on LDCs (p. 406).

A common position for the United Nations Conference was prepared at the first meeting of the Conference of Ministers of African LDCs (Addis Ababa, 27-30 July).<sup>(1)</sup> Meetings were also held to review the economic situation of each African LDC (p. 405).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA Conference of Ministers of LDCs, E/ECA/CM.8/10.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 416(XVI), 10 Apr.

#### Technical co-operation

Expenditures on ECA technical co-operation activities in 1981 totalled \$11.6 million. The main source was the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), which supplied \$7.7 million for projects in intra-African trade, statis-

tics, national accounts, transport and communications, and conservation and development of forest resources. Support was given to co-ordination of the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa (p. 614) and \$275,000 of the UNDP contribution came from its Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries. Among the regional training and research institutions which received assistance were the Eastern and Southern African Mineral Resources Development Centre, the African Regional Centre for Engineering Design and Manufacturing, the African Regional Centre for Technology, the African Institute for Higher Technical Training and Research, and the African Institute for Economic Development and Planning. In addition, UNDP was the main source of funds for the ECA Multinational Programming and Operational Centres (MULPOCs) (p. 631).

The United Nations regular programme of technical co-operation provided #1.3 million for regional and subregional advisory services in such areas as development of conventional and non-conventional energy sources; training of personnel in public finance, budgeting and management; social welfare training; statistics; transport and communications; economic co-operation; and administrative support to MULPOCs. Additional money came from the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (p. 628) and the Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women (p. 630).

There were 144 ECA technical co-operation experts serving in the field in 1981 and 76 fellowship awards were granted.

#### International trade

Recommendations on the dissemination of trade information, training of personnel, trade promotion and co-operative arrangements among their members were made by the First Joint Symposium of Presidents and Secretaries-General of African Chambers of Commerce (Addis Ababa, 16-20 June 1981), organized by ECA and the Association of African Trade Promotion Organizations.<sup>(1)</sup>

The ECA secretariat organized a tour for African businessmen to selected Asian and Latin American countries as a means of establishing direct trade contacts. During the year, ECA assistance was rendered to Governments negotiating subregional economic integration schemes in eastern, southern and central Africa (p. 612). A paper was published on the general state of intra-African trade, its obstacles and potential.<sup>(2)</sup>

Report: ("Symposium of chambers of commerce, ST/ECA/ATC/1.

Study: <sup>(2)</sup>E/CN.14/WP.1/141.

## Transport and communications

Transport and Communications  
Decade in Africa (1978-1988)

The first of four consultative meetings between African countries and potential donors, aimed at securing financing for road, air transport, telecommunications and postal services projects under the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa, took place in June 1981 (p. 617). As work progressed on the implementation and updating of a programme for the first phase (1980-1983) of the Decade (p. 618), preparations for the second phase (1984-1988) began in October 1981 (p. 619). The Decade, spanning 1978-1988, was proclaimed by the General Assembly in 1977.<sup>(12)</sup>

Activities relating to the Decade were reported by the Secretary-General(\*) to the General Assembly, which appealed in December for increased financial support from donors.

The Committee for Development Planning, commenting at its March/April session<sup>(4)</sup> on prospects for economic co-operation among developing countries (p. 383), pointed out that financing was the major problem in the way of transport and communications development in Africa. Most African countries were small and could not raise the resources needed to build infrastructure that would yield returns only over a long period of time. The Committee suggested that co-financing with developed countries could make use of excess capacity in certain industries of those countries, but noted that sub-regional, regional and global planning and co-operation would be required for such an undertaking.

ECA ACTIVITIES. The Second Conference of African Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning (Addis Ababa, 16-18 March)<sup>(5)</sup> took stock of the progress made in implementing the programme for the Decade, decided on a programme of consultative meetings on financing, endorsed proposals for updating the first phase programme and agreed to a schedule of preparatory work for the second phase. It also urged ratification of the convention adopted by the Diplomatic Conference on Air Tariffs (Addis Ababa, December 1980), the priority use of African expertise in implementation of projects for the Decade, the according of transit facilities to land-locked countries and the organizations of a co-ordinating meeting of agencies involved in satellite communications projects.

The Conference was preceded by two preparatory meetings: the Inter-agency Co-ordinating Committee on the Decade (fourth meeting, Addis Ababa, 9-10 March),<sup>(6)</sup> which took note of several developments relating to the first phase

of the programme, and the second intergovernmental Meeting of Experts in Transport, Communications and Planning (Addis Ababa, 9-15 March).<sup>(7)</sup>

On 10 April, the ECA Conference of Ministers endorsed the decision to hold consultative meetings on financing, requested an early start on the second phase programme and asked the Secretary-General to provide ECA with resources to enable it to discharge its mandate as lead agency for the Decade.<sup>(9)</sup>

On the same date, the Conference also endorsed, as part of a programme on the social implications of the Lagos Plan of Action for African economic development (p. 627), a number of proposed measures to maximize the social benefits of the expansion of an intra-African transport and communications network and to cope with adverse consequences for population and manpower distribution patterns.<sup>(10)</sup> These suggestions included studies of migration policies to help solve social problems arising from migration, encouragement of video-taped and other programmes on social life and events in African countries until an intra-African satellite communications system was developed, allocations of labour between partners in joint economic projects such as heavy industries, agreements on the rights of workers deployed in such projects, and promotion of intra-African tourism.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. On 24 July, by a resolution on the Decade adopted without vote,<sup>(11)</sup> the Economic and Social Council reiterated its appeal to African States to accord the highest priority to transport and communications projects. It appealed to countries and financing institutions to step up their financial support (p. 617), urged close collaboration among States and organizations on updating the first phase programme (p. 618) and recommended that the General Assembly consider measures to enable ECA to carry out its role in preparing for the second phase (p. 619).

The text was approved by the First (Economic) Committee on 21 July, also without vote. It was submitted by the Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier draft by Venezuela, on behalf of the Group of 77,<sup>(3)</sup> which was later withdrawn. The two texts differed in their provisions on the first and second phases. In addition, the approved text incorporated an oral amendment by Nigeria affecting the provisions on financing.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 17 December, the General Assembly, by a resolution on the Decade adopted without vote,<sup>(13)</sup> reiterated its appeal to African States to give the highest priority to transport and communications projects. It appealed for increased financial support

from donors (p. 618), urged close co-operation among States and organizations on updating the first phase programme (p. 618) and requested the ECA Executive Secretary to begin preparation for the second phase as soon as possible (p. 619). The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to provide ECA with the financial means and resources needed to organize the remaining consultative meetings on financing, by using extrabudgetary funds and existing resources to the maximum, to complete preparation of the second phase and to fulfil its role as lead agency for the Decade. He and the ECA Executive Secretary were asked to submit progress reports.

The resolution was approved by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 7 December, also without vote. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier draft, submitted by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77<sup>(1)</sup> and later withdrawn. The Algerian draft had been preceded by a text introduced by Nigeria on behalf of 12 African nations,<sup>(2)</sup> which the sponsors withdrew when the Algerian draft was submitted.

The first two drafts were essentially similar, except for a few wording changes and the addition of a paragraph requesting a progress report by the Secretary-General in 1982. The Group of 77 draft differed from the adopted text in two provisions on financing, including the financing of consultative meetings.

Introducing the first draft, Nigeria said it implied that the ECA Transport and Communications Division would have to be strengthened if ECA was to be effective as lead agency for the Decade. Introducing the second draft, Algeria stressed the need to implement during the Decade national, subregional and regional projects that had been decided upon many years previously, with the aim of establishing an integrated transport and communications network to support African development.

Explaining their positions on the resolution, the USSR and the United States said the activities it called for should be met within existing United Nations resources.

During the Committee's debate, a number of African and other countries-including Botswana, China, India, Sierra Leone and the Sudan-called attention to the importance of mobilizing resources for the Decade. China added that it would continue to provide bilateral assistance to African countries, since transport and communications were less developed in Africa than in other developing regions. Ethiopia observed that the grave economic problems of Africa were due in part to lack of means of distribution. Senegal thought donors should be en-

couraged to make loans directly to subregional institutions such as the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Nigeria mentioned the need to provide sufficient funds to enable ECA to convene the consultative meetings. Zaire hoped the ECA Executive Secretary would do all he could to maintain co-ordination between funding agencies and African countries.

Draft resolutions withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.125; <sup>(2)</sup>Angola, Central African Republic, Chad, Gambia, Kenya, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire, Zambia, A/C.2/36/L.23; <sup>(3)</sup>Venezuela, for Group of 77, E/1981/C.1/L.12.

Reports: <sup>(4)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27; <sup>(5)</sup>ECA Conference of Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning, E/CN.14/812; <sup>(6)</sup>ECA Co-ordinating Committee, E/CN.14/TRANS/167; <sup>(7)</sup>ECA Meeting of Experts, E/CN.14/TRANS/168; <sup>(8)</sup>S-G, A/36/342.

Resolutions: ECA (report, E/1981/54), 10 Apr.: <sup>(9)</sup>422(XVI); <sup>(10)</sup>423(XVI), annex, sect. VI, D. <sup>(11)</sup>ESC: 1981/67, 24 July, text following. GA: <sup>(12)</sup>32/160, 19 Dec. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 603) <sup>(13)</sup>36/177, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/714; S-G statements, A/C.2/36/L.42, A/C.5/36/100.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.13-15, 17 (14-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-8, 10-26, 28, 29, 30-32, 45, 46 (24 Sep.-7 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.74 (14 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/67

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/106) without vote. 21 July (meeting 17); draft by Chairman (E/1981/C.1/L.19), based on Informal consultations on draft by Venezuela, for Group of 77 (E/1981/C.1/L.12). orally amended by Nigeria; agenda Item 8.

#### Transport and Communications Decade in Africa The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolutions 1979/61 of 3 August 1979 and 1980/46 of 23 July 1980 on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa,

Mindful of the decision of the Conference of African Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning, at its meeting held at Addis Ababa from 9 to 12 May 1979, in which the Conference adopted the global strategy for the implementation of the programme for the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa and the programme of action for the first phase (1980-1983) of the Decade,

Conscious of the need, during the Decade, to implement fully national, regional and subregional projects geared towards the establishment of an integrated transport and communications network in Africa in support of the accelerated development of the African region,

Considering the need for sustained efforts to mobilize additional resources for the implementation of the programme for the Decade,

Recalling the decision of the Conference of African Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning at its second meeting, held at Addis Ababa from 16 to 18 March 1981, in which the Conference authorized the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to organize four technical consultative meetings between member States, African intergovernmental organizations concerned and donors,

Mindful of the role of the Economic Commission for Africa as the lead agency in the implementation of the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa,

Bearing in mind resolution 422(XVI) of 10 April 1981, adopted at the seventh meeting of the Conference of Ministers of the Economic Commission for Africa, held at Freetown from 6 to 11 April 1981, in which, inter alia, the Conference requested the Executive Secretary of the Commission, in collaboration with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, to embark urgently on the preparation of the plan of action for the second phase of the Decade,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/108 of 5 December 1980, in which the Assembly requested that the above-mentioned technical consultative meetings be organized by the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa, and also requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Council, at its second regular session of 1981, a progress report on the implementation of the programme for the Decade,

1. Notes the report of the Secretary-General on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa;

2. Takes note of the technical consultative meeting on transport and communications for the West African sub-region, held at Lomé from 8 to 11 June 1981, and the report on the meeting prepared by the Economic Commission for Africa;

3. Notes with appreciation the contribution made by some countries towards the implementation of the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa;

4. Expresses disappointment, however, at the overall level of resources so far made available, which is far short of that required for financing the subregional programme, and appeals to donor countries, the funding agencies and the various financing institutions to step up their financial support for regional and subregional projects of the Decade;

5. Further notes with appreciation the steps taken by the Commission with regard to the scheduling of the remaining technical consultative meetings, which will be held, respectively, at Yaoundé (28 to 30 September 1981), Abidjan (27 to 30 November 1981) and Ouagadougou (20 to 23 January 1982);

6. Requests the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to make the report of the technical consultative meeting to be held at Yaoundé in September 1981 available to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, and also to make available reports on the technical consultative meetings to be held at Abidjan and Ouagadougou to the Council at its second regular session of 1982;

7. Reiterates its appeal to States members of the Economic Commission for Africa to accord the highest priority in their development plans to transport and communication projects;

8. Urges the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to maintain close collaboration with member States, the Organization of African Unity, the regional African development organizations, the development institutions and the specialized agencies concerned in updating, on a regular basis, the programme for the first phase of the Decade;

9. Calls upon member States of the Organization of African Unity to intensify efforts in exploring possible sources of finance to execute projects adopted for the Decade;

10. Requests the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to maintain co-ordination between funding agencies and African countries in ensuring the successful implementation of the programme for the first phase of the Decade;

11. Further requests the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, to proceed as early as possible with the preparation of the plan of action for the second phase of the Decade;

12. Recommends that the General Assembly should give further consideration to measures that would enable the Economic Commission for Africa to carry out its role in initiating and accomplishing the preparation of the programme for the second phase of the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa.

General Assembly resolution 36/177

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.1) without vote. 7 December (meeting 46): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.142), based on informal consultations draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.125); agenda item 69.

#### Transport and Communications Decade in Africa

The General Assembly.

Recalling its resolutions 32/160 of 19 December 1977, 33/197 of 29 January 1979 and 34/15 of 9 November 1979 on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa and, in particular, its resolution 35/108 of 5 December 1980, by which it approved the organization of consultative technical meetings for the various African subregions,

Recalling Economic and Social Council resolutions 1979/61 of 3 August 1979, 1980/46 of 23 July 1980 and 1981/67 of 24 July 1981 on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa,

Recalling a/s resolution 341(XIV) adopted on 27 March 1979 by the Conference of Ministers of the Economic Commission for Africa at its fifth meeting, in which the Conference Urged member States to give high priority to the development of transport and communications,

Recalling further resolution CM/Res.738(XXXIII) adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-third ordinary session, held at Monrovia from 6 to 20 July 1979,

Aware of the need to implement fully, during the Decade, national, subregional and regional projects aimed at establishing an integrated transport and communications network in Africa to support the accelerated development of the continent,

Noting with appreciation the considerable financial efforts made by the Governments of African States to enable a considerable part of the programme for the first phase (1980-1983) of the Decade to be financed and implemented,

Considering that sustained efforts must be exerted to mobilize additional resources in order to ensure the implementation of the programme for the Decade,

Recalling the decision by which the Conference of African Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning, at its second session, held at Addis Ababa from 16 to 18 March 1981, authorized the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to organize four consultative technical meetings between member States, interested African inter-governmental organizations and donors,

Aware of the role played by the Economic Commission for Africa as the lead agency in the implementation of the programme for the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa,

Bearing in mind resolution 422(XVI) adopted on 10 April 1981 by the Conference of Ministers of the Economic Commission for Africa at its seventh meeting, in which the Conference, *inter alia*, requested the Executive Secretary of the Commission, in collaboration with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, to embark as early as possible on the preparation of the plan of action for the second phase (1984-1988) of the Decade,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the Secretary-General on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa;

2. Takes note of the results of the consultative technical meeting on transport and communications for West Africa, which was held at Lomé from 8 to 11 June 1981, and of the report on the organization of three other meetings scheduled to be held in 1982;

3. Notes with satisfaction the contribution made by some countries to the implementation of the programme for the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa;

4. Expresses its disappointment, however, at the overall level of resources mobilized so far, which is far below the level required to finance the subregional programme, and appeals to donor countries, the funding agencies and the

various financial institution to increase their financial support to the regional and subregional projects for the Decade;

5. Also notes with satisfaction the measures taken by the Economic Commission for Africa with respect to the organization and scheduling of the three other consultative technical meetings, to be held at Ouagadougou from 20 to 23 January 1982, at Yaoundé from 15 to 18 March 1982 and at Abidjan from 3 to 5 May 1982;

6. Reiterates its appeal to States members of the Economic Commission for Africa to give the highest priority in their development plans to transport and communications projects;

7. Appeals to donor countries and funding agencies to participate constructively and in large numbers in the three consultative technical meetings to be held in 1982 and to consider, together with the Economic Commission for Africa, possible ways of financing those projects for the Decade which are not national in character;

8. Urges the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to maintain close co-operation with member States, the Organization of African Unity, regional African development organizations, development agencies and interested specialized agencies with a view to the updating, on a regular basis, of the programme for the first phase of the Decade and in order to relate better the projects to national and subregional plans;

9. Calls upon States members of the Economic Commission for Africa to step up their efforts in connection with the study of the possible sources of finance for the implementation of the projects adopted for the Decade;

10. Requests the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to maintain the necessary co-ordination between the sources of finance and the African countries to assure the success of the implementation of the programme for the first phase of the Decade;

11. Also requests the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to organize in 1982, with groups of donor countries and the financing institutions and with the participation of Governments, United Nations institutions and African Intergovernmental organizations, the three consultative technical meetings scheduled with a view to finding additional financial resources for the implementation of the projects for the Decade;

12. Further requests the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to begin as soon as possible, in collaboration with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, the preparation of the plan of action for the second phase of the Decade;

13. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Economic Commission for Africa with the financial means and resources necessary to enable it to organize the three consultative technical meetings scheduled to be held in 1982, *inter alia*, by using extrabudgetary funds and existing resources to the maximum extent possible, to complete the preparation of the plan of action for the second phase of the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa and to fulfil effectively its role as the lead agency for the Decade, and to submit to the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, a progress report on the implementation of the programme for the Decade;

14. Requests the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to continue to submit progress reports on the implementation of the programme for the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa;

15. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report on the progress achieved in the implementation of the present resolution.

Convening of consultative meetings on financing. ECA decided in 1981 to convene four technical consultative meetings at which African States and donors could discuss the financing of

projects in connection with the Decade. The first of these was held in June 1981; the rest were scheduled for 1982.

The decision to hold the meetings was taken in March 1981 by the ECA Conference of Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning (p. 614).<sup>(5)</sup> The Conference also recommended that ECA, the African Development Bank (ADB), the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the United Nations should continue their search for financing, and that African countries should express stronger interest in the Decade at the annual United Nations pledging conferences for development activities.

In its resolution of 10 April on the Decade (p. 614), the ECA Conference of Ministers endorsed the decision to organize the consultative meetings, appealed to donor countries and financial institutions—including the World Bank, ADB the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa and the various Arab funds—to participate fully and positively, and invited non-African third world countries to express their solidarity by participating.<sup>(6)</sup>

The first technical consultative meeting (Lomé, Togo, 8-11 June) dealt with roads, air transport, telecommunications and postal services in the 16 countries of ECOWAS. It examined a programme of 138 projects costing an estimated \$1.6 billion. The ECA Executive Secretary informed the Economic and Social Council's First Committee in July that available resources would cover one third of the road programme, one fourth of the communications programme and one tenth of the air transport programme.

The three remaining meetings were to be held in 1982: at Yaoundé, United Republic of Cameroon, on roads and inland waterways of 10 Central African States (originally scheduled for September 1981 but postponed to allow further consultations<sup>(4)</sup>); Abidjan, Ivory Coast, on maritime transport and ports of 25 countries belonging to the Ministerial Conference of West and Central African States (originally scheduled for November 1981); and Ouagadougou, Upper Volta, on railways throughout Africa.

The Council, in its resolution of 24 July on the Decade,<sup>(7)</sup> noted with appreciation the contribution made by some countries for the Decade but expressed disappointment at the level of resources made available, far short of that required for financing the subregional programme, and appealed to donor countries and financial institutions to step up their financial support for regional and subregional projects. It requested reports on the remaining meetings, called on OAU members to intensify efforts to explore possible sources of finance and asked the ECA Executive Secretary to maintain co-ordi-

nation between funding agencies and African countries.

This text, submitted by the Chairman of the First Committee, differed from the original draft by Venezuela, submitted on behalf of the Group of 77,<sup>(3)</sup> which did not contain the expression of appreciation to contributing countries and which would have had the Council express disappointment at the level of resources made available by those present at the Lomé meeting rather than at the overall level for the Decade. The Chairman's draft was orally amended by Nigeria to separate into two paragraphs the expressions of appreciation and disappointment.

Using similar language, the General Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on the Decade,<sup>(8)</sup> noted with satisfaction the contribution of some countries to the Decade, expressed disappointment at the overall level of resources mobilized, far below that required for the sub-regional programme, and appealed for increased financial support for regional and subregional projects. It appealed to donor countries and funding agencies to participate constructively and in large numbers in the forthcoming meetings and to consider, with ECA, ways of financing projects that were not national in character. It called on ECA members to step up efforts in connection with the study of possible sources of finance, requested the ECA Executive Secretary to maintain co-ordination between financial sources and African countries, asked him to organize the three remaining meetings in 1982 with a view to finding additional funds, and requested the Secretary-General to provide resources for those meetings, including the maximum use of extrabudgetary funds and existing resources.

The original draft by 12 African countries<sup>(2)</sup> would have had the Assembly note with appreciation rather than satisfaction the contribution made to date, and appeal to financial institutions to participate fully and positively rather than constructively and in large numbers in the remaining meetings. These changes were incorporated in the second draft, by Algeria for the Group of 77.<sup>(1)</sup> That draft, in turn, differed from the adopted text in that it would have had the Assembly call on members of OAU rather than of ECA to step up efforts in connection with possible sources of finance. In addition, the call for maximum use of extrabudgetary funds and existing resources for the organization of the remaining meetings was not in the Algerian text.

Most funding for projects in connection with the Decade was provided through bilateral and multilateral arrangements with recipient countries. In addition, two countries paid a total of \$1,700 in 1981 to the Trust Fund maintained by the United Nations for the Decade, and eight

countries pledged a total of \$76,693 for 1982 (see table below). Expenditures from this fund in 1981 amounted to \$30,304, mainly from previous years' income.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS TRUST FUND  
FOR THE TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS  
DECADE IN AFRICA, 1981 AND 1982  
In US dollar equivalents)

Country	1981 payment	1982 pledge
Mali	-	500
Sao Tome and Principe	500	-
Swaziland	1,200	1,150
Togo	-	20,000
United Republic of Cameroon	-	34,130
upper Volta	-	3,413
Yemen	-	1,000
Zambia	-	11,500
Zimbabwe	-	5,000
Total	1,700	76,693

Draft resolutions withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.125; <sup>(2)</sup>Angola, Central African Republic, Chad, Gambia, Kenya, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire, Zambia, A/C.2/36/L.23; <sup>(3)</sup>Venezuela, for Group of 77, E/1981/C.1/L.12.

Note: <sup>(4)</sup>S-G, A/36/562.

Report: <sup>(5)</sup>ECA Conference of Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning, E/CN.14/812.

Resolutions: <sup>(6)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 422(XVI), paras. 4-12, 10 Apr.; <sup>(7)</sup>ESC, 1981/67, 24 July (p. 615); <sup>(8)</sup>GA, 36/177, 17 Dec. (p. 616).

Phase I programme (1980-1983). During 1981, ECA began updating the programme for the first phase of the Transport and Communications Decade (1980-1983), initially established at a level of 771 projects costing nearly \$9 billion.<sup>(8)</sup> New project proposals were incorporated, including those identified in April 1981 by a mission of consultants sent to Angola, Equatorial Guinea, and Sao Tome and Principe-countries which ECA had previously been unable to visit.

It was agreed at the Conference of Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning (p. 614) that all proposals on updating would be sent to ECA by 31 May. However, the deadline was not met and the updating process extended into 1982. Meanwhile, ECA collected and computerized information on progress in the first phase programme.

The ECA Conference of Ministers, on 10 April, directed the ECA Executive Director to update regularly the programme for the first phase, in consultation with African States, United Nations specialized agencies and African inter-governmental organizations.<sup>(5)</sup> The Economic and Social Council, on 24 July, urged the Executive Secretary to maintain close contact with African States, OAU, regional African development organizations, institutions and specialized agencies in regularly updating the first phase programme.<sup>(6)</sup> The General Assembly, on

17 December, acted similarly, adding that updating should be done so that the projects would relate better to national and subregional plans.<sup>(7)</sup>

These actions were included in the resolutions on the Decade adopted by ECA, the Council and the Assembly. The phrase in the Assembly resolution on relating the projects to national and subregional plans was not included in the earlier drafts by 12 African nations<sup>(2)</sup> and by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77.<sup>(1)</sup>

Plans to establish in 1982 an operating authority for the Cairo-Gaborone Trans-East African Highway Authority, linking countries between Egypt and Botswana, were reviewed by a Meeting of Experts (Addis Ababa, 16 and 17 November 1981).<sup>(3)</sup> Other activities by ECA during 1981 included: a mission to the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference countries to identify maritime transport activities prior to the possible establishment of a multinational shipping company; a meeting with the Pan-African Telecommunications Union (Lagos, Nigeria, October/November) on harmonizing studies of a proposed African satellite communications system; and preparation of a preliminary study on connecting Mali, the Niger and the Upper Volta to the railway network of Togo.

According to a table annexed to the Secretary-General's June 1981 report on the Decade,<sup>(4)</sup> contributions by donors amounted to \$3.2 billion for 120 transport projects and 25 communications projects. In October, the ECA Executive Secretary informed the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee that, of the 771 projects planned for the first phase, 298 were either being implemented or had been completed. Of the \$4.4 billion needed for the projects under way or finished, 68 per cent had been provided by the African countries.

Draft resolutions withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.125; <sup>(2)</sup>Angola, Central African Republic, Chad, Gambia, Kenya, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire, Zambia, A/C.2/36/L.23.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>Meeting on Trans-East African Highway, ST/ECA/TRANS/2; <sup>(4)</sup>S-G, A/36/342.

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 422(XVI), para. 13, 10 Apr.; <sup>(6)</sup>ESC, 1981/67, para. 8, 24 July (p. 616); <sup>(7)</sup>GA, 36/177, para. 8, 17 Dec. (p. 617).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(8)</sup>1980, p. 761

Phase II programme (1984-1988). Preparations began in 1981 for the second phase (1984-1988) of the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa.

A schedule of activities for the preparations was adopted in March 1981<sup>(1)</sup> by the Conference of African Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning. Work was to commence in October 1981, when African States were to send provisional lists of projects to ECA; it was to be

concluded in January 1983 with the distribution of a final version of the second phase programme to African States and potential donors.

The Conference was of the view that United Nations specialized agencies, OAU and African intergovernmental organizations should participate more actively in preparations for the second phase, and that African countries should state more clearly and comprehensively their local financial contributions to projects. It was agreed that each African State would establish its own programme and submit it to ECA, which could then establish a master plan based on the national projects and write two reports: one on projects to be financed partly by African States and the other on projects to be financed externally.

The Conference recommended that the General Assembly appropriate from the United Nations budget half the estimated cost of \$1.5 million needed by ECA for preparatory work, with the rest to come from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

The ECA Conference of Ministers, on 10 April, requested the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the OAU Secretary-General, to start preparing the second phase as early as possible, and called on UNDP to provide adequate resources for preparation and implementation of the second phase.<sup>(2)</sup> The Economic and Social Council, on 24 July, and the Assembly, on 17 December, made similar requests to the Executive Secretary in their resolutions on the Decade.

The Council also recommended that the Assembly consider measures to enable ECA to carry out its role in initiating and accomplishing the preparation of the second phase programme.<sup>(3)</sup> The Assembly responded by requesting the Secretary-General to provide the financial means and resources to complete the preparation of the second phase plan of action.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Inter-agency Co-ordinating Committee on the Decade (fifth meeting, Geneva, 10-12 December) decided on procedures and a schedule for preparing the second phase programme.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA Conference of Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning, E/CN.14/812.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 422(XVI), paras. 14 & 15, 10 Apr.; <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/67 paras. 11 & 12, 24 July (p. 616); <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/177, paras. 12 & 13, 17 Dec. (p. 617).

International trade and transport of Zaire

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. By a resolution of 24 July 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted without vote, the Economic and Social Council recommended that the Secretary-General and the General Assembly give strong support to efforts by United Nations organs to provide technical assistance as soon as possible so that studies on

the problems of Zaire on transport, transit and access to foreign markets could be undertaken and completed without delay. It requested the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions urgently to consider the question of financing the studies requested by the Assembly in 1979<sup>(4)</sup> and 1980,<sup>(5)</sup> and to report to the Assembly in 1981. It invited the ECA Executive Secretary to submit the conclusions of his studies in 1982.

The resolution was sponsored by 15 nations and introduced by Zaire, which orally revised it before its approval by the First (Economic) Committee on 21 July, also without vote. The original version would have had the Council recommend that the Assembly provide ECA with the resources that would enable it to undertake and complete the studies.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In October, the Secretary-General reported to the General Assembly on action taken with respect to the projected studies as well as other action by United Nations bodies and specialized agencies to meet Zaire's trade and transport problems.<sup>(2)</sup>

With respect to the studies, the report said that ECA had been unable to secure funds from outside the United Nations budget to finance a mission for an in-depth study in Zaire on transport/transit problems. However, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) had sent a mission to Zaire to collect transit traffic data on trade with Burundi and Rwanda and to prepare an inventory on all other transit corridors for access to the sea that were of interest to Zaire, and another UNCTAD team was studying bottle-necks and transit costs for traffic via Zambia and Zimbabwe as part of a sub-regional project for southern Africa. In addition, a transit/transport project for Zaire was included in a \$10 million ECA master plan for the development of transport and communications in eastern and southern Africa, for which funds from UNDP were to be available in 1982.

The report also described other assistance to Zaire by UNDP (aviation personnel training, export policy, transport systems management), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) (free-export zones, industrial financing, industrial planning, industrial research, metrology and standardization, small-scale industry, wood-processing industry), the International Trade Centre and specialized agencies.

After this report was submitted, an ECA/UNCTAD mission went to Zaire in November to update the results of a preliminary mission sent in 1978,<sup>(7)</sup> identify projects to improve the national transport network and international transport systems affecting Zaire, and make recommendations on transport system improvements.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(6)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to give strong support to ECA and other United Nations organs with a view to providing technical assistance as soon as possible so that studies on Zaire's problems of transport, transit and access to foreign markets could be undertaken and completed without delay. It invited the ECA Executive Secretary, in conjunction with UNDP, to release funds for the transit project provided for in the ECA master plan for transport and communications development in eastern and southern Africa. It requested the Secretary-General to seek, from voluntary contributions or existing resources, funds that ECA needed to implement previous Assembly requests for studies.

The resolution was approved without vote on 16 November by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee. It was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on a revised draft sponsored by 17 countries, mainly African, introduced by Zaire and later withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup> The 17-nation draft would have had the Assembly request the Secretary-General to seek funds for the ECA studies; the reference to voluntary contributions or existing resources was added in the Vice-Chairman's text.

In the Committee, Zaire mentioned some of its projects for the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa, including an 828-kilometre segment of a trans-African highway, a feasibility study for a deep-water port at Banana at the mouth of the Zaire River, construction of a rail link from Banana upstream to Matadi and improvement of navigation on the river. Although funds had been made available in 1979 to enable ECA to carry out preliminary studies, the envisaged mission had not materialized. Observing that any expansion of its trade depended on the transport infrastructure, Zaire requested support for the speedy implementation of resolutions on the subject.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Belgium, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, Morocco, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Yugoslavia, Zaire, A/C.2/36/L.27/Rev.1.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/538.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC: 1981/68, 24 July, text following. GA: (4)34/193, 19 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 581); <sup>(5)</sup>35/59, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 619); <sup>(6)</sup>36/139, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1980, p. 618.

Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.2/36/L.49.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.13, 14, 15, 17 (14-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July). GA: 22nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 40 (24 Sep.-16 Nov); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).



## Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/68

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/106) without vote, 21 July (meeting 17); 15-nation draft (E/1981/C.1/L.14), orally revised: agenda item 8.

Sponsors: Belgium, Burundi, China, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, Kenya, Morocco, Peru, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire, Zambia.

Particular problems facing Zaire with regard to transport, transit and access to foreign markets

The Economic and Social Council.

Recalling resolution 293(XIII), adopted on 26 February 1977 by the Economic Commission for Africa at its thirteenth session (fourth meeting of the Conference of Ministers), and Council decision 249(LXIII) of 25 July 1977,

Recalling also General Assembly resolution 32/160 of 19 December 1977, in which the Assembly recalled Council resolution 2097(LXIII) of 29 July 1977 and proclaimed the period 1978-1988 as the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa,

Recalling further resolution 110 (V) of 3 June 1979, adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at its fifth session, held at Manila from 7 May to 3 June 1979,

Recalling also General Assembly resolution 34/193 of 19 December 1979, requesting the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps to enable the Economic Commission for Africa to accelerate the implementation of Conference resolution 110 (V),

Aware of the particular difficulties confronting Zaire as a result of the problems encountered in its foreign trade with regard to transport, transit and access to foreign markets.

Convinced that this situation is prejudicial to the development of the Zairian economy,

1. Recommends that the Secretary-General and the General Assembly should give strong support to efforts by the appropriate organs of the United Nations to provide the necessary technical assistance as soon as possible, so that studies on the particular problems facing Zaire with regard to transport, transit and access to foreign markets can be undertaken and completed without delay;

2. Requests the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to give urgent consideration to the question of financing the studies requested in General Assembly resolutions 34/193 of 19 December 1979 and 35/59 of 5 December 1980 and to report to the Assembly at its thirty-sixth session;

3. Invites the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to take all the measures necessary to ensure the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 34/193 and to submit the conclusions of his studies to the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982.

## General Assembly resolution 36/139

Adopted without vote Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.3) without vote, 16 November (meeting 40); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.68), based on informal consultations on 17-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.27/Rev.1); agenda item 69 (c).

Particular problems facing Zaire with regard to transport, transit and access to foreign markets

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of special measures relating to particular problems facing Zaire with regard to transport, transit and access to foreign markets,

Recalling resolution 110(V) of 3 June 1979 adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at its fifth session, held at Manila from 7 May to 3 June 1979,

Recalling also its resolutions 32/160 of 19 December 1977, concerning the Transport and Communications

Decade in Africa, and 34/193 of 19 December 1979, in which it requested the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps to enable the Economic Commission for Africa to accelerate the implementation of resolution 110(V) of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and to report thereon to the General Assembly,

Recalling further its resolution 35/59 of 5 December 1980, in which it requested the Secretary-General to continue his efforts with a view to enabling the appropriate organs of the United Nations to provide the necessary technical assistance as soon as possible to the Government of Zaire, and Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/68 of 24 July 1981, in which the Council recommended that the Secretary-General and the General Assembly should give strong support to efforts by the appropriate organs of the United Nations to provide the necessary technical assistance as soon as possible, so that studies on the particular problems facing Zaire with regard to transport, transit and access to foreign markets can be undertaken and completed without delay,

Recalling that the Economic Commission for Africa has so far not been able to carry out the in-depth studies, the need for which was recognized in the interim report of the Secretary-General and which were requested in the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General and noting with regret the slow progress in implementing General Assembly resolutions 34/193 and 35/59,

Aware of the particular difficulties facing Zaire because of the problems encountered in its foreign trade with regard to transport, transit and access to foreign markets, which require special and urgent assistance from the international community,

Convinced that the continuance of this situation is prejudicial to the development of the Zairian economy,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to give strong support to the Economic Commission for Africa and other appropriate organs of the United Nations with a view to providing the necessary technical assistance as soon as possible, so that studies on the particular problems facing Zaire with regard to transport, transit and access to foreign markets can be undertaken and completed without delay;

2. Invites the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa, in conjunction with the United Nations Development Programme, to release the funds needed for undertaking the transit project provided for in the master plan for the development of transport and communications in the sub-regions of eastern and southern Africa;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to seek from voluntary contributions or from existing resources the funds that need to be made available to the Economic Commission for Africa for the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 34/193 and 35/59.

## Industrial development

## Industrial Development

## Decade for Africa (1980-1990)

Proposals for the formulation and implementation of a programme for the Industrial Development Decade for Africa (1980-1990) were approved in 1981 by the Sixth Conference of African Ministers of Industry (Addis Ababa, 23-25 November). <sup>(2)</sup>Following the proclamation of the Decade by the General Assembly in December 1980, <sup>(5)</sup> the proposals were drafted by a working group of representatives of the secretariats of ECA, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and UNIDO. They were further discussed by an Intergovernmental Meeting of Ex-

perts on the Programme of the Industrial Development Decade for Africa, convened by the three organizations (Addis Ababa, 19-23 October), which made recommendations to the ministerial Conference. The proposals were to be revised to reflect the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Meeting and the Conference, for publication in 1982.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Conference approved proposals in four working papers submitted by the working group, on a framework for preparation and implementation of the programme, guidelines for the formulation of strategies for major industrial subsectors and areas, modalities for programme implementation, and monitoring and reporting on implementation.

With respect to the framework, the Conference concluded that there should be two phases: reparation (1982-1984) and implementation (1985-1989). During the preparatory phase, a set of national, subregional and regional policies, master plans and programmes would be prepared, machinery to achieve the Decade's objectives would be promoted, investment programmes and projects would be submitted to financial institutions, an industrial manpower development plan would be prepared, policy instruments for fostering intra-African industrial co-operation would be adopted, an African mechanism for industrial consultations and negotiations would be established, and action would be taken to popularize the Decade.

The Conference agreed on broad guidelines for the formulation of strategies for eight industrial subsectors identified as of major priority: food processing, textiles, forestry, building materials and construction, metallurgy, chemicals, engineering and small-scale industry. It also concluded that energy development programmes should be prepared and implemented. To monitor and report on implementation, the Conference suggested the establishment of national co-ordinating committees and the organization of workshops and review missions; the Conference itself and a follow-up committee would continue to provide the umbrella for regional monitoring.

Also in 1981, the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly declared the Decade to be one of the most important programmes of UNIDO and called for the allocation of adequate financial resources to assist in the rapid industrialization of Africa, with particular reference to the least developed countries. The Board and the Assembly also requested the UNIDO Executive Director to provide adequate resources for the co-ordination unit for the Decade.

The Board's request on 30 May that the Assembly allocate adequate funds<sup>(7)</sup> was repeated

by the Council in a resolution of 24 July on industrial development co-operation; the Council added that the resources should be provided as from the 1982-1983 biennium.<sup>(4)</sup> Commenting on this provision, Belgium and the Federal Republic of Germany felt that no additional appropriations should be made available.

The Assembly, in a resolution of 17 December on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(6)</sup> decided to allocate adequate funds as from the 1982-1983 biennium. In addition, in line with a request which the Board had addressed to the UNIDO Executive Director, the Assembly asked him and the ECA Executive Secretary to intensify contacts with other organizations and bodies of the United Nations system in order to contribute to the success of the Decade. Having received a report by the UNIDO Executive Director on activities relating to the Decade, transmitted by a note by the Secretary-General,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly requested the Executive Director and the Executive Secretary to submit a comprehensive report in 1982.

After the Second Committee approved this resolution, Poland, speaking also on behalf of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said plans for the Decade must be implemented in the context of resources available to the United Nations, through either voluntary contributions from Member States or contributions from those States which continued to exploit Africa's human resources. During the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, the Byelorussian SSR approved of the idea of the Decade but felt there should be no increase in UNIDO staff or extrabudgetary expenditures.

Among African States, Egypt said the Assembly should ensure that funds were available to accelerate Africa's industrialization, in view of the fact that its share in world industrial production amounted to less than 1 per cent. Kenya regarded the UNIDO report on the Decade as incomplete and called on United Nations bodies to co-operate with OAU on proposals for implementing its objectives. Morocco also favoured greater co-ordination among UNIDO, ECA and OAU with a view to achieving the target of a 4 per cent growth rate in industrial production in Africa by 1990.

Nigeria, observing that many African nations had not even participated in the marginal industrial growth of developing countries in general, said the fact that future reports on the subject would be prepared jointly by ECA and OAU underscored the need for co-ordination between them so that they could carry out their mandate

for the industrialization of Africa. The Sudan trusted that the Assembly would provide funds to achieve the Decade's objectives, and the United Republic of Cameroon urged the international community to make additional funds available. Zaire suggested that the UNIDO Executive Director contact African States, other United Nations bodies and OAU as soon as possible in order to facilitate the drafting of a programme for possible financing by the Assembly.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>ID/287.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference of African Ministers of Industry, E/ECA/CM.8/2; <sup>(3)</sup>UNIDO Executive Director, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/466.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC: 1981/75, para. 12, 24 July (p. 578). GA: <sup>(5)</sup>35/66 B, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 662); <sup>(6)</sup>36/182, sect. II, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 579). <sup>(7)</sup>IDB (report, A/36/16): 54(XV), 30 May.

#### Other activities

The first Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts on the Establishment of Iron and Steel Industry in Eastern and Southern African Subregion (Addis Ababa, 25-29 May 1981) listed the constraints on industrial development in this sector and decided to meet again to prepare a development programme. <sup>(2)</sup> The Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Chemicals for Eastern and Southern Africa (first meeting, Addis Ababa, 14-18 September) made several recommendations on the establishment of chemical industries and recommended that a feasibility study be carried out for a subregional multinational corporation that would act as a holding company for chemical enterprises. <sup>(1)</sup>

An ECA Seminar of African Businessmen on Development of Industrial Entrepreneurial Capabilities in Africa (Addis Ababa, 9-14 November) established an interim group to facilitate the formation of regional associations of African manufacturers and businessmen.

Studies were issued by UNIDO on the domestic financing of manufacturing in Africa, <sup>(4)</sup> industrial development in Rwanda <sup>(5)</sup> and the potential for resource-based industrial development in Botswana. <sup>(6)</sup>

Social policy measures in relation to industrial development were set out in a programme on the social aspects of the Lagos Plan of Action (p. 627) endorsed by the ECA Conference of Ministers on 10 April. <sup>(3)</sup> It was recommended that Governments: increase control over raw materials and natural resources as a prerequisite for industrialization; adopt an industrialization policy based on considerations of relative and competitive advantage in terms of raw materials; take account of opportunities for job creation; consider the impact of new industrial establishments on agriculture; adopt a policy of decentralized industrialization, combined with advance planning; set

standards and regulations for industrial waste disposal and worker protection; and adopt a pay system that would stimulate motivation and discipline so as to encourage productivity.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Meeting on chemicals for eastern and southern Africa, ST/ECA/INR/2; <sup>(2)</sup>Meeting on iron and steel industry in eastern and southern African subregion, ST/ECA/INR/1.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 423(XVI), annex, sect. VI.B, 10 Apr.

Studies: <sup>(4)</sup>UNIDO/IS/256, <sup>(5)</sup>UNIDO/IS/268, <sup>(6)</sup>UNIDO/IS/274.

#### Natural resources

##### Mineral resources

The first Regional Conference on the Development and Utilization of Mineral Resources in Africa (Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, 2-6 February 1981) formulated programmes and projects for the extraction, processing and development of mineral resources. <sup>(1)</sup> It made recommendations on a number of aspects of mineral resources development, including: building up technical knowledge of the mineral resources base; developing national and multinational capabilities for mineral extraction, processing and marketing; developing intra-African trade and extra-African markets for minerals; training of personnel; research and development; national and international mineral exploration; the mining- and processing-equipment industries; and environmental protection. The recommendations of the Regional Conference were endorsed by the ECA Conference of Ministers on 10 April. <sup>(2)</sup>

A Seminar and Study Tour for African Specialists on Mining Methods (Krivoy Rog, Ukrainian SSR, 1-12 June) enabled 28 Africans to improve their managerial and technical competence with respect to mining operations.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on mineral resources, E/CN.14/804.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 406(XVI), 10 Apr.

##### Water resources

A Regional Seminar and Study Tour on Water Resources Development in Arid Zones (Tashkent, USSR, 3 June-12 July 1981), organized by ECA, examined the application of theory, methods and techniques; machinery and equipment used in exploration, exploitation, conservation and utilization; and managerial and research aspects.

An intensified search for simple yet efficient methods of providing adequate water supplies for personal use, such as the use of windmills, was among the measures endorsed by the Conference of Ministers on 10 April <sup>(1)</sup> in a programme on the social implications of the Lagos Plan of Action for economic development (p. 627).

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 423(XVI), annex, sect. VI.C, para. 5, 10 Apr.

## Energy

A Regional Preparatory Meeting on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (Addis Ababa, 12-16 January 1981) prepared an African Regional Plan of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy. The report of the Meeting<sup>(1)</sup> was endorsed on 10 April by the ECA Conference of Ministers,<sup>(4)</sup> which urged African States to give high priority to measures for implementing national, subregional and regional programmes conceived within the framework of the African Plan.

The United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, in a resolution of 21 August on implementation of regional plans of action (P. 690), called on the international community, including Governments and United Nations organizations, to give financial and technical support for the development of new and renewable energy sources in Africa.<sup>(2)</sup>

As part of a programme of measures to implement the social aspects of the Lagos Plan of Action for African economic development (p. 627), the ECA Conference of Ministers endorsed on 10 April three measures to maximize the social advantages of the discovery of new energy resources: planning for the resettlement of people displaced by energy projects; planning and implementation of social services for the labour force attracted by such projects; and the establishment of protective standards for workers and communities.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Preparatory Meeting on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/8/Add.2 (E/CN.14/800).

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference Sources of Energy (report, A/CONF.100/11, Sales No. on New and Renewable

E.81.I.24); 6, sect. I, 21 Aug. ECA (report, E/1981/54), 10 Apr.: <sup>(3)</sup>423(XVI), annex, sect. VI.E; <sup>(4)</sup>425(XVI).

## Food and agriculture

ECA ACTIVITIES. Five subregional reports containing evaluations of ongoing and planned food development programmes and projects of some 40 African intergovernmental organizations, as well as guidelines for new programmes, were discussed in February and March 1981 with the governing bodies of the four Multinational Programming and Operational Centres (p. 631). As a result, a number of projects were incorporated into the centres' work programmes.

Five Governments received advice and assistance in the field of agricultural statistics, and the ECA secretariat participated in missions to Equatorial Guinea to assist in improving its agricultural development policies and plans. In co-operation with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), studies were initiated in Burundi, Rwanda, the United

Republic of Tanzania and Zambia to collect information on small farmers, including their problems with respect to farm investments and uses of improved inputs.

Measures for agricultural development were included in a programme on social aspects of the Lagos Plan of Action which the Conference of Ministers, on 10 April,<sup>(4)</sup> urged African States to consider (p. 627). They included agrarian reform, research to adapt production technologies, soil conservation and reforestation, programmes to settle nomadic pastoralists, eradication of illiteracy, promotion of food production co-operatives, expansion of small-scale and cottage industries, State entrepreneurship in large-scale food production, education programmes to change taboos and attitudes concerning food production and utilization, agricultural extension services, equitable price policies and expanded marketing facilities, improved credit availability and food distribution systems, expanded health services and food conservation research.

WORLD FOOD COUNCIL ACTION. In conclusions and recommendations adopted at its annual session in May, the World Food Council (p. 717) instructed its secretariat to gather for its 1982 session information about the work of international bodies on agriculture in Africa, highlighting the adequacy of what was being done about Africa's food problem.<sup>(3)</sup>

Commenting on this provision after its adoption, Canada said the Council should recommend action after assessing the effectiveness of multilateral aid programmes.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. In a resolution on food and agriculture adopted on 24 July, the Economic and Social Council emphasized that measures of international assistance to African agriculture demanded continued and increased efforts by the international community and particularly by the United Nations system.<sup>(5)</sup>

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. The Secretary-General submitted to the General Assembly in October 1981 an interim report on Africa's food and agriculture problems in the 1980s,<sup>(2)</sup> in response to a December 1980 request from the Assembly for a study on the establishment of regional food trade and distribution organizations in Africa.<sup>(6)</sup> The report described the problems- poor production, rapidly increasing demand, and ineffective national policies and programmes- and the actions and programmes devised by ECA to remedy the situation. It included recommendations for short-, medium- and long-term action.

To bring about an immediate improvement in Africa's situation and lay the foundations of Col-

lective self-sufficiency in cereals, livestock, fish and forestry products, it recommended: the formulation and implementation, by countries or groups of countries, of food policies, programmes and strategies for agricultural development and rapid industrialization; reduction of losses of food staples during all stages from harvesting to distribution; improvement of farming practices and technologies; price incentives; input subsidies; adequate production incentives and appropriate pricing policies; national food security; establishment of an African commodity intelligence service; and free movement of food and raw materials within Africa.

For the medium term, the report recommended reduction of food losses, agro-economic research, food security programmes up to the regional level, social and economic reforms to develop the agricultural base for self-sufficiency and marketable surplus, and programmes to reduce food imports while increasing intra-African agricultural trade. Long-term recommendations dealt with steps to attack the crisis of the rural sector, including: revision of national development plans and expenditures in favour of the rural sector; development of transportation, storage and marketing facilities; improvement of structures to channel credits and other farming inputs and to widen employment opportunities in rural areas; economic co-operation among African countries; closer integration between forestry and agriculture; and research and exchange of information on adaptive technology.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 17 December, in a resolution on food and agriculture in Africa, the General Assembly urged African countries to increase production and called for support to those efforts through provision of additional financial and technical assistance to Africa by the United Nations system<sup>(7)</sup> International assistance, it stressed, should include not only food aid but, more important, support of national efforts to restore and develop agricultural production. Governments and organizations were urged to assist food security projects, especially in the Sudano-Sahelian region, and to consider financing recurrent expenditures for agricultural development and granting concessional financial terms as appropriate. The Assembly urged support for an FAO programme to control African animal trypanosomiasis (a vector-borne parasitic disease). It also urged the international community to assist Africa to achieve by 1985 a significant improvement in the food situation, reduction of post-harvest losses, improved transport and more effective agronomic research.

This resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, which approved it in

similar fashion on 10 December. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier draft sponsored by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77<sup>(1)</sup> and later withdrawn.

The adopted text differed from the original draft in the following respects: concessional financial terms were to be granted "as appropriate" rather than "whenever necessary"; a clause commending FAO for its efforts to alleviate the effects of the African food crisis by mobilizing emergency food aid was replaced by a clause recognizing the role of the international community, FAO and the World Food Programme in mobilizing food aid and agricultural assistance in Africa; the FAO programme against African animal trypanosomiasis was to be "implemented" rather than "strengthened"; and a clause in the earlier text requesting that ECA, in consultation with the Organization of African Unity (OAU), take every necessary measure to hold joint meetings on implementation of the resolution, was modified to request them to take every necessary measure including the holding of joint meetings.

The magnitude of Africa's food problems was mentioned by a number of speakers in the Second Committee. Ethiopia, citing World Food Council statistics showing that the per capita food production index in Africa at the beginning of 1980 had been 10 per cent less than its 1960 value, said that, while any lasting solution required a sharp increase of food production in the developing countries themselves, ambitious policies were needed for the transfer of resources, inputs, food aid, food security and favourable trade arrangements. Senegal referred to ECA figures indicating that, while food production in Africa had increased at an annual rate of 1.5 per cent during the 1970s, population had been increasing at a rate of 2.8 per cent a year. The United Republic of Cameroon noted that, of the 34 food-deficit developing countries, 24 were in Africa, although some 20 years earlier the continent had been almost self-sufficient in food.

Kenya urged United Nations bodies to co-operate more closely with one another and with African States to overcome Africa's critical difficulties and thought the affluent countries of the North had a special moral obligation to help solve its food problems. Nigeria regretted that some reports gave the impression that African countries did not devote sufficient resources to agricultural development; the modest efforts made by those countries, such as Nigeria's "green revolution", should be recognized. Zaire suggested that the heads of ECA and OAU be invited to agree on a joint approach to the implementation of the Regional Food Plan for Africa.<sup>(8)</sup>

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.128.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/149; <sup>(3)</sup>WFC, A/36/19.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54): 423(XVI), annex, sect. VI.A, 10 Apr. <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/71, para. 2, 24 July (p. 722). GA: <sup>(6)</sup>35/69, para. 10, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 696); <sup>(7)</sup>36/186, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(8)</sup>YUN 1978, p. 590.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee. A/C.2/36/SR.3-6. 10-26, 28-32, 45, 47 (24 Sep.-10 Dec.); plenary; A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/186

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.6) without vote. 10 December (meeting 47); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.153), based on informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.36/L.128), orally amended by United Kingdom: agenda Item 69 (g).

#### Situation of food and agriculture in Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362 (S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling the Programme of Action of the World Food Conference, containing the Universal Declaration on the Eradication of Hunger and Malnutrition adopted by the Conference,

Recalling also the Declaration of Principles and the Programme of Action adopted by the World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development,

Noting with concern that, over the past two decades, the situation of food and agriculture in Africa has drastically deteriorated, resulting in a decline in food production per capita and a reduction in average dietary standards below essential requirements,

Deeply concerned at the unabated encroachment of the desert in many countries of Africa, which has continued to accentuate the food problem on that continent,

Noting that a decision on food and agriculture was adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-sixth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 23 February to 1 March 1981,

Deeply concerned the critical food shortages currently affecting many countries in the African region, which necessitate a distressingly large allocation of the scarce foreign exchange of those countries for the import of foodstuffs, to the detriment of their overall development;

Recognising the commitment and determination of Africa to devoting its limited resources on a priority basis to agricultural development in accordance with the Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its second extraordinary session, devoted to economic matters, held at Lagos on 28 and 29 April 1980,

Recognizing that the responsibility for the development of food and agricultural production lies primarily with the developing countries themselves and that there is an increasing effort and growing commitment by the developing countries to accelerate the development of their food and agricultural sectors.

Recognizing the role of food-sector strategies, which emerged from the World Food Council, as a means for interested developing countries to adopt an integrated approach for increasing food production, improving consumption and attracting the necessary additional international resources.

Recognizing the central role of science and technology in raising global agricultural productivity and output, as well as the importance of appropriate infrastructure such as storage

facilities and a system of transport conducive to the efficient distribution of agricultural products within each country and throughout the African continent,

Recalling its resolution 35/108 of 5 December 1980 on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa,

Stressing that the current shortages of foodstuffs demonstrate the continued vulnerability of many countries in the region to food crises due, inter alia, to crop failure, drought, soil erosion, low reserves and the high level of post-harvest losses,

Recalling its resolution 35/169 of 5 December 1980, concerning the critical situation of food and agriculture in Africa,

Noting that an important document on the problem of famine in Africa was published jointly by the Organization of African Unity and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which explains in more detail the nature of famine and the means of eradicating it in Africa,

Noting with appreciation the assistance provided to African countries through bilateral and multilateral channels, inter alia, by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Food Programme, the World Bank and other competent organizations,

Recognizing the vital role played by transport infrastructure in food situations, particularly emergency food situations,

Recognizing the useful contribution that the effective execution of the Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa can make to the improvement of the food situation, in particular, and to the rapid overall development of Africa,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on food problems in Africa and expresses its concern at the inadequacy of the results achieved in the implementation of its resolution 35/69;

2. Urges the countries of Africa to implement, in accordance with their national development programmes and priorities, measures to increase substantially their food and agricultural production;

3. Calls upon the international community to continue to support efforts undertaken by African countries at the national, subregional and regional levels to increase food production through, inter alia, the provision, on a priority and long-term basis, of additional financial and technical assistance to Africa by organizations of the United Nations system, such as the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the United Nations Development Programme and other organizations involved in the financing of agricultural development, and through an increase in lending by the World Bank to the agricultural sector in Africa;

4. Stresses that international assistance should not only take the form of food aid and the corresponding additional support but, more important, should also support national efforts for the restoration and development of agricultural production, specifically crops and livestock, in the regions affected;

5. Urges Governments and the international organizations concerned to provide the necessary technical, financial and food assistance to food security projects in the region, especially in the countries of the Sahel and the Sudano-Sahelian countries, in the framework of their own activities, including strengthening the Food Security Assistance Scheme of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations through the participation of current and prospective donors;

6. Calls for the urgent consideration of the adoption of a positive and flexible approach to the financing of agricultural development by external institutions and Governments, which would finance, inter alia, recurrent expenditure in connection with investment and the cost of factors of production, and for the granting of concessional terms as appropriate;

7. Recognizes the role of the international community, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the World Food Programme in mobilizing food aid and agricultural assistance in Africa, and requests existing and new

donor countries to increase the resources required to meet African can needs for food aid and agricultural development;

8. Recommends that the Programme for the Control of African Animal Trypanosomiasis and Related Development, endorsed by the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations at its twentieth session In its resolution 8/79 of 28 November 1979, should be implemented on an urgent basis under the overall co-ordination of that organization and with the active financial and technical support of the International community;

9. Urges all relevant organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to Intensify their activities In Africa to assist Governments, Inter alia, In the areas relating to food production, agricultural processing, integrated research and extension service;

10. Also urges the international community to assist countries In the African region to achieve, by 1985, the following goals:

(a) A significant improvement in their food situation and the laying of the foundations for the attainment of self-sufficiency In cereals, livestock and fish;

(b) Significant progress towards attaining a 50 per cent reduction in post-harvest losses, through, Inter alia, the construction of storage facilities;

(c) An Improved transport Infrastructure to facilitate food distribution at the national, subregional and regional levels;

(d) Expanded and more effective agronomic research, with special emphasis on improved seeds and an adequate supply of fertilizers, pesticides and other chemicals suitable for African conditions;

11. Further urges all relevant organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to expand their training programmes in the building up of national capabilities for the preparation, execution, monitoring and evaluation of agricultural development projects;

12. Requests the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa, In consultation with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, to take every necessary measure, including the holding of joint meetings, with a view to considering the possibilities for implementing General Assembly resolution 35/69 and the present resolution;

13. Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Organization of African Unity and organs and bodies of the United Nations system, In his final report called for In resolution 35/69:

(a) To identify the problems perceived in the attainment of the goals set forth in paragraph 10 above;

(b) To estimate the amount of external resources needed to attain those goals;

(c) To report on the level of technical and financial resources which the United Nations system will deploy towards the attainment of those goals and to suggest ways of attracting extra funding;

(d) To report on the action-oriented plans of the relevant organs and organization of the United Nations system which will implement the present resolution.

#### Science and technology

The ECA Intergovernmental Committee of Experts for Science and Technology Development (Addis Ababa, 2-6 November 1981) reviewed national and regional progress in implementing the science and technology chapter of the Lagos Plan of Action for African economic development (p. 611), and set up three working groups to monitor developments more closely.<sup>(1)</sup>

The social impact of science and technology in Africa was dealt with in a programme of measures on the social implications of the Lagos

Plan (see below), endorsed on 10 April by the ECA Conference of Ministers.<sup>(2)</sup> It was recommended that Governments mount research programmes on the adaptation of science and technology to their country's needs, promote public acceptance of appropriate technology, and encourage and support co-operatives in the use of scientific developments for agriculture and production.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA Committee on science and technology, E/ECA/TPCW.3/3 & Add.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 423(XVI), annex, sect. VI.C, 10 Apr.

#### Social development

On 10 April 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the ECA Conference of Ministers endorsed the recommendations of the third Conference of African Ministers of Social Affairs (Addis Ababa, October 1980),<sup>(2)</sup> and urged African States to consider adopting and implementing a series of measures approved at that meeting on the social implications, of the Lagos Plan of Action for African economic development (p. 611). Included were measures for international co-operation in social development, such as subregional pooling of university resources to train high-level manpower, the establishment in each subregion of centres for basic and applied social research, and assistance to the Association for Social Work Education in Africa.

The programme also covered measures to improve the demographic (see below) and health (p. 629) situation, the quality of human resources (p. 629) and the status of women (p. 630); measures to deal with problems of youth unemployment (p. 629), and refugees and displaced persons; and social policy measures to be taken in anticipation of adverse social consequences of the implementation of the Lagos Plan in the fields of agricultural development (p. 624), industrial development (p. 623), science and technology (see above), transport and communications (p. 614), water supply (p. 623) and energy resources development (p. 624).

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 423(XVI), 10 Apr.  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 758.

#### Population

##### Population policy

Measures to improve Africa's demographic situation were included in a programme on the social implications of the Lagos Plan of Action for economic development (see above), endorsed on 10 April 1981 by the ECA Conference of Ministers.<sup>(1)</sup> It was recommended that African States formulate and implement population policies appropriate to their countries so as to reduce the dependency ratio, strike a balance between

population and resources, and reduce fertility and infant mortality rates and the burden of excessive childbirths on women.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 423(XVI), annex. sect. I, para. 1, 10 Apr.

#### Training and research institutions

Proposed new statutes for the Regional Institute for Population Studies at Accra, Ghana, and the Institut de formation et de recherche démographiques at Yaoundé, United Republic of Cameroon, were forwarded by ECA in April 1981 for approval by the General Assembly, but the Assembly referred them back to the Commission in December for consideration of points raised by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ).

The institutes were established in 1972 following agreements between the United Nations and the host Governments; their management was decentralized from United Nations Headquarters to ECA in 1980. The proposed statutes, endorsed by ECA in 1980,<sup>(8)</sup> were intended to regionalize the institutes by involving all the countries served by each institute in its financing and management. The Institute at Accra served English-speaking Africa and that at Yaoundé served French-speaking Africa.

On 10 April 1981, the ECA Conference of Ministers recommended that the Assembly approve the statutes and invited African States to discharge their financial obligations towards the institutes, as determined at meetings on their future to be held by interested States.<sup>(5)</sup> This and earlier ECA resolutions on the topic were transmitted to the Assembly by the Secretary-General.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Economic and Social Council, on 24 July, decided without vote to endorse the statutes and recommended their approval by the Assembly so that the two institutes could become operational as soon as possible.<sup>(6)</sup> This decision was approved without vote on 21 July by the First (Economic) Committee, on an oral proposal by the Chairman.

However, the Assembly decided without vote on 18 December to recommend that the Council, at its 1982 organizational session, invite the Conference of Ministers to take up the matter again in 1982 in the light of points raised by ACABQ<sup>(7)</sup> and any suggestions by the Secretary-General. The recommendation to this effect was made without objection on 16 December by the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, on an oral proposal by the Chairman based on a modified version of a recommendation by ACABQ. The modification consisted of adding the reference to the Council's organizational session (held early in the year); it was made at the suggestion of the ACABQ Chairman to meet a point raised by Ghana and the United Republic

of Tanzania, which wanted to be sure that there would be no delay in considering the statutes.

In suggesting reconsideration of the statutes, ACABQ said they did not give a clear picture of how the institutes were to be financed, what the financial role of the United Nations and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) would be, whether the institutes' staff members would be international staff of the United Nations, who would be responsible for grading posts and establishing staffing tables, and other personnel matters.<sup>(4)</sup>

The question had been referred to the Fifth Committee by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, which decided without vote on 13 November<sup>(1)</sup> to transmit a draft decision by a Vice-Chairman that would have had the Assembly approve the statutes.<sup>(2)</sup>

Communication: <sup>(1)</sup>2nd Committee Chairman, A/C.5/36/64.

Draft decision not acted upon: <sup>(2)</sup>2nd Committee Vice-Chairman, A/C.2/36/L.30.

Note: <sup>(3)</sup>S.G., A/36/569.

Report: <sup>(4)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/670.

Resolution and decisions: Res.: <sup>(5)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 426(XVI), 10 Apr. Dec.: <sup>(6)</sup>ESC, 1981/189, 24 July, text following; <sup>(7)</sup>GA, 36/450, 18 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: (8)1980, p. 758.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.12, 13, 15, 17 (13-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.4, 7-10, 35, 39 (25 Sep.-13 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.80 (16 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/189

##### Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/105) without vote. 21 July (meeting 17); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 7.

##### Economic Commission for Africa: regional Institutes for population studies

At its 41st plenary meeting, on 24 July 1981, the Council, having considered the report of the Secretary-General on regional co-operation and recalling resolution 426(XVI) of 10 April 1981 of the Conference of Ministers of the Economic Commission for Africa, decided to endorse the new statutes of the Regional Institute for Population Studies and the Institut de formation et de recherche démographiques annexed to that resolution and to recommend that the General Assembly should approve the statutes at its thirty-sixth session, in order to enable the two institutes to become operational as soon as possible.

#### General Assembly decision 36/450

##### Adopted without vote

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/843) without objection. 16 December (meeting 80); oral proposal by Chairman, based on ACABQ recommendation (A/36/670); agenda item 12.

##### Proposed statutes of the regional Institutes for population studies at Accra and Yaoundé

At Its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, recommended that the Economic and Social Council, at its organizational session for 1982, should invite the Conference of Ministers of the Economic Commission for Africa to take up once again at Its next session in 1982 the proposed



statutes of the regional institutes for population studies at Accra and Yaoundé. In the light of the points raised by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in its report and such suggestions as might be made by the Secretary-General thereon.

#### Technical co-operation

Funds from UNFPA were used by ECA in 1981 for infrastructure support in population, regional advisory services in demography and statistics, case studies, information and clearing-house activities, and national workshops in population and development, as well as for technical support and other services to the population institutes at Accra and Yaoundé (p. 628) and the Regional Centre for Population Studies of the Central African Customs Union. Work on data processing for a Zambian/ECA survey on infant and childhood mortality was completed in 1981. Staff members of ECA participated in some UNFPA needs-assessment missions.

#### Health and human resources

##### Health policy

Measures to improve the health situation in Africa were included in a programme to deal with the social implications of the Lagos Plan of Action for economic development (p. 627) endorsed by the ECA Conference of Ministers on 10 April 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> They called for the organization and strengthening of national health systems, with special attention to mothers and children, including pre- and post-natal care, family life education and responsible parenthood, nutrition education, and better community health through improved primary health services.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 423(XVI), annex, sect. I, para. 2, 10 Apr.

##### Disabled persons

In connection with the 1981 observance of the International Year of Disabled Persons (IYDP) (p. 795), the ECA Conference of Ministers, on 10 April, endorsed the report, findings and resolutions of a Regional Seminar on IYDP (Addis Ababa, October 1980), and called for follow-up measures by United Nations bodies directed towards proper rehabilitation actions, social integration of the disabled and adequate prevention of disability.<sup>(2)</sup> Also on 10 April, the Conference condemned South Africa for atrocities resulting in a growing number of disabled persons and appealed to the international community to assist the front-line States of southern Africa in the rehabilitation and technical and vocational training of disabled persons.<sup>(3)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Regional Seminar on IYDP, E/CN.14/786.

Resolutions: ECA (report, E/1981/54), 10 Apr.: <sup>(2)</sup>410(XVI), <sup>(3)</sup>411 (XVI).

#### Human resources

An ECA-sponsored Conference of Ministers Responsible for Human Resources Planning, Development and Utilization (Monrovia, Liberia, 5-7 October 1981) identified project proposals for national action and technical co-operation in human resources development and utilization, called on African Governments to adapt those proposals to their national situation, and adopted interim terms of reference for the Conference as a part of ECA machinery.<sup>(1)</sup> The Conference was preceded by a Technical Preparatory Committee of Officials on Human Resources Planning, Development and Utilization (Monrovia, 28 September-3 October), which drew up detailed recommendations on education and training.

Several national training workshops in manpower planning, career planning, guidance and counselling were organized in 1981 with the help of ECA, and a regional workshop was held for training development officers and managers from public and private sectors. Advisory missions were sent for manpower planning, education and training, and career planning. A number of technical publications were produced.

The ECA Conference of Ministers, on 10 April, called on its members to consider a series of measures to improve the quality of human resources and to tackle problems of youth unemployment, as part of a programme to deal with the social implications of the Lagos Plan of Action (p. 627). Measures in the field of education included the eradication of illiteracy within the shortest possible time, preparation and distribution of reading materials for new literates, universalization of educational opportunities, increasing the vocational and technical content of primary and secondary school curricula, creation of vocational orientation systems, more emphasis on science and technology in higher education, and the teaching of African history, culture and civilization. Suggested steps to combat youth unemployment included vocational training facilities, continuing education for school drop-outs, national youth service programmes, and financial support for youth movements and workers' organizations.<sup>(3)</sup>

In his September report to the General Assembly, on social and economic development of Africa in the 1980s,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General described as acute and widespread the need for human resources development in that region, and presented information on measures taken by various organs of the United Nations system to assist African countries in their endeavour.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference of ministers for human resources, E/ECA/CM.8/3; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/513.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 423(XVI), annex, sects. II & IV, 10 Apr.

African Institute for Higher Technical Training and Research. The ECA Conference of Ministers called on 10 April 1981 for support from African States to permit the African Institute for Higher Technical Training and Research to become operational.<sup>(1)</sup> The Conference expressed concern that only a restricted number of States had subscribed to the Institute's constitution and still fewer had paid their contributions to its 1980/1981 budget.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 417(XVI), 10 Apr.

#### Human settlements and environment

The terms of reference of the Joint Intergovernmental Regional Committee on Human Settlements and Environment were approved by the ECA Conference of Ministers on 10 April 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> In addition to the human settlements functions of its predecessor body prior to the expansion of its mandate in 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee was to formulate regional and transnational environmental management policies, promote the exchange of information and experience, review the ECA work programme on the environment, assist in assembling information on national environmental problems, promote environmental education and training, and promote inter-organizational co-operation.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 408(XVI), 10 Apr.  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 757.

#### Environment

The ECA Conference of Ministers, on 10 April 1981, urged African States to enact laws and regulations on environmental protection, including the preservation and reconstruction of historic sites, and directed the ECA Executive Secretary to provide technical assistance for environmental legislation, assessment and management.<sup>(1)</sup>

A draft action plan for the development of marine science research and training was prepared at a workshop (Addis Ababa, 8-13 June) organized under a joint project involving ECA, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the International Oceanographic Commission.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 412(XVI), 10 Apr.

#### Women

The Africa Regional Co-ordinating Committee for the Integration of Women in Development (second meeting, Addis Ababa, 12-14 March 1981) requested increased funding for regional and subregional ECA programmes for women, called for wider dissemination of information on activities in this field, urged African Governments to involve women in the formulation and implementation of national development plans, asked that ECA provide permanent

posts for the African Training and Research Centre for Women, and appealed for support for projects to aid rural women. On 10 April, the ECA Conference of Ministers, noting the Committee's report,<sup>(1)</sup> reaffirmed the necessity for States and organizations to provide resources to programmes for the advancement of women, urged that substantial resources from the United Nations Trust Fund for African Development be devoted to the ECA women's programme, and urged intensified efforts to provide regular posts for the staff of the Training and Research Centre.<sup>(3)</sup>

Measures to improve the status of African women and increase their opportunities for involvement in national development efforts were part of a programme on the social implications of the Lagos Plan of Action for African economic development (p. 627) endorsed by the Conference of Ministers on 10 April.<sup>(4)</sup> The measures called for campaigns to change attitudes about the place of women in society, efforts to equalize educational opportunities, immediate abolition of discrimination in employment, raising the minimum age of marriage, support for the Pan-African Women's Organization and the African Training and Research Centre for Women, establishment of day-care centres, the development of labour-saving devices to free women from daily drudgery, giving women access to appropriate work tools, and a percentage share of seats for women on bodies and in services concerned with development.

The ECA secretariat organized a training workshop on improvement of the quality of life of rural women (Addis Ababa, May) for trainers, planners and leaders from Portuguese-speaking Africa. Financing from the Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women (1976-1985) was used to strengthen national machinery for the integration of women in development, for information, training and supply of equipment, and to help support the African Training and Research Centre for Women. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) also provided financial support for the staffing of the Centre, through a \$798,000 commitment for 1981-1983 approved by the UNICEF Executive Board in May.<sup>(2)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on women in development, E/CN.14/809; <sup>(2)</sup>UNICEF Executive Board. E/1981/48.

Resolutions: ECA (report, E/1981/54), 10 Apr.: <sup>(3)</sup>407(XVI); <sup>(4)</sup>423(XVI), annex, sect. III.

#### Statistics

Experts from ECA provided advisory services to African countries in several statistical areas during 1981, including economic, demographic

and social statistics. Following a survey which found a serious shortfall in output by African statistical services, demonstrated by delays in data dissemination, a working group concluded that the services could produce better results with existing resources if they organized their work properly.

Project proposals were prepared for a number of countries participating in the African Household Survey Capability Programme, a component of the global National Household Survey Capability Programme, designed to help developing countries produce integrated economic, social and demographic statistics at the household and other levels (p. 1072). A work programme for the African Programme was recommended by a Working Group on Organization, Content and Methodology of Household Surveys (Addis Ababa, 29 June-3 July).<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Working Group on household surveys, E/CN.14/SM/42.

Programme, organizational and administrative questions concerning ECA

The views of the Conference of Ministers on the role of ECA, and of United Nations regional commissions in general, in the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system were set out in a resolution of 10 April 1981 (p. 607).

#### Regional institutions

Noting the difficulties experienced by regional and subregional institutions sponsored by ECA due to their small memberships and inadequate financial support, the ECA Conference of Ministers, on 10 April 1981, appealed to its members to join those institutions and to meet their financial obligations, and requested the Executive Secretary to explore the feasibility of establishing a buffer fund that could advance money to the institutions during periods of financial difficulty.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Conference of Chief Executives of ECA-sponsored Regional and Subregional Institutions, which at its inaugural session in 1980 had called the Commission's attention to the difficulties facing those bodies, reviewed the situation further at its second session (Abidjan, Ivory Coast, 1-5 December).<sup>(1)</sup> It recommended that African Governments hosting such institutions grant them the same facilities, privileges and immunities as United Nations offices received.

Proposed new statutes for two regional population institutes were under consideration during the year (p. 628).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference of executives of regional institutions, E/ECA/CM.8/4.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 409(XVI), 10 Apr.

#### Financial questions

UN Trust Fund for African Development. Nineteen Governments paid a total of \$1,858,774 in 1981 to the United Nations Trust Fund for African Development (see table below), established at the request of ECA in 1977 to help implement its work programmes. An additional \$1,684,378 was pledged for 1982 by 24 Governments. Including public donations and interest, the Fund received income of \$2,271,868 in 1981 and spent \$2,447,878 for activities in intra-African trade, manpower, industry, natural resources, building materials and agriculture, and for ECA Multinational Programming and Operational Centres.

The third pledging conference of African Governments and financial institutions for the Fund was held during the 1981 session of the ECA Conference of Ministers. On 10 April, the Conference appealed to its member States and to countries outside Africa, as well as African and non-African institutions, to provide resources for the work programme adopted by ECA within the framework of the Lagos Plan of Action.<sup>(1)</sup>

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS TRUST FUND  
FOR AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT, 1981 AND 1982  
(In US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment	1982 pledge
Benin	-	5,000
Botswana	20,578	25,000
Burundi	-	20,000
Congo	-	40,000
Ethiopia	14,602	14,602
Gabon	-	40,000
Gambia	5,000	-
Germany, Federal Republic of	239,776	-
Guinea	-	30,000
India	208,250	-
Kenya	3,616	70,000
Lesotho	-	8,000
Liberia	-	20,000
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	200,000	200,000
Mali	4,346	25,000
Mauritania	28,501	-
Morocco	-	500,000
Netherlands	153,194	-
Nigeria	-	200,000
Rwanda	15,000	15,000
Sierra Leone	19,089	30,000
Somalia	-	30,000
Swaziland	1,776	-
Sweden	93,782	-
Togo	-	10,000
Tunisia	25,000	-
United Republic of Cameroon	81,488	40,000
United Republic of Tanzania	2,000	50,000
United States	741,000	-
Upper Volta	1,776	1,776
Zaire	-	250,000
Zambia	-	40,000
Zimbabwe	-	20,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,858,774</b>	<b>1,684,378</b>

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 420(XVI), 10 Apr.

Financing of Multinational Programming and Operational Centres. Established in 1977 and 1978 as the operational arms of ECA in African subregions, five Multinational Programming

and Operational Centres were responsible for promoting economic integration schemes (p. 612) and overseeing United Nations technical co-operation projects. They were located at Gisenyi, Rwanda, for the Economic Community of the Great Lakes Countries (Burundi, Rwanda, Zaire); Lusaka, Zambia, for eastern and southern Africa; Niamey, Niger, for West Africa; Yaoundé, United Republic of Cameroon, for Central Africa; and Tangier, Morocco, for North Africa. Discussions were under way at the end of 1981 to make the Tangier Centre operational.

The ECA Conference of Ministers, on 10 April, expressed appreciation for the efforts made to strengthen the Centres, particularly by decentralizing ECA activities, and called for the integration of the Centres' staff into the staffing table financed from the United Nations regular budget.<sup>(2)</sup>

Since their inception, the Centres south of the Sahara had been financed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), which provided \$2.6 million for the purpose in 1981; the Tangier Centre was financed from the United Nations regular budget. However, faced with an anticipated reduction in funds for its African regional programme, UNDP indicated that, from 1982, it would phase out its assistance for the Centres' staffing and office operations, and support only their operational activities.

The General Assembly, in a resolution adopted without vote on 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> called on the Secretary-General urgently to seek extrabudgetary funding to enable all the Centres to carry out their 1982 work programmes in the fields of general programming, research, studies and the organization of meetings. It urged UNDP to continue to support the Centres' operational activities during 1982-1986, and called on other bodies, within and outside the United Nations system, to render support. It called for two reports from the Secretary-General in 1982: one for the Economic and Social Council, in consultation with the UNDP Administrator, on financing the Centres on an established basis, and the other for the Assembly on implementation of the resolution.

The resolution was approved on 7 December by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, also without vote. The draft was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier text sponsored by Benin on behalf of the African Group.<sup>(1)</sup> The Benin draft would have had the Assembly call for resources from the United Nations regular budget to finance the Centres' non-operational activities.

Benin stated in introducing the initial draft that the survival of the Centres might be jeopardized unless adequate funds for their operation were made available regularly.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Benin, for African Group, A/C.2/36/L.72.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 418(XVI), 10 Apr.; <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/178, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.2/36/L.123.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 46, (24 Sep.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/178

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.1) without vote. 7 December (meeting 46): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.140). based on informal consultations on draft by Benin, for African Group (A/C.2/36/L.72); agenda item 69.

Multinational Programming and Operational Centres

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 32/197 of 20 December 1977 and 33/202 of 29 January 1979 on restructuring the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system so as to make it more fully capable of dealing with problems of International economic co-operation and development in a comprehensive and effective manner,

Recalling, in particular, section IV of the annex to resolution 32/197 on structures for regional and interregional co-operation, through which the General Assembly designated the regional commissions, inter alia, as the main general economic and social development centres within the United Nations system for their respective regions,

Recalling also its resolution 35/64 of 5 December 1980 on special measures for the social and economic development of Africa in the 1980s,

Recalling further the Final Act of Lagos, adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its second extraordinary session, devoted to economic matters, held at Lagos on 28 and 29 April 1980, which called, inter alia, for the establishment of a subregional common market by 1990 as the first step towards the establishment of an African economic community by the year 2000,

Taking note of resolution 31.1 (XIII) adopted on 1 March 1977 by the Conference of Ministers of the Economic Commission for Africa, by which the Conference decided to establish a certain number of Multinational Programming and Operational Centres at the subregional level,

Bearing in mind that the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres have become an integral part of the Economic Commission for Africa, through which the Commission effectively carries out its terms of reference not only with regard to studies, research, the organization of meetings and consultations but also with regard to its operational activities as an executing agency,

Emphasizing the importance of the activities of the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres for the African countries and the need for substantial and adequate financial and human resources to sustain those activities,

1. Calls upon the Secretary-General urgently to seek to provide extrabudgetary resources to enable all the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres to carry out in 1982, at the subregional level, their work programme in the field of general programming, research, studies and the organization of meetings,

2. Welcomes the financial support which the United Nations Development Programme has extended to the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres since their inception and urges the Administrator of the Programme to continue with this essential support to the operational activities of the Centres during the third programming cycle, 1982-1986, of the Programme;

3. Calls upon other organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, as well as intergovernmental and

non-governmental organizations, to render their fullest support to the activities of the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres;

4. Invites the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme and the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa, to submit to the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, a report on the financing of the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres on an established basis;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report on the implementation of the present resolution.

#### Work programme and medium-term plan

The proposed ECA work programme and priorities for 1982-1983, prepared by the secretariat,<sup>(1)</sup> gave high priority to the development of knowledge about African natural resources, the need to organize intra-African trade in industrial raw materials, and the development of indigenous skilled personnel, technology, and institutional and physical infrastructure. After examination by the Technical Preparatory Committee of the Whole, the programme was considered by the ECA Conference of Ministers, which adopted on 10 April 1981 a draft resolution for action by the Economic and Social Council, approving the programme and urging the Secretary-General to provide resources to enable ECA to implement it fully.<sup>(3)</sup> The Council did not act on the draft.

Also on 10 April,<sup>(2)</sup> the Conference recommended the adoption of the ECA medium-term plan for 1984-1989. This was to form part of the United Nations medium-term plan, to be considered by the Committee for Programme and Coordination and the General Assembly in 1982.

Proposed work programme: <sup>(1)</sup>E/CN.14/790.

Resolutions: ECA (report, E/1981/54), 10 Apr.:  
<sup>(2)</sup>419(XVI), <sup>(3)</sup>428(XVI).

#### ECA secretariat

Personnel questions. The ECA Conference of Ministers, on 10 April 1981, encouraged efforts to Africanize the ECA secretariat, urged under-represented African States to make competent nationals available, appealed to United Nations authorities to take steps to ensure stability in employment and improve working and living conditions of the staff, and invited the Secretary-General to reconsider the recent cost-of-living survey for Addis Ababa to take corrective measures.<sup>(1)</sup>

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECA (report, E/1981/54), 421 (XVI), 10 Apr.

Training programmes for translators. The General Assembly decided on 18 December 1981<sup>(2)</sup> that a fourth training programme for English and French translators and précis-writers at ECA should be pursued and financed from the United Nations regular budget for 1982-1983. This action was taken by a recorded vote of 113

to 25, following the approval by the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee on 24 November of an oral proposal by the United Republic of Cameroon, by a roll-call vote of 62 to 20, with 17 abstentions. The Committee vote was requested by the United States and the roll-call by the Ukrainian SSR.

The Secretary-General had recommended that an amount of \$461,300 for this purpose, tentatively included in the proposed United Nations budget for 1982-1983, should be deleted, since current vacancies among ECA translator posts could be filled by successful candidates from previous courses. In a report evaluating the three courses organized since 1978,<sup>(1)</sup> he noted that ECA was considering financing 14 translator posts from extrabudgetary sources, mainly for its Multinational Programming and Operational Centres (p. 631), but that, according to United Nations budget policy, training for extrabudgetary posts should normally be provided from sources other than the regular budget. He recommended that the Assembly approve the resumption of the training programme as soon as extrabudgetary resources had been identified.

In proposing that the budgetary provision be confirmed, the United Republic of Cameroon, supported by Uganda, said the consultations held by officials at United Nations Headquarters with the ECA Executive Secretary had been inadequate. Nigeria asserted that the subregional Centres needed translators. The appropriation was also supported by Egypt and Mauritania.

Belgium, Japan, the United Kingdom (for the European Community members) and the United States took an opposing view, supporting the Secretary-General's recommendation that training for posts in the subregional Centres should be financed from extrabudgetary funds. Brazil, abstaining in the vote in the Committee, opposed the transfer to the regular budget of activities that should be financed outside it.

Report: "S-G, A/C.5/36/17 & Corr.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/235, sect. VI, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 34 52 (12 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section VI

113-25 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) by roll-call vote (62-20-17), 24 November (meeting 52); oral proposal by United Republic of Cameroon; agenda item 100.

Training programme for English and French translators/précis-writers at the Economic Commission for Africa [General Assembly..]

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General,

Decides that the fourth training programme for English and French translators/précis-writers at the Economic Commission for Africa should be pursued and financed from the regular budget of the United Nations for the biennium 1982-1983;

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

#### Expansion of conference facilities

On the recommendation of the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly requested in December 1981 a study of the adequacy of conference facilities at ECA headquarters in Addis Ababa.

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** The request by the Council was contained in a resolution of 24 July,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the First (Economic) Committee, which approved it in similar fashion on 21 July. The draft was sponsored by 15 African nations, introduced by Ethiopia, orally revised by the sponsors and orally amended by the United States.

By this resolution, the Council recalled that the conference facilities at Addis Ababa had been designed to service the limited number of African Member States in the late 1950s and that there were currently 50 African Members. Accordingly, it requested the General Assembly to entrust the Secretary-General, within existing resources, with a study on the adequacy of the facilities to meet the demands resulting from the enlarged membership and increased activities of ECA, and to report to the Assembly in 1982, through ECA and the Council.

The sponsors orally revised their original draft, which would have had the Council recognize the need to expand the facilities, request the Secretary-General to study the requirements and their budgetary implications, and report to the Council in 1982, through ECA. In addition, the sponsors accepted an oral proposal by the United States to insert the phrase "within existing resources" after the proposal for a study. However, they rejected an oral proposal by Canada that the Assembly be asked to "consider authorizing" the Secretary-General to make the study rather than to entrust him with it.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to undertake urgently a study of the adequacy of the conference facilities at ECA headquarters to meet demands resulting from the enlarged membership and increased activities. He was asked to report the findings and his suggestions to the Assembly in 1982, through ECA and the Economic and Social Council.

This resolution was recommended by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 16 November, also without vote. The draft was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on an earlier text by 40 African nations, Bangladesh and Democratic Yemen,<sup>(1)</sup> later withdrawn. The only substantive change was in a preambular paragraph, which in the original version stated that the facilities had proved grossly inadequate and in the final version that the facilities were believed to be inadequate.

Introducing the original draft, Benin observed that the inadequacy of conference facilities had been mentioned by the ECA Executive Secretary in a statement to the Committee. Ethiopia said it had decided to donate the land needed for additional construction. The United States expressed hope that any future expenditure incurred in connection with the study would be offset by savings elsewhere.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, A/C.2/36/L.35.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/65, 24 July, text following; <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/176, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/A/36/714; S-G statements, A/C.2/36/L.44, A/C.5/36/53.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.12, 13, 15, 17 (13-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 35, 36, 40 (24 Sep.-16 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.52(24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV. 103 (17 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/65

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/105) without vote, 21 July (meeting 17); 15-nation draft (E/1981/C.1/L.17), orally revised, and orally amended by United States; agenda item 7.

Sponsors: Algeria, Burundi, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Morocco, Senegal, Sudan, Togo, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire, Zambia.

Expansion of the conference facilities of the Economic Commission for Africa at Addis Ababa

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling that the Economic Commission for Africa was established at Addis Ababa in 1958,

Appreciating the important contribution made by the Commission to the development of Africa over the past two decades,

Recalling that the present conference facilities of the Commission were made available by the Government of Ethiopia.

Further recalling that the conference facilities were designed to service the limited number of African countries that were States Members of the United Nations in the late 1950s,

Noting with satisfaction the increase in the number of independent States of Africa as a result of the process of decolonization,

Noting further that there are at present fifty African States Members of the United Nations and that there is the prospect of others joining the United Nations family,

Recalling the Lagos Plan of Action for the implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its second extraordinary session, held at Lagos on 28 and 29 April 1980,

Mindful of the heavy responsibilities entrusted to the Economic Commission for Africa for the implementation of the Lagos Plan of Action in the decades to come,

Noting that the present conference facilities at the headquarters of the Commission may be insufficient to meet the needs of the large number of African States that have become members of the Commission since its establishment and the growing number of international, intergovernmental and regional organizations participating in conferences,

Requests the General Assembly to entrust the Secretary-General, within existing resources, with a study on the adequacy of conference facilities at the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Africa to meet the demands thereon as a result of its enlarged membership and increased activities and to ask him to report, through the Commission and through the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982, to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

General Assembly resolution 36/176

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.1) without vote, 16 November (meeting 40); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.67), based on informal consultations on 42-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.35); agenda item 69.

#### Expansion of the conference facilities of the Economic Commission for Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/65 of 24 July 1981,

Recalling also that the Economic Commission for Africa was established at Addis Ababa in 1958 and that its conference facilities, which were donated to the United Nations by the Government of Ethiopia, were designed to service the limited number of African countries that were States Members of the United Nations in the late 1950s and early 1960s,

Noting with satisfaction the increase in the number of independent States in Africa as a result of decolonization,

Noting further that there are at present fifty African States Members of the United Nations and that there is the prospect that more will be admitted to membership in the United Nations,

Mindful of the heavy responsibilities entrusted in the present decade to the Economic Commission for Africa as the main centre for the promotion of the economic development of Africa, in general, and for the implementation of the Lagos Plan of Action for the implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, in particular, which the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity adopted at its second extraordinary session, held at Lagos on 28 and 29 April 1980,

Noting that the present conference facilities at the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Africa are believed

to be inadequate in relation to the needs of the large number of African States that have become members of the Commission since its establishment and the growing number of international, intergovernmental and regional organizations participating in conferences there,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to undertake, as a matter of urgency, a study of the adequacy of the conference facilities at the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Africa to meet the demands thereon as a result of the enlarged membership and increased activities of the Commission;

2. Further requests the Secretary-General to report the findings of the study together with his suggestions, through the Economic Commission for Africa at its seventeenth session and the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982, to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

## Asia and the Pacific

The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) held its thirty-seventh session at its headquarters at Bangkok, Thailand, from 10 to 20 March 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> Energy was the main theme for the session, and ESCAP concluded that it should play an active role as the regional focal point for further work in this field (p. 644).

A highlight of the year was the inauguration in August of the Asian and Pacific Development Centre, with headquarters at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia (p. 636). The Regional Co-ordination Centre for Research and Development of Coarse Grains, Pulses, Roots and Tuber Crops was established at Bogor, Indonesia, and began operations in April (p. 645).

Among the five ESCAP committees which met in 1981, the Committee on Development Planning (March) commented on the energy situation and discussed the role of transnational corporations (p. 637). The Committee on Statistics (June) (p. 647) and the Committee on Industry, Technology, Human Settlements and the Environment (September) recommended additional secretariat activities on these topics (p. 641). The Committee on Natural Resources (October/November) endorsed recommendations aimed at ensuring that environmental considerations were taken into account in mineral resources development (p. 643). The Committee on Shipping, and Transport and Communications (November) recommended that the 1980s be proclaimed Transport Decade for Asia and the Pacific, and decided on several activities in regard to rail and road transport and tourism (p. 640).

A \$30.5-million programme of technical co-operation was carried out by ESCAP in 1981, the largest such programme among the United Nations regional commissions (p. 638).

Other areas of ESCAP activity included economic and technical co-operation among

developing countries (p. 637), information systems (p. 637), rural development (p. 638), special measures for the least developed and other developing countries (p. 638), international trade (p. 639), transnational corporations (p. 642), social development (p. 646), population (p. 646), women (p. 646), and youth and aging persons (p. 647).

Guam was admitted during the Commission's session as the ninth associate member of ESCAP, raising its total membership to 44 (p. 648). Vanuatu changed from associate to full member on its admission to the United Nations on 15 September.<sup>(4)</sup>

The ESCAP programme of work and priorities for 1982-1983, and a draft of the ESCAP section of the United Nations medium-term plan for 1984-1989, were endorsed by ESCAP with several changes, following their consideration by the Advisory Committee of Permanent Representatives and Other Representatives Designated by Members of the Commission.<sup>(1)</sup> On 19 March, in one of the nine resolutions adopted at its 1981 session, ESCAP paid tribute to its retiring Executive Secretary, Johan B. P. Maramis,<sup>(3)</sup> who was replaced on 3 May by Shah A. M. S. Kibria of Bangladesh.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee of representatives, E/ESCAP/235; <sup>(2)</sup>ESCAP, E/1981/52.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESCAP, 218(XXXVII), 19 March; <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/1, 15 Sep. (p. 350).

#### Economic and social trends

The contrast between the more rapidly growing economies of east and south-east Asia and the rest of the region, characteristic during the 1970s, had become far less marked in 1979 and 1980, according to a summary of the Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific, 1980<sup>(3)</sup> noted by the Economic and Social Council on 24 July 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> Growth in gross product tended to wind down in those two years. Agricultural output continued to expand and diversify, although the region's non-food crop production fell below the 1979 level. Several non-oil-producing developing economies in the region kept pace with the expansion in world exports-running at an annual rate of 25 per cent in 1979 and over 20 per cent in the first half of 1980-with the largest gains recorded in south-east Asia. However, the growth rates of export volume decelerated in 1980 for both manufactures and primary products.

In its analysis of regional economic trends, the Committee for Development Planning, in the report on its March/April 1981 session,<sup>(2)</sup> noted that Asia was characterized by almost as much diversity as was to be found in the world as a whole. The more than 500 million people who

lived in absolute poverty in Asia- three fourths of them in rural areas-accounted for about 90 per cent of the world's poor. The regional development strategy of ESCAP identified six objectives of development for the 1980s: high growth, fuller employment, distributive equity, fulfilment of basic mass needs, fuller participation in development and self-reliance. In addition to national actions and institutional changes, large capital inflows would be needed. In the context of collective self-reliance, great potential existed for substantially increased interaction between south Asia and the countries in east and west Asia, as well as with Africa.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/187, para. (b), 24 July (p. 609).

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27.

Surveys: <sup>(3)</sup>Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific, 1980 (ST/ESCAP/149), Sales No. E.81.II.F.1 (summary, E/1981/72); 1981 (ST/ESCAP/187), Sales No. E.82.II.F.1.

Publications: Economic Bulletin for Asia and the Pacific, vol. XXXII, No. 1 (ST/ESCAP/164), Sales No. E.81.II.F.18; No. 2 (ST/ESCAP/204), Sales No. E.83.II.F.3.

#### Development policy

##### Asian and Pacific Development Centre

The Asian and Pacific Development Centre (APDC), defined by its Charter as an intergovernmental institution for policy research and training relating to development, was inaugurated on 17 August 1981 at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Its purpose, according to its Charter, was to assist member Governments and other countries of the region, and collaborate with governmental and non-governmental research and training institutions and other public education institutions in the region, in the study, formulation, implementation, management and evaluation of development strategies and policies. It was to do this by conducting and encouraging research and programmes for exchange of experience, facilitating and arranging training, serving as an information clearing-house and providing consultants. The Centre integrated and replaced four regional training and research institutions: the Asian and Pacific Development Institute, the Asian and Pacific Development Administration Centre, the Social Welfare and Development Centre for Asia and the Pacific, and the Asian and Pacific Centre for Women and Development.

The Centre's Charter was approved by ESCAP on 19 March,<sup>(2)</sup> except for three provisions relating to financing and management, on which informal consultations were held during the year with a view to resolving disagreements. The Management Board (second session, Kuala Lumpur, 18 and 19 August) approved a work programme for 1982-1983.<sup>(1)</sup>



The Centre organized a conference on development perspectives in the 1980s (Kuala Lumpur, December). With funds from the United Nations Development Programme, it carried out nine training programmes and three research projects, paying special attention to the training needs of the least developed countries.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>APDC Board, E/ESCAP/272.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESCAP (report, E/1981/52), 215(XXXVII), 19 Mar.

#### Economic and technical co-operation among developing countries

In its resolution of 20 March 1981 on the role of United Nations regional commissions in the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system (p. 607), ESCAP emphasized the need to enhance the commissions' role in promoting economic and technical co-operation among developing countries, and requested the Executive Secretary to assist countries at their request and to consult the secretaries of other regional commissions on co-operative activities.<sup>(2)</sup>

A project for interregional co-operation was formulated in 1981 and, as a first stage towards finalizing it, discussions were held with the secretariat of the Economic Commission for Latin America. Other activities under way included a project on co-operation in the automotive industry among countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), for which a final report was produced, and another to examine possibilities for ASEAN and Pacific economic co-operation, for which studies were initiated on food security, energy and minerals, and primary commodity exports, and a consultant's study on marine and forest resources <sup>(3)</sup> was issued. Published as a third volume in the series on inter-country institutional co-operation among developing Asian countries, Pacific Institutions described more than 165 intergovernmental, non-governmental and national institutions in the Pacific.<sup>(1)</sup>

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>ST/ESCAP/168.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESCAP (report, E/1981/52), 219(XXXVII), para. 9, 20 Mar.

Study: <sup>(3)</sup>DP/EGAPEC/7.

#### Development planning

With a view to establishing an information service on development planning in Asia and the Pacific, ESCAP missions visited nine countries during 1981 to establish focal points and discuss implementation of the project; background studies were undertaken on the issues involved in establishing such a system, and operating procedures were devised. Work continued on the development of an econometric modelling framework for medium- and long-term projections of

economic performance under alternative policy scenarios, and an informal consultation was held to consider choices of computer software and ESCAP country model systems (Osaka, Japan, August/September). An interregional seminar was organized on strategies and measures for enhancing capabilities for development administration in developing countries (Bangkok, December).

The ESCAP Committee on Development planning (third session, Bangkok, 2-6 March) commented on the energy situation in Asia and the Pacific (p. 644) and discussed the role of transnational corporations in the region (p. 643).<sup>(1)</sup>

On 19 March, ESCAP urged Governments to reflect in their policy formulation the goals, objectives and policy measures of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,<sup>(4)</sup> and called for proposals from its secretariat on programmes towards achieving those goals.<sup>(2)</sup> It also requested that its secretariat pay attention to the need for a unified approach to economic and social development and planning, and urged Governments to co-operate in an exchange of national experience in that area.<sup>(3)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ESCAP Committee on Development Planning, E/ESCAP/213.

Resolutions: ESCAP (report, E/1981/52), 19 Mar.: <sup>(2)</sup>212(XXXVII), <sup>(3)</sup>213(XXXVII). <sup>(4)</sup>GA: 35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503).

Publication: Development Strategies for the 1980s in South Asia (ST/ESCAP/154), Sales No. E.81.IIF.16.

#### Development information

The Study Group on the Co-ordination of Government Information Systems (second session, Bangkok, 2-7 February 1981) recommended some specific steps Governments might take in gathering raw data, organizing and using such data for planning, and ensuring the best institutional framework for a government information plan.<sup>(2)</sup> An Intergovernmental Meeting on Government Information Systems and Data Processing (Tokyo, 16-21 December)- the first intergovernmental meeting under the ESCAP information systems programme-recommended that countries give high priority to the management of their information resources at all government levels, suggested guidelines for them to follow and proposed additional activities by the ESCAP secretariat.<sup>(1)</sup>

Two ESCAP regional advisers, on administrative information systems and data processing, financed by France, and on data preparation and processing of censuses and surveys, financed by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, visited 15 countries of the region and made recommendations to the Governments. The ESCAP secretariat installed in March a new

computer system donated by Japan, and established in May an Advisory Board on Information Systems to improve the management of information within the secretariat.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Intergovernmental Meeting on Government Information Systems and Data Processing. E/ESCAP/STAT.5/23; <sup>(2)</sup>Study Group on information systems, ADM/GISDP/7.

#### Rural development

As part of the ESCAP integrated programme on rural development, a Regional Workshop on the Development of Low-income Groups and Improving the Accountability of Public Agencies in Rural Areas (Bangkok, 27-30 October 1981) recommended ways to overcome disadvantages and disabilities faced by the rural poor so that they could improve their living conditions.<sup>(2)</sup> The Workshop examined a secretariat study on this topic, issued in August and based on nine case studies in seven countries.

Officials from 10 countries took part in a Study Tour/Seminar on Integrated Rural Development in China (22 June-4 July) to study that country's rural development experiences and how they might be applied elsewhere.<sup>(1)</sup> Under an inter-country project on training of personnel in rural banking institutions, a regional training workshop (Chainat, Thailand, November) was attended by banking officials and trainers from eight countries concerned with rural credit. The ESCAP rural development programme assisted Maldives to act on a long-term atoll development project and aided the Philippines to formulate an integrated development plan for Pangasinan province.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Study Tour/Seminar on Integrated Rural Development in China. IRD/STCIAC/1; <sup>(2)</sup>Workshop on development of low-income groups in rural areas, IRD/WDLIG/2.

Study: <sup>(3)</sup>IRD/WDLIG/1.

#### Special measures for the least developed and other developing countries

On 19 March 1981, ESCAP urged donor countries and multilateral development institutions to allocate more funds and technical assistance for major structural transformations in the least developed countries (LDCs), with a view to doubling by 1985 the flow of official development assistance to those countries and helping them to develop their energy resources and to secure markets for their exports.<sup>(3)</sup>

As one of a series of regional meetings in preparation for the September 1981 United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (p. 405), ESCAP and the Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA) organized a Ministerial Meeting on LDCs of the ESCAP and ECWA Regions (Bangkok, 10 and 11 August),<sup>(1)</sup> preceded by a Meeting of Senior Officials.

In June 1981, an evaluation mission was sent to the least developed land-locked and transit countries of the region to formulate measures for the next phase, 1982-1984, of an assistance project to those countries financed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The Special Body on Land-locked Countries (sixth session, Bangkok, 28 July-1 August) examined particular problems faced by the land-locked countries of the region and discussed ways in which the United Nations system could help them.<sup>(2)</sup> A workshop on special measures in favour of least developed land-locked countries (Bangkok, July), organized by ESCAP, UNDP and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), assessed activities by the UNCTAD and ESCAP secretariats and discussed subjects relating to the transit trade of those countries.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Ministerial Meeting on LDCs, 12 (TRADE/MLDC/1); <sup>(2)</sup>Special Body on Land-locked Countries. E/ESCAP/256.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ESCAP (report, E/1981/52), 214(XXXVII), 19 Mar.

#### Technical co-operation

The total value of the regional technical co-operation programmes administered by ESCAP grew in 1981 to \$30.5 million. Some \$21 million of this amount came from extrabudgetary contributions by countries and organizations, including contributions for regional training and research institutions and the Interim Committee for Co-ordination of Investigations of the Lower Mekong Basin (p. 644). UNDP provided \$5.2 million.

Thirteen regional advisers and experts undertook 43 missions providing technical and advisory services to the developing countries of the region, devoting primary attention to the needs of the least developed, land-locked and developing island countries. The United Nations Development Advisory Team for the South Pacific, financed mainly by ESCAP donor countries and UNDP and partly by the United Nations regular programme of technical co-operation, enlarged its programme of short-term consultancies and arranged 37 outside consultancy projects.

Regional projects financed by UNDP dealt with manpower training and development, agricultural machinery, industrial development, trade, natural resources, energy, public administration, finance, remote sensing, statistics, maritime transport, and assistance to the Asian and Pacific Development Centre (p. 636). The United Nations Fund for Population Activities provided institutional support and information services to the ESCAP secretariat, and financed advisory services (p. 646).

## International trade and finance

With a view to updating the 1975 Bangkok Agreement (First Agreement on Trade Negotiations among Developing Member Countries of ESCAP),<sup>(4)</sup> the Standing Committee of the Agreement (Bangkok: tenth session, May; eleventh session, December) finalized the modalities and guidelines for the second round of negotiations among members of the Agreement with a view to expanding its membership and enlarging the list of products enjoying preferential treatment, and decided that the second round would be held in 1982.

In the area of trade promotion, regional seminars combined with study tours focused on the two largest centrally planned economies, examining the foreign trade of the USSR (Moscow and Leningrad, September) and trade promotion techniques and institutions in China (Beijing, Tianjin, Nanjing and Guangzhou, October/November). Consultants or trainers on trade promotion were sent to six developing countries in the region. ESCAP drafted the Articles of Association and a technical co-operation project for the new Handicraft Promotion and Development Association, an institution of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN).

Several national and regional seminars on technical aspects of trade and market information were organized, including a workshop on trade information services for participants from the least developed countries of the region (Kathmandu, Nepal, December). The ESCAP Trade Information Service began in July the issuance of quarterly information on prices of selected products in Asia and the Pacific.<sup>(1)</sup>

ESCAP and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development organized seminars on the generalized system of preferences for exports of developing countries (Bangkok, January) and on anti-fraud and anti-smuggling measures (Bangkok, 22-27 April); the latter adopted a set of arrangements for mutual administrative assistance and co-operation among customs administrations.<sup>(3)</sup> A workshop was held for trainers in export and import techniques for ASEAN countries, organized by ESCAP with the co-operation of the Canadian International Development Agency and the Foundation for International Training for Third World Countries (Bangkok, March/April).

Seminars were also held on facilitation measures for movement of goods in international trade (Bangkok, 19-25 November) and on long-term contracts (Bangkok, 9-11 December). The recommendations of the seminar on facilitation were endorsed in November by the ESCAP Committee on Shipping, and Transport and Communications (p. 640), which recommended the

convening of similar seminars in the future, particularly at the country level. A Regional Consultation on consumer protection (Bangkok, 2-8 June)<sup>(2)</sup> made recommendations for action in this area (p 557) . .

Four bodies of the ESCAP Trade Co-operation Group were active during the year. The Subgroup for Monetary and Credit Co-operation (second session, Bangkok, 2-3 November) recommended action to enlarge the membership of the Asian Clearing Union and the Asian Reinsurance Corporation, and sought Governments' views on the idea of setting up refinancing facilities for deferred-payment exports by developing countries on soft terms. The Subgroup for Long-term Contracts (fourth session, Bangkok, 4-5 November) suggested that the secretariat prepare guidelines, and possibly standard clauses, to help persons negotiating such contracts. The Subgroup for Encouragement and Liberalization of Trade within the Region (third session, Bangkok, 6-9 November) recommended further work by the secretariat to establish or update lists of trade barriers. A fourth Subgroup dealt with commodities (see below).

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Prices Of Selected Asia/Pacific Products (quarterly).

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Regional Consultation on consumer protection, TRADE/RCCP/8 (extract, E/1981/C.3/L.2): <sup>(3)</sup>Seminar on Anti-fraud and Anti-smuggling Measures, TRADE/AFASM/4.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1975, p. 527.

## Commodities

An Intergovernmental Working Group Meeting of Tapioca Producing/Exporting Countries (Bangkok, 2-4 September 1981) approved a programme of co-operative activities recommended in an ESCAP study and requested the secretariat to convene an intergovernmental consultative committee of tapioca-producing countries of the ESCAP region as soon as at least three Governments confirmed their willingness to participate.<sup>(1)</sup> An Intergovernmental Meeting of Tropical Timber-producing Countries (Bangkok, June) agreed that, subject to government concurrence, a regional co-operative arrangement should be established to seek price stability and effective marketing arrangements for wood and wood products, and optimum utilization and development of timber. Co-operative activities-including studies, meetings and technical assistance -were agreed upon by a Government Consultation among Jute-producing Countries (Bangkok, 18-21 August).

The Subgroup for Commodities (fourth session, Bali, Indonesia, 21-24 September) of the ESCAP Trade Co-operation Group supported the work towards regional co-operative arrangements for jute, tapioca and tropical timber;

authorized meetings in 1982 on arrangements for shrimp and other marine products and for silk; and recommended measures to assist existing associations for coconuts, natural rubber and pepper.

ESCAP co-operated with the International Pepper Community (IPC) in organizing two meetings of specialists, on a socio-economic study on production and productivity of pepper holdings in IPC member countries (second session, Jakarta, Indonesia, April) and on determination of remunerative price levels of pepper products (second session, Jakarta, August).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Meeting of Tapioca Producing/Exporting Countries, TRADE/TCG/TPEC/2.

#### Transport and tourism

The Transport, Communications and Tourism Wing of the ESCAP Committee on Shipping, and Transport and Communications (fifth session, Bangkok, 24-30 November 1981) proposed that the Third United Nations Development Decade (the 1980s) be proclaimed "Transport Decade for Asia and the Pacific". It also made recommendations on the facilitation of international trade (p. 639), railway and road transport (see below), and tourism (p. 641). <sup>(1)</sup>

A regional transportation course was organized (Dacca, Bangladesh, February-April) to improve the skills of senior officers responsible for planning, appraising and supervising the execution and operation of national transport projects. A workshop on research towards a methodology for defining the transport needs of isolated communities (Bangkok, June) developed a simple methodology based on research and emphasizing people's participation.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ESCAP Committee on Shipping, and Transport and Communications, E/ESCAP/263 & Corr.1.

#### Railway transport

Missions of railway experts were sent by the ESCAP secretariat in 1981 to examine modernization of signalling and telecommunication in Malaysia and Thailand; missions also proposed upgrading of the Pakistan Regional Railway Training Centre and other needs in Bangladesh, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Singapore. A seminar and study tour to China on new railway construction, including tunnelling, bridging and operations (18 May-7 June), enabled railway engineers of the region to acquaint themselves with the technology in use on Chinese railways. <sup>(2)</sup> The secretariat initiated a programme of roving training courses for railway personnel with a course on signalling and telecommunication in the State Railway of Thailand and Bangladesh Railways (September).

A Working Group of Experts to Study the Es-

tablishment of an Asian Railway Union (Bangkok, 20-27 April) heard views favouring and opposing such a union, and recommended that the ESCAP secretariat set up a project or unit to promote co-operation among the region's railways. <sup>(3)</sup> This recommendation was endorsed in November by the Committee on Shipping, and Transport and Communications, which also requested the secretariat to convene as soon as possible a meeting of railway ministers. In addition, the Committee asked the secretariat to pursue recommendations made by the Conference of Top Railway Executives of Asia and the Middle East (sixth session, New Delhi, India, 14-23 October), <sup>(1)</sup> including the possible establishment of a regional management development institute for railway personnel.

The secretariat issued in October its first review of the region's railways. <sup>(4)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference of railway executives, E/ESCAP/STC.5/36; <sup>(2)</sup>Seminar on railway construction. E/ESCAP/STC.5/4; <sup>(3)</sup>Working Group on an Asian railway union, E/ESCAP/STC.5/6.

Review: <sup>(4)</sup>E/ESCAP/STC.5/13.

#### Road transport

An Intergovernmental Meeting of Highway Experts (Bangkok, 3-9 February 1981) made recommendations relating to energy-saving measures in transport, the economic advantages of road maintenance, environmental aspects of roads and road transport, rural road planning and construction, and the organization of seminars, study tours and training programmes. <sup>(1)</sup> Its recommendations that the ESCAP secretariat begin preparing for a meeting of road transport ministers and that the Meeting of Highway Experts be reconvened every two years were endorsed in November by the Committee on Shipping, and Transport and Communications.

A regional consultative meeting (Bangkok, June) finalized two manuals drafted by the ESCAP secretariat on rural road construction and maintenance.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Intergovernmental Meeting of Highway Experts, E/ESCAP/STC.5/26.

#### Water transport

Under its shippers' co-operation project, the ESCAP secretariat organized regional workshops in 1981 on cargo consolidation (Calcutta, India, January), calculation of ocean costs (Madras, India, January), and the economic, operational and legal implications for shippers of containerization and unit loads (Bangkok, October); and country-level workshops on planning of shipping services (Jakarta, Indonesia, May/June) and economic and operational decision-making (Shanghai, China, October). Another workshop, for shipowners (Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia,

December), discussed the implementation of the 1974 United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences.<sup>(3)</sup>

Meetings were convened at Bangkok for chief executives of national shippers' organizations (fifth session, 1-2 December), port authorities (second session, 1-2 December), customs authorities (first session, 2 December) and national shipowners' associations (fourth session, 2 December). A joint meeting of all four groups (first session, Bangkok, 3 December) requested the ESCAP secretariat to continue assisting countries in simplifying procedures and documentation for cargo movements and to develop the concept of joint planning of shipping services, and decided to create joint study groups of shippers and shipowners to deal with two topics: shippers' contracts, and the economic implications of currency adjustment and bunker adjustment factors in charges for shipping services.

A meeting of legal experts on a model maritime code for the ESCAP region (first session, Bangkok, May) decided that guidelines should be prepared for the drafting of a code and laid down the scope, technique and procedure for their preparation.

A seminar on coastal (domestic) shipping (Bangkok, 19-22 May) requested the ESCAP secretariat to organize a follow-up seminar and study tour on coastal shipping in Japan. A Seminar/Study Tour on Inland Ports and Waterways (China, 30 August-17 September) recommended that studies be conducted and meetings organized on various inland water transport topics, particularly ferro-cement technology, towing methods and aids to navigation systems. A Seminar on Port Containerization (Tianjin, China, 6-14 October) was aimed at assisting China to overcome problems by upgrading management personnel.<sup>(1)</sup>

A mission to survey seafarers' training facilities visited China early in 1981. A study of the factory ship concept in Papua New Guinea, as a possible supplement to conventional crushing of copra in the South Pacific, commenced in November.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Seminar on Port Containerization, E/ESCAP/STC.6/19; <sup>(2)</sup>Seminar/Study Tour on Inland Ports and Waterways, SPIW/STIPW/12.  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1974, p. 460.

#### Tourism

In November 1981, the Committee on Shipping, and Transport and Communications, emphasizing that the secretariat should increase its assistance to ESCAP countries in tourism development, asked it to focus more attention on domestic tourism, carry on training of personnel and help countries develop a special mechanism for promoting international rail travel.

The ESCAP secretariat co-operated with the Tourism Authority of Thailand and the Automobile Association of Singapore in organizing the Asian Highway Auto Venture, 1981, between Singapore and Bangkok. The aim was to promote international road transport through the Asian Highway, the use of ESCAP Asian Highway guidemaps, facilitation of frontier formalities and the development of international tourism. A study was issued on the impacts of tourism on the social and physical environment, analysing regional peculiarities and recommending ways of minimizing the undesirable effects of tourism.<sup>(1)</sup>

Study: <sup>(1)</sup>E/ESCAP/STC.5/31.

Industry, technology,  
human settlements and environment

The ESCAP Committee on Industry, Technology, Human Settlements and the Environment (fifth session, Bangkok, 1-7 September 1981) reviewed ESCAP activities in each of these areas and recommended some new directions.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ESCAP Committee on Industry, Technology, Human Settlements and Environment, E/ESCAP/240.

#### Industrial development

The Ad Hoc Group of Ministers of Industry (second meeting, Bangkok, July 1981) proposed a programme of ESCAP secretariat activities and drew attention to the need to strengthen national manufacturing capabilities.<sup>(2)</sup> In September, the Committee on Industry, Technology, Human Settlements and the Environment recommended that the secretariat try to have the programme implemented.

A Regional Consultative Forum on the Vegetable Oils and Fats Industry (first session, Jakarta, Indonesia, 23-27 March), organized by ESCAP and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), made proposals for integrated development schemes with the participation of smallholders, dissemination of information on such schemes, and assistance to the least developed countries through a survey on better utilization of existing oil-seeds and non-traditional oil-bearing materials.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Technical Advisory Committee of the Regional Network for Agricultural Machinery (fifth session, Los Baños, Philippines, July; sixth session, Manila, Philippines, November) approved a 1982-1984 work programme for the Network, including: establishment and strengthening of national networks; strengthening design capabilities; testing, evaluation and modification of prototypes; promotion of local manufacturing; popularization of improved implements and machinery; and information dissemination. The Network's Governing Body

(fourth session, Manila, November) approved this programme and the accompanying budget, and endorsed the Committee's recommendation that donor countries should substantially increase their contributions and that potential new donors should be approached. Among the Network's continuing activities was the testing, evaluation and modification of a Chinese reaper and the International Rice Research Institute's manual rice transplanter.

A seminar on the development of project generation capabilities and consultancy services (Jakarta, November) made recommendations for the strengthening of national manufacturing capabilities and endorsed an ESCAP/UNIDO proposal for a regional industrial consultancy network. A seminar on development of the electronics industry in Thailand and in ESCAP countries urged the Commission to take the lead in increasing technical co-operation among developing countries in this area through workshops, visit programmes, fellowships and training courses. An industrial survey of the South Pacific was launched by ESCAP, the Asian Development Bank and the South Pacific Bureau for Economic Co-operation.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Forum on Vegetable Oils and Fats Industry, IHT/RCFVOF/1/1; <sup>(2)</sup>Group of Ministers of Industry, E/ESCAP/IHT.5/8.

#### Science and technology

National seminars on patent information (Bangkok and Chiang Mai, Thailand, January 1981) were organized by the World Intellectual Property Organization, ESCAP and its Regional Centre for Technology Transfer. In September, the Committee on Industry, Technology, Human Settlements and the Environment recommended that the Centre concentrate on the evaluation, acquisition and absorption of foreign technologies and development of indigenous technologies, and provide advisory services to help countries set up institutions for technology development and to improve their technological capability, including their contract negotiating capacity.

A meeting of senior officials (Bangkok, February)<sup>(1)</sup> preparatory to an ESCAP meeting of ministers of science and technology suggested that a regional task force of representatives of United Nations bodies be established to assist in preparations for the high-level meeting. However, no decision on dates was taken by ESCAP in 1981.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Meeting preparatory to meeting of ministers of science and technology, IHT/PRE-MMST/1.

#### Environment

The ESCAP secretariat, in co-operation with the South Pacific Bureau for Economic Co-

operation, completed in 1981 a comparative study of environmental legislation in the South Pacific. With assistance from France, a study tour was conducted on remote sensing for monitoring the marine environment, and missions on the subject were sent to Bangladesh, Malaysia, Pakistan, Singapore and Thailand. A Working Group Meeting on Environmental Management in Mineral Resources Development took place under the natural resources programme (p. 643).

A regional technical workshop (Jodhpur, India, 20-23 October) to consider the implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, adopted in 1977 by the United Nations Conference on Desertification,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended research, monitoring, training, and information collection and dissemination to speed progress towards the goals set by the Plan.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(1)</sup>1977, p. 509.

#### Human settlements

In September 1981, the Committee on Industry, Technology, Human Settlements and the Environment recommended that the ESCAP secretariat should be involved with the preparation of a feasibility report on the establishment of an Asian human settlements bank, under study by the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (p. 856).

A roving seminar on rural centre planning in Asia and the Pacific visited China, Fiji and the Republic of Korea (August/September). An expert group meeting (Bangkok, November) reviewed a draft outline prepared by the ESCAP secretariat for use by national officials as a framework in the preparation of country monographs for a survey of the human settlements situation in the region.

#### Transnational corporations

An Expert Group Meeting on Transnational Corporations (TNCs) in Primary Commodity Export Industries (Pattaya, Thailand, 19-21 February 1981) examined studies on tea in Bangladesh, copper in south-east Asia, forestry in Indonesia and bananas in the Philippines, as part of an interregional project with the United Nations commissions for Africa and Latin America.<sup>(1)</sup> The second phase of this programme began with the preparation of further case studies by the Joint Unit of ESCAP and the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations (p. 603).

Also organized, during the year with the Joint Unit's participation were a round-table meeting on information and technical co-operation needs on matters relating to TNCs (Bangkok, May), and workshops on negotiations with TNCs (Singapore, October) and on regulating and negotiating with

TNCs in the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (Bangkok, November).

The ESCAP Committee on Development Planning (p. 637) reviewed the Joint Unit's work programme in March and stressed the importance of helping to increase the negotiating capacity of developing countries on whose territory TNCs operated.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Expert Group Meeting on TNCs in Primary Commodity Export Industries, CTD/ESCAP/PCEI/15.

#### Natural resources

The ESCAP Committee on Natural Resources (eighth session, Bangkok, 27 October-2 November 1981) made a number of recommendations on mineral (see below) and energy resources (p. 645).<sup>(1)</sup>

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Proceedings of the Committee on Natural Resources, Eighth Session, and Of the Regional Expert Group Meeting on the Follow-up of the Nairobi Programme of Action- on New and 'Renewable Sources Of Energy (ST/ESCAP/219), Sales No. E.83.II.F.8.

Other publication: Proceedings Of the Seventh Session Of the Committee on Natural Resources (ST/ESCAP/SER.F/59), Sales No. E.81.II.F.10.

#### Mineral resources

At two 1981 meetings on co-ordination in ESCAP mineral programmes (Bangkok: eighth session, March; ninth session, October), current and future secretariat programmes and related regional projects were considered, and activities of mutual interest were defined.

A map of the sedimentary basins of the ESCAP region, on the scale of 1: 10,000,000, was completed and published in 1981. Work proceeded on an oil and natural gas map (p. 645).

The Working Group Meeting on Environmental Management in Mineral Resources Development (Phuket, Thailand, 14-19 June) recommended national action and increased ESCAP activities to ensure that environmental considerations were taken into account in exploration, mining, processing, smelting and conversion into final products.<sup>(1)</sup> Its recommendations for international action were endorsed by the ESCAP Committee on Natural Resources in November.

After observing newly developed methods and techniques for mineral resources exploration, participants in a Seminar/Study Tour on Drilling, Sampling and Borehole Logging (Donetsk, USSR, 16-26 September) recommended that further seminars be held on prospecting, exploration and evaluation of mineral ore, oil and natural gas deposits.<sup>(5)</sup> The recommendations on topics for future seminars were endorsed in November by the Committee on Natural Resources. The Committee also suggested that the secretariat establish a clearing-house

for information on energy planning, pricing, demand management and modelling.

The Committee for Co-ordination of Joint Prospecting for Mineral Resources in Asian Offshore Areas (CCOP) (eighteenth session, Seoul, Republic of Korea, 21 September-2 October) reviewed activities carried out under its auspices in the fields of petroleum resources, tin and other heavy detrital minerals, Quaternary geology, geological maps, the marine environment, training of personnel and publications.<sup>(2)</sup> The CCOP Technical Advisory Group (seventeenth session) and Northwest Quadrant Panel of the Circum-Pacific Map Project (seventh meeting) also met during the CCOP session.

The Committee for Co-ordination of Joint Prospecting for Mineral Resources in South Pacific Offshore Areas (CCOP/SOPAC) (tenth session, Port Vila, Vanuatu, 6-13 October) approved a 1981-1982 work programme, including offshore cruises and other prospecting projects in the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu, and decided to establish a working group to foster and implement research on science, tectonics and resources.

The Regional Mineral Resources Development Centre expanded its activities, sending advisory missions, issuing technical reports, and organizing a workshop on geoscience information with emphasis on practical applications (Bandung, Indonesia, May) and a symposium on tungsten geology (jiangxi Province, China, October). Field-work began in May on an experimental geochemical programme in Indonesia, involving the collection and analysis of samples. These activities were reviewed by the Centre's Governing Council (fourth session, Bandung, 12-16 November).<sup>(4)</sup>

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Proceedings Of the Working Group Meeting on Environmental Management in Mineral Resources Development (ST/ESCAP/186), Sales No. E.82.II.F.9.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>CCOP, E/ESCAP/276; <sup>(3)</sup>CCOP/SOPAC, E/ESCAP/277; <sup>(4)</sup>Regional Mineral Resources Development Centre Council, E/ESCAP/278; <sup>(5)</sup>Seminar/Study Tour on Drilling, Sampling and Borehole Logging, E/ESCAP/NR.8/24 & Corr.1.

#### Water resources

After reviewing case studies by the ESCAP secretariat of irrigation projects in Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand,<sup>(3)</sup> an Expert Group Meeting on Measures to Improve the Performance of Irrigation Projects (Bangkok, 26 May-2 June 1981) made recommendations on engineering, management, agricultural, socio-economic and institutional factors affecting the efficiency of irrigation projects.<sup>(1)</sup> Participants in a Group Study Visit to China on Methods of Watershed Management for Flood Loss

Prevention and Management (September) recommended measures which Governments could take in this area.<sup>(2)</sup> A roving seminar on ground-water development and management (Philippines, Republic of Korea and Thailand, July/August) trained some 90 specialists in field practices and analytical techniques.

An inter-agency task force on water for Asia and the Pacific (Bangkok: seventh session, June; eighth session, November) considered likely areas for co-operation among its members on water resources development.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Expert Group Meeting on irrigation, E/ESCAP/NR.8/6; <sup>(2)</sup>Group Study Visit on watershed management for flood loss prevention, E/ESCAP/NR.8/23.

Study: <sup>(3)</sup>NR/MIPIP/2.

Publication: *Water Resources Journal*, ST/ESCAP/SER.C/127 & 128.

#### Mekong river basin development

The Interim Committee for Co-ordination of Investigations of the Lower Mekong Basin (tenth session, Bangkok, 13-18 January; eleventh session, Bangkok, 10-21 March; twelfth session, Vientiane, Lao People's Democratic Republic, 9-13 September) adopted a 1981 work programme listing 107 activities to be carried out by the Mekong secretariat, funded largely by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

Pre-investment work done during the year under the Committee's auspices, as described in its annual report,<sup>(1)</sup> included: completion of the third phase of studies on the Nam Pong environmental management research project (Thailand) and formulation of a simulation model for the Nam Pong system; updating of cost estimates for the Pa Mong dam project (Lao People's Democratic Republic-Thailand), together with a review of previous ideas regarding ownership, management and financing; and conduct of additional studies of hydropower potential at Khone Falls (Lao People's Democratic Republic-Kampuchea) and Stung Treng (Kampuchea). Investment work in 1981 included the installation of electric pumps for the Mekong pump irrigation project, where 19 pumps were in operation during the 1980/1981 dry season; and the start of operations on a flood-protection and swamp-reclamation project on the Vientiane Plain, where a swamp-reclamation study was also initiated.

Additional contributions (including pledges) for projects in the Committee's work programme totalled \$47 million in 1981, raising to \$475 million the total resources contributed to the programme from its inception to 31 December 1981.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Mekong basin, E/ESCAP/275.

#### Tropical storms

The Panel on Tropical Cyclones (Colombo, Sri Lanka, February 1981), convened by ESCAP and the World Meteorological Organization, decided to implement in 1982 a regional cyclone operational plan, starting with the issuance of tropical cyclone weather statements and warnings by the Regional Meteorological Centre at New Delhi, India, and improved information exchange between the Centre and national meteorological services.

A pre-experimental phase of the Typhoon Operational Experiment, involving the first attempt to conduct an operational experiment on a tropical cyclone in real time, was carried out from 29 July to 18 August. The Typhoon Committee (fourteenth session, Manila, Philippines, 10-16 November) discussed plans for the main experiment, to be held in 1982 with support from UNDP and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Typhoon Committee, E/ESCAP/242.

#### Energy

An ESCAP secretariat study on short-term policy aspects of the energy situation,<sup>(5)</sup> issued in February 1981, concluded that the developing countries of Asia and the Pacific would have to design their development strategies for the short-to-medium term on the premise that their dependence on petroleum products for the bulk of their commercial energy needs would not significantly decline. Accordingly, faced with prospects of steadily increasing oil prices, they would have to adopt policies ensuring the most efficient use of energy, as well as accelerate the development of indigenous energy sources and substitutes for imported petroleum.

A draft of the study was examined by a High-level Expert Group Meeting on Short-term Economic Policy Aspects of the Energy Situation in the ESCAP Region (Bangkok, 16 and 17 January), which identified major issues requiring further attention and suggested areas for follow-up work.<sup>(3)</sup> The completed study was discussed in March by the ESCAP Committee on Development Planning (p. 637), which stressed the need for rapid development of the region's indigenous energy sources so as to reduce dependence on imported energy supplies.

Energy was the main theme for the March session of ESCAP, which endorsed the recommendations for greater energy efficiency and substitution, and concluded that the energy transition would necessitate substantial investments, beyond the capacity of the region's developing countries. Accordingly, ESCAP stated in its report,<sup>(2)</sup> much larger capital flows and technical



assistance would be needed. ESCAP should serve as the regional focal point for work on energy, promoting and co-ordinating new initiatives, collecting and analysing data, conducting research and selectively providing technical assistance, particularly to smaller countries. In November, the Committee on Natural Resources suggested that the secretariat establish a clearing-house for information on energy planning, pricing, demand management and modelling.

With regard to specific fuels, an Expert Group Meeting on Fuelwood and Charcoal (Bangkok, 5-11 May), organized by ESCAP, UNEP and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), made 35 recommendations for checking the accelerated diminution of fuelwood supplies.<sup>(1)</sup> The Expert Working Group Meeting on the Third Edition of the Oil and Natural Gas Map of Asia (Bangkok, 12-14 May)<sup>(4)</sup> revised the map's legend, which was thereafter sent to countries with a request to start preparing their sections.

During the year, the ESCAP secretariat defined a number of new projects and helped finalize project documents of the regional and Pacific energy development programmes aided by UNDP. Features of the preparatory assistance phase of the Pacific programme included strong local involvement through the South Pacific Bureau for Economic Co-operation, financing of capital equipment by the European Economic Community, and UNDP financing of technical, managerial and energy planning components.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Proceedings Of the ESCAP/FAO/UNEP Expert Group Meeting on Fuelwood and charcoal (ST/ESCAP/190), Sales No. E.82.IIF.10.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ESCAP, E/1981/52; <sup>(3)</sup>Meeting on energy, E/ESCAP/DP.3/8; <sup>(4)</sup>Meeting on oil and natural gas map of Asia, E/ESCAP/NR.8/2 & Corr.1.

Study: <sup>(5)</sup>E/ESCAP/212 & Corr.1.

#### Food and agriculture

The Regional Co-ordination Centre for Research and Development of Coarse Grains, Pulses, Roots and Tuber Crops (CGPRT) was established at Bogor, Indonesia, and began to operate with effect from 29 April 1981, initially at ESCAP headquarters. A work programme for the Centre was endorsed by an Expert Group Meeting on CGPRT (Bangkok, 6-9 October), which recommended more emphasis on research aimed at strengthening national capabilities.<sup>(3)</sup> A Seminar on the Development of CGPRT (Krasnodar, USSR, 29 July-11 August) examined the advanced technology of cultivation, harvesting, marketing and processing of these crops, and made several recommendations, including one for the establishment of an ESCAP gene bank to provide germplasm to breeders.<sup>(4)</sup>

Local-level planning of agricultural development was the subject of a national workshop in Nepal (Kathmandu, February), the last of five on this topic in different countries of the region. Study tours were held to plan small-farmer pilot development projects for Thailand (April) and to observe farmers' group marketing in China (November). Small-farmer group marketing in Asia was examined at a regional round-up workshop (Bangkok, November). Under the agricultural information development scheme, financially supported by Japan, experts were sent to help Bangladesh, the Philippines and Solomon Islands to organize workshops for farm radio-programme producers.

In March, ESCAP endorsed a report by an Ad Hoc Advisory Group Meeting on a Special Study on Food Supply in the ESCAP Region (Bangkok, January) which recommended major policy areas for coverage in the study, to be completed in 1982.

As part of the Agricultural Requisites Scheme for Asia and the Pacific (ARSAP), funded and technically supported by the Netherlands, the fourth in a series of training workshops for instructors of agro-pesticides retailers (Dacca, Bangladesh, 5-17 February) produced teaching materials in local languages. The ARSAP/2 Agro-pesticides Regional Consultative and Evaluation Meeting (Bangkok, 30 November-3 December) recommended continuation of the training programme on safety and efficiency in the use of pesticides by farmers, as well as continued collection and analysis of data by the secretariat.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Fertilizer Advisory, Development and Information Network for Asia and the Pacific (FADINAP)-a joint project of ESCAP, FAO and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization- continued disseminating information through periodicals, and organized study tours to Malaysia to observe the operation of small-scale fertilizer mixing plants (June), to the Republic of Korea to observe the role of co-operatives in fertilizer promotion (September) and to the Philippines on the role of dealers in fertilizer promotion (September). A symposium on fertilizer marketing and adoption in South Asia (Bangkok, June), organized by ESCAP and the East-West Centre, was followed by a regional training course on fertilizer marketing (Bangkok, October). The FADINAP Technical Liaison Officers' Consultative Meeting (Bangkok, 31 August-2 September) discussed arrangements for the Network's activities.<sup>(2)</sup>

The role of women in food production was discussed at two meetings: a survey planning meeting on improving the socio-economic conditions of women in fisheries (Manila, Philippines, 22-25 September) and a workshop on women's

participation in paddy production and processing (Kota Bahru, Malaysia, 21-28 October).

The Regional Network for Agricultural Machinery, established under ESCAP auspices, continued its activities (p. 641).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ARSAP Meeting, E/ESCAP/AD.4/15; <sup>(2)</sup>FADINAP Meeting, AD/TLOCM/1; <sup>(3)</sup>Meeting on CGPRT, E/ESCAP/AD.4/6; <sup>(4)</sup>Seminar on CGPRT, AD/SG/CGPRT/1.

Publications: Agricultural Information Development Bulletin, vol. 3, Nos. 1-3; News in Brief Agro-chemicals, Fertilizers and Agro-pesticides, vol. 4, Nos. 1-3 & special (June) issue (quarterly).

#### Social development

A workshop on legal approaches to social problems of low-income urban groups (Bangkok, February 1981) developed a conceptual framework for dealing with problems of the poor. Two subsequent workshops examined that framework in terms of people's participation in relation to law and social change (Penang, Malaysia, June; Baguio, Philippines, November).

On 19 March, ESCAP requested its secretariat to continue work on the role of the co-operative movement in the social and economic development of Asian and Pacific developing countries, taking full account of the need to assist efforts to promote co-operatives, especially in rural areas.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Inter-agency Meeting on Social Development (thirteenth session, Bangkok, 21 May) considered ways of improving collaboration among organizations of the United Nations system in matters concerning youth (p. 647) and women (see below) in the ESCAP region.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Inter-agency Meeting, SD/RIMSD/2.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESCAP (report, E/1981/52), 216(XXXVII), 19 Mar.

Publication: Social Development Newsletter (3 issues yearly).

#### Population

An ESCAP regional seminar on evaluation of schemes and strategies for integrated family planning programmes with special reference to increased involvement of local institutions (Bangkok, June 1981) made recommendations on conceptual issues, strategies, policy and evaluation. A study on the impact of family planning programmes on fertility was completed in Indonesia and Sri Lanka, and major findings of the various country studies on this topic were disseminated to Governments.

The ESCAP secretariat, in collaboration with the South Pacific Commission (SPC), convened a seminar on population problems of small island countries of the ESCAP/SPC region, which made recommendations on collection and analysis of demographic data and country and intercountry studies.

Country reports and manuals were completed or under preparation as part of a continuing com-

parative study on migration, urbanization and development. A technical working group on migration and urbanization (Bangkok, December) discussed methods and techniques for analysing survey data. Another working group considered data bases for measurement of levels, trends and differentials in mortality (Bangkok, October).

The United Nations Fund for Population Activities continued to finance ESCAP regional advisory services, training of personnel and other activities in demography and population statistics, as well as studies and monographs. It funded 15 fellowships awarded by the ESCAP secretariat for training at the International Institute for Population Studies, Bombay, India.

The Preparatory Committee for the Third Asian and Pacific Population Conference (second session, Bangkok, August) agreed on the purposes of the 1982 Conference.

Publications: ADOPT (Asian and world-wide documents on population topics), vol. 3, Nos. 1-12 (monthly); Asian-Pacific Population Programme News, vol. 10, Nos. 1/2, 3 & special (1980/1981) issue.

#### Human resources

On 19 March 1981, ESCAP requested its Executive Secretary, while intensifying activities for the training of national personnel, to pay special attention to the Commission's priority areas and the needs of developing countries; it recommended that the Asian and Pacific Development Centre (p. 636) provide for intensified training of personnel, particularly from the least developed, land-locked and island developing countries.<sup>(1)</sup>

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESCAP (report, E/1981/52), 217(XXXVII), 19 Mar.

#### Women

An Ad Hoc Inter-agency Meeting on Women in Development (Bangkok, February 1981) identified areas for joint action and mechanisms for effecting co-operation.<sup>(1)</sup> In order to strengthen its activities for promoting the integration of women in development, ESCAP asked its Executive Secretary on 19 March 1981 to request a transfer to the ESCAP secretariat by 1982 of a senior post from within the United Nations regular budget, to redeploy such a post within the secretariat pending approval of that request, and to seek additional resources, such as extrabudgetary funding, for programmes and projects in this field.<sup>(2)</sup>

ESCAP joined with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in organizing a workshop of national co-ordinators for promotion and training of rural women in income-generating activities (Suva, Fiji, 30 March-4 April), and with the International

Council on Social Welfare in a training workshop on management of economic activities of women (Bombay, India, September). Two national workshops were held in October on the promotion of income-generating activities for rural women (Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea; Port Vila, Vanuatu). Other meetings dealt with women's role in food production (p. 645).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Inter-agency Meeting on Women in Development, SD/IMWD/4.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESCAP (report, E/1981/52), 211(XXXVII), 19 Mar.

#### Youth and aging persons

##### Youth

Activities by ESCAP in 1981 to promote the role of youth in development included a national leadership training workshop for youth leaders and workers in Bangladesh (January/February), a workshop on youth and social development in Asia (Hong Kong, August/September), and a seminar and training workshop on policies and programmes for mobilization of youth in national development in the Pacific (Suva, November). The Suva meeting evaluated national youth policies and suggested mechanisms for maximizing youth development efforts. The first edition of the Youth Development Newsletter was published in August.

##### Aging persons

The Regional Intergovernmental Preparatory Meeting for the World Assembly on Aging (Manila, Philippines, October 1981)<sup>(1)</sup> adopted a regional programme of action on aging, to serve as the basis for ESCAP activities and as the region's input into the global plan of action to be adopted at the 1982 Assembly (p. 1024). The draft programme was considered by a Technical Meeting on Aging for the Asian and Pacific Region (Bangkok, 27-30 January),<sup>(2)</sup> which also examined a regional survey of the aging submitted by the secretariat.<sup>(3)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Preparatory Meeting, E/ESCAP/SD.3/2;

<sup>(2)</sup>Technical Meeting, SD/RPMWAA/1 & Corr.1.

Survey: <sup>(3)</sup>SD/AAPR/1.

##### Statistics

An Asian Workshop on Environment Statistics (Pattaya, Thailand, 10-16 February 1981), organized by ESCAP and the United Nations Statistical Office, recommended that ESCAP act as a clearing-house for environmental statistics and discussed plans for pilot studies in selected countries.<sup>(4)</sup> At a Regional Workshop on the CONCOR Computer Software Package for Census Edit (Bangkok, May), participants reviewed the use

of this computer language for programming the input and editing of census and survey data.<sup>(3)</sup> A workshop was organized for Pakistani officials on the collection and compilation of economic statistics of shipping (Karachi, Pakistan, June). Recommendations for promoting the development of labour productivity statistics were made at another seminar (Moscow, 19-28 August).<sup>(2)</sup> An industrial census training workshop (Suzhou, China, 16 November-11 December), preparatory to the 1983 World Programme of Industrial Statistics (p. 1068), discussed all aspects of planning and organizing industrial censuses, considered a minimum programme suitable for small countries, and discussed the organization of surveys to cover cottage industries.

The ESCAP secretariat promoted the participation of Asian and Pacific countries in the National Household Survey Capability Programme (p. 1072) by helping to prepare a project proposal for the Republic of Korea and to revise a proposal for Thailand, participating in a review of Sri Lanka's programme, assisting Fiji with a household survey and drawing up a proposal for training courses in India. Regional advisory services in national accounts, household surveys, population censuses, civil registration and vital statistics were maintained through the financial support of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities and the International Labour Organisation.

The statistical activities of ESCAP-including work on government information systems (p. 637)-were reviewed by its Committee on Statistics (fourth session, Bangkok, 9-15 June).<sup>(1)</sup> One of its conclusions was that there was a great need to improve the methodology and compilation of price statistics, given the rapid inflation of recent years.

The ESCAP-associated Statistical Institute for Asia and the Pacific completed its eleventh general course in March and began its twelfth in October. Seven specialized courses were also given during the year and two workshops were organized.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ESCAP Committee on Statistics, E/ESCAP/261 & Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>Seminar on Labour Productivity Statistics, E/ESCAP/STAT.5/13; <sup>(3)</sup>Workshop on computer software for census, E/ESCAP/STAT.4/5; <sup>(4)</sup>Workshop on Environment Statistics, E/ESCAP/STAT.4/4.

Publications: Quarterly Bulletin of Statistics for Asia and the Pacific, vol. XI, No. 1 (ST/ESCAP/148), Sales No. E.81.II.F.9; No. 2 (ST/ESCAP/159), Sales No. E.81.II.F.13; No. 3 (ST/ESCAP/172), Sales No. E.82.II.F.2; No. 4 (ST/ESCAP/181), Sales No. E.82.II.F.4. Statistical Yearbook for Asia and the Pacific 1987 (ST/ESCAP/185), Sales No. E/F.83.II.F.2. Handbook on Agricultural Statistics for Asia and the Pacific 1981 (yearly). Statistical Indicators for Asia and the Pacific, vol. XI, Nos. 1-4 (quarterly). Statistical Newsletter, Nos. 41-44 (quarterly).

#### Organizational questions concerning ESCAP

On 20 March 1981, ESCAP made a number of recommendations on its role in the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system (p. 607).

#### Admission of Guam as an associate member

After being informed by the United States that its Territory of Guam had requested admission as an associate member, ESCAP, on 10 March 1981, approved the request and recommended that the Economic and Social Council make the consequential changes in the ESCAP terms of reference. The Council acted accordingly on 24 July (p. 608).

## Europe

The Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) held its thirty-sixth session at its Geneva headquarters from 30 March to 8 April 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> During the session, members examined the main economic problems facing Europe and North America, reviewed the performance of ECE and approved plans for its future work.

On 8 April, ECE adopted a resolution on its work and future activities.<sup>(2)</sup> Calling on its members to continue taking full advantage of its potential as an instrument for strengthening economic relations and multilateral co-operation, it reaffirmed their determination to work towards multilateral implementation of the Final Act of the 1975 Helsinki (Finland) Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and requested its principal subsidiary bodies to take account of the pertinent provisions of that document and of the interests of economically developing European States. It reiterated its April 1980 suggestion<sup>(3)</sup> that Governments study a USSR proposal to hold all-European congresses on energy and transport.

All but one of the principal subsidiary bodies of ECE met during 1981. The Committee on the Development of Trade (December) promoted various activities to expand intraregional, especially East-West, trade (p. 649). The Inland Transport Committee (January) placed new emphasis on transport policy and economics while continuing its efforts to co-ordinate inland water, rail and road transport (p. 650).

Concerning industry (p. 652), the Chemical Industry Committee (September), the Steel Committee (October) and the new Working Party on Engineering Industries and Automation (February) approved work programmes that included studies on the efficient use of energy. The Committee on Water Problems (November)

approved a pilot project on monitoring and evaluation of transboundary water pollution (p. 653). Regarding energy (p. 654), the Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Energy (February and November) continued work on a major study of energy problems and co-operation in Europe, while the Coal Committee (September), the Committee on Electric Power (January) and the Committee on Gas (January) examined economic and technical problems in their fields.

Under the auspices of the Committee on Agricultural Problems (March), ECE published its first collected volume of quality standards for perishable produce (p. 655). The Timber Committee (October) convened a seminar in May on forest fire prevention and control (p. 656).

The Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Science and Technology (June) organized a seminar in November on evaluation of research and development (p. 657). The Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Environmental Problems (February) pursued work on low- and non-waste technology, while two other ECE-sponsored programmes dealt with transboundary air pollution (p. 657). The Committee on Housing, Building and Planning (September) oversaw work on ranging from housing forecasts to earthquake-resistant construction (p. 658). The Conference of European Statisticians (June) promoted the co-ordination of national statistical activities (p. 659).

The Senior Economic Advisers to ECE Governments did not hold a formal session in 1981 but convened an Ad Hoc Meeting on Long-term Economic Problems and Prospects (September) (P. 649). Five intercountry technical co-operation projects executed by ECE concerned inland waterways, roads, fuels, electric power and computers (p. 649).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE, E/1981/53 & Add.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ECE, 1(XXXVI), 8 Apr.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 741.

#### Economic trends

The years 1980 and 1981 formed a period of near-stagnation for the western European economy, while economic activity in eastern Europe and the USSR was more buoyant in 1980 than in 1979 but still below the planned level, according to a summary of the Economic Survey of Europe in 1980<sup>(2)</sup> prepared by the ECE secretariat and noted by the Economic and Social Council on 24 July 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> The slowing down in western Europe's output had led to a 1.7 million increase in unemployed persons, while inflation had risen by an average of 11.4 per cent for 1980 and the trade deficit had increased because of worsened terms of trade caused by higher petroleum prices. Prospects for 1981 were described as

bleak in western Europe and not particularly good in southern Europe. In eastern Europe, net material growth had risen by some 3 per cent, or 1.1 per cent without the USSR, and, while the trade surplus was estimated at \$2 billion, the total current account deficit amounted to between \$4.2 billion and \$6 billion, due largely to debt payments to western Europe.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/187, para. (a), 24 July (p. 609).

Publications: <sup>(2)</sup>Economic Survey Of Europe in 1980, Sales No. E.81.II.E.1 (summary, E/1981/69); 1981, Sales No. E.82.II.E.1.

Other publication: Economic Bulletin for Europe, vol. 33, Nos. 1-4.

#### Development and regional economic and social policy

##### Economic projections and planning

On 8 April 1981, ECE requested the Senior Economic Advisers to ECE Governments to consider adopting a set of common assumptions and deciding on a set of common time horizons to guide ECE bodies in their work on economic projections.<sup>(1)</sup> It also invited its principal subsidiary bodies to co-operate with the Advisers in the identification of long-term economic trends and possibilities for the development of international co-operation,<sup>(2)</sup> and requested the secretariat to continue work on creation of an ECE data bank so that those bodies could have comparable data for their economic projections.

An Ad Hoc Meeting on Long-term Economic Problems and Prospects (Geneva, 21-23 September), convened by the Advisers, discussed secretariat summaries of economic prospects for 1980-1985, and studies of changes in economic trends in the 1970s and some long-term implications.<sup>(3)</sup> A Seminar on Recent Innovations in Economic Models including Methods for Planning Complex (Large-scale) Development Projects (Geneva, 27 April-1 May) discussed general economic planning models and models for development projects aimed at solving intersectoral or interregional problems.<sup>(4)</sup>

Decisions: ECE (report, E/1981/53), 8 Apr.: <sup>(1)</sup>A(XXXVI), paras. 1-3; <sup>(2)</sup>D(XXXVI).

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>Meeting on Long-term Economic Problems and Prospects, EC.AD.(XVII)/AC.1/2; <sup>(4)</sup>Seminar on economic models, EC.AD./SEM.7/7.

##### Co-operation among Mediterranean countries

On 8 April 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> ECE requested its Executive Secretary to continue to co-operate with the secretariats of the economic commissions for Western Asia and Africa and other United Nations bodies, and to pursue contacts with all Mediterranean countries not members of ECE on subjects within its competence of common interest to the Mediterranean countries. It recom-

mended that its subsidiary bodies continue efforts to identify areas of interest for economic co-operation in the Mediterranean within the framework of ECE activities and its work programme.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE (report, E/1981/53), F(XXXVI), 8 Apr.

##### Technical co-operation

Some \$1 million was spent in 1981 on ECE technical co-operation activities, most of it provided by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Five UNDP-supported projects were being executed by ECE: preparation for a feasibility study on a navigable waterway between the Danube River and the Aegean Sea (p. 651), the Trans-European North-South Motorway (p. 652), research on the utilization of low-calorific-value coals and shales (p. 654), interconnection of electric power networks in the Balkans (p. 655) and statistical computing (p. 659).

##### International trade

In its resolution of 8 April 1981<sup>(11)</sup> on its work and future activities (p. 648), ECE recognized the importance of developing intraregional trade and the particular importance of ECE in respect of trade among countries having different economic and social systems; and invited European Governments to pay particular attention to trade obstacles, economic and commercial information, business contacts and facilities, industrial co-operation, small and medium-sized enterprises, and compensation transactions.

An Ad Hoc Meeting on Compensation Trade (Geneva, 9-30 November) analysed various forms of this trade on the basis of studies illustrating the growth in the importance and frequency of compensation transactions between European countries having different economic and social systems, but it reached no agreement on how ECE should deal with the topic.<sup>(8)</sup> An Ad Hoc Meeting to Discuss the Inventory of All Kinds of Obstacles to the Development of Trade (Geneva, 3-6 November) discussed proposals for keeping the existing ECE inventory current and for further work in this field.

The ECE Committee on the Development of Trade (thirtieth session, Geneva, 1-4 December) reviewed the trade situation in Europe, considered practical measures to remove obstacles to intra-regional trade and to promote and diversify trade, and discussed trade promotion through industrial co-operation, the development of market information and techniques, and the improvement of procedures and contract practices.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Working Party on Facilitation of International Trade Procedures (Geneva: thirteenth session, 26 and 27 March; fourteenth session,

24 and 25 September)<sup>(10)</sup> adopted a revised version of the basic international standard for the layout of trade documents, with terminology adapted to current data-processing vocabulary,<sup>(1)</sup> and a recommendation on facilitation measures related to international trade procedures.<sup>(2)</sup> Both texts were recommended by Group of Experts No. 2: Procedures and Documentation (Geneva: twenty-third session, 23 and 24 March; twenty-fourth session, 21 and 22 September).<sup>(7)</sup> The Working Party also adopted texts produced by its Group of Experts No. 1: Data Elements and Automatic Data Interchange (Geneva: twenty-third session, 24 and 25 March; twenty-fourth session, 22 and 23 September),<sup>(6)</sup> including a recommendation on numerical codes to be used in reporting statistics on modes of transport for merchandise in international trade.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Group of Experts on International Contract Practices in Industry (Geneva: eighteenth session, 13-15 July; nineteenth session, 9-11 December) approved a first draft of a guide for drawing up international contracts on consulting engineering, including related aspects of technical assistance.<sup>(5)</sup>

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>United Nations Layout for Key Trade Documents (ECE/TRADE/137), Sales No. E.81.II.E.19.

Recommendations: Working Party on Facilitation of International Trade Procedures: 18 ECE/TRADE/141; <sup>(3)</sup>No. 19, ECE/TRADE/138.

Reports: <sup>(4)</sup>ECE Committee on trade, ECE/TRADE/140;

<sup>(5)</sup>Group of Experts on contract practices in industry, TRADE/GE.1/49 & Add.1 (July), TRADE/GE.1/51 (Dec.); <sup>(6)</sup>Group of Experts on data elements and automatic data interchange, TRADE/WP.4/GE.1/43 (Mar.), TRADE/WP.4/GE.1/45 (Sep.); <sup>(7)</sup>Group of Experts on procedures and documentation, TRADE/WP.4/GE.2/43 (Mar.), TRADE/WP.4/GE.2/45 (Sep.);

<sup>(8)</sup>Meeting on Compensation Trade, TRADE/AC.18/2;

<sup>(9)</sup>Meeting on obstacles to trade, TRADE/AC.17/2;

<sup>(10)</sup>Working Party on Facilitation of International Trade Procedures, TRADE/WP.4/135 (Mar.), TRADE/WP.4/137 (Sep.).

Resolution: <sup>(11)</sup>ECE (report, E/1981/53), I (XXXVI), paras. 9-12, 8 Apr.

Other publication: Trade Facilitation News, Nos. 36-38 (1981).

#### Inland transport

The ECE Inland Transport Committee (forty-first session, Geneva, 26-30 January 1981) decided to place new emphasis on transport policy and financing by establishing standing groups of experts on these subjects in place of ad hoc meetings.<sup>(3)</sup> The Group of Experts on Transport Trends and Policy (first session, Geneva, 8-10 July) proposed a revised work programme for the Committee.<sup>(9)</sup> The Group of Experts on Transport Economics (first session, Geneva, 19-21 October) began work on a report on energy consumption in transport, including specifics on rail, road and inland water transport,

and discussed the distribution between countries of the benefits of new transport infrastructures used also by international traffic.<sup>(8)</sup>

The Group of Experts on Customs Questions Affecting Transport (forty-third to forty-fifth sessions, Geneva, 23-27 February, 29 June--3 July, 19-23 October) completed a review of a draft international convention on harmonization of frontier controls of goods, leaving several questions to be resolved in 1982; approved a draft resolution recommending the establishment of links between national customs transit systems; and discussed further ways of harmonizing and simplifying road transport documents.<sup>(5)</sup> The Administrative Committee for the TIR Convention 1975 (fourth session, Geneva, 22 and 23 October)<sup>(2)</sup> adopted two technical amendments to the Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets—a treaty governing permits for the transport of merchandise by motor vehicles between customs ports without customs inspection (transport international routier).<sup>(11)</sup>

The Group of Experts on Combined Transport (third session, Geneva, 15-19 June) approved a draft resolution intended to facilitate combined road/rail transport by piggyback.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Group of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods (thirty-third session, Geneva, 19-22 May) considered the development and revision of international regulations, including the introduction of special training for drivers of vehicles carrying dangerous goods.<sup>(6)</sup> A number of technical amendments to the European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road and the corresponding provisions of the International Regulations concerning the Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Rail (RID) were approved by joint meetings of the RID Safety Committee (a body of the Central Office for International Railway Transport) and the ECE Group of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods (Geneva, 16-27 March, Berne, Switzerland, 21 September-2 October).<sup>(10)</sup>

The Group of Experts on the Transport of Perishable Foodstuffs (thirty-sixth session, Geneva, 12-15 October) continued work on the application of and amendments to the Agreement on the International Carriage of Perishable Foodstuffs and on the Special Equipment to be Used for Such Carriage.<sup>(7)</sup>

On 8 April ECE, noting that a general introduction and harmonization of summer time in Europe would eliminate difficulties involving international transport, requested Governments and organizations to comment on a unified date for the introduction of summer time, invited the Inland Transport Committee to consider harmonization and the possibilities of unifying

dates, and invited the ECE Executive Secretary, in conjunction with ECE bodies, to make proposals and to report in 1982.<sup>(1)</sup> In November, the Working Party on Rail Transport (see below) proposed that Governments be asked to continue trying to unify the application of summer time and to refrain from unilateral changes without informing other Governments well in advance.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE (report, E/1981/53), C(XXXVI), 8 Apr.  
 Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee for TIR Convention, TRANS/GE.30/AC.2/8; <sup>(3)</sup>ECE Inland Transport Committee, ECE/TRANS/44; <sup>(4)</sup>Group of Experts on Combined Transport, TRANS/GE.24/6; <sup>(5)</sup>Group of Experts customs questions, TRANS/GE.30/23 (Feb.), TRANS/GE.30/25 (June/July), TRANS/GE.30/27 (Oct.); <sup>(6)</sup>Group of Experts on dangerous goods, TRANS/GE.15/19; <sup>(7)</sup>Group of Experts on perishable foodstuffs, TRANS/GE.11/19 & Corr.2; <sup>(8)</sup>Group of Experts on Transport Economics, TRANS/GE.37/2; <sup>(9)</sup>Group of Experts on Transport Trends and Policy, TRANS/GE.36/2; <sup>(10)</sup>Meeting of RID Safety Committee and ECE Group of Experts on dangerous goods, TRANS/GE.15/AC.1/8 (Mar.), TRANS/GE.15/AC.1/10 & Add.1 (Sep./Oct.).  
 Yearbook reference: <sup>(11)</sup> 1975, p. 523.

#### Inland water transport

The Working Party on Inland Water Transport (twenty-fifth session, Geneva, 9-13 November 1981) approved the text of Recommendations on Technical Requirements for Inland Navigation Vessels, intended to harmonize national and subregional rules for the benefit of international trade, safety of navigation and the protection of human life.<sup>(1)</sup> The recommendations were drafted by the Group of Experts on Standardization of Technical Requirements for Vessels and of Ships' Papers (Geneva: seventeenth session, 4-8 May; eighteenth session, 31 August-4 September).<sup>(4)</sup>

The Group of Experts on the Standardization of Rules of the Road and Signs and Signals in Inland Navigation (Geneva: seventeenth session, 2-6 March; eighteenth session, 28 September-2 October) continued work on the harmonization of the two main European agreements on this topic.<sup>(3)</sup> The Group of Experts on River Law (sixth session, Geneva, 26-28 October) was unable to reach agreement on a draft convention on liability for damage caused by small craft.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Group of Rapporteurs for the Economic Study of the Danube-Oder (-Elbe) Connection (fifteenth session, Tallin, USSR, 30 March-3 April)<sup>(5)</sup> completed a multiyear study intended to serve as the basis for future co-operation between the riparian States in the planning, construction and operation of this waterway link between the Danube river basin countries and the nations of central and western Europe and Baltic and North Sea ports. <sup>(7)</sup> The Group of Rapporteurs on Economic Aspects of the Danube/

Aegean Sea Waterway Link (first session, Geneva, 13-15 April) commented on economic aspects of the proposal for a navigable waterway and considered goods traffic flows in the area, in connection with a project financed by the United Nations Development Programme intended to provide Greece and Yugoslavia with information on which to base a decision about whether to proceed with construction.<sup>(6)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE Working Party on Inland Water Transport, TRANS/SC3/103; <sup>(2)</sup>Group of Experts on River Law, TRANS/SC3/GE.33/5; <sup>(3)</sup>Group of Experts on rules and signs and signals in inland navigation, TRANS/SC3/GE.2/32 & Corr.1 (Mar.), TRANS/SC3/GE.2/34 (Sep./Oct.); <sup>(4)</sup>Group of Experts on vessels and ships' TRANS/SC3/GE.1/32 (May), TRANS/SC3/GE.1/34 (Aug./Sep.); <sup>(5)</sup>Group of Rapporteurs for Danube-Oder (-Elbe) connection, TRANS/SC3/AC.2/1; <sup>(6)</sup>Group of Rapporteurs on Danube/Aegean Sea waterway, TRANS/SC3/AC.1/2.  
 Study: <sup>(7)</sup>TRANS/SC3/105.

#### Rail transport

The ECE Working Party on Rail Transport (thirty-fifth session, Geneva, 2-5 November 1981), in addition to its action on summer time (see above), agreed to undertake preparatory work for a European rail network, starting with a determination of internationally important railway lines, identification of their capacity, and a listing of bottle-necks and measures to eliminate them.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE Working Party on Rail Transport, TRANS/SC2/154.

#### Road transport

The ECE Working Party on Road Transport (sixty-ninth session, Geneva, 16-19 November 1981) agreed to examine the possibility of establishing a set of rules and recommended practices which could be incorporated into a future international agreement on the use of roads for international road transport.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE Working Party on Road Transport, TRANS/SC1/307.

Motor vehicles. During 1981, the Group of Experts on Construction of Vehicles (sixty-third to sixty-fifth sessions, Geneva: 9-13 March, 22-26 June, 26-30 October) approved six new international regulations aimed at improving safety and limiting the harmful effects of motor vehicles on the environment.<sup>(1)</sup> The regulations concerned headlamps for mopeds, light-signalling devices for mopeds and motor cycles, pneumatic tyres for motor cycles, rear under-ride protection systems for commercial vehicles, replacement silencing systems and new provisions to limit the noise emitted by four-wheeled vehicles.

The Group of Rapporteurs on Brakes and Running Gear (Geneva: ninth session, 18-21 May; tenth session, 8-11 December) continued work on a draft regulation on braking of agricultural vehicles and on amendments to a regulation on service brake performance.<sup>(2)</sup> The Group of Rapporteurs on Crashworthiness (Geneva: eighth session, 19-21 January; ninth session, 24-26 August) continued work on a draft regulation on the protection of occupants of private cars in the event of a head-on collision.<sup>(3)</sup> The Group of Rapporteurs on General Safety Provisions (thirty-seventh session, Rome, Italy, 4-7 May; thirty-eighth session, Geneva, 30 November-3 December) approved draft regulations on anti-theft protection for motor cycles and on unauthorized modifications of mopeds, and continued work on a draft regulation on accessibility and arrangement of tractor controls.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Group of Rapporteurs on Lighting and Light-signalling (eighth session, Lippstadt, Federal Republic of Germany, 7-10 April; ninth session, Leipzig, German Democratic Republic, 15-17 September) continued work on a draft regulation on the installation of lighting and light-signalling devices on agricultural tractors. The Group of Rapporteurs on Protective Devices (ninth session, London, 24-27 February; tenth session, Geneva, 20-23 July) considered amendments to regulations on protective helmets, vehicle seats and seat belts.<sup>(8)</sup> The Group of Rapporteurs on Safety Provisions on Motor Coaches and Buses (twenty-fifth session, Fellbach, Federal Republic of Germany, 1-4 June; twenty-sixth session, London, 10-13 November) continued work on amendments to provisions regulating the strength of seats and their mountings, approved draft requirements on retractable steps and discussed the carriage of disabled persons in public service vehicles.<sup>(9)</sup>

The Group of Rapporteurs on Noise (tenth session, Washington, D. C., 29 September-2 October) adopted a draft regulation to limit the noise emitted by mopeds. The Group of Rapporteurs on Pollution and Energy (Geneva: third session, 9-12 February; fourth session, 7-9 September) continued discussion of possible changes in the regulation on emissions.<sup>(7)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup> Group of Experts on TRANS/SC1/WP29/79 (Mar.), TRANS/SC1/WP29/81 (June), TRANS/SC1/WP29/85 (Oct.); <sup>(2)</sup> Group of Rapporteurs on Brakes and Running Gear, TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRRF/9 (May), TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRRF/10 (Dec.); <sup>(3)</sup> Group of Rapporteurs on Crashworthiness, TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRCS/8 (Jan.), TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRCS/9 (Aug.); <sup>(4)</sup> Group of Rapporteurs on General Safety Provisions, TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRSG/16 & Add.1 & Add.1/Corr.1 (May), TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRSG/17 (Nov.-Dec.); <sup>(5)</sup> Group of Rapporteurs on Lighting and Light-signalling, TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRE/8 & Corr.1 (Apr.), TRANS/

SC1/WP29/GRE/9 (Sep.); <sup>(6)</sup> Group of Rapporteurs on Noise, TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRB/8; <sup>(7)</sup> Group of Rapporteurs on Pollution and Energy, TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRPE/3 (Feb.), TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRPE/4 (Sep.); <sup>(8)</sup> Group of Rapporteurs on Protective Devices, TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRDP/9 (Feb.), TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRDP/10 (July); <sup>(9)</sup> Group of Rapporteurs on Safety Provisions on Motor Coaches and Buses, TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRSA/16 (June), TRANS/SC1/WP29/GRSA/17 (Nov.).

Other road transport questions. In 1981, the Group of Experts on Road Traffic Safety (Geneva: forty-first session, 11-14 May; forty-second session, 5-9 October) drew up recommendations designed to facilitate the movement of handicapped persons in traffic and to require special markings for road maintenance vehicles, and elaborated proposals for improved road traffic-accident statistics.<sup>(1)</sup> It also approved a recommendation on instruction methods for persons wishing to take driving tests for the operation of private vehicles, as drawn up by the fifth Ad Hoc Meeting on Methods of Professional Driving Instruction (Geneva, 3-6 February).<sup>(2)</sup> The recommendations were adopted in December by the Working Party on Road Transport.

Work continued on the 10-nation Trans-European North-South Motorway project, including preparation of guidelines for an environmental impact assessment and a manual on seismic aspects in design procedures, an initial study on the general development of infrastructure, preliminary studies on the international financing of selected links, and agreements on frontier crossings and standards. The project, financed by the United Nations Development Programme, was co-ordinated by a Steering Committee (Geneva: sixth session, 21-23 January; seventh session, 15-17 July).<sup>(3)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup> Group of Experts on Road Traffic Safety, TRANS/SC1/GE.20/33 (May), TRANS/SC1/GE.20/35 (Oct.); <sup>(2)</sup> Meeting on driving instruction, TRANS/SC1/GE.20/AC.1/8; <sup>(3)</sup> Steering Committee (Trans-European Motorway project), TEM/7 (Jan.), TEM/8 (July).

## Industry

### Chemical industries

The ECE Chemical Industry Committee (fourteenth session, Geneva, 2-4 September 1981) approved a work programme for 1982-1986 emphasizing the development of new sources of raw materials and energy, new processes for conserving them, and the recycling of wastes.<sup>(1)</sup> The Group of Experts on the Periodic Survey of the Chemical Industry (ninth session, Geneva, 31 August and 1 September) approved sections of a draft survey covering market trends for chemical products in 1975-1980 and prospects to 1990.<sup>(2)</sup> An Ad Hoc Meeting for the Study on Trade in



Chemical Products among ECE Member Countries (Geneva, 30 November and 1 December) reviewed a draft of the study, scheduled for publication in 1982, and agreed that its title should be revised to reflect the fact that it dealt with East-West trade.<sup>(3)</sup>

A Seminar on Process Automation in the Chemical Industry (Noordwijkerhout, Netherlands, 27 April-1 May) concluded that the rapid changes wrought by microprocessors in systems for controlling industrial chemical processes created problems in regard to retraining, standardization between systems and reliability, and that applied research on the man-computer dialogue should be encouraged.<sup>(4)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE Chemical Industry Committee, ECE/CHEM/36; <sup>(2)</sup>Group of Experts on Periodic Survey of Chemical Industry, CHEM/GE.1/12; <sup>(3)</sup>Meeting for study on trade in chemical products, CHEM/AC.11/2; <sup>(4)</sup>Seminar on Process Automation in Chemical Industry, CHEM/SEM.10/3.

Publications: Annual Bulletin of Trade in Chemical Products, vol. VIII, 1981, Sales No. E/F/R.83.II.E.5; Annual Review of the Chemical Industry 1981 (ECE/CHEM/45), Sales No. E.83.II.E.6.

#### Engineering industries

The ECE Working Party on Engineering Industries and Automation, established in April 1980,<sup>(6)</sup> held its first session in 1981 (Geneva, 24-27 February),<sup>(2)</sup> at which it agreed on its terms of reference and on a 1981-1985 work programme that included studies on various aspects of innovation, the production and use of engineering equipment for preventing pollution, low-waste processes and more effective energy use. On 6 April, ECE adopted the Working Party's terms of reference and approved its work programme.<sup>(1)</sup>

A Seminar on Automation of Assembly in Engineering Industries (Geneva, 22-25 September) made recommendations on educating management and workers in the gains to be made from automation of assembly lines and on the need for compatibility of equipment, especially electronic components.<sup>(5)</sup> An Ad Hoc Meeting on the Methodology for Assessing the Techno-économie Trends of Automation (Geneva, 24 and 25 November) proposed additional topics for study by ECE, including robotization and the impact of automation on productivity.<sup>(4)</sup> An Ad Hoc Meeting on a Study of Techno-économie Aspects of the International Division of Labour in the Automobile Industry (Geneva, 26 and 27 November) adopted an outline for the study and approved plans to begin the collection of information.<sup>(3)</sup>

Work also proceeded on the collection and harmonization of statistics (p. 659).

Decision: (1)ECE (report, E/1981/53), H(XXXVI), 6 Apr.  
Reports: (2)ECE Working Party on Engineering Industries and Automation, ECE/ENG.AUT/2; (3)Meeting on in-

ternational division of labour in automobile industry, ENG.AUT/AC.2/2; <sup>(4)</sup>Meeting on trends of automation, ENG.AUT/AC.3/2; (5)Seminar on automation of assembly, AUTOMAT/SEM.8/3.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 744.

Publications: Annual Review of Engineering Industries and Automation 1980 (ECE/ENG.AUT/7), Sales No. E.82.II.E.18; 1981 (ECE/ENG.AUT/10), Sales No. E.83.II.E.20.

#### Iron and steel industry

The ECE Steel Committee (forty-ninth session, Geneva, 21-23 October 1981) concentrated on current preoccupations of the industry—cost reduction, energy efficiency and adaptation of production to demand—and added to its work programme studies on structural changes in the international steel trade and protection of steel products against corrosion.<sup>(1)</sup>

An Ad Hoc Meeting on the Strategy for Energy Use in the Iron and Steel Industry (Geneva, 18 and 19 February) adopted an outline for a study on this question,<sup>(3)</sup> and the Steel Committee, in October, requested the ECE secretariat to revise a questionnaire on the topic for submission to Governments. A Seminar on the Energy Situation in the Iron and Steel Industry (Vienna, Austria, 7-11 September) recommended that a systematic approach be taken to decrease the energy consumed in steel production, by developing new production processes, using new energy sources, intensifying research into coal gasification and liquefaction, and designing equipment to recover low-potential energy sources.<sup>(4)</sup>

An Ad Hoc Meeting on the Evolution of the Specific Consumption of Steel (Geneva, 19 and 20 October) decided on an outline for an ECE study on this topic, which was intended to assist national steel industries to adapt their production to demand.<sup>(2)</sup> The Working Party on the Steel Market (twentieth session, Geneva, 18 and 19 June) concluded that 1980 statistics appeared to indicate a modest development of the steel industry in Europe and it anticipated no marked improvement for 1981.<sup>(5)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE Steel Committee, ECE/STEEL/34; Meeting on consumption, STEEL/AC.6/4; <sup>(3)</sup>Meeting on energy use, STEEL/AC.7/2; <sup>(4)</sup>Seminar on energy situation, STEEL/SEM.7/3; <sup>(5)</sup>Working Party on Steel Market, STEEL/WP.1/18.

Publication: The Steel Market in 1981 (ECE/STEEL/39), Sales No. E.82.II.E.16.

#### Water

On 8 April 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> ECE welcomed the 1980 decision of its Committee on Water Problems to convene an ad hoc meeting to prepare draft terms of reference for a pilot project on monitoring and evaluation of transboundary water pollution. This draft was prepared by the Ad Hoc Meeting

on Monitoring and Evaluation of Transboundary Water Pollution (Geneva, 14 and 15 May)<sup>(3)</sup> and was approved by the Committee (thirteenth session, Geneva, 16-20 November) on the understanding that, before the project was initiated, all ECE Governments would be invited to indicate their willingness to participate and to specify the terms and conditions of their participation.<sup>(1)</sup>

Also on 8 April, ECE endorsed decisions by its committees on water and agricultural problems to consider closer co-operation on water problems in agriculture, and requested them to examine the possibility of further joint projects, relating particularly to irrigation and drainage.<sup>(6)</sup> One such project, a Seminar on Water Pollution from Animal Production (Geneva, 15-18 September), recommended that, for water conservation purposes, priority should be accorded to the effective enforcement of legal and administrative provisions prohibiting all direct discharges of waste from animal production, treated or not, into surface waters and ground-water aquifers.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Group of Experts on Aspects of Water Quality and Quantity (ninth session, Geneva, 11-14 May) prepared a draft decision calling on European Governments to pursue and strengthen efforts to co-operate on the development, use and conservation of shared water resources. The draft was approved by the Committee on Water Problems in November for submission to ECE. The Committee also decided to prepare a report and elaborate a declaration on rational use of water.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE Committee on Water Problems, ECE/WATER/28; <sup>(2)</sup>Group of Experts on water quality and quantity, WATER/GE.1/18; <sup>(3)</sup>Meeting on transboundary water pollution, WATER/AC.4/2; <sup>(4)</sup>Seminar on Water Pollution from Animal Production, AGRI/SEM.14/2-WATER/SEM.8/2.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(5)</sup>ECE (report, E/1981/53), 1(XXXVI), para. 8, 8 Apr. Dec.: <sup>(6)</sup>ECE, B(XXXVI), 8 Apr.

## Energy

On 8 April 1981, ECE reiterated the importance of an exchange of information and views on energy among its member Governments, and reiterated the need to give due attention to all aspects of the work of the Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Energy.<sup>(4)</sup> It selected energy as the next major topic to be considered in depth from the point of view of concentration, integration and co-ordination of its work programme.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Advisers on energy<sup>(1)</sup> (third session, Geneva, 16-20 February) approved a work programme divided into four areas: programmes, policies and prospects; demand; trade and co-operation; and conservation. Subsequently (fourth session, Geneva, 23-27 November), the

Advisers suggested improvements in a draft report by the secretariat on energy problems and co-operation, heard differing views on the desirability of convening a high-level ECE meeting on energy, and discussed conservation and new and renewable energy sources.

An Ad Hoc Meeting on Scientific and Technological Research related to Low-Calorific-Value Fuels (Sofia, Bulgaria, 27-30 April) recommended that ECE pursue work on this topic involving such fossil fuels as brown coal, lignite and peat and supported a Bulgarian proposal for a regional project to promote research into the technology for using such fuels.<sup>(3)</sup> The recommendation for preparation of a full-scale regional project was approved in June by the Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Science and Technology (p. 657).

An Informal Meeting on the Implementation of the Recommendations of the Seminar on Improved Techniques for the Extraction of Primary Forms of Energy (Geneva: first meeting, 25 and 26 May; second meeting, 5 and 6 October)<sup>(2)</sup> considered follow-up measures to the recommendations of the November 1980 Seminar.<sup>(6)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE Advisers on energy, ECE/ENERGY/6 (Feb.), ECE/ENERGY/8 (Nov.); <sup>(2)</sup>Meeting on extraction of energy, ENERGY/AC.2/2 (May), ENERGY/AC.4/2 (Oct.); <sup>(3)</sup>Meeting on low-calorific-value fuels, SC.TECH./AC.16/2.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(4)</sup>ECE (report, E/1981/53), 1(XXXVI), paras. 13-15, 8 Apr. Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>ECE, A(XXXVI), para. 7, 8 Apr.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 741.

## Coal

The ECE Coal Committee (seventy-seventh session, Geneva, 21-24 September 1981) took note of divergent views among its members on a proposal to establish an ECE co-ordinating centre on coal gasification and liquefaction, and decided to study the matter further.<sup>(1)</sup> The Working Party on Coal Trade (twenty-second session, Geneva, 24-26 June) completed a study on the use of steam coal in electric power stations and approved a questionnaire for a study on coal trade prospects up to the year 2000.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Group of Experts on Opencast Mines (third session, Geneva, 28-30 January)<sup>(2)</sup> completed studies on the better use of coal and increased economy and efficiency in extraction,<sup>(6)</sup> and on surfacing materials for the reclamation of opencast (strip) mines.<sup>(7)</sup> The Group of Experts on Productivity and Management Problems in the Coal Industry (twelfth session, Geneva, 17-19 June) reviewed progress in technical studies on specific aspects of mechanization and automation.<sup>(3)</sup> The Group of Experts on the Utilization and Preparation of Solid Fuels (twelfth session, Geneva, 15-17 June) continued

work on the preparation of a new ECE classification of coals, the production of coke from low-grade coking coals, the control of water pollution and ground damage caused by the operation of preparation plants, and the use of coal for urban district heating.<sup>(4)</sup>

Records: (1)ECE Coal Committee, ECE/COAL/61; (2)Group of Experts on Opencast Mines, COAL/GE.5/6; (3)Group of Experts on productivity and management, COAL/GE.1/18; (4)Group of Experts on Utilization and Preparation of Solid Fuels, COAL/GE.3/18; (5)Working Party on Coal Trade, COAL/WP.1/46.

Studies: (6)ECE/COAL/58, (7)ECE/COAL/59.

#### Electric power

The ECE Committee on Electric Power (thirty-ninth session, Geneva, 12-16 January 1981) reviewed the electric power situation in the region, asked for a report on how to organize international co-operation in research on the problems of the electric power industry, examined the results of work done under its auspices in 1980 and approved a work programme for 1981-1985.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Group of Experts on Problems of Planning and Operating Large Power Systems (thirteenth session, Geneva, 25-27 May) considered various aspects of the interconnection of electric power transmission systems and measures to save fuel.<sup>(4)</sup> The Group of Experts on Electric Power Stations (twelfth session, Geneva, 19-21 October) continued its study of selected problems of conventional and nuclear power stations, reviewed a project on the combined production of electric power and heat, and added several nuclear power topics to its work programme.<sup>(2)</sup> The Group of Experts on the Relationship between Electricity and the Environment (tenth session, Geneva, 9-11 November) initiated a comparative study of electric space-heating systems and reviewed the progress of several other studies.<sup>(3)</sup>

A Seminar on the Medium-term and Long-term Prospects for the Electric Power Industry (London, 26-30 October) made a number of recommendations aimed at promoting the replacement of petroleum products and natural gas by electricity.<sup>(5)</sup>

In April, the Co-ordinating Committee for the Interconnection of the Electric Power Transmission Systems of the Balkan Countries assessed the results of five years of co-operation on this ECE-assisted project and decided on priorities for future co-operation.

Reports: (1)ECE Committee on Electric Power, ECE/EP/35; (2)Group of Experts on Electric Power Stations, EP/GE.3/18; (3)Group of Experts on electricity and environment, EP/GE.4/18; (4)Group of Experts on large power systems, EP/GE.2/18; (5)Seminar on prospects for electric power industry, ECE/EP/49.

#### Gas

The ECE Committee on Gas (twenty-seventh session, Geneva, 19-23 January 1981) reviewed the gas situation and gas markets in Europe, discussed investments in the gas industry and their financing possibilities, reviewed the 1980 activities of its groups of experts and seminars, and approved a work programme for 1981-1985.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Group of Experts on Gas Statistics and Forecasting Problems (eighteenth session, Geneva, 8 and 9 January) agreed on topics for a symposium, proposed for 1982, on trends in the European gas industry and gas markets up to the year 2000.<sup>(3)</sup> The Group of Experts on the Use and Distribution of Gas (twelfth session, Geneva, 4-6 May) considered problems caused by adding hydrogen-containing gas to natural gas, discussed ways of ensuring compatibility between gases of different characteristics and from different sources, and approved a questionnaire for a study on the operation of gas-run heat-pumps.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Group of Experts on the Transport and Storage of Gas (twelfth session, Geneva, 6-8 May) approved reports on transport system maintenance and on long-distance transport by large-diameter pipelines, and considered a draft report on problems in managing international pipelines.<sup>(4)</sup> The Group of Experts on Natural Gas Resources (sixth session, Geneva, 7-9 September) agreed to prepare a new classification of natural gas reserves and resources.<sup>(2)</sup>

A Seminar on Exploration for Gas Fields in the ECE Region (Hanover, Federal Republic of Germany, 19-22 May) reviewed geological and geophysical methods and techniques in prospecting for gas, and recommended areas for further work.<sup>(6)</sup> The new role of liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) in the energy situation of the 1980s was the focus of a Symposium on the LPG Situation in the ECE Region during 1980-1990 (Dublin, Ireland, 30 September-2 October), which made recommendations on production, consumption, international trade, safety and environmental issues.<sup>(7)</sup>

Reports: (1)ECE Committee on Gas, ECE/GAS/50;

(2)Group of Experts on resources, GAS/GE.4/12;

(3)Group of Experts on statistics and forecasting, GAS/GE.1/14; (4)Group of Experts on transport and storage, GAS/GE.3/18; (5)Group of Experts on use and distribution, GAS/GE.2/18; (6)Seminar on exploration, ECE/GAS/64; (7)Symposium on LPG, ECE/GAS/62.

#### Agriculture

The ECE Committee on Agricultural Problems (thirty-second session, Geneva, 9-13 March 1981) conducted its annual review of agricultural developments and also reviewed trade and commodity reports, recent developments in European trade in agricultural products and the market situation of selected commodities.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Working Party on Standardization of Perishable Produce (thirty-seventh session, Geneva, 23-26 June) discussed ways of improving co-ordination with the Codex Alimentarius Commission, a joint body of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Health Organization.<sup>(9)</sup> The Group of Experts on International Trade Practices relating to Agricultural Products (twenty-fourth session, Geneva, 24-26 March) began the preparation of general conditions of sale for milk and milk products.<sup>(4)</sup> The Group of Experts on Standardization of Dry and Dried Produce (Fruit) (twenty-seventh session, Geneva, 16-20 February) continued work on standards for dried apricots, dates, figs, pistachio nuts, prunes, sweet almonds and walnut kernels.<sup>(3)</sup> The first collected volume of ECE quality standards for perishable produce was published in 1981.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Joint FAO/ECE Working Party on Agrarian Structure and Farm Rationalization (fourth session, Geneva, 9-13 February) held a round-table discussion on the role of tourism and other services and industries in promoting agricultural development in less-favoured areas, particularly in southern Europe.<sup>(7)</sup> The Joint FAO/ECE Working Party on Mechanization of Agriculture (twenty-seventh session, Geneva, 26-29 October) discussed studies on changes and trends in the quantity and balance of energy consumption in agriculture, and on methods and machines for deep loosening of soil.<sup>(8)</sup>

A Symposium on Observations on the Practical Use of New Sources of Protein in relation to Energy Supply for High Production of Milk and Meat (Geneva, 12-15 January) discussed the characteristics and effects of various protein feeds for livestock-including soya, fishmeal and forage protein-and agreed on the importance of establishing the effects of their use on the quality of milk and meat.<sup>(6)</sup> A Symposium on Managerial and Economic Aspects of Large Livestock Holdings, and Technical, Economic and Sanitary Aspects of Their Buildings and Equipment (Madrid, Spain, 19-23 October) recommended continued research on systems for housing and mechanically feeding farm animals, handling manure and protecting animal health.<sup>(5)</sup> A Seminar on Water Pollution from Animal Production was organized in September in co-operation with the Committee on Water Problems (p. 654).

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>UN/ECE Standards for Fresh Fruit and Vegetables (ECE/AGRI/55 & Amend.2,3). Sales No. E.81.11.E.8 & Amend.2,3.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ECE Committee on Agricultural Problems. ECE/AGRI/57; <sup>(3)</sup>Group of Experts on dry and dried fruit, AGRI/WP.1/GE.2/24; <sup>(4)</sup>Group of Experts on International Trade Practices relating to Agricultural

Products, AGRI/WP.1/GE.7/71 & Add.1; <sup>(5)</sup>Symposium on livestock holdings, AGRI/SEM.15/2; <sup>(6)</sup>Symposium on protein for production of milk and meat, AGRI/SEM.13/2; <sup>(7)</sup>Working Party on Agrarian Structure and Farm Rationalization, FAO/ECE/AGRI/WP.3/8; <sup>(8)</sup>Working Party on Mechanization of Agriculture, FAO/ECE/AGRI/WP.2/47; <sup>(9)</sup>Working Party on perishable produce, AGRI/WP.1/29.

Other publications: Prices of Agricultural Products and Selected Inputs in Europe and North America, 1980/81 (ECE/AGRI/64), Sales No. E.82.II.E.6; Review of the Agricultural Situation in Europe at the End of 1981, vol. I: General Review and Grain & vol. II: Livestock, Meat and Dairy Products (ECE/AGRI/66, 2 vols.). Sales No. E.82.II.E.8 (2 vols.); Agricultural Trade in Europe: Recent Developments (prepared in 1981) (ECE/AGRI/65), Sales No. E.82.II.E.11.

#### Forestry and timber

A Seminar on Forest Fire Prevention and Control (Warsaw, Poland, 20-22 May 1981) stressed the importance of training fire-fighters and supervisors and improving their safety, suggested a study of the motivation and attitudes of people who caused wild fires, and identified topics for further work by ECE and other organizations.<sup>(5)</sup> A Seminar on the Maintenance of Forest Machinery in Large- and Small-Scale Forest Operations (Garpenberg, Sweden, 24-28 August) made a number of recommendations to improve maintenance through training of personnel, planning and control, and better machine design, and listed several topics for international collaboration.<sup>(6)</sup> A Seminar on Occupational Safety and Health and Applied Ergonomics in Highly Mechanized Logging Operations (Ottawa, Canada, 21-25 September) urged manufacturers to consider ergonomic needs when designing chain saws and other machines for the logging industry, and stressed the importance of dispelling the belief that ergonomics and safety were costly.<sup>(7)</sup>

Work continued in co-operation with the FAO European Forestry Commission and the International Labour Organisation. An Ad Hoc Meeting to Revise the FAO/ECE Classification and Definitions of Forest Products (Geneva, 2-4 March) produced a complete revision of this list, used as an authoritative framework for collecting compiling, analysing and presenting statistics. Publication of the list was authorized by the Joint Working Party on Forest Economics and Statistics (thirteenth session, Geneva, 9-12 June).<sup>(8)</sup> The Working Party also endorsed, with revisions, a questionnaire to Governments prepared by an Ad Hoc Meeting on Forest Resource Assessment (Geneva, 4-6 March),<sup>(4)</sup> as an initial step for a study on this topic; and recommended steps to improve information on energy derived from wood.

An Ad Hoc Meeting on Standardization of Stress Grading and Finger-jointing of Coniferous

Sawn Timber (Geneva, 29 June-1 July) drew up revised ECE standards for structural coniferous sawnwood, as well as forms for its impartation.<sup>(3)</sup>

The ECE Timber Committee (thirty-ninth session, Geneva, 12-16 October) asked that ECE studies place more emphasis on the impact of energy developments on forestry, and approved plans for the start of work on a major long-term study of timber trends and prospects, for publication in 1986.<sup>(4)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE Timber Committee, ECE/TIM/19; <sup>(2)</sup>Meeting on classification and definitions of forest products, TIM/EFC/WP.2/AC.1/5 & Add.1; <sup>(3)</sup>Meeting on coniferous sawn timber, TIM/WP.3/AC.3/10 & Add.1; <sup>(4)</sup>Meeting on Forest Resource Assessment, TIM/EFC/WP.2/AC.2/7 & Add.1 & 2; <sup>(5)</sup>Seminar on Forest Fire Prevention and Control, TIM/EFC/WP.1/SEM.10/2; <sup>(6)</sup>Seminar on forest machinery, TIM/EFC/WP.1/SEM.11/2; <sup>(7)</sup>Seminar on occupational safety and health and ergonomics, TIM/EFC/WP.1/SEM.12/2; <sup>(8)</sup>Working Party on Forest Economics and Statistics, TIM/EFC/WP.2/10.

Publication: Timber Bulletin for Europe, vol. XXXIV, Nos. 1,2 & Supplements 1-10.

#### Science and technology

Reaffirming the importance it attached to its activities in science and technology, ECE, on 8 April 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> requested the Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Science and Technology to prepare specific proposals on the ECE contribution to the follow-up of the 1979 United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development,<sup>(\*)</sup> and invited the Advisers to examine the possibility of convening an ad hoc meeting on the subject.

The Senior Advisers (ninth session, Geneva, 15-19 June) responded by requesting the secretariat to prepare a progress report containing proposals and a synthesis of views of ECE members, for consideration in 1982.<sup>(2)</sup> On other matters, the Advisers called for continued work on low-calorific-value fuels (p. 654) and authorized the start of statistical studies on international technology flows and patents (p. 659).

A Seminar on the Evaluation of Research and Development (Prague, Czechoslovakia, 2-6 November) suggested several projects for further investigation, including a comparative study on the impact of national research and development management systems on scientific and technological development, an analysis of experience with the methods used in evaluating research and development, and a study of the possibility of having a multidisciplinary team of experts evaluate a selected research and development programme.<sup>(3)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE (report, E/1981/53), E/XXXVI, 8 Apr.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Advisers to ECE Governments on Science and Technology, ECE/SC.TECH/21; <sup>(3)</sup>Seminar on Evaluation of Research and Development, SC.TECH/SEM.9/2. Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>YUN 1979, p. 635.

#### Standardization

In 1981, the Group of Experts on Standardization Policies (eighth session, Gottwaldov, Czechoslovakia, 27-30 January; ninth session, Geneva, 3-6 November) began work on the topic of testing and decided to concentrate on the implications of testing activities for international trade and on the co-ordination of government policies in that sphere.<sup>(2)</sup>

On 6 April 1981, ECE decided to convene the Seventh Meeting of Government Officials Responsible for Standardization Policies, from 1 to 4 March 1982.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE (report, E/1981/53), G/XXXVI, 6 Apr.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Group of Experts on Standardization Policies, STAND/GE.1/17 (Jan.), STAND/GE.1/19 (Nov.).

#### Environment

The Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Environmental Problems (ninth session, Geneva, 10-13 February 1981) expressed the view that the attention of other ECE bodies should be drawn to the environmental aspects of energy extraction, transportation, conversion and use.<sup>(2)</sup> An Ad Hoc Meeting to Define Activities on Environmental Impact Assessment (Geneva, 25 and 26 November) recommended a work programme according to which the Advisers, through a group of experts, would examine frameworks and methods of environmental assessment as well as applications of assessment in various economic sectors.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Working Party on Low- and Non-Waste Technology and Reutilization and Recycling of Wastes (second session, Geneva, 1-3 June), whose terms of reference were adopted by the Senior Advisers in February, considered the progress of studies on methods for comparing and evaluating technologies, incentives for promoting such technologies, and international waste exchanges.<sup>(10)</sup> Under its auspices, National Focal Points for the Compilation of a Compendium on Low- and Non-waste Technology fourth meeting, Geneva, 2 and 3 December<sup>(5)</sup> approved an additional 31 monographs for inclusion in the ECE Compendium, a collection of information on energy and resource-saving technologies available in Europe which already contained 46 monographs, focusing primarily on manufacturing technologies.<sup>(1)</sup>

On 8 April 1981,<sup>(11)</sup> ECE reiterated an appeal for early ratification by States of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, adopted under ECE auspices in 1979.<sup>(2)</sup> Of the 35 signatories in 1979, the following 12 States had ratified, accepted or approved the Convention as at 31 December 1981 (States which acted in 1981 are italicized):

-Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Finland, France, Hungary, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United States.

Twenty-four ratifications were required to bring the Convention into force.

The Interim Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (second session, Geneva, 2-5 November) made recommendations to the Convention's signatories on sulphur emission control, calling for the establishment of clear goals for total reduction of such emissions and the adoption of energy conservation measures and of technologically sound and commercially available control technologies.<sup>(3)</sup> These recommendations were based on the findings of the Third Seminar on Desulphurization of Fuels and Combustion Gases (Salzburg, Austria, 18-22 May),<sup>(6)</sup> as elaborated by the Working Party on Air Pollution Problems (eleventh session, Geneva, 7-9 September).<sup>(9)</sup> The Executive Body also endorsed in principle the conclusions and recommendations of its Working Group on Effects of Sulphur Compounds on the Environment (first session, Geneva, 27-30 April), which proposed a research project on the influence of such compounds on the corrosion rate of paints, sandstone and limestone, and plastics.<sup>(8)</sup>

The Co-operative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe began a new three-year phase in 1981, embracing 70 monitoring stations in 20 ECE countries. The Steering Body to the Programme (fifth session, Geneva, 7 and 8 December) recommended that highest priority be given to measurements of sulphur compounds and that the Programme be expanded to include research on nitrogen compounds with a view to a better understanding of air and precipitation chemistry.<sup>(7)</sup>

Compendium: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE/ENV/36.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ECE Advisers on environmental problems, ECE/ENV/35; <sup>(3)</sup>Executive Body on transboundary air pollution, ECE/ENV/IEB/4; <sup>(4)</sup>Meeting on environmental impact assessment, ENV/AC.14/2; <sup>(5)</sup>National Focal Points for compendium on low- and non-waste technology, ENV/AC.7/8; <sup>(6)</sup>Seminar on Desulphurization of Fuels and Combustion Gases, ENV/SEM.13/3; <sup>(7)</sup>Steering Body to programme on air pollutants, ENV/WP.1/GE.1/10; <sup>(8)</sup>Working Group on sulphur compounds, ENV/IEB/WG.1/2; <sup>(9)</sup>Working Party on Air Pollution Problems, ENV/WP.1/16; <sup>(10)</sup>Working Party on low- and non-waste technology, ENV/WP.2/4.

Resolution: <sup>(11)</sup>ECE (report, E/1981/53), 1(XXXVI), paras. 6 & 7, 8 Apr.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(12)</sup>1979, p. 710.

#### Human settlements

A Seminar on the Forecasting and Programming of Housing (Madrid, Spain, 30 March-3 April 1981) considered national and local fore-

casting and their interrelationship, improvement of information on the quality of housing and its environment, and programming issues arising from changes in the existing housing stock. Current trends in housing problems and policies were reviewed by the Working Part on Housing (tenth session, Geneva, 19-22 May).<sup>(7)</sup>

The Working Party on Urban and Regional Planning (thirteenth session, Geneva, 2-5 June) discussed systems of settlements and how they might be adapted to contemporary economic, social and administrative requirements.<sup>(s)</sup> It was joined in this discussion by the Group of Experts on Urban and Regional Research (twelfth meeting, 1-3 June), which also devoted attention to a study of long-term perspectives for human settlements development in Europe.<sup>(2)</sup> An Ad Hoc Meeting on New Concepts in the Layout of Urban Districts and the Design and Management of Traffic Therein (Veldhoven, Netherlands, 4-7 May) concluded that planning for urban districts should take account of the needs of an entire neighbourhood, and that design should aim at reducing the volume and speed of car traffic in residential areas.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Working Party on Building (thirteenth session, Geneva, 9-12 June) pursued work on an ECE compendium of model provisions for building regulations and endorsed an outline for a study on energy conservation policies in buildings.<sup>(6)</sup> A Second Seminar on Construction in Seismic Regions (Lisbon, Portugal, 12-16 October) called for increased international exchange of information on the redesign, repair and strengthening of buildings in seismic regions, and closer co-ordination of international codes and studies on design of earthquake-resistant buildings.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Committee on Housing, Building and Planning (forty-second session, Geneva, 14-18 September)<sup>(1)</sup> decided that the ECE secretariat should produce a synthesis report on human settlements every five years, based on country monographs to be submitted by Governments; agreed on a work-programme covering various aspects of urban renewal and modernization policies; and endorsed the conclusions of the Committee's Seminar on Citizen Participation in the Planning, Implementation and Management of Human Settlements (Split, Yugoslavia, October 1980).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE Committee on Housing, Building and Planning, ECE/HBP/35 & Corr.1 & Add.1; <sup>(2)</sup>Group of Experts on Urban and Regional Research, HBP/WP.3/GE.1/19; <sup>(3)</sup>Meeting on layout of urban districts and traffic, HBP/WP.3/AC.4/2-TRANS/SC1/AC.4/2; <sup>(4)</sup>Seminar on Construction in Seismic Regions, HBP/SEM.28/2; <sup>(5)</sup>Seminar on Forecasting and Programming of Housing, HBP/SEM.27/2; <sup>(6)</sup>Working Party on Building, HBP/WP.2/18; <sup>(7)</sup>Working Party on Housing, HBP/WP.1/14; <sup>(8)</sup>Working Party on Urban and Regional Planning, HBP/WP.3/14.

## Statistics

The Conference of European Statisticians (twenty-ninth session, Geneva, 22-26 June 1981) devoted attention to the improvement of international comparisons of basic economic aggregates, including comparisons between countries having different economic and social systems.<sup>(1)</sup> Attention was also given to the collection of statistics for analysis of new areas of priority interest (energy, environment, science and technology) and the adaptation of statistical services to new technological capabilities.

The Working Party on Electronic Data Processing (seventeenth session, Geneva, 18-22 May) completed work on a report on computer aspects of the use of registers in statistical offices.<sup>(2)</sup> A Seminar on Statistical Data Collection and Processing Systems under New Conditions (Moscow, 21-25 September) discussed the relationship between national statistical offices and other organizations concerned with statistics; modern techniques and the regionalization of statistical activities; methods to ensure the quality, reliability, timeliness and confidentiality of statistics; and training of personnel in electronic data processing.<sup>(9)</sup> The second Meeting on Problems relating to Household Surveys (Geneva, 1-4 June) recommended continued work on guidelines for the presentation of the quality of statistics.<sup>(6)</sup>

An intercountry project on the use of computers for statistical purposes and the design and development of automated statistical information, financed by the United Nations Development Programme and executed by ECE, produced working papers for system specifications, prepared a new software installation and enabled several statistical offices to install a software package for everyday work. Guidance for the project was furnished by the Steering Committee for the Statistical Computing Project (second meeting, Budapest, Hungary, 28-30 October).<sup>(10)</sup>

Statistical activities were also conducted under the auspices of ECE sectoral bodies. The Group of Experts on Coal Statistics (eighteenth session, Geneva, 22-24 June) reviewed a comparative analysis of working time at mechanized coal faces, and initiated work on three topics: integration of coal statistics in general energy statistics, analysis of labour input and costs by location of work, and attendance patterns of mine workers.<sup>(2)</sup> A Meeting on General Energy Statistics (Geneva, 14-16 September) recommended that ECE carry out work on statistical information needed to assess conservation efforts, classification of products and activities for statistical purposes, development of price statistics, and methods for developing statistics on new and renewable energy sources.<sup>(5)</sup>

On the recommendation of the fourth Joint Meeting on the Development of Science and Technology Statistics (Geneva, 4-7 May),<sup>(7)</sup> the Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Science and Technology (p. 657) decided in June to authorize ECE studies on indicators to measure the international flow of technology and on the utility of patent statistics for the measurement of technology transfer. The third Ad Hoc Meeting on Questions of Statistics concerning Engineering Industries and Automation (Geneva, 11 and 12 June) asked the ECE secretariat to test the availability of internationally comparable data on production and international trade according to a revised list of selected commodities.<sup>(s)</sup> The Group of Experts on Transport Statistics (thirty-third session, Geneva, 28 September-1 October) devised a plan of work towards a manual on methods of compiling price and quantity indices, decided to prepare draft uniform guidelines for the collection of statistics on container transport, and concurred with a suggestion for obtaining wider data coverage for East-West flows of European goods.<sup>(3)</sup>

Meetings were also organized in conjunction with specialized agencies. The Study Group on Food and Agricultural Statistics in Europe (twelfth session, Geneva, 9-12 June), a body of ECE and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, made recommendations on the reporting of statistics on crops, livestock and livestock products.<sup>(11)</sup> The second Joint Meeting on Consumer Prices (Geneva, 5-8 October), convened by ECE and the International Labour Organisation (ILO), considered several methodological problems and drew up a list of topics for further work by ECE and ILO.<sup>(4)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference of European Statisticians, ECE/CES/18; <sup>(2)</sup>Group of Experts on Coal Statistics, COAL/GE.2/18; <sup>(3)</sup>Group of Experts on Transport Statistics, TRANS/GE.6/10; <sup>(4)</sup>Meeting on Consumer Prices, CES/AC.49/21; <sup>(5)</sup>Meeting on General Energy Statistics, CES/AC.32/32; <sup>(6)</sup>Meeting on household surveys, CES/AC.48/30; <sup>(7)</sup>Meeting on science and technology statistics, CES/AC.33/35-SC.TECH./AC.17/2; <sup>(8)</sup>Meeting on statistics concerning engineering industries and automation, ENG.AUT/AC.1/2; <sup>(9)</sup>Seminar on data collection and processing; CES/SEM.14/3; <sup>(10)</sup>Steering Committee for Statistical Computing Project, ECE/UNDP/SCP/8; <sup>(11)</sup>study Group on food and agricultural statistics, FAO/ECE/CES:ESS(81)-10; <sup>(12)</sup>Working Party on Electronic Data Processing, CES/WP.9/190

Publications: Annual Bulletin of Steel Statistics for Europe, vol. IX, 1981, Sales No. E/F/R.82.II.E.7; Annual Bulletin of Coal Statistics for Europe, vol. XVI, 1981, Sales No. E/F/R.82.II.E.9; Annual Bulletin of Housing and Building Statistics for Europe, vol. XXV, 1981, Sales No. E/F/R.82.II.E.12; Statistics of World Trade in Steel 1981, Sales No. E/F/R.82.II.E.15; Annual Bulletin of Transport Statistics for Europe, vol. XXXIII, 1981, Sales No. E/F/R.82.II.E.17; Annual Bulletin of Electric Energy Statistics for Europe, vol. XXVII, 1981, Sales No. E/F/R.82.II.E.19; Statistics of Road Traffic Accidents in

Europe 1981, Sales No. E/F/R.82.II.E.21; Annual Bulletin of Gas Statistics for Europe, vol. XXVII, 1981, Sales No. E/F/R.82.II.E.22; Annual Bulletin of General Energy Statistics for Europe, vol. XIV, 1981, Sales No. E/F/R.83.II.E.9; Bulletin of Statistics on World Trade in Engineering Products 1981, Sales No. E/F/R.83.II.E.8; Half-yearly Bulletin of Electric Energy Statistics for Europe 1981, vol. XXVI, Nos. 1, 2; Quarterly Bulletin of Coal Statistics for Europe 1981, vol. XXX, Nos 1-4; Quarterly Bulletin of Steel Statistics for Europe 1981, vol. XXXII, Nos. 1-4; Statistical Indicators of Short-Term Economic Changes in ECE Countries 1981, vol. XXIII (monthly).

#### Programme questions concerning ECE

On 8 April 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> ECE invited its principal subsidiary bodies to consider ways to improve co-ordination and co-operation among themselves by, for example, examining further possibilities for organizing their work jointly in areas of common interest and examining means of strengthening mutual consultation. It invited them to evaluate their activities regularly in order to eliminate those of marginal utility and release resources for other activities. In addition, it asked for greater exchange among them in regard to economic projections (p. 649) and it selected energy as the next topic for a study on co-ordination of its activities (p. 654).

Also on 8 April,<sup>(1)</sup> in its resolution on its work and future activities (p. 648), ECE approved its work programme for 1981-1982 and endorsed in principle, subject to review in 1982, its long-term work programme for 1981-1985.<sup>(3)</sup> It also noted that its Executive Secretary would transmit to the Secretary-General, under his own responsibility, the draft of the ECE portion of the proposed United Nations medium-term plan for 1984-1989, which it decided to review in 1982.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>ECE (report, E/1981/53), 1(XXXVI), paras. 18-20, 8 Apr. Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>ECE, A(XXXVI), 8 Apr.

Workprogramme: <sup>(3)</sup>ECE, E/1981/53/Add.1.

## Latin America

The adoption of a Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s and the proclamation of that period as the Latin American Development Decade were the highlights of the nineteenth session of the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), held at Montevideo, Uruguay, from 4 to 15 May 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> The Programme identified economic and social development goals for Latin America, including the Caribbean area, and suggested action which the Governments of the region could take to achieve them, both in their mutual relations and in their contacts with the developed and developing countries outside (p. 661).

TWO ECLA bodies concerned with subregional integration met during the year- the Committee on Central American Economic Co-operation in July and the Caribbean Development and Co-operation Committee in November (p. 662). The two major institutes of the ECLA system- the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning (p. 662) and the Latin American Demographic Centre (p. 667)- continued their work of gathering information, publishing studies and advising Governments. From its headquarters at Santiago, Chile, the ECLA secretariat managed a technical co-operation programme of \$8.6 million in 1981 (p. 663).

A Regional Plan of Action on New and Renewable Sources of Energy was adopted in March by a Regional Preparatory Meeting (p. 665) convened in connection with the United Nations Conference on the subject, held at Nairobi, Kenya, in August (p. 689).

Other topics dealt with by the ECLA secretariat during the year in its research and assistance activities- most of them also covered in the Regional Programme or in the 24 other resolutions adopted at the May session- included international trade and finance (p. 663), transport (p. 664), industrial development (p. 664), transnational corporations (p. 665), natural resources (p. 665), food and agriculture (p. 666), science and technology (p. 666), social development (p. 666), environment (p. 667), human settlements (p. 667), women in development (p. 667) and statistics (p. 668). In addition, ECLA presented its views on its role as a result of the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system (p. 607).

The Netherlands Antilles was admitted on 14 May as the second associate member of ECLA (p. 668), raising its total membership to 40.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA, E/1981/56.

Publications: CEPAL Review, No. 13 (E/CEPAL/G.1145), Sales No. E.81.II.G.2; No. 14 (E/CEPAL/G.1179), Sales No. E.81.II.G.3; No. 15 (E/CEPAL/G.1187), Sales No. E.81.II.G.4. Latin America: The New Regional and World Setting, Sales No. E.81.II.G.22.

#### Economic and social trends

The economic growth rate of 6 per cent recorded by Latin America in 1980, though below the 6.4 per cent attained in 1979, was the highest for any major developing region and markedly above the rates of the centrally planned economies and the developed market-economy countries, stated the Economic Survey of Latin America 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> the preliminary summary of which the Economic and Social Council noted on 21 July 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> However, higher imports, along with an enormous rise in interest rates, had increased Latin America's balance-of-



payments deficit on current account to a record \$27.7 billion. At the same time, the decade-long rise in the net inflow of foreign capital halted, leaving the region with an insufficient amount to cover the current account deficit, so that Latin America's balance of payments closed with a negative balance—for the first time since 1962—of a little over \$1.7 billion. Furthermore, the region's gross debt almost doubled over three years, to \$212 billion in December 1980. On the positive side, the value of Latin America's exports grew by 28 per cent, compared to the world average of 20 per cent.

The Committee for Development Planning, in the analysis of regional economic trends contained in its March/April 1981 report,<sup>(4)</sup> said of Latin America that deteriorating international circumstances made it less likely that the rapid growth of a few countries in the early 1970s would be repeated for the region as a whole. Whereas economic growth for the oil-producing countries was likely to accelerate, such growth for the other countries would require profound changes in the external environment. It would require policies to increase domestic savings, improve income distribution, eradicate the worst aspects of poverty, and enable all sectors of society to participate economically and socially. It would also require substantial changes in developed countries' policies to facilitate growth and diversification of Latin American exports, and improved international financial mechanisms to reduce the region's dependence on private capital markets. Thought should be given to alternative development styles, less imitative of industrialized country patterns and more compatible with meeting the social needs of the majority.

A Panama Declaration, adopted by the foreign and other ministers and senior officials of the Latin American Economic System at a consultation meeting on Latin America's economic relations with the United States (Panama, 30 November and 1 December), was transmitted to the Secretary-General by a letter of 8 December from Panama.<sup>(2)</sup> It called for a series of measures affecting international trade, commodities, financing, transnational corporations, foreign investment and technology transfer.

Decision: (1)ESC, 1981/187, para. (d), 24 July.

Letter: (2)Panama, 8 Dec., A/C.2/36/6.

Publications: (3)Economic Survey of Latin America 1980 (E/CEPAL/G.1191), Sales No. E.82.II.G.1 (summary, E/1981/77); 1981 (E/CEPAL/G.1248), Sales No. E.83.II.G.2.

Report: (4)CDP, E/1981/27.

#### Development policy and economic co-operation

On 15 May 1981, ECLA proclaimed the 1980s as the Latin American Development Decade and

adopted a Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Programme focused on implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade<sup>(5)</sup> on the basis of Latin America's objectives and conditions. After sketching in broad outline the current situation and the needs of national economic and social development, it defined goals for co-operation within Latin America, with other developing areas and globally, in each major economic sector: technical co-operation (p. 663), international trade and finance (p. 663), transport (p. 664), industry (p. 664), transnational corporations (p. 665), natural resources (p. 665), energy (p. 665), food and agriculture (p. 666), and science and technology (p. 666). The ECLA Committee of High-level Government Experts, which drafted the Programme (fifth session, Quito, Ecuador, 9-13 March),<sup>(1)</sup> was entrusted with the task of appraising its implementation.

The Programme established a number of targets for the 1980s, including annual growth rates of 4.4 per cent for agriculture and fisheries, 8.5 per cent for industry and a little over 7 per cent for the region's economy as a whole. At the national level, it called for the real participation of the population in development and its benefits, along with deep-seated structural changes. Regionally, it stated that machinery for integration and co-operation must be supported and improved, trade preferences established for products originating in the region, and special consideration given to less economically advanced countries. At the global level, substantial funds must be procured on terms favouring development.

ECLA decided to assign top priority to the studies and action referred to in the Programme,<sup>(3)</sup> and requested that the Programme be presented to the Inter-American Development Bank and taken into account when the Bank defined its functions and policies in the 1980s.<sup>(4)</sup>

The European Economic Community members of ECLA and the United States said they could not support the adoption of the Programme because it went beyond the mandate of defining a regional development strategy.

Report: (1)Committee of High-level Government Experts, E/CEPAL/G.1155.

Resolutions: ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 15 May: (2)422(XIX); <sup>(3)</sup>425(XIX), para. 1 (a); (4)429(XIX). (5)GA: 35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503).

Publications: Latin American Development in the 1980s (E/CEPAL/G.1158/Rev.1), Sales No. E.81.II.G.10; Latin American Development Projections for the 1980s (E/CEPAL/G.1150), Sales No. E.81.II.G.11; Regional Appraisals for the International Development Strategy (1973 & 1975), Sales No. E.81.II.G.23; International Development Strategy and Establishment of a New International Economic Order: Third Regional Appraisal (1977), Sales No. E.81.II.G.38.

### Economic integration and co-operation

A study on regional integration and co-operation in the 1980s was issued by the ECLA secretariat in April 1981.<sup>(5)</sup> It summarized the economic problems facing the region, examined the potential of integration, analysed specific cases and outlined proposals for action.

The benefits of integration and other forms of co-operation among Latin American countries were stressed in the Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s (p. 661), adopted by ECLA on 15 May.<sup>(1)</sup> To strengthen integration treaties, it stated, machinery should be set up to grant trade preference to products originating in the region, grant special consideration to the less economically developed countries, keep in view the final goal of a Latin American common market, and link the integration plans although retaining their institutional individuality.

Also on 15 May, ECLA decided that it should strengthen links with and lend full support to Latin American integration and economic co-operation agencies.<sup>(2)</sup>

With regard to economic co-operation among developing countries on a global scale, the Programme called for broadening and deepening co-operation between Latin America and other developing areas, and specified the nature of such ties in regard to technical co-operation (p. 663), technology, food, energy, raw materials and industrialization.

Also on 15 May, ECLA asked its Executive Secretary to strengthen the secretariat's machinery for economic and technical co-operation among developing countries and for regional economic integration, and to identify joint activities with other regional commissions; and called for full support of those efforts from developed and developing countries.<sup>(3)</sup>

In addition, ECLA requested its Executive Secretary to consider what advisory services it could provide and studies it could prepare in the light of the results of the High Level Conference on Economic Co-operation among Developing Countries (p. 383), held at Caracas, Venezuela, in May.<sup>(4)</sup>

ECLA continued to collaborate with the Economic Commission for Africa in a pioneering interregional project to promote economic and technical co-operation among developing countries in international trade, human resources development and technology.

Resolution: ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 15 May: <sup>(1)</sup>422(XIX), annex, sect. III.B.1; <sup>(2)</sup>425(XIX), para. 1 (b); <sup>(3)</sup>438(XIX); <sup>(4)</sup>439(XIX).

Study: <sup>(5)</sup>E/CEPAL/G.1151.

Caribbean area. Throughout 1981, the ECLA Subregional Office for the Caribbean carried out

activities to promote integration and co-operation in such fields as development planning (see below), development information (p. 663), international trade, shipping, energy, agriculture, science and technology, social development and women.

On 15 May, ECLA urged its developing member countries and the various regional secretariats to identify possibilities of technical and economic co-operation between countries of the Caribbean and other Latin American countries, and requested its Executive Secretary to prepare work programmes for such co-operation, identify obstacles and collaborate in preparing joint projects.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Caribbean Development and Co-operation Committee met at the technical level (sixth session, first part, St. George's, Grenada, 4-10 November 1981) to prepare for the ministerial part of its session in New York in February 1982.

The offices for the Caribbean and Central America were the subject of a Joint Inspection Unit report considered by ECLA and the Economic and Social Council in 1981 (p. 668).

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 440(XIX), 15 May.

Central America. The Committee on Central American Economic Co-operation, at an ad hoc meeting at Mexico City on 3 July 1981, recommended that its members take advantage of and harness the interest which the subregion had awakened internationally, so as to mobilize outside resources to strengthen economic interdependence.<sup>(1)</sup> To put this recommendation into effect, the ministers for foreign affairs of the Central American countries signed a declaration on 16 August at Tegucigalpa, Honduras, establishing a Central American Economic and Social Development Co-operation Group.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Central American Economic Co-operation, E/CEPAL/G. 1182.

### Development planning

The Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) organized a seminar on public enterprises in the development planning of Central America and the Caribbean (San José, Costa Rica, 1-3 July 1981). It provided advisory services to Brazil, Colombia, Haiti, Panama and Venezuela, and sent missions to Brazil and Cuba. International courses were held at Santiago on social planning (6 April-12 June) and central planning (20 April-13 November), and national courses on planning were given in Brazil, Costa Rica, Grenada, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay and Spain.

The ECLA secretariat published a study on Latin American development in the 1980s.<sup>(2)</sup>

On 15 May, ECLA endorsed a recommendation that the United Nations Development Programme be requested to continue its financial support for ILPES, and urged Governments and co-operation agencies to provide ILPES with additional resources for its Caribbean activities.<sup>(1)</sup>

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 435(XIX), 15 study; <sup>(2)</sup>E/CEPAL/G.1150.

#### Development Information

The Latin American Economic and Social Documentation Centre, in addition to publishing a number of studies and reports, organized in 1981 a second training course/seminar on the operation of the information for planning system in Latin America (Santiago, 11-25 May), a technical meeting on terminology for development (Santiago, 1-3 July) and a meeting, sponsored by the International Development Research Centre, to launch a national planning information network in Panama (Panama City, 30 November-2 December). Together with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, it organized a seminar on methodologies for evaluating information and related infrastructures in Latin America (Santiago, 30 September-2 October).

The Caribbean Documentation Centre organized workshops on techniques for effective participation in the Caribbean Information System-Planning (Wilkey, Barbados, 9-13 March), basic techniques for library organization and services (Saint Vincent, 15-26 June), and methodology for inventory of development information units (Bridgetown, Barbados, 19-23 October).

On 15 May, ECLA requested its secretariat to study the possibilities of broadening the supply of economic and trade information for Latin American countries, in order to enable them to set up or improve their own development information units.<sup>(1)</sup>

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 437(XIX), 15 May.

#### Special measures for LDCs

In its Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s,<sup>(1)</sup> adopted on 15 May 1981 (p. 661), ECLA called for concentrated efforts to develop co-operation in areas of major interest to the least developed countries (LDCs) of Latin America and the Caribbean, such as energy, economic planning and administration, access to the sea, markets, development of infrastructure, training of technicians and professionals, and acquisition of strategic raw materials.

In another action on the same date, ECLA decided to set up an office at La Paz, Bolivia, for the study and analysis of the problems of de-

pressed areas, and requested support for the office from the United Nations Development Programme and international and regional financial institutions.<sup>(2)</sup>

Resolutions: ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 15 May: <sup>(1)</sup>422(XIX), annex, sect. III.B.10; <sup>(2)</sup>424(XIX).

#### Technical co-operation

Expenditures by ECLA for technical co-operation activities in 1981 totalled \$8.6 million, of which the major sources were voluntary trust funds (\$2.8 million), the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (\$2.7 million) and the United Nations Development Programme (\$2.1 million).

Major areas of activity included demographic sampling, household surveys, economic development, transport, export promotion, water resources, energy, environment and socio-economic planning. ECLA and its two sister organizations, the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) (p. 662) and the Latin American Demographic Centre (CELADE) (p. 667), provided advisory services to Governments. ILPES trained 41 fellows from 14 Latin American countries and CELADE granted 30 fellowships.

#### Technical co-operation among developing countries

The Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s (p. 661), adopted by ECLA on 15 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> suggested several ways in which Latin American countries could enhance their mutual technical co-operation activities, including greater use of national consultancy services and of capital goods produced within the region, partnerships between engineering enterprises, the creation of multinational enterprises to execute joint projects, and technological complementarity in sectors where some countries had acquired greater experience and know-how. In other resolutions of the same date, ECLA called for a strengthening of its activities to promote economic and technical co-operation among developing countries (p. 662).

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 422(XIX), annex, sect. III.B.9, 15 May.

#### International trade and finance

Expansion of intraregional trade, elimination of non-tariff barriers in Latin America, establishment of trade information systems, co-operation in transport and insurance, the possible establishment of multinational marketing enterprises, support to producers' associations, co-operation in export promotion and promotion of tourism were among the international trade measures envisaged in the Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s (p. 661), adopted

by ECLA on 15 May 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> With respect to a Latin American policy on world trade, the Programme called for the region's countries to consider voluntary application of similar tariff treatment to exports of developed countries which practised protectionist policies, persistent and co-ordinated action to secure fuller participation in negotiations and mechanisms for the defence of Latin American interests, and joint action to shift to other countries activities that were not internationally competitive.

With regard to monetary and financial matters, the Programme suggested that Latin American countries adopt concrete measures on joint regional activities, machinery for payments clearance and balance-of-payments support, financing of intraregional trade, medium- and long-term financing of investment, financing of multinational projects, strengthening of co-operation among Latin American banks, and mutual technical and financial co-operation. On external problems, the Programme urged increased international financial flows adapted to the needs of developing countries, support to debt renegotiation for countries requesting it, the establishment within the World Bank of a long-term financing facility for capital goods, reform of the international monetary system and a greater role for developing countries in decision-making on monetary issues.

Also on 15 May, ECLA instructed its secretariat to respond to government requests for advice on the repercussions of agreements emanating from multilateral trade negotiations, and to give priority to studies on the cost to Latin America of protectionism practised by developed countries and on the effects of the various national trade preference schemes under the Generalized System of Preferences (p. 546).<sup>(2)</sup>

An ECLA secretariat project examining the economic relations between individual Latin American countries and Eastern Europe was completed in early 1981. Another continuing project investigated the implications for Latin America of the state of the international monetary and financial systems.

Under an export promotion project carried out by ECLA and the International Trade Centre, a round-table meeting was held on the financing of exports of manufactures (Santiago, 29 June-1 July), followed by a meeting of export credit insurance bodies (Santiago, 2-4 December) at which the statutes of the Latin American Association of Export Credit Insurance Agencies were drawn up. A seminar on consortia and other joint export schemes (Mexico City, 3-7 August) examined various joint export alternatives available to Latin American export producers, particularly small and medium-sized enterprises.

Resolutions: ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 15 May: <sup>(1)</sup>422(XIX), annex, sects. III.B & D; <sup>(2)</sup>430(XIX).

Publication: Monetary Policy and Balance-of-Payments Adjustment: Three Studies (E/CEPAL/1088), Sales No. E.81.11.G.50.

#### Transport

In its Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s (p. 661), adopted on 15 May 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> ECLA suggested that Governments review measures for co-ordinated action to build a land and river transport system linking the Atlantic and Pacific in South and Central America, as well as the Orinoco, Amazon and Plate river basins in eastern South America. With regard to maritime transport, the Programme cited two problems: the difficulty in obtaining freight rate reductions for countries which had improved their ports, and adaptation of merchant marine policies to deal with unilateral decisions of liner conferences (shipping cartels).

Also on 15 May, ECLA expressed support for the organization of an international meeting of interested countries on the Orinoco-Amazon-Plate link, at which countries could also present construction plans for the Trans-Jungle Border Highway of the Bolivarian Nations.<sup>(4)</sup>

A meeting attended by 55 railway company representatives, under a project sponsored by ECLA with the Latin American Railways Association and the World Bank, considered operational and management information systems in the region's railways (Santiago, 5-9 October). A round-table meeting on the transport and foreign trade of Paraguay (Asunción, Paraguay, 15-17 June) was organized by ECLA with the Paraguayan Export Promotion Centre and the International Trade Centre. As part of a new project financed by the Netherlands, the ECLA secretariat prepared a study on economic co-operation among Latin American and Caribbean countries in the establishment of container repair and maintenance enterprises.<sup>(5)</sup> Meetings of experts were held on trade facilitation and strengthening of transport institutions in South America (Santiago, 16-20 March)<sup>(2)</sup> and the Caribbean (Paramaribo, Suriname, 27-30 October).<sup>(1)</sup>

Reports: Meetings on trade facilitation and transport in: <sup>(1)</sup>Caribbean. E/CEPAL/G.1192; <sup>(2)</sup>South America, E/CEPAL/G.1178.

Resolutions: ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 15 May: <sup>(3)</sup>422(XIX), annex, sects. II.B.3 & III.D.8; <sup>(4)</sup>423(XIX).

Study: <sup>(5)</sup>E/CEPAL/G.1186.

#### Industrial development

In its Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s (p. 661), adopted on 15 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> ECLA stated that the countries of the region should strengthen basic industry, agro-industry, and small and medium-sized

enterprises; establish a regional industrial strategy based on comparative advantage; establish long-term policies for restructuring of production capacity; accelerate import substitution where necessary; improve industrial development plans to rationalize the use of natural resources in the light of regional demand; expand scientific and technological capacity; improve national legislation on technology transfer and the activities of transnational corporations; set up regional multinational enterprises, and implement joint projects to increase exportable manufactures and semi-manufactures. The Programme called for consultations within the region to identify joint action for restructuring world industry.

A study on Latin American industrial policy in the 1980s was issued.<sup>(2)</sup> Studies on the supply and production of capital goods were continued by the ECLA secretariat. Industrial profiles of Barbados, the Dominican Republic, Grenada, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago were prepared.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 422(XIX), annex, sects. III.B.5 & D.7, 15 May.

Study: <sup>(2)</sup>E/CEPAL/G. 1161.

#### Transnational corporations

Ways of improving the position of Latin American countries when dealing with transnational corporations (TNCs)—through information, common positions in negotiations, opposition to restrictive business practices and the determination of areas where such enterprises might make genuine contributions—were cited in the Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s (p. 661), adopted by ECLA on 15 May 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> The Programme set out principles to which TNCs should conform, stating that they should comply with host country laws and regulations, not interfere in internal or foreign affairs, not serve as instruments of another State's foreign policy, be subject to the host country's permanent sovereignty over its natural resources, comply with national development policies and supply information to ensure that they were doing so, make a real economic contribution to the host country, contribute to the development of its scientific and technological capacity, and refrain from restrictive trade practices.

The United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations and ECLA joined in organizing a seminar for South American government officials to consider various aspects of TNCs and Latin American development (Santiago, 30 March–10 April). Another seminar dealt with alternative approaches to negotiating with foreign investors and TNCs in the copper and tin industries.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 422(XIX), annex, sects. III.B.11 & D.5, 15 May.

#### Natural resources

The Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s (p. 661), adopted by ECLA on 15 May 1981, called for action to foster collective self-reliance in the regional supply of raw materials, environmental conservation and the rational use of resources, better returns from commodity exports through a greater degree of local processing and greater participation by producing countries in distribution and price-setting, and co-operation through producers' associations and marketing companies.<sup>(\*)</sup>

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 422(XIX), annex, sect. III.B.3, 15 May.

#### Water

The first Latin American Seminar on Horizontal Co-operation for the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade (Santiago, 9–13 March 1981) examined ways of encouraging co-operation to achieve the targets of the Decade (1981–1990) (p. 684), with emphasis on social, economic and financial aspects.<sup>(1)</sup> For the second such seminar, planned for January 1982, the ECLA secretariat prepared two papers describing co-operation in this field among the countries of Central America<sup>(5)</sup> and the Caribbean.<sup>(6)</sup> Another paper examined the needs and possible sources of financing for Latin American programmes to improve drinking water supply and sanitation during the Decade.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Inter-secretariat Working Group on Water Resources in Latin America held its first meeting (Montevideo, Uruguay, 7 May) to co-ordinate activities among organizations of the United Nations system.<sup>(2)</sup> The ECLA secretariat co-operated on a regional seminar on environmental management in large water resource projects (p. 667).

On 15 May, ECLA requested a survey of the progress being made on water resources in Latin America, and asked its secretariat to promote co-operation, support government activities to improve water resource management, and strengthen its efforts concerning the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade.<sup>(3)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Seminar on drinking water and sanitation decade, E/CEPAL/G.1171; <sup>(2)</sup>Working Group on Water Resources in Latin America, E/CEPAL/G.1181.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 443(XIX), 15

Studies: <sup>(4)</sup>E/CEPAL/G.1166, <sup>(5)</sup>E/CEPAL/L.256, <sup>(6)</sup>E/CEPAL/L.259.

Publication: Water Resources of Latin America: Regional Report, 1977, Sales No. E.81.II.G.36.

#### Energy

Regional co-operation should be fostered in the use of non-traditional energy sources, the processing and channelling of data on energy

sources such as petroleum, and in training of personnel, business management and other aspects of energy economics and technology, ECLA declared in its Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s (p. 661), adopted on 15 May 1981.<sup>(3)</sup> At the global level, the Programme called for several measures to maintain the rational development of developing countries' energy resources and to meet their needs, including the provision of financial and technical resources, exploration and development of indigenous resources, protection of the purchasing power of the unit value of energy exports by developing countries, and greater participation by those countries in transportation and post-extraction activities.

A Regional Plan of Action on New and Renewable Sources of Energy<sup>(1)</sup> was adopted by a regional preparatory meeting convened by ECLA and the Latin American Energy Organization (Mexico City, 16-20 March) in preparation for the 1981 United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 695).

On 15 May, ECLA decided that its secretariat should continue to help member countries with their energy problems and policies, provide timely information on available energy resources and on world supply and demand, support the work of the Latin American Energy Organization, and carry out the studies that would enable Latin American countries to implement the Plan of Action.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, on 21 August, called on the international community to give financial and technical support for the development of those energy sources in the developing countries of Latin America.<sup>(2)</sup>

Plan of Action: <sup>(1)</sup>A/CONF.100/8/Add.5 (E/CEPAL/CONF.73/L.2/Rev.3).

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (report, A/CONF.100/11, Sales No. E.81.1.24); 6, sect. III, 21 Aug. ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 15 May: <sup>(3)</sup>422(XIX), annex, sects. III.B.4 & D.3; <sup>(4)</sup>426(XIX).

#### Food and agriculture

Latin America should seek to check the rapid rise in the number of people suffering from hunger and malnutrition and quickly recover its position as a net exporter of agricultural products, stated the Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s (p. 661), adopted by ECLA on 15 May 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> To that end, the region should pursue a substantial increase in investment for food production, more research, modernization, national food reserve policies, participation in warning systems on shortages, international mobilization of financing and action against agricultural protectionism in developed countries.

Also on 15 May, ECLA called for a major study by its secretariat on the relationship between styles of development and food systems, with particular reference to modernizing or changing economic structures;<sup>(2)</sup> and resolved to support regional information machinery on agricultural surpluses and shortages and to promote studies on food security.<sup>(3)</sup>

A co-operation agreement was signed between ECLA and the Mexican Food System, leading to a joint programme aimed at assessing Mexico's recent experience in the study of food problems. A study on agricultural development in the 1980s was issued.<sup>(4)</sup> The ECLA secretariat co-operated on a regional seminar on expansion of the agricultural frontier and the environment (p. 667).

Resolutions: ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 15 May : <sup>(1)</sup>422(XIX), annex, sects. III.B.6 & D.4; <sup>(2)</sup>427(XIX); <sup>(3)</sup>428(XIX).

Study: <sup>(4)</sup>E/CEPAL/G.1159.

#### Science and technology

The Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s (p. 661), adopted by ECLA on 15 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> called for several measures to develop science and technology in Latin America, including action to safeguard the interests of technology-purchasing countries, strengthening of indigenous technological capacities, training of personnel and the design of policies to make the best use of them, obtaining international and regional financial support, harmonizing standardization policies, and the establishment of joint programmes for training and exchange of skilled workers.

The ECLA secretariat continued its study of the impact of micro-electronics on Latin American economies, and prepared country studies on the economic and technological behaviour of metal-working enterprises in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 422(XIX), annex, sects. III.B.7 & D.6, 15 May.

#### Social development

Goals for social development in Latin America were set by the Regional Programme of Action for Latin America in the 1980s (p. 661) adopted by ECLA on 15 May 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> They called for a redistribution policy to eliminate extreme poverty, integration of women into development, policies to reduce unemployment and democratize education, reduction of the housing shortage, expansion of health services so that all inhabitants could achieve a level of health that would allow them to lead productive lives, extension of social security to the entire population, prevention of disability and rehabilitation of disabled persons,

integration of population programmes into socio-economic strategies, consideration of environmental impacts and the elimination of regional disequilibrium within countries.

Work was completed at the end of 1981 on a project that produced more than 80 studies on various aspects of development and education in the region. Sponsors of the project were ECLA, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and the United Nations Development Programme.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 422(XIX), annex, sects. III.A.2, 15 May.

#### Population

The Latin American Demographic Centre (CELADE) continued in 1981 to assist countries with their census programmes, and to issue and revise population estimates for individual countries. In February it initiated at its Santiago headquarters a regular two-year post-graduate teaching programme offering the Master's degree in demography and in social population studies; this programme replaced previous courses on demographic analysis, the last of which was completed in June. The fourth regional intensive course on demography was given at San José, Costa Rica (August-December). National courses and seminars were arranged in Argentina, Costa Rica and Panama.

With the Statistical Service of Barbados and the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, CELADE co-sponsored a regional seminar on indirect procedures for estimating immigration (Barbados, 10-21 May). Another seminar dealt with recent demographic techniques (Santiago, 7-18 June).

After being informed that CELADE had had to cut back its activities for financial reasons, ECLA, on 15 May, called on the United Nations Fund for Population Activities to continue its financial support, requested ECLA members to provide more resources, and recommended that any new funds be used for the CELADE office at San José so as to strengthen activities in Central America and the Caribbean.<sup>(\*)</sup>

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 436(XIX), 15 May.

#### Environment

Three regional seminars were held in 1981 under a joint project between ECLA and the United Nations Environment Programme concerned with horizontal co-operation in Latin America on styles of development and the environment.

The first of these, the Regional Seminar on Environmental Management and Large Water Resource Projects (Concordia, Argentina, 1-3

October), suggested that high-level experts be brought in to identify likely environmental effects of dams and other big projects and that ECLA consider establishing a centre for training in environmental management of such projects.<sup>(\*)</sup> The Regional Seminar on the Expansion of the Agricultural Frontier and the Environment in Latin America (Brasilia, Brazil, 10-13 November) recommended a number of steps to protect frontier areas from environmental degradation while providing economic support to lands newly opened to agricultural development.<sup>(2)</sup> The Regional Seminar on Metropolitanization and Environment (Curitiba, Brazil, 16-19 November) favoured the establishment of co-operation machinery among authorities responsible for planning and developing Latin American metropolises, with a scientific and technical nucleus that would propose subjects for co-operation.<sup>(3)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>seminar on Environmental Management and Large Water Resource Projects, E/CEPAL/L.262 & Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>Seminar on Expansion of Agricultural Frontier and Environment, E/CEPAL/L.261 & Corr.1; <sup>(3)</sup>Seminar on Metropolitanization and Environment; E/CEPAL/L.266 & Corr.1.

#### Human settlements

Observing that ECLA had not yet received resources for its human settlements activities in accordance with the decentralization envisaged by the General Assembly in 1977 when it established the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat),<sup>(2)</sup> ECLA asked its Executive Secretary on 15 May 1981 to take steps to obtain the resources needed to permit the proper execution of the Latin American programme in this field.<sup>(1)</sup>

A seminar on technologies appropriate for human settlements in humid tropical climate (Lima, Peru, 30 November-12 December) was held by ECLA in co-operation with the Peruvian Ministry of Housing.

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 444(XIX), 15 May; <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 32/162, sect. IV, 19 Dec. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 523).

#### Women

The Presiding Officers of the Regional Conference on the Integration of Women into the Economic and Social Development of Latin America and the Caribbean (fourth meeting, Quito, Ecuador, 9 and 10 March 1981) made recommendations to Governments and United Nations bodies, including a suggestion that ECLA co-operate with Governments in identifying and generating economic co-operation projects which concerned the situation of women.<sup>(1)</sup> Among ECLA activities in this sphere during the year were a Caribbean regional training work-

shop in programme and project planning skills (Barbados, 14-26 June) and an inter-agency seminar to analyse the integration of women into social planning (Santiago, 7 and 8 September).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Presiding Officers of Conference on women and development, E/CEPAL/G.1173.

#### Statistics

The ECLA secretariat continued to assemble and publish quantitative information on Latin America, and its three regional advisers carried out 12 advisory missions in 1981. A workshop on environmental statistics was held in conjunction with the United Nations Statistical Office (Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, 26-28 August).

Publications: Statistical Yearbook for Latin America 1980 (E/CEPAL/G.1210), Sales No. S/E.81.II.G.5; 1981 (E/CEPAL/G.1281), Sales No. S/E.83.II.G.1.

#### Organizational questions concerning ECLA

On 15 May 1981, ECLA made a number of recommendations on its role in the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system (p. 607).

Admission of the Netherlands Antilles as an associate member

Having been informed by the Netherlands that it wished the Netherlands Antilles to be admitted as an associate member, ECLA approved the request on 14 May 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> The Economic and Social Council made the consequent changes in the ECLA terms of reference on 24 July (p. 608).

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECLA (report, E/1981/56), 445(XIX), 14 May.

#### Work programme and medium-term plan

The 1982-1983 work programme of the ECLA system (including the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning and the Latin American Demographic Centre) was approved by ECLA on 15 May 1981, along with its calendar of conferences for 1981-1984.<sup>(1)</sup> In a related action on the same day, ECLA resolved that its Committee of the Whole should review the planning and programming process in 1982 and that the Committee of High-level Government Experts, at its annual sessions, should make suggestions to the member Governments about priorities in the work programme.<sup>(2)</sup>

ECLA also decided on 15 May to transmit to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination the ECLA section of the draft United Nations medium-term plan for 1984-1989, as revised by the secretariat to take account of decisions at the Commission's 1981 session.<sup>(3)</sup>

Resolutions: ECLA (report E/1981/56), 15 May: <sup>(1)</sup>432(XIX), <sup>(2)</sup>433(XIX), <sup>(3)</sup>434(XIX).

#### Subregional offices

A December 1980 report by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) on the ECLA subregional offices for Central America and Panama and for the Caribbean was transmitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General in February 1981, together with his comments.<sup>(3)</sup> The report, prepared by Inspector Alfred N. Forde, focused on the delegation of administrative authority from ECLA headquarters at Santiago to its two subregional offices, located at Mexico City and at Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago.

The report found that, while the delegation of authority on programming and substantive matters had been real, excessive administrative control from Santiago had weakened the capacity of the Caribbean office. It recommended a greater delegation of authority to that office on staff matters, and the strengthening of its capacity to handle its financial affairs. It also recommended that headquarters staff members be rotated or redeployed to the subregional offices.

In his comments, the Secretary-General observed that there had recently been a significant decentralization of administrative authority to the Caribbean office, especially on personnel matters. However, as that office had a staff of 45 in February 1980 compared to 119 in the Central American office, it was cost-effective to differentiate between the offices in the decentralization of some administrative tasks, especially financial affairs. The Secretariat's Administrative Management Service would survey the situation in 1982 and make recommendations. In addition, instructions would be issued to increase staff rotation among ECLA offices.

ECLA took note of the JIU report and the Secretary-General's comments in May.<sup>(2)</sup> The Economic and Social Council did likewise on 23 July, in a decision recommended without vote on 17 July by its Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee, on an oral proposal by its Chairman.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/182, 23 July, text following.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ECLA, E/1981/56; <sup>(3)</sup>JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/102.& Corr.1, and S-G comments, Add.1.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.17 (17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.40 (23 July).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/182

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee E/1981/96 (Part III) without vote. 17 July (meeting 17); draft orally proposed by Chairmen; agenda item 18.

Report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the subregional offices for Central America and Panama and for the Caribbean of the Economic Commission for Latin America. At its 40th plenary meeting, on 23 July 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Report on the subregional offices for Central America and Panama and for the Caribbean of the Economic Commission for Latin America" and of the comments of the Secretary-General thereon.



## Western Asia

The Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA) held its eighth session at Sana'a, Yemen, from 3 to 7 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> adopting on 6 May a total of 19 resolutions on various issues concerned with closer co-operation among the Arab States of the region.

An ECWA Conference on International Migration in the Arab World (Nicosia, Cyprus, May) recommended ways of overcoming problems caused by the increase in migration for employment (p. 671). Also during the year, expert group meetings were held on economic co-operation and integration (see below), the petrochemical and engineering industries (p. 670), agriculture (p. 671), new and renewable energy sources (p. 671), and international trade and industrial statistics (p. 672). Among the other major programmes of ECWA activity were international trade and finance (p. 670), transport (p. 670), science and technology (p. 671), and social development and disabled persons (p. 672).

The ECWA secretariat continued work on two projects relating to the Palestinians, initiated by ECWA in 1976.<sup>(3)</sup> In connection with one of them, ECWA stressed the need to complete as soon as possible the study on the economic and social situation and potential of the Palestinian Arab people, and affirmed that the study would cover the situation of those people wherever they might be.<sup>(2)</sup> It took similar action with respect to the other project, a census of the Palestinians (p. 671).

A \$1.8-million technical co-operation programme was executed by ECWA in 1981, with emphasis on advisory services to Governments in such areas as population and the role of women in development (p. 670).

In December, the Iraqi Government made available to ECWA its new temporary site at Baghdad, the city where it was to establish its permanent headquarters once its accommodations were ready (p. 672). The decision to move the headquarters from Beirut, Lebanon, was taken in 1979.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ECWA, E/1981/55.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ECWA, 88(VIII), 6 May.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1976, p. 504.

### Economic trends

Whereas Western Asia had benefited from the sharp rise in the price of petroleum, which more than doubled over the previous two years, it had been adversely affected by world inflation and international monetary instability, according to the summary of the Survey of Economic and Social

Developments in the ECWA Region, 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> noted by the Economic and Social Council on 24 July 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> For the countries of the region, about half of them oil-exporting, the oil-spurred growth momentum had continued in 1979-1980 but at a more moderate pace. Oil production had declined in 1980 by about 7 per cent below the 1979 level, due to the interruption of production in Iraq in the last quarter of 1980 because of the armed conflict with Iran. The average real growth rate of gross domestic product in 1979 was provisionally estimated at about 7 per cent. Income disparity had tended to widen between countries and among income groups.

The Committee for Development Planning, in its March/April 1981 review of regional economic conditions,<sup>(3)</sup> remarked that a shortage of capital was not generally a major constraint in Western Asia, in contrast to other developing regions. But the great economic diversity in the region and within countries continued to grow, pointing to the need for development strategies aimed at creating a more diversified and productive physical and human infrastructure. Oil-producing countries with accumulated financial surpluses had to face basic decisions on expenditure and consumption patterns, and needed to find opportunities for secure and sound investment. The Committee viewed increased diversification of investments within a framework of regional and interregional co-operation as an attractive alternative.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/187, para. (c), 24 July.

Publication: <sup>(2)</sup>Survey of Economic and Social Developments in the ECWA Region, 1980 (summary, E/1981/78).

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27.

### Development policy and economic co-operation

On 6 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> ECWA called on its Executive Secretary to help its member States assess the implications for the region of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,<sup>(3)</sup> translate the Strategy's objectives into specific national goals and targets, and undertake a periodic review and appraisal of progress in implementing the Strategy. On the same date, ECWA requested the Executive Secretary to intensify activities in favour of the least developed countries and to consult with the Secretary-General on the decentralization of such activities to ECWA.<sup>(2)</sup>

An Expert Group Meeting on Feasible Forms of Economic Co-operation and Integration in Western Asia (Beirut, Lebanon, 14-18 December) recommended that the factors which had hindered regional co-operation and integration be identified and analysed; that regional arrangements be flexible in view of rapidly changing circumstances; that emphasis be placed on co-operative efforts initiated at the lower policy-

making levels rather than at the top; that existing regional institutions be rationalized; and that consideration be given to creating such bodies as an Arab science and technology fund, an inter-Arab export-import bank and an Arab investment underwriting facility. A study on problems and prospects of financial integration<sup>(4)</sup> and another entitled "Towards a feasible path to economic co-operation and integration in Western Asia" were among the papers prepared by the ECWA secretariat on issues dealt with by the Meeting.

The secretariat, with funds from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), continued to assist the Arab Planning Institute, located in Kuwait, by providing administrative and technical support and financing fellowships. The assistance was limited to fellowships after 3 August

Resolution: ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 6 May-

<sup>(1)</sup> 93(VIII), <sup>(2)</sup> 100 (VIII), <sup>(3)</sup> GA:35/56, annex, 5 Dec 1980 (Y.U.N.1980,p.503):

Study: <sup>(4)</sup> E/ECWA/DPD/WG.15/12

#### Technical co-operation

Expenditures on technical co-operation activities executed by ECWA in 1981 totalled \$1.8 million. The largest share came from the United Nations regular programme of technical co-operation and financed regional advisory services to Governments. These were provided for public finance, national accounts, human resources development, customs administration, transport, and science and technology.

With support from UNDP, ECWA assisted Arab institutes for planning (see above) and statistics (p. 672) and two UNDP-funded projects were launched to help establish an Arab Institute for Banking and Financial Studies and to provide a regional training programme in petroleum technology. Technical co-operation was also financed by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (p. 671) and the Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women (p. 672).

On 6 May, ECWA requested its Executive Secretary to contact UNDP and other international bodies to secure funds for the establishment of ECWA advisory services to Governments in regard to agro-industries and textile industries, and international trade and balance of payments (see below).<sup>(1)</sup>

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup> ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 90(VIII), 6 May.

#### International trade and finance

On 6 May 1981, ECWA recommended that funds be allocated to enable its secretariat to provide Governments with advisory services in in-

ternational trade and balance of payments, to promote exports and to rationalize imports in the interest of comprehensive economic and social development.<sup>(2)</sup>

After receiving a survey report by the secretariat on the technical assistance needs of selected countries in financial management,<sup>(1)</sup> ECWA requested its Executive Secretary to study the possibility of establishing a regional facility to meet the training and advisory needs of ECWA members in development finance and to draw up proposals for assistance to such a project by UNDP.<sup>(3)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup> ECWA secretariat, E/ECWA/DPD/2.

Resolutions: ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 6 May: <sup>(2)</sup> 90(VIII), para. 2; <sup>(3)</sup> 104(VIII).

#### Transport

On 6 May 1981, ECWA called on its members to give due attention to the recommendations of its Intergovernmental Meeting on the Development of an Integrated Transport System for Western Asia (Beirut, Lebanon, March 1980) and requested that its secretariat continue to strengthen regional co-operation among developing countries on transport.<sup>(1)</sup>

The ECWA secretariat issued in December a report on transport harmonization and standardization, including the application of international and regional conventions.<sup>(2)</sup>

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup> ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 92(VIII),

Study: <sup>(2)</sup> E/ECWA/TCTD/WP.2.

#### Industrial development

In a resolution of 6 May 1981 urging expansion of its secretariat's advisory services to Governments (see above), ECWA recommended the establishment of advisory services for the agro-industries and textile industries.<sup>(3)</sup>

Two expert group meetings at Vienna, Austria, were convened jointly by ECWA and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization. An Expert Group Meeting on the Development of the Petrochemical Industry in the ECWA Region (9-12 June) proposed a programme of surveys, studies and field investigations as a basis for formulating a scheme for petrochemical industry development in the region, to be submitted to an intergovernmental meeting in 1983.<sup>(2)</sup> An Expert Group Meeting on Identification of Projects for Regional Co-operation in Capital Goods and Heavy Engineering Industries (15-19 June) recommended criteria for the selection of manufacturing industries as regional Arab transnational projects, and proposed four regional projects for the manufacture of digital telephone exchange equipment and four country projects involving transformer and telephone cable manufacture.<sup>(1)</sup>

Among the studies prepared by the ECWA secretariat for the Meeting on capital goods and heavy engineering industries were a preliminary report on industrialization and industrial polity<sup>(4)</sup> and a statistical compendium on exports of the world's major exporters of engineering products to the Arab world, 1971-1978.<sup>(5)</sup> For the Meeting on the petrochemical industry the secretariat prepared a paper outlining a basis for the formulation of strategies pertaining to the industry's development.<sup>(6)</sup>

A regional training programme for the development of industrial technological capabilities in petroleum-based industries was launched by ECWA in 1981, with financing from the United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Meeting on capital goods and heavy engineering industries, E/ECWA/ID/WG.4/25; <sup>(2)</sup>Meeting on petrochemical industry, E/ECWA/ID/WG.5/5.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 90(VIII), para. 16 May.

Studies: <sup>(4)</sup>E/ECWA/ID/WG.4/18, <sup>(5)</sup>E/ECWA/ID/WG.4/21, <sup>(6)</sup>E/ECWA/ID/WG.5/3.

#### Food and agriculture

Ways of combating desertification were examined by an Expert Group Meeting on Management, Conservation and Development of Agricultural Resources in the ECWA Region (Damascus, Syrian Arab Republic, 9-15 May 1981), which made recommendations to the secretariat, Governments and international organizations on agricultural resource, surveys, resource use policies, legislation, institution strengthening, education and training, research, communication documentation and information support, and international and regional co-operation. The Meeting was co-sponsored by ECWA, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the Arab Centre for the Studies of Arid Zones and Dry Lands. The Joint ECWA/FAO Agriculture Division prepared for the Meeting a survey of the state of resources and management in the agricultural sector of the region.<sup>(1)</sup>

A national workshop on food security planning was held in Jordan (Amman, 8-10 December).

Study: <sup>(1)</sup>Joint ECWA/FAO Agriculture Division, E/ECWA/AGR/WG.12/3.

#### Energy

A regional preparatory expert group meeting (Beirut, Lebanon, 12-16 January 1981) drew up a report<sup>(1)</sup> for submission to the August 1987 United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 689). Taking note of this report on 6 May, ECWA requested its Executive Secretary to ensure that additional

resources were allocated to it for the proper implementation of the programme of action stemming from the Conference and for any other related functions which might be entrusted to it.<sup>(2)</sup>

The ECWA secretariat published a study on Arab energy prospects to the year 2000.<sup>(3)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Preparatory Meeting on new and renewable sources of energy, A/CONF.100/7/Add.4 (E/ECWA/NR/WG.1/7).

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 94(VIII), 6 May.

Study: <sup>(3)</sup>E/ECWA/NR/12 & Corr.1.

#### Population

A Conference on International Migration in the Arab World (Nicosia, Cyprus, 11-16 May 1981) made recommendations on action by Governments and regional and international organizations to overcome the increasing difficulties stemming from greater intraregional and inter-regional migration for employment purposes. A report on the Conference indicated that the remittances of workers to countries exporting labour made a significant contribution to the economy of those countries, representing about 40 per cent of the net domestic product in some cases.

On 6 May 1981, ECWA requested the Executive Secretary to pursue measures needed to complete the census of the Palestinian Arab people which it had called for in 1976<sup>(2)</sup> and urged its members to supply census and other information concerning Palestinians in their territories.<sup>(1)</sup>

Advisory services in demography and population statistics were provided by ECWA in 1981 to Egypt, Oman, Qatar, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Emirates, with financing from the United Nations Fund for Population Activities.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 89(VIII), 6 May.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1976, o. 504.

Publication Population Latin of the United Nations Economic Commission for Western Asia, Nos. 20 & 21.

#### Science and technology

On 6 May 1981, ECWA requested its Executive Secretary to take measures to enable the secretariat to assume the increasing responsibilities entrusted to it in regard to science and technology, and to secure the necessary resources from within and outside the United Nations system.<sup>(1)</sup> Also on that date, ECWA urged its members to set up national centres or other organs for technology transfer and the establishment of technological capabilities, and invited United Nations organizations to co-operate with the ECWA secretariat in assisting States to do so.<sup>(2)</sup>

At a Seminar on Technology Policies in the Arab States (Paris, 14-18 December), held in co-

operation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, some 70 participants discussed papers on sectoral technology policies, investment aspects, the environment of technology policy in government operations, research and development, and international co-operation, as well as the role of consulting and engineering in technology transfer and development.

Resolutions: ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 6 May: <sup>(1)</sup>103(VIII), <sup>(2)</sup>106(VIII).

#### Social development and health

On 6 May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> ECWA urged its members to elaborate and implement long-term programmes on disability, requested the Executive Secretary to strengthen the work of ECWA in this area, and forwarded to the General Assembly a regional plan of action<sup>(1)</sup> as a contribution to the International Year of Disabled Persons (1981) (p. 795).

The ECWA secretariat issued in January a survey of social development in Western Asia during 1980.<sup>(3)</sup>

Plan of action: <sup>(1)</sup>E/ECWA/119 & Add.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 91(VIII), 6 May.

Survey: <sup>(3)</sup>E/ECWA/SDHS/L.9.

#### Women

With financing from the Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women (1976-1985), workshops in the ECWA region were conducted in Democratic Yemen, to strengthen the role of rural women extension workers; in the United Arab Emirates, to enable women from the Gulf area to organize training workshops; and in southern Lebanon, to train women workers in the administration of day-care centres and community services. The Fund also enabled ECWA to carry out field research, to prepare manuals and to begin data analysis in women-related fields.

#### Statistics

On 6 May 1981, ECWA recommended the strengthening of its Statistical Unit so that it could meet the increasing needs of member States for data, training of personnel and advisory services.<sup>(1)</sup> On the same date, it urged its members to participate fully in ECWA-executed regional statistical projects.<sup>(2)</sup>

An Expert Group Meeting on Foreign Trade and Industrial Statistics (Amman, Jordan, 5-10 September) recommended that the ECWA secretariat translate into Arabic the basic United Nations documents on these topics, organize meetings and training courses, and assist nation-

al statistical offices in modernizing international trade classifications and organizing industrial surveys and censuses.

The ECWA secretariat continued to collect and publish statistical series and indicators. It also assisted Democratic Yemen and Jordan in regard to national accounts, and aided those countries as well as the United Arab Emirates and Yemen with their national household survey capability programmes. With funds from the United Nations Development Programme, the secretariat provided technical and administrative support to courses organized by the Arab Institute for Training and Research in Statistics, at Baghdad, Iraq.

Resolutions: ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 6 May: <sup>(1)</sup>96(VIII), <sup>(2)</sup>102(VIII).

#### Programme and organizational questions concerning ECWA

On 6 May 1981, ECWA made a number of recommendations on its role in the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system (p. 607).

#### Relocation of headquarters

At a ceremony at Baghdad on 22 December 1981, temporary offices for ECWA were turned over to the United Nations by the Government of Iraq. This enabled the secretariat to begin moving from its former headquarters at Beirut, Lebanon, in accordance with a decision taken by the Economic and Social Council in 1979,<sup>(2)</sup> on the recommendation of ECWA. The temporary site, made available following the signing of an agreement between the United Nations and the Iraqi Government, consisted of two 10-storey buildings for offices, with two additional 10-storey buildings in 'the same compound available for housing of General Service staff members.

In anticipation of this development ECWA, on 6 May 1981, requested its Executive Secretary to continue to pay special attention to issues affecting staff efficiency and provide favourable terms of employment at the new location.<sup>(1)</sup>

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 95(VIII), 6 May. Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1979/49, 27 July 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 741).

#### Work programme

On 6 May 1981, ECWA adopted its work programme for 1982-1983<sup>(1)</sup> and decided to give member and non-member States participating in its annual sessions the opportunity to make financial contributions to its programmes for general or specific purposes.<sup>(2)</sup>

Resolutions: ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 6 May: <sup>(1)</sup>98(VIII), <sup>(2)</sup>99(VIII).

## Publications

On 6 May 1981, ECWA approved its publications programme for 1982-1983 and urged the secretariat to expand as widely as possible the publication and distribution of the results of its work.<sup>(1)</sup> The programme called for an increase in the number of recurrent publications from 6 to 10, with new series in food and agriculture, industrial development and natural resources.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 101 (VIII), 6 May.

## Co-operation with regional organizations

On 6 May 1981, ECWA recommended that its secretariat consult with specialized Arab and regional organizations before proposing new activities, and co-operate with such organisations on joint studies.<sup>(1)</sup> During the year, ECWA co-operated with the Arab Centre for the Studies of Arid Zones and Dry Lands in sponsoring a meeting on agricultural resources p. 671) and with the League of Arab States on statistical matters.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ECWA (report, E/1981/55), 97(VIII), 6 May.

## Chapter IX

## Natural resources

Revised arrangements for financing natural resources exploration and authorization of broadened activities for water resources development were among the highlights of United Nations work on natural resources issues in 1981.

The United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, despite financial constraints, expanded its mineral exploration programmes in developing countries, under the administration of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (p. 674). On the recommendation of the UNDP Governing Council, the Economic and Social Council, in July,<sup>(3)</sup> approved proposals made in January by a Working Group of Government Experts on the Fund's financial and other arrangements, including the establishment of a fixed ceiling for the amount countries would have to repay the Fund from their earnings on resources it helped to locate, with a reduced rate for contributions from the least developed countries. The Governing Council also decided to review in 1982 the possible expansion of the Fund's activities into geothermal energy.

Acting in July on recommendations of the Committee on Natural Resources, which held its seventh session from 18 to 29 May in New York,<sup>(1)</sup> the Economic and Social Council requested the Secretary-General to report to the Committee in 1983 on the utilization of subsurface space for storage, water supply and other purposes.<sup>(10)</sup> The Committee reviewed reports on new exploration techniques including remote sensing (p. 676) and on permanent sovereignty over natural resources (p. 677). The Secretary-General reported to the General Assembly on

the continuing programme of missions to assess the needs and costs of natural resources exploration and development in individual developing countries (p. 676).

In regard to mineral resources, the Council requested the Secretary-General to prepare for the Committee at its next session, in 1983, reports on investments in major mineral industries,<sup>(6)</sup> development prospects for rare metals,<sup>(5)</sup> prospects for the development of non-metallic raw materials,<sup>(4)</sup> and possible new locations in the developing countries for phosphate rock and potash exploration.<sup>(7)</sup>

On water resources development, the Council adopted a six-part resolution<sup>(8)</sup> calling for new initiatives in this field, including the sending of interdisciplinary advisory missions to help Governments formulate water policy and legislation. It also authorized United Nations involvement in information exchange on the development of shared water resources, including international river basins.<sup>(9)</sup>

The Council requested the Secretary-General to arrange for the convening of the Tenth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Pacific in 1983 at Bangkok, Thailand.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Committee on Natural Resources also acted as the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 694).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Natural Resources, E/1981/50.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1981/6, 4 May (p. 688); <sup>(3)</sup>1981/57, 22 July (675). <sup>(4)</sup>1981/76 (679), <sup>(5)</sup>1981/77 (679), <sup>(6)</sup>1981/78 (679), <sup>(7)</sup>1981/79 (p. 680), <sup>(8)</sup>1981/80 (p. 681), <sup>(9)</sup>1981/81 (p. 686), <sup>(10)</sup>1981/82 (p. 677), 24 July.

## General aspects of natural resources

### Exploration

#### UN Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration

With its operations growing, 1981 was the first year of a mineral exploration programme in full force by the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration. According to a report on its 1981 activities by the UNDP Administrator,<sup>(1)</sup> the Fund had field work under way in 9 countries and new projects were approved for 3 others, raising to 15 the number of projects since its establishment by the General Assembly in 1973 as a financing source for natural resources exploration activities in developing countries.<sup>(3)</sup>

In 1981, five countries paid \$861,837 in voluntary contributions to the Fund (p. 676); its programme delivery reached an estimated \$4.9 million, a 29 per cent increase over 1980; and its cumulative programme commitments were \$25.7 million. Although the Fund was able to approve additional allocations for four projects in 1981 for a total possible maximum allocation of \$7.9 million, the Administrator advised the Governing Council that it was operating under serious financial constraint.

By the end of 1981, the Fund had 26 international staff members in the field, a 73 per cent increase over 1980, and its staff carried out missions to 27 developing countries to monitor and assess field activities and evaluate new project proposals.

The third Fund project to be completed, for mineral exploration in Panama, was concluded in the first half of the year. It found that porphyry-copper and gold mineralization in the main target area was not extensive enough to mine, but it located a smaller area which could support a low-grade gold-mining operation.

Of the 12 active projects, field work was under way in Argentina, Cyprus, Guyana, Kenya, Liberia, the Philippines, the Sudan, Suriname and the Upper Volta. With the approval of supplementary short-term funding, further exploration of promising mineral potentials was at an advanced stage in Argentina and Cyprus, where both the recipient Governments and mining groups had expressed interest in possible investment follow-up. Mineral targets were identified for drilling in early 1982 in Guyana and Kenya; new project agreements were approved for Benin, the Congo and Mali, and a minimum

work programme was approved for a project in Yugoslavia.

Evaluation of potential projects took place in China, Haiti, Morocco, Peru, the Philippines and the United Republic of Tanzania, while newly requested projects, in which assessments were under way, were submitted by Ecuador, Egypt and Yemen. In addition, missions to identify possible projects were sent to Burundi, Colombia, Costa Rica, Fiji, the Ivory Coast, Nicaragua, Oman, Portugal, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Thailand and Vanuatu.

Taking into account suggestions by the Administrator, the Governing Council, on 18 June,<sup>(4)</sup> appealed to Governments for generous contributions to the Fund (p. 676); recognized the desirability of an annual minimum funding target of \$10 million for its solid minerals exploration programme; and delegated to the Administrator authority to approve supplementary short-term funding beyond approved allocations at any stage in project development, where further work was vital to the continuation of field operations, on the understanding that such action would be reported to the Council. In addition, it approved projects and set maximum expenditure limits for investigation of kaolin in Benin (\$600,000), offshore phosphate deposits in the Congo (\$865,000) and minerals in Mali (\$2.8 million), along with a supplementary project for mineral exploration in Argentina (\$650,000).

The Economic and Social Council, in a resolution of 22 July concerned mainly with a review of the Fund's activities (see below), endorsed the Governing Council's decisions.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Administrator DP/1982/40.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC. 1981/57, paras. 2 & 3, 22 July (p. 675); <sup>(3)</sup>GA. 3167(XXVIII), 17 Dec. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 408). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/8, 18 June 1981.

Review of the Fund's activities. A Working Group of Government Experts on the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, which met in New York from 12 to 23 January 1981, proposed a set of recommendations on the Fund's operation and financing which was subsequently approved by the UNDP Governing Council and the Economic and Social Council. The Group was composed of 17 members appointed by the Secretary-General to serve in their personal capacity.

In its report to the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(\*)</sup> the Group proposed the establishment of a ceiling for replenishment contributions, according to which no country would have to pay back, out of what it earned from minerals produced under Fund-assisted projects, more than 10 times the Fund's investment; a repayment formula for feasibility studies, limited to reimburse-

ment of expenditures plus overheads; and a reduction in the rate of replenishment contributions by the least developed countries (LDCs). It also recommended that an effort be made to introduce a system by which Governments would indicate future pledges and thereby give the UNDP Administrator reasonable expectations of future contributions on a firm and continuing basis.

The Group reached a general consensus that the Fund should expand its activities into geothermal energy but limit them for the time being to exploration of hydrothermal systems. It recommended that geothermal work should be oriented exclusively towards power generation and/or thermal energy production as substitutes for fuel-based consumption.

On 27 May, the Committee on Natural Resources commended the Working Group's report to the consideration of the Economic and Social Council and suggested that the Council request the UNDP Administrator to report in 1982 on co-operation between the Fund and other units and organizations of the United Nations system.<sup>(2)</sup>

On 23 June, the UNDP Governing Council approved the main recommendations of the Group, confirming the existing rate of replenishment contributions with a concessional rate reduction for LDCs; decided to review in 1982 a possible expansion of the Fund's activities into geothermal energy (p. 709); recognized the overall UNDP role of policy guidance and co-ordination; and decided that a second review of the Fund's activities should be carried out at a date it would determine.<sup>(6)</sup>

Further, in a 24 June decision on United Nations technical co-operation activities (p. 460), the Governing Council endorsed the Group's recommendation that the Fund maintain close co-operation with the United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development and that maximum use should be made of the Department's technical services for Fund-financed operational activities.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Economic and Social Council, in a resolution adopted without vote on 22 July,<sup>(4)</sup> welcomed the Group's report and endorsed the Governing Council's decisions. As the Governing Council had recommended, the Economic and Social Council amended parts of its 1973 resolution on the principles and objectives of the Fund,<sup>(3)</sup> pertaining to payments by recipient States, rate of repayment and the length of the repayment period, and specified that the UNDP Council would continue to be the Fund's governing body. In addition, it requested the Administrator to include in his next annual report on the Fund information on co-operation between

the Fund and other units and organizations of the United Nations system, and urged Member States to recognize the need for additional contributions (p. 676).

This text, introduced by Italy, was approved by the Council's Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee without vote on 17 July after its sponsors-Argentina, Italy, Japan and Peru-agreed to an oral amendment by the United Kingdom to have the Administrator include information on the Fund in his annual report, rather than prepare a separate report as originally proposed.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Working Group, E/1981/23.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on Natural Resources (report, E/1981/50): 7/1, 27 May. ESC: <sup>(3)</sup>1762(LIV), para. 1, 18 May 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 406); <sup>(4)</sup>1981/57, 22 July 1981, text following.

Decisions: UNDP Council (report, E/1981/6/Rev.1): <sup>(5)</sup>81/11, para. 4, 24 June; <sup>(6)</sup>1/24, 23 June.

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/57

Adopted without vote Meeting 39 22 July 1981

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/102) without vote. 17 July (meeting 16); 4-nation draft (E/1981/C.3/L.12), orally amended by United Kingdom; agenda item 17.

Sponsors: Argentina, Italy, Japan, Peru.

#### United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration

The Economic and Social Council, Recalling its resolution 1762(LIV) of 18 May 1973 and General Assembly resolution 3167(XXVIII) of 17 December 1973, concerning the establishment of the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration.

Recalling also General Assembly resolution 33/194 of 29 January 1979 on multilateral development assistance for the exploration of natural resources and Council resolution 1979/65 of 3 August 1979,

1. Welcomes the report of the Working Group of Government Experts on the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration;

2. Takes note of decisions 81/8 of 18 June 1981 and 81/24 of 23 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme;

3. Endorses the recommendations contained in those decisions;

4. Requests the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme to include in his annual report on the Fund for 1981, to be submitted through the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme at its twenty-ninth session to the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982, information on co-operation between the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration and other units and organizations of the United Nations system;

5. Decides to amend its resolution 1762(LIV) to read as follows:

(a) Paragraph 1 (h) (ii): 'Payments by recipient participating States as specified in project agreements with the Fund';

(b) Paragraph 1 (l), between the words 'recipient State;' and the words 'In deciding': 'the rate of repayment and the length of the repayment period should be on the basis of the pertinent provisions contained in the operational procedures and administrative arrangements approved by the governing body of the Fund';

(c) Paragraph 1 (m): 'The Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme shall continue to be the governing body of the Fund';

6. Urges all States Members of the United Nations to recognize the need for additional voluntary contributions to the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, to enable it to fulfil more adequately its mandate for the benefit of developing countries.

**Contributions to the Fund.** Appeals for generous government contributions to the Fund were made in 1981 by the UNDP Governing Council in June<sup>(2)</sup> and the Economic and Social Council in July.<sup>(1)</sup> In 1981, payments totalling \$861,837 were made by five countries, and four countries pledged a total of \$18,864 for 1982 as at 31 December 1981 (see table below). By the year's end, total pledges made since 1974 amounted to approximately \$28.7 million.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/57, para. 6, 22 July (see above). Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/8, sect. I, para. 3, 18 June.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS REVOLVING FUND FOR  
NATURAL RESOURCES EXPLORATION, 1981 AND 1982

(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment	1982 pledge
Bangladesh	-	1,000
Chile	-	5,000
Indonesia	20,000	-
Iraq	-	11,864
Italy	840,336	-
Mail	450	-
Panama	1,000	1,000
Uganda	51	-
Total	861,837	18,864

#### Assessment missions

In a September 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General described work carried out up to June by the United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development in sending missions mandated by the Assembly in 1979<sup>(2)</sup> to assess the needs of developing countries for natural resources exploration and development, including an estimate of costs. Of the 77 assessment missions requested by 43 countries, 44 had been undertaken. Thirty-one reports had been completed, estimating mineral or energy requirements in 22 countries. Nine of the reports covered petroleum and gas, or hydrocarbons and coal; 3 dealt exclusively with coal and 3 with geothermal energy; and the remaining 16 covered non-fuel minerals, except for 2 which also included uranium. (By the end of 1981, 34 mineral and 25 energy assessment missions to 30 countries had been completed.)

The aggregated total financial requirements for the 22 countries for which reports had been completed were estimated at between \$2,203 million and \$2,415 million. Requirements for petroleum exploration accounted for 58 per cent of the total, covering eight countries, leaving 42 per cent for non-petroleum mineral exploration,

geological surveys and mapping, and institutional improvement. In order to cover more countries and thus improve the validity of a global estimate, the Secretary-General suggested that the assessment programme be continued.

On 17 December, the General Assembly, acting without vote,<sup>(3)</sup> took note of the Secretary-General's report. This was done on the recommendation of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, made in like manner on 10 December on an oral proposal by its Chairman.

In the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, Suriname supported the assessment programme but said its estimates of a country's financial needs should not be limited to the cost of general surveys; it should cover costs that would be incurred in the intensive investigation of limited areas, including seismic surveys and multiple drilling in the case of petroleum.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/418.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 33/194, para. 2, 29 Jan. 1979 (YUN 1978, p. 573); Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/443, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee. A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 47 (24 Sep.-10 Dec.); plenary; A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/443

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.5) without vote. 10 December (meeting 47): oral proposal by Chairman: agenda item 69 (f).

#### Multilateral development assistance for the exploration of natural resources

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, took note of the report of the Secretary-General on multilateral development assistance for the exploration of natural resources.

#### Exploration techniques

A March 1981 report by the Secretary-General<sup>(2)</sup> to the Committee on Natural Resources described recent trends and possible future developments in remote sensing and other new techniques for the identification, exploration and assessment of mineral and energy resources.

The report stated that, by the end of 1980, more than 110 countries were participating in remote-sensing activities, which had become a routine tool for mineral exploration. Satellite imagery (p. 116) and traditional aerial photography provided a comprehensive and relatively low-cost data base, particularly for large, inaccessible regions. For ground surveying, advances in electronic circuitry had made geophysical equipment more reliable under a wide range of environmental conditions, while advances in seismology included new techniques for more



accurate location of stratigraphic traps and direct detection of hydrocarbons. Exploration drilling for oil and gas had reached an unprecedented level, with some 77,000 onshore and offshore wells having been drilled in 1980 outside the centrally planned economies, though all but about 10 per cent of them were in Canada or the United States.

The Committee on Natural Resources, on 27 May,<sup>(1)</sup> took note of this report, prepared in response to a request it had made in 1979.<sup>(3)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Natural Resources (report, E/1981/50), 7/3, 27 May.  
Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, E/C.7/116.  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1979, p. 679.

#### Permanent sovereignty over natural resources

A report on recent development relating to the exercise by developing countries and peoples of permanent sovereignty over their natural resources was submitted by the Secretary-General in May 1981 to the Committee on Natural Resources.<sup>(1)</sup>

Assessing the petroleum sector, the report examined such current trends as the more active participation by developing countries in the industry, sometimes through State-controlled exploration and development, and new patterns in their relations with transnational oil companies. In the non-fuel minerals sector, it reviewed the impact of new investors from petroleum-exporting countries, the hurdles posed by market volatility, the growth of control by State enterprises, and the decline of concession agreements in favour of joint ventures and management or service contracts. It suggested that the United Nations might help by undertaking or co-ordinating the dispatch of long-term advisers to developing countries, elaborating model contracts and regulations as well as negotiation manuals, and assisting national and regional mechanisms for dispute settlement through arbitration and renegotiation.

Taking note of this report on 27 May, the Committee recommended that a further report be prepared for its 1983 session.<sup>(3)</sup>

The General Assembly, in its 24 November resolution on activities of foreign economic and other interests impeding decolonization,<sup>(2)</sup> reiterated that any administering or occupying Power which deprived colonial peoples of the exercise of their legitimate rights over their natural resources violated its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. The Assembly invited all Governments and United Nations organizations to ensure that the permanent sovereignty of the colonial Territories over their natural resources was fully respected and safeguarded.

In other actions, the Assembly continued its

study of permanent sovereignty over national resources in the territories occupied by Israel (p. 323) and the foreign exploitation of uranium in Namibia (p. 1169).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/C.7/119.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/51, 24 Nov. (p. 1108). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>Committee on Natural Resources (report, E/1981/50), 7/2, 27 May.

#### Utilization of subsurface space

The Economic and Social Council, acting on the recommendation of the Committee on Natural Resources, recognized, in a resolution of 24 July 1981, the potential of subsurface space for the storage of water, energy, food and other commodities, as well as for water supply, sewage handling and energy conservation. It requested the Secretary-General to compile a report for the Committee in 1983 on the utilization of subsurface space, with particular reference to the potential benefits to developing countries.<sup>(1)</sup> The Council adopted the resolution without vote, following similar approval by the Committee on Natural Resources on 27 May and by the Council's First (Economic) Committee on 17 July.

The item was included in the 1981 agenda of the Committee on Natural Resources at Sweden's initiative.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/82, 24 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.14, 15, 16(15-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/82

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/112) without vote. 17 July (meeting 16): draft by Committee on Natural Resources (E/1981/50): agenda Item 15.

#### Utilization of subsurface space

The Economic and Social Council,

Deeply concerned by the problems of population, urbanization and overcrowding and the need to provide people with food, water and fuel,

Recognising the potential of subsurface space for, inter alia, the storage of water, energy, food and other commodities, as well as for water supply, sewage handling and the conservation of energy,

Taking into account the experience of the use of subsurface space already available in many parts of the world,

Requests the Secretary-General to compile a report on the utilization of subsurface space, with particular reference to the potential benefits to the developing countries, bearing in mind the mandate of the Committee on Natural Resources and drawing upon documentation already available, to be considered by the Committee at its eighth session.

#### Medium-term plan for 1984-1989

A draft covering the natural resources and energy programme, for inclusion in the proposed United Nations medium-term plan for 1984-1989, was presented by the Secretariat for consideration by the Committee on Natural Resources at its May 1981 session. Covering activities in the fields of minerals, energy, water

resources and cartography, it listed energy and minerals as priority areas.

Expressing regret that its members could not comment in detail on the draft because the text was made available during the session and in only one language, the Committee, on 27 May,<sup>(1)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to recast sections of the plan in the light of comments and to submit the revised text for further comments by members and observers.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Natural Resources (report, E/1981/50), 7/1, 27 May.

Agenda for the 1983 session of the Committee on Natural Resources

On 24 July 1981, the Economic and Social Council, without vote, took note of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its 1981 session<sup>(2)</sup> and approved the provisional agenda and documentation for its next session, in 1983.<sup>(1)</sup> This action had been recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources on 29 May and by the Council's First (Economic) Committee on 17 July, also without vote. The provisional agenda included most of the items listed in 1981, with the addition of sub-items on a mining investments survey (see below) and on terminology for mineral production and consumption.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/191, 24 July, text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on Natural Resources, E/1981/50.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.14, 15, 16 (15-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/191

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/112) without vote, 17 July (meeting 16); draft by Committee on Natural Resources (E/1981/50): agenda item 15.

Report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its seventh session and draft provisional agenda and documentation for the eighth session of the Committee At its 41 st plenary meeting, on 24 July 1981, the Council:

- (a) Took note of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its seventh session;
- (b) Decided to approve the provisional agenda and documentation for the eighth session of the Committee, as set out below:

1. Election of officers
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work
3. Mineral resources:
  - (a) Trends and salient issues, including problems of transfer of technology:
    - (i) Non-metallic minerals
    - (ii) Rare metals
  - (b) New sources of phosphate rock and potash, particularly low-grade deposits
  - (c) Survey of investments in mining.
  - (d) Terminology for mineral production and consumption

Documentation

Report of the Secretary-General on trends and salient issues, including transfer of technology, with particular reference to non-metallic minerals

Report of the Secretary-General on trends and salient issues, including transfer of technology, with particular reference to rare metals

Report of the Secretary-General on new locations for exploration for phosphate rock and potash in the developing countries

Report of the Secretary-General on the survey of planned investment for mineral development

Report of the Secretary-General on the standardization of definitions and terminology for mineral resources

4. Energy resources: trends and salient issues, including problems of transfer of technology

Documentation

Report of the Secretary-General on trends and salient issues in energy

5. New techniques, including remote sensing, for identifying, exploring and assessing natural resources

Documentation

Report of the Secretary-General on new techniques for identifying, exploring and assessing natural resources

6. United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration

Documentation

Report of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme on the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration

7. Permanent sovereignty over natural resources

Documentation

Report of the Secretary-General on the question of recent developments affecting permanent sovereignty over natural resources

8. Water resources: progress in the implementation of the Mar del Plata Action Plan

Documentation

Report of the Secretary-General on progress achieved in the implementation of the Mar del Plata Action Plan, including the international Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade

9. Utilization of subsurface space

Documentation

Report of the Secretary-General on the utilization of subsurface space

10. Co-ordination of programmes within the United Nations system in the field of natural resources

Documentation

Report of the Secretary-General on co-ordination of programmes within the United Nations system in the field of natural resources: minerals

11. Draft provisional agenda for the ninth session of the Committee

Documentation

Note by the Secretariat on the draft provisional agenda and documentation for the ninth session of the Committee

12. Adoption of the report of the Committee

## Mineral resources

### Survey of investments

The Economic and Social Council, on 24 July 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to prepare for the Committee on Natural Resources in 1983 a report analysing investments, both planned and effectively made, in major mineral industries, particularly in regard to regional distribution of mineral exploration and development. The report was to pay special attention to measures that could assist developing countries in their capacity to respond promptly to chang-

ing situations and to establish and implement effective mineral resources development policies.

The text, adopted without vote, had been recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources on 27 May and approved by the Council's First Committee on 17 July, also without vote.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC. 1981/78, 24 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.14, 15, 16 (15-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/78

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/112) without vote. 17 July (meeting 16); draft by Committee on Natural Resources (E/1981/50); agenda item 15.

Survey of planned investment for mineral development  
The Economic and Social Council,

Having regard to its resolution 1954(LIX) of 25 July 1975 on problems of availability and supply of natural resources,

Bearing in mind that continued investment in exploration for mineral resources and in new mines and processing plants is of great importance for the development of the mineral sector of all countries, especially the developing countries, and for ensuring uninterrupted supplies of vital mineral raw materials.

Aware that information on planned investment and its regional distribution, while important for policy decisions by Governments, is not adequately available to most developing countries or is often unreliable and not sufficiently detailed,

Recognizing that information on the actual implementation of exploration programmes and the development of new capacity is not in many cases readily available,

Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, for the Committee on Natural Resources at its eighth session, a report analysing investments, both planned and effectively made, in major mineral industries, in particular in regard to the regional distribution of mineral exploration and development, and paying special attention to measures that might be undertaken to assist developing countries in strengthening their capacity to respond promptly to changing situations and to establish and implement effective mineral resources development policies.

#### Metals

By a resolution of 24 July 1981, the Economic and Social Council requested the Secretary-General to prepare, for submission to the Committee on Natural Resources in 1983, a report evaluating the development prospects of rare metals with special reference to tantalum, niobium (columbium) and lithium, and paying special attention to measures that might be undertaken in the developing countries to increase exploration for and production of those metals.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Council adopted the text without vote on the basis of a draft recommended on 27 May by the Committee on Natural Resources and approved without vote on 17 July by the First Committee.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC. 1981/77, 24 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.14, 15, 16 (15-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/77

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/112) without Vote. 17 July (meeting 16); draft by Committee on Natural Resources (E/1981/50); agenda item 15.

Trends and salient issues, with particular reference to rare metals, especially tantalum, niobium (columbium) and lithium

The Economic and Social Council,

Having regard to Economic and Social Council resolution 1954(LIX) of 25 July 1975 on problems of availability and supply of natural resources,

Recalling that issues related to the raw materials base of the copper, nickel, chromium, molybdenum, cobalt, vanadium and phosphate rock and potash industries have been discussed at previous sessions of the Committee on Natural Resources,

Reaffirming that the Committee on Natural Resources should continue to consider problems of availability and supply of natural resources of selected minerals and metals,

Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, for submission to the Committee on Natural Resources at its eighth session, a report evaluating the development prospects of rare metals, with special reference to tantalum, niobium (columbium) and lithium, and paying special attention to measures that might be undertaken in the developing countries to increase exploration for and production of those metals.

#### Non-metallic mineral resources

The Economic and Social Council, on 24 July 1981, requested the Secretary-General to prepare for the Committee on Natural Resources in 1983 a comprehensive report on the prospects for the development of non-metallic raw materials, with special reference to non-metallic minerals for the construction, paper, ceramics and glass industries.<sup>(\*)</sup>

The Council took this action without vote following similar approval of the text by the Committee on Natural Resources on 26 May and by the First Committee on 17 July.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC. 1981/76, 24 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.14, 15, 16 (15-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/76

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/112) without vote. 17 July (meeting 16); draft by Committee on Natural Resources (E/1981/50); agenda item 15.

Prospects for the development of non-metallic raw materials

The Economic and Social Council,

Having regard to its resolution 1954(LIX) of 25 July 1975 on problems of availability and supply of natural resources,

Recognizing the Importance of natural resources for economic development, in particular non-metallic raw materials,

Recalling that the Committee on Natural Resources considered copper, nickel and chromium, and molybdenum, cobalt and vanadium, as well as phosphate rock and potash, at its fifth, sixth and seventh sessions, respectively,

Taking note of the reports of the Secretary-General on trends and salient issues in respect of mineral resources, with particular reference to molybdenum, cobalt and vanadium and including problems of the transfer of technology, and on phosphate rock and potash,

Taking into account the work undertaken by other United Nations organizations concerned, such as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization.

Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, for the eighth session of the Committee on Natural Resources, a comprehensive report on the prospects for the development of non-metallic raw materials, with special reference to non-metallic minerals for the construction, paper, ceramics and glass industries, bearing in mind developments in material sciences, and paying special attention to measures that might be undertaken to evaluate prospective raw materials in developing countries.

#### Phosphates and potash

The availability and supply of phosphate rock and potash, essential raw materials in the manufacture of fertilizers and industrial chemicals, was discussed in a report of the Secretary-General<sup>(1)</sup> submitted in March 1981 to the Committee on Natural Resources, in response to a 1979 request by the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(2)</sup>

The report stated that fertilizer production in most developing countries had been considerably less than consumption for many years and that more than half the current fertilizer requirements were being met by imports. As fertilizer manufacture was energy intensive, and the continuing price increase would have a deleterious impact on the foreign exchange position of non-oil-exporting countries, special efforts were needed to assist those countries to establish fertilizer production within their territories. It was suggested that the Committee consider setting up a working group to stimulate, guide and co-ordinate exploration for these minerals, and also consider other activities such as workshops and study tours on identification and evaluation of deposits.

Acting on the recommendation of the Committee, which approved the draft on 27 May 1981, the Economic and Social Council, by a resolution of 24 July, requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report identifying possible new locations where phosphate rock and potash might be sought in developing countries; to assist in evaluating deposits; and to examine other possible activities, including workshops and study tours, that would help developing countries in identifying and evaluating their fertilizer raw materials. He was also requested to explore all possible sources of funding for such activities.

This text was approved by the Council's First Committee without vote on 17 July.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/C.7/114 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1979/71, 3 Aug. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 687); <sup>(3)</sup>1981/79, 24 July 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.I/SR.14, 15, 16 (15-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/79

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/112) without vote. 17 July (meeting 16); draft by Committee on Natural Resources (E/1981/50); agenda item 15.

#### Availability and supply of selected minerals:

phosphate rock and potash

The Economic and Social Council,

Having regard to Its resolution 1954(LIX) of 25 July 1975 on problems of availability and supply of natural resources,

Bearing in mind that a number of developing countries are interested in an evaluation of the situation with regard to exploration for and development of indigenous fertilizer raw materials, in particular phosphate rock, and noting the recommendations and conclusions contained in the report of the Secretary-General entitled *Availability and supply of selected minerals: phosphate rock and potash*,

Taking into account the work on fertilizers undertaken by other United Nations organizations, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, and the phosphate resources research project of the International Geological Correlation Programme,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, for the eighth session of the Committee on Natural Resources, a report identifying possible new locations for the exploration for phosphate rock and potash in the developing countries, making use of advanced exploration techniques, where appropriate, on the basis of available geological data;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to assist in the evaluation of known and newly discovered deposits on the basis of available data, bearing in mind (a) the need for the use of low-grade ores and local sources of raw materials in the manufacture of fertilizers, (b) the economic advantages of the direct application of phosphate rock in agriculture, and (c) the need to update the data on the future availability of this non-renewable resource;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to examine, in collaboration with other United Nations organizations concerned, the possibility of specific activities, including workshops and study tours, to assist developing countries in the identification and subsequent technical and economic evaluation of their fertilizer raw materials, with special emphasis on techniques suitable in the climatic and infrastructural conditions of those countries and with a view to improving the flow of information and transfer of technology to those countries;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to explore all possible sources of funding for such activities;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a report to the Committee on Natural Resources at its eighth session on progress achieved on these questions.

#### Technical co-operation

In addition to mineral survey work performed by the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration (p. 674), and mineral and energy resources assessment missions mandated by the General Assembly (p. 676), the United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development increased its mineral resources activities in 1981, with emphasis on training of personnel, institution-building and planning to improve exploration and development efforts in developing countries. Among the projects under way were the strengthening of the Geological Survey Division of, the Philippine Bureau of Mines and Geosciences; assistance to China, Mexico and Mozambique in the use of

remotely-sensed data obtained by satellite imagery; and, in Bolivia, the reprocessing and interpretation of existing airborne magnetic data, using the latest data-processing techniques to determine subsurface lithological and structural conditions in greater depth.

## Water

### Water resources development

Expressing deep concern over serious constraints faced by developing countries in water resources development, including a shortage of trained personnel, inadequate funds, institutional and legal deficiencies, and lack of equipment, the Economic and Social Council adopted on 24 July 1981 a six-part resolution<sup>(3)</sup> dealing with various aspects of water resources development. It called for national action, with international assistance, to: formulate water policy and legislation and set up institutional arrangements (p. 683); intensify action for water resources assessment (p. 684); increase research and training of water management personnel (p. 684); expand technical co-operation among developing countries (p. 684); and take concrete steps to achieve the targets of the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade (1981-1990) (p. 684).

The Council noted measures taken to improve co-ordination of activities on water questions in the United Nations system (p. 686) and called on the Committee on Natural Resources to review again in 1983 the progress made in the implementation of the Mar del Plata Action Plan, adopted by the 1977 United Nations Water Conference at Mar del Plata, Argentina.<sup>(4)</sup>

This resolution, adopted without vote, originated in the Committee on Natural Resources, where it was approved on 27 May. The Council's First (Economic) Committee approved it without vote on 17 July.

Commending this resolution during the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee in October, Finland said the Nordic States would contribute to its implementation.

As background to the discussion in the Committee on Natural Resources, the Secretary-General submitted a report in April summarizing current and future activities of the United Nations system in this field<sup>(2)</sup> and another in March presenting conclusions and recommendations for further action, based on an analysis of the current status of water resources development.<sup>(1)</sup> The Council requested a further progress report in 1983.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>E/C.7/117, <sup>(2)</sup>E/C.7/120.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/80, 24 July, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1977, p. 555.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.I/SR.14, 15, 16 (15-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July).

### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/80

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/112) without vote, 17 July (meeting 16): draft by Committee on Natural Resources (E/1981/50); agenda item 15.

#### Water resources development

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 34/191 of 18 December 1979, in which the Assembly requested the Committee on Natural Resources to review during the 1980s the progress made in the implementation of the Mar del Plata Action Plan,

Taking into account the provisions of General Assembly resolution 35/18 of 10 November 1980, in which the Assembly proclaimed the period 1981-1990 as the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade and decided to review at its fortieth session the progress made towards the attainment of the goals of the Decade,

Bearing in mind resolution 25 of 30 July 1980 on the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade, adopted by the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace,

Recognizing that access to adequate supplies of clean water affects not merely health but also general development, including human productivity, crop cultivation, livestock production, small-scale industry and overall economic growth,

Recalling its resolutions 1979/67, 1979/68 and 1979/70 of 3 August 1979, concerning the follow-up activities for the implementation of the Mar del Plata Action Plan,

Reiterating the importance of the provisions of the Action Plan in promoting the accelerated development and orderly administration of water resources for the improvement of the economic and social well-being of mankind,

Deeply concerned that Governments of developing countries, in their water development activities, continue to be faced with serious constraints, including a shortage of trained manpower, inadequate financial resources, deficiencies in institutional and legal frameworks and lack of equipment,

Bearing in mind that the majority of Governments of developing countries have expressed the view that bilateral and multilateral co-operation, in the form of, inter alia, the provision of scholarships, financing, equipment and technical advisory services, would be helpful in overcoming the above-mentioned constraints,

Taking note of the three reports prepared by the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, entitled "Present status of water resources development: progress and prospects since the United Nations Water Conference", "Progress and prospects relative to water resources policy, planning, legislation and institutional arrangements: proposals for interdisciplinary missions", and "Present and future activities of the United Nations system in water resources development",

#### I. Water resources planning, policy formulation, legislation and institutional mechanisms for co-ordinating national interests

1. Recalls the importance of the provisions of section D of the Mar del Plata Action Plan and asks those Governments that have not done so to formulate a national water policy statement that allows for the harmonization of their water development plans within the framework of national economic development planning, and to keep under review planning objectives and methods;

2. Urges Governments to intensify their efforts in the formulation and updating of water legislation, where appropriate, taking into account the applicable experiences of other countries;

3. Reiterates the importance of co-ordinating water resources at the national level, as well as the regional and local levels, as a means of effective and comprehensive planning for the development and management of national water resources;

4. Endorses the proposal for the organization of interdisciplinary advisory missions, staffed by experts from the various organizations of the United Nations system, to render technical assistance to Governments, inter alia, on the formulation of comprehensive water policies, the setting up of appropriate legislative and administrative arrangements and the formulation of national master plans, in response to requests from Governments and in line with their specific requirement and on the understanding that those missions would be organized along the lines set out in paragraph 87 of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its seventh session and funded from extrabudgetary resources, as specified in that paragraph;

5. Requests the Secretary-General and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme to inform Governments of developing countries, through the resident co-ordinators of the United Nations system, of the possibility of requesting the services of such missions;

## II. Assessment of water resources

1. Urges Governments to intensify their activities in water resources assessment which is a prerequisite for national water resources development, planning and management to include, inter alia, the strengthening of services for the collection, processing and dissemination of water resources data, the improvement of studies on the water cycle and hydrological processes and on the reciprocal reactions between these and human activities and the ecosystems, as well as improvements in the procedures for the assessment of water resources on the basis of area, and the development of appropriate infrastructures;

2. Requests the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Meteorological Organization and other organizations concerned to promote unified methodologies for water resources assessment and to enhance international co-operation in this area;

## III. Education, training and research and development

1. Urges Governments of Member States to increase their capabilities for the provision of training and research at the national level by setting up new facilities and/or increasing the capacity of existing ones in the various fields of water resources, including planning, legislation, the assessment of water resources and their development and use for different purposes, such as agriculture, municipal water supplies and industry, and the preservation of ecological systems;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to develop, in co-operation with the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, integrated and comprehensive approaches and programmes with regard to education and training in the field of water resources in developing countries, and to report thereon to the Committee on Natural Resources at its ninth session;

3. Requests the regional commissions and the organizations concerned to consider the establishment and upgrading of regional and subregional water training programmes and networks, taking into account existing arrangements, and requests the Secretary-General to report on progress made in this regard to the Committee on Natural Resources at its ninth session;

## IV. Technical co-operation among developing countries in water resources development

1. Urges Governments of developing countries to intensify co-operation in the form of technical co-operation among developing countries in such areas as the exchange of informa-

tion and consultant services, technical and economic co-operation projects, the establishment of joint water-management centres and the standardization of services in the development of water resources;

2. Calls upon the United Nations Development Programme and the other organizations of the United Nations system concerned with water development to play a catalytic role in promoting projects for technical co-operation among interested developing countries by assisting in formulating and carrying out proposals designed to promote co-operation among developing countries;

## V. International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade

1. Calls upon Governments to take concrete steps, including the establishment of national committees, to proceed rapidly with the development of rational action plans for the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade and to attain their respective targets for the Decade, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/18;

2. Further calls upon Governments of Member States to give sufficient priority to the Decade in their overall development plans, so that adequate resources for achieving the targets set for the Decade may be made available;

3. Notes the progress being made by organizations in the United Nations system in the context of the Decade, in particular the role of the Steering Committee for Co-operative Action, in bringing about a concerted approach to these activities and calls upon the intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations concerned to increase their technical co-operation with and financial support for developing countries, so as to bring about a substantial improvement in the level of services in the supply of drinking water and in sanitation by 1990;

4. Urges Governments to recognize the role of the resident co-ordinator in carrying out his responsibilities as the focal point for co-operative action for the Decade at the country level and to provide assistance to facilitate that task;

## VI. International co-operation in the implementation of the Mar del Plata Action Plan

1. Takes note of the arrangements made by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination for co-operation and co-ordination at the international level;

2. Takes note of the guidelines agreed upon by the organizations of the United Nations system for consultation and co-ordination with regard to field project activities, and looks forward to their implementation;

3. Recommends that the United Nations Development Programme and all other programmes and agencies of the system, including the World Bank, engaged in executing technical assistance programmes and projects in developing countries in the field of water resources development funded by the Programme, should ensure the full application of the policies relating to technical co-operation set forth in the decision of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme annexed to General Assembly resolution 3405(XXX) of 28 November 1975 and the policies governing the execution of such programmes and projects, inter alia, as set out in Governing Council decisions 25/20 of 3 July 1978 and 79/48 of 10 July 1979, so as to secure the maximum possible participation, as appropriate, of local technical and material resources, and to place the fullest possible reliance on local resources, including engineering consultants and contractors, wherever they are found competent to handle their task independently or in collaboration with foreign consultants; that in the implementation of these policies due consideration should continue to be given to making local and foreign consulting firms and contractors jointly responsible when the local firm is a major participant; that in appropriate situations the lead/principal role in joint ventures should be given to the major contributors, whether local or foreign firms; and considers that the full implementation of the procedures and rules already established and those which may be agreed upon in the future by the Governing Council of the Pro-

programme is essential to improve the effectiveness of the Programme's assistance to the developing countries for enhancing their capabilities of implementing the Mar del Plata Action Plan within the shortest possible time:

4. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultation with the organizations of the United Nations system, a report, based on existing material, on the progress Governments have made in achieving the goals of the Mar del Plata Action Plan and of the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade, to be submitted to the Committee on Natural Resources at its eighth session, with a view to enabling the Committee to make its contribution in those fields to the first review of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, scheduled for 1984;

5. Calls upon the Committee on Natural Resources to review further at its ninth session the overall progress made in the implementation of the Mar del Plata Action Plan by Governments and by the United Nations system, simultaneously with the review of the progress made in the attainment of the objectives of the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade, to be carried out in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 34/191 and 35/18 and Economic and Social Council resolution 1957 B (LIX) of 25 July 1975.

Institutional arrangements,  
laws and regulations, and policy

In its resolution of 24 July 1981 on water resources development,<sup>(5)</sup> the Economic and Social Council endorsed a proposal by the Secretary-General for organizing interdisciplinary advisory missions to assist Governments, at their request, in formulating comprehensive water policies and national master plans and in setting up legislative and administrative arrangements. The missions would be composed of experts from various United Nations organizations and would be funded from extrabudgetary resources. The Council asked Governments to formulate water policy statements and urged them to intensify their efforts to formulate and update water legislation.

The Council stated that the missions should be organized along lines set out in the 1981 report of the Committee on Natural Resources.<sup>(1)</sup> Among several points the Committee had agreed to in May were that regional commissions would play leading roles in organizing the missions and that only projects formally requested by Governments would be considered.

In October, the Intersecretariat Group for Water Resources (p. 687) agreed on further points regarding the missions, including the principle that they should not as a rule become involved in formulating specific projects for implementation by any given organization but should concentrate on broader issues and that countries receiving extensive international assistance would not be the most appropriate choice for pilot missions.<sup>(2)</sup>

The proposal for interdisciplinary missions was originally made by the Secretary-General in

1980, in a report to the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(6)</sup> Details were spelt out in an April 1981 report to the Committee on Natural Resources on progress and prospects in water resources policy, planning, legislative and institutional arrangements.<sup>(3)</sup> This report stressed the importance of formulating national water policy statements as guides for planning, discussed the effects of water pricing policies, and noted the need for improved national water legislation along with effective mechanisms for co-ordinating water interests at different jurisdictional levels.

United Nations activities in water resources planning, management and policy formulation were largely concentrated in the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development, the regional commissions, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Environment Programme. In his report to the Committee on Natural Resources on the water resources activities of the United Nations system,<sup>(4)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that, since planning, management and policy issues arose in regard to both general and specific aspects of water resources, any attempt to reduce the existing overlap among organizations would probably decrease the total capacity of the system to assist developing countries.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Natural Resources, E/1981/50;  
<sup>(2)</sup>Intersecretariat Group for Water Resources, ACC/1981/37; S-G, <sup>(3)</sup>E/C.7/118, <sup>(4)</sup>E/C.7/120.  
Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/80, sect. I, 24 July (p. 681).  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 702.

#### Assessment of water resources

In 1981, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) were jointly engaged in implementing a project aimed at increasing national capabilities and determining countries' needs with regard to water resources assessment. Describing this and other activities of the United Nations system in a report to the Committee on Natural Resources,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General said that WMO activities included an innovative approach to technology transfer through its Hydrological Operational Multi-purpose Subprogramme. Among UNESCO projects was a survey of discharges of sediments and water pollutants from rivers to the sea, as part of the regional seas programme of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (p. 833). The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) assisted countries to utilize isotope techniques for the assessment of surface and ground water resources. Under the Global Environmental Monitoring System, several agencies co-operated in the monitoring of inland water quality.

In a report to the Committee on water resources development since the 1977 United Nations Water Conference,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that lack of reliable data continued to create serious problems in most developing countries, and suggested the advisability of co-ordinated data-collection arrangements among national agencies, with one agency serving as a focal point. He also suggested that the Committee consider formulating specific measures of assistance to developing countries, including a call for increased bilateral and multi-lateral assistance in the form of scholarships, financing, provision of equipment and technical advisory services.

In its 24 July resolution on water resources development,<sup>(3)</sup> the Economic and Social Council urged Governments to intensify water resources assessment activities, including the strengthening of data collection, processing and dissemination. The Council also requested UNESCO, WMO and other organizations to promote unified methodologies for assessment and to enhance international co-operation in that area.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>E/C.7/117, <sup>(2)</sup>E/C.7/120.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/80, sect. II, 24 July (p. 682).

#### Research and training of water management personnel

Programmes offered by several United Nations organizations in research on water development and training of personnel were described in the Secretary-General's April 1981 report to the Committee on Natural Resources on water-related activities in the United Nations system.<sup>(2)</sup>

On research, the UNESCO International Hydrological Programme sought to strengthen research capabilities in developing countries. The United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) worked on small-scale power generation. Other UNIDO research activities concerned low-cost water-lifting devices and water desalination using solar energy.

In the field of training, UNESCO sponsored 15 continuing post-graduate courses on hydrology and water resources, providing fellowships for some 300 specialists from developing countries. Similar courses were offered by WMO, in addition to courses for hydrology technicians under a project at Niamey, Niger, financed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). IAEA periodically sponsored regional courses on the application of isotope hydrology. The World Health Organization, in collaboration with UNESCO and the International Labour Organisation, supported graduate programmes

for sanitary engineers and the training of water sewage works operators. UNEP offered several training programmes on integrated management of water resources. The regional commissions also had training components in some of their water resources development activities.

In his March progress report on implementation of the Mar del Plata Action Plan,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General remarked on the need for a programme of concerted multifaceted action to reduce such existing constraints as lack of qualified staff to meet the massive demand for training at all levels and in different fields of water resources development.

In its 24 July resolution on water resources development,<sup>(3)</sup> the Economic and Social Council requested the Secretary-General to develop integrated and comprehensive education and training programmes. Regional commissions and other organizations were asked to consider establishing or upgrading regional programmes and Governments were urged to increase their capabilities in this area.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>E/C.7/117, <sup>(2)</sup>E/C.7/120.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/80, sect. III, 24 July (p. 682).

#### Technical co-operation

In his March 1981 report on implementation of the Mar del Plata Action Plan,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General noted that considerable progress had been made in technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC) in such areas as information exchange, exchange of experts, establishment of institutions, joint ventures and standardization of engineering services. He suggested that the Committee on Natural Resources consider urging developing countries to increase such activities.

In its 24 July resolution on water resources development,<sup>(2)</sup> the Economic and Social Council urged Governments of developing countries to intensify TCDC activities in various areas of water resources management and development, and called on UNDP and other United Nations organizations to play a catalytic role in promoting such projects. It also recommended that UNDP and others executing United Nations technical co-operation projects endeavour to secure maximum participation of local technical and material resources, including engineering consultants and contractors.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/C.7/117.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/80, sects. IV & VI, 24 July (p. 682).

#### International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade (1981-1990)

The Economic and Social Council, in its resolution of 24 July 1981 on water resources devel-



opment,<sup>(3)</sup> called on Governments to take concrete steps to develop action plans and attain their targets for the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade, proclaimed by the General Assembly in November 1980.<sup>(4)</sup> The Council called on intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to increase technical co-operation and financial support so as to bring about a substantial improvement in drinking water and sanitation services by the end of the Decade in 1990. It urged Governments to recognize the United Nations resident co-ordinator as a country-level focal point for co-operative action for the Decade and to provide assistance to facilitate that task.

In his April 1981 report on United Nations activities in water resources development,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General listed a series of activities undertaken in the context of the Decade, including efforts by the World Health Organization (WHO) to improve rural water supply and sanitation as a component of primary health care. In co-operation with the United Nations Environment Programme, WHO also had a project on prevention of health hazards through systematic surveillance of drinking water quality. The Steering Committee for Co-operative Action, composed of representatives of United Nations organizations active in the field of drinking water supply and sanitation, ensured overall harmonization of efforts and had agreed that resident representatives of the United Nations Development Programme should serve as focal points for system-wide co-operation at the country level.

UNICEF ACTIVITIES. In 1981, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) assisted water supply and sanitation programmes in 94 countries, with expenditures of more than \$45 million, mainly employing simple, low-cost technology and serving low-income rural or peri-urban communities. Because lack of adequate water supply and sanitation facilities was a major factor in child disease and mortality, UNICEF work in that area was viewed as a prerequisite for improving child and national health, and for releasing women and children from the time-consuming, energy-sapping chore of carrying water. Special importance was attached to linking sanitation and health education activities to water supply schemes.

In May, the UNICEF Executive Board<sup>(2)</sup> called for greater emphasis on the social aspects of its water programmes, especially health education and the involvement of women and the community as a whole. Expressing concern about the state of maintenance of drinking water and sanitation installations in some areas, the Board said UNICEF should considerably strengthen its co-operation in programme planning and promo-

tion of governmental services and community participation in the maintenance and operation of such installations as hand-pumps, mechanized pump stations, protected springs, piped schemes and latrines.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G. E/C.7/120; <sup>(2)</sup>UNICEF Executive Board. E/1981/48.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/80, sect. V, 24 July (p. 682); <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 35/18, 10 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 712).

#### Shared water resources

The first United Nations Interregional Meeting of International River Organizations (Dakar, Senegal, 5-14 May 1981) brought together representatives of 36 States and 17 international river organizations to discuss institutional and legal arrangements, co-operative arrangements, and economic and other considerations related to the development and management of international river basins and other shared water resources.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Meeting drew a series of conclusions, including the following: it was desirable to have integrated development programmes drawn up and possibly executed at the basin level by recognized entities, but where that approach was not viable, co-ordination of the activities of agencies should be sought; international river organizations should deal with such matters as water quality, environmental protection, flood control and ground water investigations; the local population and others affected by water projects should be involved from the outset, not after project designs had been finalized; no agreed method existed for apportioning benefits and costs, but United Nations bodies might elaborate basic principles as a guide; and the United Nations might also serve as a clearing-house for information on financial and other aspects.

Acting on other conclusions of the Meeting, the Economic and Social Council, in a resolution adopted without vote on 24 July,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to undertake several tasks within existing budgetary and staff resources, including the organization of periodic interregional seminars, preparation of a manual on technical and managerial aspects, and the collection and distribution of information on the activities of international river and lake organizations. Member States and secretariats of those organizations were urged to consider transmitting such information to the United Nations.

This text originated in the Committee on Natural Resources, which approved it on 27 May. It was approved without vote on 17 July by the Council's First (Economic) Committee.

The preparation of draft articles on the non-navigational uses of international watercourses

remained on the agenda of the International Law Commission in 1981 (p. 1222).

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Experiences in the Development and Management Of International River and Lake Basins: Proceedings of the United Nations Interregional Meeting of International River Orgnnizations (ST/ESA/120), Sales No. E.82.II.A.17.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/81, 24 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.I/SR.14, 15, 16 (15-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/81

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/112) without vote, 17 July (meeting 16); draft by Committee on Natural Resources (E/1981/50): agenda item 15.

#### water resources

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling resolution VII of the Mar del Plata Action Plan, adopted on 25 March 1977 by the United Nations Water Conference,

Recalling further Council resolution 2121(LXIII) of 4 August 1977, in which it endorsed, *inter alia*, resolution VII of the Mar del Plata Action Plan,

Noting with satisfaction that the first Interregional Meeting of International River Organizations, organized by the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development in co-operation with the Government of Senegal and the Organization for the Development of the Senegal River, was held at Dakar from 5 to 14 May 1981;

Considering that the first Interregional Meeting of International River Organizations reached a number of conclusions in fields pertaining to the development, use and protection of international water resources,

Further considering that some conclusions emanating from that Meeting call for the immediate attention of the appropriate United Nations bodies, agencies and organizations.

1. Urges States members of existing international river and lake organizations and the secretariats of such organizations to consider furthering the exchange of information on the development, use and protection of international water resources by transmitting to the Secretary-General, for systematic collection, analysis and distribution, periodic information concerning activities, projects and programmes of those organizations;

2. Requests the Secretary-General, within existing budgetary and manpower resources:

(a) To establish within the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development a support function for the collection, analysis and periodic distribution of information concerning the activities, programmes and developments of interested international river and lake organizations;

(b) To prepare a manual on the technical and managerial aspects of the development, use and protection of international water resources, drawing on the competence of the organizations of the United Nations system, as required;

(c) To organize periodically interregional seminars, and to facilitate the exchange of personnel, concerned with specific technical and managerial aspects of the development, use and protection of international water resources;

3. Urges the regional commissions to consider, at the request of the Governments concerned, and whenever appropriate, the promotion of training activities for the preparation of qualified cadres of managers, administrators and technicians needed for the development, use and protection of international water resources.

#### Co-ordination in the UN system

Ways of improving co-ordination of activities on water questions among United Nations or-

ganizations were considered in several United Nations bodies during 1981.

In his April report to the Committee on Natural Resources on the activities of the United Nations system in this field,<sup>(6)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that, while considerable progress had been made in harmonizing problems dealing with specific aspects of water, such as drinking water supply and environmental considerations, more complex problems were created when activities cut across various categories, such as water management or legislation. General guidelines for inter-agency co-operation had been agreed upon for joint action in regard to technical assistance, suggesting how organizations should deal with overlapping activities.

In its annual overview report to the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(2)</sup> the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) noted that its Intersecretariat Group for Water Resources, established in 1979, had met in November 1980 to consider follow-up measures to the Mar del Plata Action Plan, and that field co-ordination was being improved through the use of United Nations Development Programme resident representatives.

The Economic and Social Council took note of these guidelines and ACC arrangements in its 24 July 1981 resolution on water resources development.<sup>(\*)</sup>

The distribution of tasks and responsibilities between the regional commissions and other United Nations bodies in the field of water resources was considered briefly by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) at its May/June session (p. 1076). It examined a note by the Secretary-General<sup>(1)</sup> stating that, on the whole, the current distribution of tasks and responsibilities appeared to correspond to what was needed, though some adjustments might be appropriate. CPC was informed orally that, at a meeting of water resources programme managers at United Nations Headquarters on 18 May, representatives of the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development had differed with the view expressed by regional commission officials that water activities were largely regional in nature, but participants had agreed that analysis of the long-term distribution of tasks and responsibilities could be initiated in the context of preparations for the proposed United Nations medium-term plan for 1984-1989.

CPC found the Secretary-General's note-which also dealt with environmental issues (p. 842)-lacking in serious attempts at analysis and decided to return to the matter in 1982 on the basis of a further report.<sup>(3)</sup>

Implementation of the Mar del Plata Action Plan by the United Nations system was the topic

of a June report by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), written by Inspector Julio C. Rodriguez Arias and transmitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General in August.<sup>(5)</sup> Stating that the implementation process was just beginning, the report said that the initiative in planning and executing action remained the exclusive prerogative of Governments; the United Nations system could only play a supporting role. The concepts, policies and institutions evolved by the United Nations system needed to be strengthened and consolidated. Co-ordination arrangements were on the right course, including decentralization to the regions, but the thrust did not appear to have been sufficiently vigorous in all cases and the arrangements remained embryonic.

Commenting on this report in November, the Secretary-General welcomed the emphasis it placed on the primary role of Governments. He stated that current inter-agency arrangements through the Intersecretariat Group provided an appropriate basis for functional co-ordination and for integrated planning and implementation, as well as for increased efforts for joint planning of activities.

The JIU report was discussed at the second session of the Intersecretariat Group (Geneva, 19-23 October),<sup>(4)</sup> whose views were incorporated into the Secretary-General's comments. The Group also reviewed the water resources activities of the United Nations system and agreed on some guidelines for the interdisciplinary missions that were to advise Governments on policy and legislative matters pertaining to water resources (p. 683).

Note: (1)S-G, E/AC.51/1981/3.

Reports: (2)ACC, E/1981/37; (3)CPC, A/36/38; (4)Intersecretariat Group, ACC/1981/37; (5)JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/411, and S-G comments, Add.1; (6)S-G, E/C.7/120.

Resolution: (7)E.W. 1981/80, sect. VI, paras. 1 & 2, 24 July (p. 682).

## Cartography

Implementation of the recommendations of the Second UN Cartographic Conference for the Americas

On 4 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> acting without vote on an oral proposal by its President, the Economic and Social Council took note of a report by the Secretary-General<sup>(2)</sup> on measures taken to implement the recommendations of the Second United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas, held at Mexico City in 1979.<sup>(3)</sup>

The report mentioned United Nations technical co-operation projects in Bolivia, Honduras

and Mexico on the use of remote sensing data from satellites; a published United Nations study on the world's surveying and mapping manpower and training facilities; a study under way on the status of world hydrographic surveying and nautical charting; and plans for an inter-regional seminar in Moscow in September 1981 on thematic mapping as a tool for economic and social development.

Decision: (1)ESC, 1981/112, 4 May, text following.

Report: (2)IS-G, E/1981/19.

Yearbook reference: (3)1979, p. 994.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.8, 12, 13 (24 Apr.-4 May).

Publication: Third United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names, vol. II: Technical Papers, Athens, 17 August-7 September 1977 (E/CONF.69/4), Sales No. E/F/S.81.1.7.

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/112

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 5.

Recommendations of the Second United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas

At its 13th plenary meeting, on 4 May 1981, the Council took note of the progress report of the Secretary-General on measures taken to implement, as appropriate, the recommendations of the Second United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas.

Preparations for the Tenth UN Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Pacific

The Economic and Social Council, in a resolution adopted without vote on 4 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to arrange for the convening of the Tenth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Pacific in the first quarter of 1983 at the headquarters of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, at Bangkok, Thailand. The Council also asked him to implement as appropriate the recommendations of the Ninth Regional Conference, held at Wellington, New Zealand, in February 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> including the convening of a working group of experts on space cartography, the Group of Experts on Hydrographic Surveying and Nautical Charting, and an advisory panel on cadastral surveying and mapping. The Secretary-General was requested to report in 1984 on the desirability and feasibility of holding United Nations inter-regional cartographic conferences.

This text, introduced by New Zealand, was also sponsored by Australia, India, Nepal and Thailand.

In the Council's discussion, Australia expressed the view that regional conferences were more economical and accessible, and should not be replaced by a single world conference. New Zealand observed that small island States and isolated developing countries would benefit

more from a regional than a global conference. Sweden believed that United Nations cartographic conferences should focus on operational matters related to the conditions and problems of a particular region. However, the German Democratic Republic believed that interregional conferences should be held periodically in place of regional ones, to help solve global problems. Canada and the United Kingdom stated their understanding that a global conference would supersede and not be added to the existing regional conferences.

Brazil opposed the establishment of regional educational centres for cartography, remarking that they would duplicate the work of existing bodies such as the Cartography Section of the United Nations Department of Technical Cooperation for Development and the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, a specialized entity of the Organization of American States.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/6, 4 May, text following.

Yearbook reference <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 1025.

Financial implications: S-G statement, E/1981/L.28.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.8, 12, 13 (24 Apr.-4 May).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/6

Adopted without vote Meeting 13 4 May 1981

5-nation draft (E/1981/L.19): agenda item 5.

Sponsors: Australia, India, Nepal, New Zealand, Thailand.

#### Tenth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Pacific

The Economic and Social Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the Ninth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Pacific, held at Wellington from 11 to 22 February 1980.

Expressing its appreciation for the valuable contribution made by the Conference to the promotion of cartographic work conducted in the countries of the region for the purposes of their economic and social development plans,

Noting the recommendation of the Conference that a tenth conference should be convened in 1983,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements to convene the Tenth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Pacific at the headquarters of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific at Bangkok in the first quarter of 1983;

2. Further requests the Secretary-General to take, as appropriate, practical measures:

(a) For the implementation of the recommendations of the Ninth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Pacific;

(b) To convene, in accordance with the recommendations of the Conference:

(i) A working group of experts on space cartography;

(ii) The Group of Experts on Hydrographic Surveying and Nautical Charting;

(iii) An advisory panel on cadastral surveying and mapping;

and to keep the Council informed of developments in those matters:

3. Requests the Secretary-General to assess the desirability and feasibility of holding United Nations Interregional cartographic conferences and to submit a report on the matter to the Council in 1984, taking into account the views expressed by delegations during the Council's consideration of the question.

## Chapter X

## Energy

The United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, which met at Nairobi, Kenya, from 10 to 21 August 1981, approved a plan to promote the increased use of non-conventional power sources, including solar and wind power, ocean energy, biomass conversion, fuelwood and charcoal, geothermal energy, oil shale and tar sands, peat and draught animal power, as well as hydropower.<sup>(1)</sup> The aim of the plan, known as the Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy, was to help the world move away from its current dependence on depletable supplies of petroleum and gas (p. 689).

The General Assembly, in December,<sup>(5)</sup> endorsed the Nairobi Programme of Action and established an Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy to launch implementation of the Programme in 1982.

The Energy Account of the United Nations Development Programme, in its first full year of operation, financed 13 projects (p. 711). One of them was the Information Centre on Heavy Crude and Tar Sands, established in May with the co-sponsorship of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (p. 708).

The environmental aspects of energy were under study by the United Nations Environment Programme (p. 839), while the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements was authorized to initiate work on energy requirements for human settlements (p. 852). The Economic and Social Council, in May, requested improvements in the United Nations collection and dissemination of energy statistics (p. 1069).

With regard to nuclear energy, the General Assembly, after considering in November the annual report of the International Atomic Energy Agency, commended the Agency for its

continuing efforts in promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and noted the steady improvement in its safeguards system, intended to prevent diversion of supervised nuclear materials to military purposes.<sup>(3)</sup> Further, the Assembly endorsed in December<sup>(14)</sup> the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy<sup>(2)</sup> and decided to hold the Conference at Geneva in August/September 1983.

The use of nuclear power sources in outer space, both technical (p. 116) and legal (p. 122) aspects, remained under study in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, Nairobi, 10 to 21 August 1981 (A/CONF.100/11), Sales No. E.81.I.24.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Preparatory Committee for Conference on nuclear energy, A/36/48.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>36/25, 11 Nov. (p. 713); <sup>(4)</sup>36/78, 9 Dec. (p. 715); <sup>(5)</sup>36/193, 17 Dec. (p. 691).

## Non-nuclear energy

### UN Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy

#### Nairobi Programme of Action

The Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy<sup>(3)</sup> was adopted at the conclusion of the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, which met at Nairobi, Kenya from 10 to 21 August 1981.

The Programme of Action stated in its introduction that the issue confronting the international community was achievement of an orderly and peaceful energy transition from the current international economy based primarily on hydrocarbons (petroleum and gas to one based increasingly on new and renewable sources of energy. This was to be done in a manner which, consistent with the national plans and priorities of individual countries, was socially equitable, economically and technically viable and environmentally sustainable. An effective energy transition needed to conform with the principle of full and permanent sovereignty of each country over its natural resources, entailed the rationalization of energy development, and bore direct implications for the quality of life and general well-being.

The Programme identified five broad policy areas for concerted action with international support: assessment and planning (p. 697); research,

development and demonstration (p. 697); transfer, adaptation and application of mature technologies (p. 699); information flows (p. 698); and education and training (p. 699).

Within these areas, specific measures were identified in relation to individual energy sources. These included charcoal and fuelwood (p. 707); certain fossil fuels, particularly oil sands and shales (p. 707) and peat (p. 708); non-conventional energy sources, including biomass (p. 708), geothermal, marine and solar (p. 709), and wind (p. 710); hydropower (p. 710); and draught animals (p. 710). The Programme also proposed measures for the mobilization of additional financial resources for developing countries (p. 703) and for institutional arrangements for implementation and monitoring, including an intergovernmental body, co-ordination in the United Nations system, regional and subregional action, and co-operation among developing countries (p. 700).

The Programme was based on a preliminary draft prepared by the Secretary-General of the Conference, in accordance with a request made on 16 April<sup>(1)</sup> by its Preparatory Committee (p. 694) after the Committee had discussed a preliminary outline he had submitted. The Committee considered the draft in June and decided on 7 August to transmit it to the Conference.<sup>(2)</sup> The Conference considered it in both of its main committees before adopting it on 21 August.

Several reservations were expressed at the Conference following adoption of the Programme of Action.

Eastern European States considered that implementation of the Programme was basically the task of the countries themselves, and did not agree with provisions which emphasized the role of external economic factors, especially private foreign capital, in harnessing the energy potential of the developing countries.

On institutional arrangements, the Eastern European countries, as well as members of the European Community (EC), stressed the need to make full use of existing bodies and staff within the United Nations system. The Eastern European States and the United States said there must be no additional financial implications for the United Nations.

The EC members, Switzerland and the United States expressed reservations regarding the Programme's reference to permanent sovereignty over natural resources, stating that the application of that principle had to be governed by the rules of international law.

Japan and the United States reserved their positions on a paragraph calling for strengthening the developing countries' ability to evaluate, select, negotiate, acquire and adapt foreign tech-

nologies (p. 699). Japan said this provision did not prejudice the outcome of ongoing negotiations on technology transfer within the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (p. 755).

Decisions: Preparatory Committee (report, A/36/47):  
(<sup>1</sup>)2(III), 16 Apr.; (<sup>2</sup>)5(IV), Aug.

Report: (<sup>3</sup>)Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24).

#### Conference resolutions

In addition to the Nairobi Programme of Action, the Conference adopted seven resolutions and two decisions on 21 August.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Conference invited Governments to consider energy policy in close relation to soil, water and forest policies (p. 696). In the context of rural development, it urged acceleration of reforestation programmes and the development of other new and renewable energy sources to conserve fuelwood (p. 707) and improve living standards in rural areas (p. 706). The Conference called on the United Nations system and other international bodies to support the development of new and renewable energy sources in Africa (p. 624), Asia (p. 644) and Latin America (p. 666).

The Conference acknowledged the right of all countries to explore and acquire technology relating to all kinds of new and renewable energy sources, and to use or control it without political constraints or fear of aggression from any other State (p. 699).

The Conference condemned Israel's aggression in June against Iraq's nuclear research centre (p. 279), warned against the danger of joint military activities between Israel and South Africa (p. 192), called on Israel to stop implementing its Mediterranean-Dead Sea Canal project (p. 319), condemned the plunder and illegal exploitation of Namibian energy resources by the South African régime and multinational corporations (p. 1171), and demanded the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola (p. 218).

Report: (<sup>1</sup>)Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24).

#### Implementation of the Programme

The Nairobi Programme of Action was endorsed by the General Assembly in a resolution adopted without vote on 17 December 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> The Assembly urged Governments and organizations to implement the Programme, and established an Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy to launch that implementation in 1982 (p. 700). The Committee was to formulate plans, promote the mobilization of resources and recommend guidelines to the

financial organs of the United Nations system in respect of Programme implementation. The Assembly made the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation responsible for co-ordination within the United Nations system (p. 701), requested United Nations regional commissions to develop plans and programmes (p. 702), called for international support for co-operation among developing countries (p. 703) and emphasized the need for additional financial resources (p. 704).

The initial draft of this resolution was submitted by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries.<sup>(1)</sup> On the basis of informal consultations on that draft, a Vice-Chairman of the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee submitted a revised text, to which the Vice-Chairman and Japan made oral drafting changes before the Committee approved it without vote on 7 December.

The original and the final texts differed essentially in the fact that, while the Algerian draft would have had the Interim Committee develop and formulate policy guidelines for the United Nations system, the final text entrusted the Committee with recommending guidelines. Other changes in each of the remaining sections were on co-ordination in the United Nations system, regional and subregional action, co-operation among developing countries and financing.

Poland, speaking also for Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said they had not objected to adoption of the resolution without vote in view of the importance of energy but believed its financial implications should be met from existing resources. The United States said the resolution emphasized United Nations and other international efforts to implement a programme that was mainly the responsibility of individual countries; the United States would not contribute additional resources to the United Nations for that purpose and believed any budget increases had to be offset by savings in other areas. Comments on institutional arrangements were made by Canada and Japan.

In the Second Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, a number of developing countries stressed the need for concrete action to implement the Nairobi Programme of Action. India expressed hope that the international community would have the political will to implement it, that institutional arrangements would be made as soon as possible and that additional resource transfers would take place, as the developing countries would not look kindly on dilatory tactics. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya expressed satisfaction

with the Programme but warned that it would remain a dead letter so long as the means for putting it into effect and financing it were not found.

Nepal welcomed the Programme as a first step towards the promotion and utilization of alternative energy sources but also noted that implementation depended on the support of Governments and of the United Nations system. Uruguay hoped the Programme would be implemented promptly through technological and financial arrangements geared to the establishment of a new international economic order; meanwhile, the only option of countries without their own conventional energy sources was to depend on oil imports and to suffer the economic, financial and political consequences. Venezuela said it was concerned that some developed countries at the Conference, from both the market economy and the centrally planned economy groups, had taken positions tantamount to a denial of the necessary material resources and to an attempt to undermine implementation of the results of the Conference. Zambia pointed to the need to establish a viable machinery to implement the Programme.

Indonesia thought the adoption of the Programme augured well for international co-operation in energy and heralded the beginning of a global approach to the transition from fossil fuels to new and renewable energy sources. Oman hoped the results of the Conference would prove to be the first real steps towards increased international co-operation. The Philippines hoped the Programme would fit into the framework of a world energy plan that would secure an orderly transition from the era of hydrocarbons to that of diversified energy sources. The Republic of Korea hoped the Programme would contribute towards stabilizing energy prices and to advances in energy technology. The Sudan trusted that global solutions would be found to energy problems along the lines agreed upon in the Programme.

Among developed countries, the United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community members, urged priority attention to activities on fuelwood, small-scale rural projects and technological research. For the Nordic States, Norway also believed that fuelwood problems deserved priority.

Canada said it would establish a \$25-million programme to assist the Sudano-Sahelian countries of Africa to develop new energy resources and would intensify its aid to countries needing help in developing national energy plans. Israel offered to join other nations in implementing projects to make full use of renewable energy sources such as solar energy, including projects

designed for energy conversion of agricultural waste. Italy said it would provide fellowships or training in 12 Italian centres, send experts to developing countries and set up training centres there; it hoped to finance large agro-forestry demonstration projects in Latin America, Africa and Asia. The United States viewed the Conference as a success and said it would support selected elements of the Programme, including training programmes and efforts to help developing countries assess and utilize their resources more efficiently.

Portugal welcomed the Nairobi Programme, saying that, if satisfactorily implemented, it would mark an important advance towards global solutions to problems affecting the whole international community. Spain supported the Programme but observed that hydrocarbons could not quickly be replaced and that the new technologies were still not commercially viable.

Bulgaria could not subscribe to provisions of the Programme that entailed an over-estimation of external economic factors, particularly private foreign capital; it believed the energy problems of developing countries could be solved primarily through their own resources, the elaboration of national energy programmes, personnel training, and the effective and rational use of financial resources. The German Democratic Republic stated that assistance to developing countries for exploring, developing and planning alternative energy sources could not take the form of private capital investment or new operations by transnational corporations. Hungary endorsed the statement in the Nairobi Programme that effective energy transition must conform to the principle of full and permanent national sovereignty over natural resources. The Ukrainian SSR disagreed with provisions of the Programme that would assign a dominant role to private capital; it believed assistance to developing countries should give priority to development of the public sector.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.126.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/193, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.2/36/L.129/Add.1; 5th Committee report, A/36/830; S-G statements, A/C.2/36/L.129, A/C.5/36/102.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 45, 46 (24 Sep.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/193

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.12) without vote. 7 December (meeting 46): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.143), based on informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.126), orally revised, and orally amended by Japan; agenda item 69 (o).

United Nations Conference on New and  
Renewable Sources of Energy

The General Assembly,

Recalling Its resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling also its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recalling further its resolutions 33/148 of 20 December 1978, 34/190 of 18 December 1979 and 35/204 of 16 December 1980 and Economic and Social Council resolutions 2119(LXIII) of 4 August 1977, 1978/61 of 3 August 1978 and 1979/66 of 3 August 1979 and Council decision 1980/187 of 25 July 1980 regarding the convening of and preparation for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy,

Convinced of the importance of developing new and renewable sources of energy in order to contribute to meeting requirements for continued economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries, through, inter alia, the transition from the present International economy based primarily on hydrocarbons to one based increasingly on new and renewable sources of energy.

Stressing that the primary responsibility for promoting the development and utilization of new and renewable sources of energy rests with individual countries, that in this regard international co-operation is indispensable and should be directed to assist and support national efforts, that developed countries bear a special responsibility to ensure that both their bilateral and their multilateral efforts contribute actively to this end and that other countries in a position to do so should also continue to promote efforts in this regard.

Reaffirming that the United Nations system should fully participate in and support the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy through adequate institutional arrangements and additional and adequate resources, and that it is imperative to increase the responsiveness of the system in this respect,

Further reaffirming that the final decision on further institutional measures will be taken by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session,

Recognizing the urgent need for adopting effective measures to facilitate the transfer and adaptation of technology from developed to developing countries in particular and for mobilization of financial resources for the development of new and renewable sources of energy in developing countries,

Taking note of the Report of the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, adopted by the Conference on 21 August 1981,

Taking note also of the report of the Secretary-General on the Conference,

Noting with satisfaction the agreements reached on some issues at the Conference, as contained in the report it adopted,

Expressing deep concern that no final decisions were taken on some other important questions,

Recognizing the need for continuing commitment and efforts on the part of the international community in the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy, adopted by the Conference,

I

Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and  
Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy

1. Expresses its appreciation and thanks to the Government and people of Kenya for the excellent facilities and

generous hospitality provided for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, held at Nairobi from 10 to 21 August 1981;

2. Endorses the Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy;

3. Urges all Governments to take effective action for the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action and to maintain and/or establish, as the case may be, national focal points to facilitate such Implementation;

4. Requests the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to participate fully in and support the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action, in the short-term, medium-term and long-term context, in particular for the benefit of developing countries in accordance with their national plans and priorities;

5. Calls upon all specialized intergovernmental organizations and institutions in the field of new and renewable sources of energy to extend their co-operation in the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action;

6. Invites all non-governmental organizations concerned, in both the developing and developed countries, to support and contribute to the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action;

II

Intergovernmental body

1. Stresses that there should be an Intergovernmental body in the United Nations specifically concerned with new and renewable sources of energy and entrusted, inter alia, with guiding and monitoring the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action;

2. Decides to adopt the final arrangements with regard to the intergovernmental body at its thirty-seventh session;

3. Decides also, without prejudice to the final institutional arrangements, to establish an Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, patterned on the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, which will hold, in the first half of 1982, only one session of not more than two weeks, and which will report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session through the Economic and Social Council, and further decides to entrust it with the immediate launching of the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action;

4. Takes note with appreciation of the offer of the Government of Italy to act as host in Rome to the meeting of the Interim Committee in 1982;

5. Decides that the Interim Committee, taking into account the provisions of paragraph 60 of the Nairobi Programme of Action, shall concentrate, inter alia, on:

(a) The recommendation of policy guidelines for different organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system in regard to new and renewable sources of energy, on the basis of the Nairobi Programme of Action;

(b) The formulation and recommendation of action-oriented plans and programmes for carrying out the Nairobi Programme of Action in accordance with the areas of priority action identified in the Programme, in particular in paragraphs 47 to 56 thereof;

(c) The promotion of the mobilization of resources required in the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action;

(d) The recommendation of guidelines to the financial organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system in the financing of activities related to the implementation of the measures contained in the Nairobi Programme of Action, with a view to helping to ensure the implementation of the measures in the Programme related to financial resources;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the Interim Committee at its session in 1982 the necessary background documentation on the above-mentioned subjects, with particular emphasis on the mobilization of financial resources and the areas for priority action identified in the Nairobi Programme of Action, namely:



- (a) Energy assessment and planning;
- (b) Research, development and demonstration;
- (c) Transfer, adaptation and application of mature technologies;

- (d) Information flows, education and training;

7. Calls upon organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to inform the Interim Committee of the activities they have already initiated, particularly as regards the source-specific measures identified in paragraphs 36 to 45 of the Nairobi Programme of Action, with a view to assisting the Interim Committee in guiding and monitoring its implementation;

8. Decides that, bearing in mind the provisions of the present resolution, the Issues for discussion by the Interim Committee in 1982 shall include submission of specific recommendations for action by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session regarding, in particular, the areas for priority action and ways and means of mobilizing financial and other resources for new and renewable sources of energy;

### III

#### Secretariat support

1. Takes note of the recommendation of the Secretary-General for providing the substantive support services required by the above-mentioned intergovernmental body with a view to facilitating fully the tasks entrusted to the Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy in paragraph 5 of section II above, and requests that these interim arrangements be put into effect immediately;

2. Calls upon all organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to provide the fullest possible support to the arrangements proposed so as to ensure, in particular, adequate preparation for and follow-up to the meeting of the Interim Committee in 1982 which is to launch the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action;

3. Decides to review at its thirty-seventh session secretariat support arrangements in the light of long-term needs within the context of its final decision on further institutional measures and taking into account any comments the Interim Committee may wish to offer on these issues;

### IV

#### Co-ordination within the United Nations system

1. Calls upon all organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to organize their work and rationalize their activities according to established priorities in such a way as to meet the need for implementing the Nairobi Programme of Action;

2. Decides to entrust the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, within the framework of his mandate as defined by the General Assembly in Its resolutions 32/197 of 20 December 1977 and 33/202 of 29 January 1979, with the task of co-ordinating the contributions of the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system;

3. Decides also that, in order to ensure the necessary co-operation and co-ordination for the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action, a co-ordinating capacity for new and renewable sources of energy in the Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, who would exercise the supervisory role, should be provided for, making full and efficient use of resources already existing within the United Nations and subject to the normal procedures of the General Assembly, and decides to review the arrangements for this co-ordinating capacity for new and renewable sources of energy at its thirty-seventh session;

4. Notes with approval the decision by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination to constitute an ad hoc working group to prepare proposals for inter-agency follow-up to the Nairobi Programme of Action for presentation to the Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy at its meeting in 1982;

5. Stresses that, in order to facilitate the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action, the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination should, *Inter alia*:

(a) Undertake a thorough review of the current and planned activities of the United Nations system in the light of the recommendations of the Nairobi Programme of Action, with a view to facilitating their adaptation and reformulation as may be necessary and to providing a basic framework for future projects and programmes;

(b) Establish ad hoc task forces as necessary, without prejudice to the establishment of such ad hoc task forces as may be recommended by the intergovernmental body in accordance with paragraphs 66 and 67 of the Nairobi Programme of Action;

### V

#### Regional and subregional action

Emphasizes the importance of regional and subregional efforts for implementing the Nairobi Programme of Action and requests the regional commissions to undertake immediately, as necessary, the development of regional plans and programmes, bearing in mind, in particular, the areas for priority attention identified in paragraph 71 of the Nairobi Programme of Action, and to report thereon to the Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy at its session in 1982;

### VI

#### Co-operation among developing countries

1. Recognizes that developing countries seek to enhance their collective self-reliance in various areas, which are in their mutual interest, through programmes of economic and technical co-operation in such areas as exchange of information, joint ventures in project development, joint efforts in research, development, demonstration and adaptation of technologies for new and renewable sources of energy, and technical assistance, to supplement the indispensable action to be undertaken by the international community;

2. Calls upon, in this context, the international community to take measures to provide, as appropriate, support and assistance to the efforts of developing countries to accelerate co-operation among themselves in the field of new and renewable sources of energy;

### VII

#### Mobilization of financial resources

1. Emphasizes that the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action requires the mobilization of additional and adequate resources and that each country will continue to bear the main responsibility for the development of its new and renewable sources of energy, which would require vigorous measures for a fuller mobilization of its domestic financial and other resources;

2. Emphasizes that the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action involves numerous types of undertakings, ranging from Supporting actions, including national assessment on new and renewable sources of energy for overall energy development, and pre-investment activities, to capital investment in projects and programmes which require additional and adequate international financial resources, both public and private, from all developed countries, international financial institutions and other international organizations, and that developing countries in a position to do so should also Continue to provide assistance to other developing countries;

3. Reiterates that the magnitude of the demand for financing such types of action or activities is already considerable and will increase in the years to come, particularly with the Implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action;

4. Requests that, for the purpose of undertaking the various activities in line with the Nairobi Programme of Action, the financial mechanisms and institutions of the United Nations system should be provided with additional and adequate funds to meet the growing requirements for preliminary supporting actions and pre-investment activities related to

the development of new and renewable sources of energy in developing countries;

5. Urges financial mechanisms and institutions to respond more widely and effectively to national requests, as well as to requests from the subregional, regional and International organizations engaged in the development of new and renewable sources of energy in developing countries, according to the priorities established in the Nairobi Programme of Action and in response to recommendations of the intergovernmental body referred to in section II above as regards its Implementation;

6. Reaffirms, in this context, that specific and additional resources should be directed through such channels as the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, the long-term financial arrangements for science and technology, the United Nations Development Programme Energy Account and others directly or indirectly involved, in accordance with national plans and priorities;

7. Urges international and regional development financial organizations and institutions, in particular the World Bank, to provide additional and adequate resources specifically for large-scale supporting actions, pre-investment and investment activities in the field of new and renewable sources of energy. In accordance with national priorities;

8. Takes note of the measures taken by the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme to undertake a joint study for making as accurate an estimate as possible of the supporting actions and pre-investment requirements for new and renewable sources of energy in the developing countries in the 1980s and, in view of the urgency of meeting the needs of the developing countries in this field, requests that the final study be submitted to the Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, which is to launch the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action at its meeting in 1982;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the progress made towards the implementation of consultative meetings as outlined in paragraph 91 of the Nairobi Programme of Action;

10. Urges all interested parties to accelerate consideration of other possible avenues that would increase energy financing, including the mechanisms being examined in the World Bank, such as an energy affiliate.

#### Preparations for the Conference

Advance work for the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy was carried out at the global, regional, subregional and national levels.

Preparations at the global level included a session each of six ad hoc expert groups; two sessions each of eight technical panels, consisting of a total of 77 experts; and a meeting of a Synthesis Group (p. 695) which reviewed the reports of the panels and other groups and drafted a report for the Conference taking account of their main conclusions.<sup>(2)</sup>

The expert groups, meeting in December 1980 and January 1981, dealt with policy issues and sectoral uses: research and development (p. 698) and technology transfer (p. 699), information flows (p. 698), education and training (p. 699), financing (p. 703), industrial issues including energy utilization in transportation and allied sectors (p. 705) and rural energy including utilization in agriculture (p. 706). The

technical panels, which met between November 1979 and December 1980, were concerned with particular energy sources: fuelwood and charcoal (p. 707), oil shale and tar sands (p. 707), biomass energy (p. 708), geothermal energy (p. 709), ocean energy (p. 709), solar energy (p. 710), wind energy (p. 710) and hydropower (p. 710). In addition, an ad hoc working group prepared a report on draught animal power (p. 710) and Finland submitted a paper on peat (p. 708).

Meetings were organized by the five United Nations regional commissions (p. 695), and symposia organized in the framework of preparations for the Conference were held in Moscow, Tokyo and Stockholm, Sweden. In addition, specialized agencies and other intergovernmental bodies contributed papers giving particulars of their past and proposed activities.

National papers from 88 countries were submitted to the Conference, describing existing or prospective measures for supplementing or replacing energy resources. To encourage a large number of contributions, the Preparatory Committee, on 16 April, extended the deadline for submission of national papers to 31 May.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Preparatoq Committee (report, A/36/47), I (III). 16 Apr.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Synthesis of Technical Panel reports, A/CONF. 100/PC/42.

#### Preparatory Committee

As decided by the General Assembly in 1979,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee on Natural Resources, open to participation by all United Nations Member States as full members, acted as Preparatory Committee for the Conference. It held two sessions in 1981, <sup>(1)</sup> its third from 30 March to 16 April in New York, and its fourth from 8 to 26 June in New York and from 3 to 7 August at Nairobi, Kenya.

On 16 April the Committee approved a preliminary draft provisional agenda<sup>(4)</sup> and draft rules of procedure<sup>(5)</sup> for the Conference, urged that it be attended by high-level delegations<sup>(6)</sup> and approved its organization of work.<sup>(7)</sup> The Committee requested the Conference Secretary-General to prepare a preliminary draft programme of action (p. 689), extended the deadline for submission of national papers (see above) and requested that the idea of establishing a computerized retrieval system for studies on new and renewable energy sources be pursued if funding could be secured (p. 699). On 25 June the Committee approved a provisional agenda<sup>(8)</sup> and documents list<sup>(10)</sup> for the Conference, and decided to resume its session at Nairobi in August in an attempt to agree on the draft programme of action.<sup>(9)</sup> On 5 August it agreed on the regional distribution of Conference officers<sup>(11)</sup> and on 7 August it decided to transmit to

the Conference a preliminary draft programme of action<sup>(12)</sup>

On 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly took note of the 1981 report of the Preparatory Committee. It did so without vote on the recommendation of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, made on the oral proposal of its Chairman and adopted, also without vote, on 7 December.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Preparatory Committee, A/36/47.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA: 34/190, para. 2, 18 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 686).

Decisions: (3)GA: 36/447 17 Dec., text following. Preparatory Committee: (4)3(III), (5)4(III), (6)5(III), (7)7(III), 16 Apr.; (8)1(IV), (9)2(IV), <sup>(10)</sup>3(IV), 25 June; <sup>(11)</sup>4(IV), 5 Aug.; <sup>(12)</sup>(IV), 7 Aug.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 46 (24 Sep.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103(17Dec.).

#### General Assembly decision 36/447

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.12) without vote, 7 December (meeting 46): oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 69 (o).

#### United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, took note of the report of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy on its third and fourth sessions.

#### Regional meetings

The five United Nations regional commissions organized preparatory meetings between December 1980 and March 1981 or prepared studies in connection with the Conference<sup>(1)</sup>

The regional preparatory meeting held by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (Bangkok, Thailand, 10-15 December 1980) suggested that international machinery might be set up to underwrite financial risks of large-scale projects using relatively unproven energy technology.<sup>(6)</sup> The preparatory meeting of the Economic Commission for Africa (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 12-16 January 1981) produced a regional plan of action which included a proposal for the establishment and development of specialized regional or subregional training institutes and a regional bank or fund to finance energy projects.<sup>(2)</sup> An expert group meeting convened by the Economic Commission for Western Asia (Beirut, Lebanon, 12-16 January) urged the countries of the region to formulate a comprehensive national policy for utilization of new and renewable energy sources<sup>(3)</sup>

A ministerial-level meeting held by the Economic Commission for Latin America (Mexico City, 19 and 20 March), preceded by a technical session (16-18 March), adopted a Regional Plan of Action that listed priority pro-

grammes through which interested countries would co-operate in the study and design of specific schemes for introducing new energy sources.<sup>(4)</sup> The Economic Commission for Europe, in a report based on secretariat studies and on conclusions of seminars and symposia, stated that the long-term difficulties faced by developing countries in meeting their energy demands could reach crisis proportions if organizational, political and economic measures were not taken in time<sup>(3)</sup>

Reports: Transmitted by S-G note, <sup>(1)</sup>A/CONF.100/8 & addenda: <sup>(2)</sup>ECA, Add.2; <sup>(3)</sup>ECE, Add.1; <sup>(4)</sup>ECLA, Add.S; <sup>(5)</sup>ECWA, Add.4 & Corr.1; <sup>(6)</sup>ESCAP, Add.3 & Corr.1.

#### Synthesis Group

A synthesis report, reviewing the main issues before the Conference on the basis of work done by the technical panels and groups of experts (p. 694), was prepared by a Synthesis Group of 28 experts which met at United Nations Headquarters from 17 to 27 February 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> The Group reviewed the technological and economic prospects of various energy sources, discussed the problems involved in the application of new and renewable energy technologies, and examined the relationship between energy and development with particular reference to rural, urban, industrial and other sectoral issues.

The Group cited projections to the effect that the contribution of new and renewable energy sources to total world energy supply would have to rise from the current share of 15 per cent to 25 per cent in 20 years if even modest development objectives were to be met in developing countries, assuming a tripling of their total energy consumption. Modernized traditional and new energy technologies could assist both rural and urban development because they could be utilized in both centralized and decentralized modes—large-scale projects mainly benefiting urban areas, and small-scale hydropower, solar installations and windmills elsewhere.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Synthesis Group, A/CONF.100/PC/41 & Add.1.

#### Energy policy

CONFERENCE ACTION. In the Nairobi Programme of Action, adopted on 21 August 1981 (p. 689), the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy<sup>(5)</sup> stated that energy planning had a significant role to play in promoting an efficient and rational use of available resources and a shift away from the current excessive reliance on hydrocarbons towards a more diversified mix of energy sources. Individual countries had the primary responsibility to promote the development and utilization of new and renewable energy sources. However, developed countries had a particular

responsibility to use their economic and managerial potential to support efforts aimed at an effective energy transition. Patterns of consumption which gave access to energy to a limited number of countries, or to a few within countries, were not compatible with agreed international goals.

The close relationship between energy policy and environmental policy was stressed in a resolution of 21 August<sup>(9)</sup> by which the Conference invited Governments to consider the two together, with particular reference to soil, water and forest policies (p. 839).

Colombia withdrew a draft resolution on local planning of energy policy, also sponsored by Kenya, which would have had the Conference request United Nations bodies to promote energy planning policies at municipal and local community levels.

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL. Energy policy and its relationship to money and finance were among the topics discussed in a report on the world economic situation and prospects,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted in March 1981 by the Task Force on Long-Term Development Objectives, a subsidiary body of the inter-agency Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (p. 388). The Task Force stressed the need for regional action, particularly by smaller countries collaborating in medium- to large-scale energy developments, mutual help in the establishment of national energy institutions, joint training of personnel, policy co-ordination, regular consultation and co-operative arrangements, emergency energy sharing schemes among developing countries and maintenance of a world balance sheet on energy. Oil-importing developing countries, it said, required help in financing investment in all energy sources, balance-of-payments finance, technical assistance and the pooling of research.

The Secretary-General issued in May for the Committee on Natural Resources a report on energy trends and issues,<sup>(8)</sup> illustrating how the demand and supply situation might differ in the year 2000 depending on the extent to which policy measures were introduced to enhance energy efficiency and promote expanded production. For the developing countries, such action could mean the difference between an annual growth rate of 5 per cent and one of 6.5 per cent. Achievement of a 7 per cent growth rate was feasible but would require a "crash" programme for the exploration and development of conventional and unconventional energy sources.

In the Committee,<sup>(4)</sup> Kenya and Uganda proposed that the Secretary-General be requested to prepare a comprehensive report in 1983 on the

energy investment needs of developing countries and on international co-operation in relation to energy. However, the Committee adjourned debate on the question without acting on the proposal.

On 21 July, the Economic and Social Council's First (Economic) Committee decided not to consider, but to annex to its report to the Council,<sup>(6)</sup> a draft resolution by Kenya<sup>(2)</sup> similar to the text submitted in the Committee on Natural Resources. Kenya told the Council that the Group of 77 had decided that the Council should not take a decision on the proposal at its current session but that the Group would reconsider it during the 1981 Assembly session.

The proposal by Kenya would have had the Council recommend that the energy pricing level be included as a topic in the energy programme of the United Nations medium-term plan for 1984-1989; declare the need to identify constraints in the development of energy sources and to establish national, regional and global mechanisms to co-ordinate activities and implement and review policy measures; request the Secretary-General to co-ordinate and strengthen research and information dissemination on the world energy supply, demand and consumption situation, trends and outlook; and request him to prepare a comprehensive report for the 1983 session of the Committee on Natural Resources giving an analysis of the connection between energy availability and economic and social development, an overview of the world energy situation, an assessment of prospective supply and demand, and a review of the energy requirements of developing countries and the means to finance energy-related investments.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION. In December the Chairman of the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee circulated a draft resolution on energy<sup>(1)</sup> but then announced that, as it did not command consensus, it had been withdrawn.<sup>(7)</sup>

The draft would have had the Assembly request a comprehensive report from the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, containing: an overview of the world energy situation and an assessment of the evolution of energy prospects and projections of the developing countries; an identification of the constraints to the development of energy sources in the developing countries, including constraints of financing, exploration, energy planning, information flows, education and training, research and development, and technology transfer; a review of energy investment requirements of developing countries and the possible and available mechanisms to finance such investment, and of existing gaps and pro-

spective means of filling them, particularly in the field of exploration; and a review of the situation with regard to international co-operation on energy. The report would have been submitted to the Committee on Natural Resources in 1983.

The United Kingdom, speaking for members of the European Community, regretted that the Assembly had been unable to adopt a resolution on energy and said the energy problem should be studied in a global context rather than in North-South terms.

Earlier, during the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, 'Austria said a rapid increase of energy consumption in developing countries was inevitable in the short term, in view of their need to increase production; if the energy-importing developing countries were to reach their development objectives, the energy supply would have to be adjusted to their needs, requiring huge investments in oil and gas as well as alternative sources. Kenya said it was essential to help developing countries identify their energy needs so that they might reflect them in their development plans, and to identify obstacles to the development and utilization of coal and other energy sources; also, a mechanism should be established to co-ordinate and implement energy activities.

Draft resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>GA 2nd Committee Chairman, A/L.C.2/36/L.137 (withdrawn); <sup>(2)</sup>Kenya, E/1981/C.1/L.15 (not acted upon).

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>ACC Task Force on Long-Term Development Objectives, transmitted by S-G note, E/1981/71; <sup>(4)</sup>Committee on Natural Resources, E/1981/50; <sup>(5)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(6)</sup>ESC 1st Committee, E/1981/112; <sup>(7)</sup>GA 2nd Committee, A/36/694/Add.5; <sup>(8)</sup>S-G, E/C.7/123.

Resolution: <sup>(9)</sup>Conference, 1, 21 Aug.

#### Assessment and planning

The Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy<sup>(1)</sup> stated that the role of each energy source in meeting a country's needs could best be determined through national energy planning, an essential element of which was energy assessment. The Programme identified areas in which action was needed, including mapping and surveys to ascertain the physical resource endowment, determination of energy supply and demand and energy balances, identification and continuing review of promising technologies, and strengthening or establishment of information gathering and dissemination machinery.

Countries were urged to designate focal points for national assessment and planning, to prepare inventories of resources, needs and technologies,

as well as estimates of supply and demand in order to identify areas for short- or long-term action, including international co-operation. The Programme suggested that international support and assistance be given for strengthening national capacities for data gathering, planning, identification and assessment of new and renewable sources, and evaluation of existing technologies; and local capacities for developing and utilizing different sources of energy.

The Ad Hoc Expert Group on Research and Development and Transfer of Technology, one of the six expert groups established in preparation for the Nairobi Conference (p. 6941), recommended in a February 1981 report<sup>(2)</sup> that a United Nations task force be set up to report on ongoing or anticipated global, regional and national energy assessments and the adequacy of such efforts, as well as on further work needed. The Group recommended that analysis of the role and potential of new and renewable energy sources be given high priority in energy assessment programmes and be fully integrated into the resulting national energy plans.

The Synthesis Group (p. 695) asserted in February<sup>(3)</sup> that the role of alternative energy sources should be defined within coherent energy policies and plans that were integral parts of broader development strategies. It pointed to the need to establish a reliable data base for effective evaluation of such energy sources, followed by pre-investment studies.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Expert Group on Research and Development and Transfer of Technology, A/CONF.100/PC/37; <sup>(3)</sup>Synthesis Group, A/CONF.100/PC/41.

#### Research and development

The Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy observed that, while research into new and renewable energy sources was expanding rapidly world-wide, co-ordination and information-sharing were poor, duplication was widespread, and important aspects were neglected and received few resources. In its Programme of Action,<sup>(1)</sup> it pointed out that the bulk of research was being carried out in developed countries and much of it would have to be extensively adapted for use in developing countries. To enhance the scientific and technological capabilities of developing countries, it would be necessary to: select promising technologies with a view to launching concerted efforts to accelerate their development; identify the research needed on the economic, social and environmental implications of emerging technologies; establish or strengthen institutions and capacities for research and development, including testing and

links to production; establish criteria for evaluating new and renewable energy sources; and identify and implement demonstration projects.

The Conference recommended that international co-operation be directed to support primarily national efforts, particularly of developing countries, to initiate or enhance research, development and demonstration activities, including self-sustained indigenous research and technological capabilities. Priority programmes were identified for urban and industrial energy (p. 705) and rural energy (p. 706).

Prior to the Conference, the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Research and Development and Transfer of Technology recommended in a February 1981 report<sup>(2)</sup> that an international group of experts be formed to establish a programme for long-term testing of systems for utilization of alternative energy sources. It also proposed that two task forces be established to determine ways of ensuring the development, within five years, of technologies using new and renewable energy sources to meet the needs for small stand-alone power sources and for domestic cookers.

The Synthesis Group<sup>(3)</sup> stated in February that the development of a strong research and development capacity in developing countries would be an important step in facilitating the evaluation, adaptation and innovation of energy technologies. The presence of effective national industrial property systems would facilitate new developments in developing countries. Developing countries should be assisted in strengthening their capacity to develop equipment having maximum economic and social impact. There was also a need to improve the productivity and use of existing national energy resources.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Expert Group on Research and Development and Transfer of Technology, A/CONF.100/PC/37; <sup>(3)</sup>Synthesis Group, A/CONF.100/PC/41.

#### Information transfer

The Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy recognized the availability of adequate information as a prerequisite for sound policy-making, planning and research. In the Nairobi Programme of Action,<sup>(1)</sup> it asserted that the need for improved information flow on energy must be viewed in the broader context of global information exchange in all sectors. In view of the newness of much of the subject-matter and the rapid pace of developments, the Conference considered it necessary to: assess the capability of existing information systems and services to provide information suitable for different types of users; establish or strengthen na-

tional, subregional and regional energy information centres; develop and utilize standardized data collection and classification systems, and maximize the availability of technological information contained in patent documents.

The Conference stressed the need to support education and training programmes and to promote information exchange among countries, as well as programmes to enhance public awareness of the energy situation. New or strengthened national and regional centres could serve as focal points for such activities and for technology transfer, evaluation and demonstration. Courses were needed to train decision makers, scientists and engineers in energy assessment, planning and use. National, regional and international information systems should be closely linked.

The Ad Hoc Expert Group on Information Flows (Geneva, 8-12 December 1980)<sup>(2)</sup> recommended a series of national, regional and global measures to improve access to information. Among its suggestions was that task forces be convened, one for each energy source, to develop proposals for the better articulation of information services. The central aim would be to ensure availability of resources to specialized research, development and training centres for specific energy sources, linked to a network of regional and national institutions.

The Synthesis Group (p. 695) suggested in February 1981<sup>(3)</sup> that extension services were necessary to encourage and promote acceptance and use of new and renewable energy sources, and that a national agency be designated as a focal point for a broad range of information responsibilities so as to meet the needs of users. In order to provide practical and relevant information, sustained information analysis and evaluation activities should be established, data banks on energy could be expanded to collate information from national and regional surveys, and mechanisms could be developed to link those services into an effective international information system.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Expert Group on Information Flows, A/CONF.100/PC/31; <sup>(3)</sup>Synthesis Group, A/CONF.100/PC/41.

**Bibliography.** A compendium of existing studies on new and renewable sources of energy<sup>(1)</sup>—a bibliography prepared by the Secretary-General of the Nairobi Conference at the request of its Preparatory Committee and issued in April 1981—contained some 400 references, out of a total body of some 750,000 studies, as representative and important in the fields of biomass, fuelwood and charcoal, draught animal power, geothermal, hydropower, ocean,

oil shale and tar sands, peat, solar and wind energy. Acting on a suggestion of the Conference Secretary-General, the Preparatory Committee, on 16 April, requested him to pursue the idea of establishing a computerized retrieval system for the studies, to be provided for the Conference if resources could be secured from outside the United Nations budget.<sup>(2)</sup>

Compendium: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/CONF.100/PC/43 & Add.1.

Decision: <sup>(2)</sup>Preparatory Committee (report, A/36/47), 6(III), 16 Apr.

#### Technology transfer

The Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy<sup>(1)</sup> recognized the need to establish and support channels for the widespread transfer of technology under conditions mutually beneficial to all, taking into account agreements to be reached within the framework of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) regarding the proposed international code of conduct on the transfer of technology (p. 755). Further, it said that decision makers should take into account issues relating to climatic, cultural and institutional settings where the technology was to be applied, managerial aspects associated with its introduction and operation, economic and social costs and benefits, and environmental effects.

Among the measures suggested in the Programme was the strengthening of the developing countries' ability to evaluate technologies, the better to assess, select, negotiate, acquire and adapt them for new and renewable energy sources. National capabilities to manufacture and maintain the equipment to make such assessments should be developed, and joint industrial programmes should be established to manufacture the items needed to utilize new energy sources. The Programme also suggested the establishment and strengthening of national, subregional and regional centres for the transfer and adaptation of technologies, including field testing, demonstration and evaluation of complete systems.

In a separate decision,<sup>(5)</sup> the Conference acknowledged that it was the sovereign right of all countries, particularly developing countries, to explore and acquire technology relating to all kinds of new and renewable energy sources, and to use or control it without political constraints or fear of aggression from any other State.

This proposal, sponsored by Pakistan, was adopted on 21 August by 60 votes to none, with 36 abstentions. Explaining their abstentions, Australia and Canada considered it improper for the Conference to deal with a question under negotiation in other United Nations bodies.

In its contribution to the Conference preparatory process, the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Research and Development and Transfer of Technology recommended in February<sup>(2)</sup> that United Nations regional commissions continue to play an important role in establishing regional centres for technology transfer and in obtaining support from international organizations and developed countries. It also suggested that a United Nations task force be established to report on financial, physical and human resources needed for new or existing regional centres and to propose a financing scheme.

The UNCTAD Trade and Development Board, after deciding on 20 March<sup>(3)</sup>

question later in the year, requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General on 9 October<sup>(4)</sup> to convene a meeting of governmental experts on energy. The meeting, open to all UNCTAD members, was to examine problems concerning the transfer, application and development of energy technology, and make recommendations in 1982 to the UNCTAD Committee on Transfer of Technology. This was one of three sectoral meetings on technology transfer scheduled by UNCTAD (p. 754).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Expert Group on Research and Development and Transfer of Technology, A/CONF.100/PC/37.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: TDB (report, A/36/15 & Corr.1):

<sup>(3)</sup>230(XXII), para. 2, 20 Mar.; <sup>(4)</sup>241(XXIII), 9 Oct.

Decision: <sup>(5)</sup>Conference: 2, 21 Aug.

#### Training of personnel

Noting that the establishment, development, operation, maintenance and dissemination of new energy systems required skilled scientific and technical manpower and increased public awareness and support, the Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy<sup>(1)</sup> pointed to the need for educational and training programmes for students, decision makers, planners, managers, extension workers and the general public, as well as facilities for the training of specialized personnel. To that end, efforts were needed to estimate the requirements for various categories of trained personnel, co-ordinate information exchange on educational systems and teaching materials, encourage the establishment or strengthening of training and educational centres, and use the educational system and mass media to inform the public of opportunities for using new and renewable energy sources.

The Ad Hoc Expert Group on Education and Training (New York, 19-22 January 1981), which submitted 19 recommendations as part of

the preparatory work for the Conference,<sup>(2)</sup> suggested that, if a centre on new and renewable energy sources was established in the United Nations system, it should include a unit for the initiation, funding and organizing of education and training in developing countries. Further, such a body could facilitate implementation of several of the Group's recommendations, including those calling for a survey of the attention given to new and renewable energy sources in educational systems, development and introduction of curricula, exchange of technical information and experience, a fellowship programme, and regional courses for government policy makers, energy planners, professionals and scientists.

The Synthesis Group (p. 695) suggested in February<sup>(3)</sup> that education and training on new and renewable energy sources should be incorporated in formal programmes at all levels and that the general public should be encouraged to contribute to the widespread use of those sources. Observing that there were few courses or training programmes on the subject anywhere in the world and that there was a significant shortage of qualified manpower, it advocated the expansion or creation of educational and training centres and the introduction of courses aimed at specific groups such as scientists, energy planners, technicians and public users of energy technologies.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Expert Group on Education and Training, A/CONF.100/PC/33; <sup>(3)</sup>Synthesis Group, A/CONF.100/PC/41.

#### Institutional arrangements

The Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, in its Nairobi Programme of Action (p. 689) adopted on 21 August 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended to the General Assembly that there should be an intergovernmental body in the United Nations specifically concerned with new and renewable sources of energy, to guide and monitor implementation of the Programme. Such a body would be open to all States and would report to the Assembly through the Economic and Social Council. Among its functions would be to recommend policy guidelines for other bodies in the United Nations system, formulate plans and programmes, review and modify the priorities set in the Nairobi Programme, assess trends and policy measures with a view to increasing the contribution of new and renewable energy sources, promote mobilization of resources, recommend guidelines to United Nations financial bodies, contribute to the work of governmental and intergovernmental institu-

tions, review activities of the United Nations system and help ensure their co-ordination.

The Conference recommended, without prejudice to a final Assembly decision in 1982 on institutional arrangements, that a body patterned on the Conference Preparatory Committee be entrusted with launching the Programme in 1982. Such a body might recommend the establishment of task forces for implementing specific programmes and projects. The United Nations Secretary-General was requested to make recommendations to the Assembly in 1981 on arrangements for servicing the proposed body, including the possibility of a small Secretariat unit for new and renewable energy sources, making full use of available United Nations resources.

The Conference also made recommendations on co-ordination mechanisms in the United Nations system (p. 701), regional and subregional action (p. 702) and co-operation among developing countries (p. 703).

Reporting to the General Assembly in November,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General recommended that the secretariat support services required for the 1982 session of the interim committee be organized on the basis of a standing interdepartmental working group, which would provide guidance for the organization and synthesis of input from bodies in the United Nations system, ensure system-wide co-operative action and co-ordination, and serve as a focal point for outside inquiries in regard to United Nations activities on new and renewable energy sources. The working group would be chaired by the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation. Pending a 1982 review, staff would be supplied for the time being from within existing resources.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/652.

#### Establishment of the Interim Committee

In its resolution of 17 December 1981 on the Nairobi Conference,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly established an Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy and entrusted it with the launching of the Nairobi Programme and with guiding and monitoring its implementation. The Committee was to concentrate on recommending policy guidelines for bodies of the United Nations system, formulating plans and programmes, promoting the mobilization of resources, and recommending guidelines to financial bodies of the system with a view to implementation of the financing provisions of the Nairobi Programme. Meeting for a single two-week session at Rome, Italy, it was to submit recommendations for Assembly action in



1982 on areas for priority action and ways of mobilizing resources. The Secretary-General was requested to put into effect the interim secretariat arrangements he had recommended in his report (p. 700). The Assembly decided to adopt in 1982 final arrangements with regard to the intergovernmental body and to review secretariat arrangements.

The original draft resolution submitted by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77<sup>(1)</sup> would have authorized the Committee to develop and formulate (rather than recommend) policy guidelines for the United Nations system, provide guidelines for (rather than promote) resource mobilization, and provide (rather than recommend) guidelines on financing of implementation measures. The final text added the phrase "without prejudice to the final institutional arrangements" in the paragraph on establishment of the Interim Committee. Also added was a paragraph by which the Assembly called on bodies of the United Nations system to inform the Committee of their ongoing activities. Finally, the Assembly took note of, rather than approving as proposed in the Algerian draft, the Secretary-General's recommendations on secretariat services.

During the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, and in explanations of position after approval of the draft resolution, several countries commented on the arrangements, especially with regard to the secretariat. Japan expressed the view that sufficient Secretariat support was essential, utilizing personnel and facilities already available; as the proposed Interim Committee would have no permanent secretariat, Japan was concerned about the preparations to be made for its session. Kenya urged the establishment of an intergovernmental body and of an adequately staffed Secretariat unit, financed as far as possible within existing resources and, if necessary, from supplementary resources.

Norway, speaking for the Nordic States, believed there should be strong and efficient secretariat follow-up to the Nairobi Programme of Action. Romania favoured the establishment of an intergovernmental body and appropriate Secretariat arrangements, stating that the United Nations system should have an important role in developing and strengthening international co-operation on energy. Sri Lanka said a Secretariat unit should be set up to provide the intergovernmental committee with information on such matters as current plans and programmes in each priority area identified in the Nairobi Programme, the scope for technical and economic co-operation among developing countries, the plans

of bilateral aid agencies and multilateral aid arrangements outside the United Nations system, and the involvement of the private sector.

Canada believed that the permanent institutional arrangements should differ from those provided for in the resolution. Senegal favoured a committee open to all United Nations Members.

The USSR considered that it would be a mistake to create a new intergovernmental organ and a Secretariat division for energy; the Committee on Natural Resources and its secretariat could be used to implement the Nairobi Conference's decisions at considerable savings of expenditure. Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Hungary and the Ukrainian SSR also believed the Committee on Natural Resources and its secretariat could carry out the Nairobi Programme, while the German Democratic Republic urged full utilization of that Committee and the United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.126.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/193, sects. II & III 17 Dec. (p. 692).

#### Co-ordination in the UN system

In the Nairobi Programme of Action,<sup>(2)</sup> the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy called for full participation by the United Nations system in implementation of the Programme, with due consideration to national plans and priorities. It recommended that the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation co-ordinate contributions from within the system. Specialized intergovernmental organizations and institutions were invited to co-operate, while United Nations resident co-ordinators for development assistance would provide a focal point for national activities in consultation with the country representatives of the organizations concerned.

In a November 1981 report to the General Assembly on institutional arrangements arising from the Conference's recommendations,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that the Director-General, in carrying out his responsibilities under the Programme, would make full use of the facilities of the inter-agency Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC). It was anticipated that ACC would strengthen consultative mechanisms, promoting the concerted execution of the Programme's components and, where warranted, joint execution of projects. ACC had constituted an ad hoc working group to prepare proposals for inter-agency follow-up.

In its 17 December resolution on the Nairobi Conference,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly entrusted the Director-General with the task of co-

ordinating contributions from within the United Nations system, and decided that a co-ordinating capacity for new and renewable energy sources would be located in his Office, subject to Assembly review in 1982. Noting with approval the 30 October decision of ACC<sup>(5)</sup> to constitute an ad hoc working group to prepare proposals for the Interim Committee on inter-agency follow-up to the Nairobi Programme, the Assembly suggested that the Group review current and planned activities of the United Nations system with a view to facilitating their adaptation and reformulation, and establish task forces as necessary.

The original draft by the Group of 77 did not contain the provision on the Director-General's co-ordinating capacity. Further, its clause on ACC task forces specified that they should be tailored to the requirements of specific time-limited tasks related to research, development, demonstration, application and utilization of new and renewable energy sources on a sectoral or cross-sectoral basis; it made no mention of task forces to be established by the intergovernmental body.

During debate in the Second Committee on development and international economic co-operation, several speakers stressed the importance of effective co-ordination in implementing the Nairobi Programme. Egypt called for the deployment of a team in the Director-General's Office to carry out field studies and consultation on the priority areas identified in the Programme and to report the results to the intergovernmental committee. Japan urged ACC, the Director-General and the Conference Secretary-General to improve inter-agency co-ordination.

The ACC Ad Hoc Working Group on Inter-agency Follow-up to the Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy held its first meeting in New York on 17 and 18 December.<sup>(\*)</sup> Members agreed that each participating agency would choose a limited number of areas for intensified future action, as a basis for identifying activities for joint or co-ordinated action.

Also under ACC auspices, an ad hoc inter-agency meeting of energy programme managers (New York, 16 December) reviewed the proposed United Nations energy programme, to be included for the first time as a separate major programme in the proposed United Nations medium-term plan for 1984-1989, and agreed that it should contain cross-references to objectives of the specialized agencies and of other United Nations programmes.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACC Working Group, ACC/1982/3; <sup>(2)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/652.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/193, sect. IV, 17 Dec. (p. 693). Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>ACC, 1981/14, 30 Oct.

#### Regional and subregional action

The Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, in the Nairobi Programme of Action adopted on 21 August 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> stated that, whenever appropriate and necessary to facilitate implementation of the Programme, regional commissions and regional development banks should be strengthened, regional programmes supported and intergovernmental bodies established. It proposed that priority attention be given to support of resource evaluation, research, development and demonstration, training, energy planning and identification of regional or subregional projects, and that those activities be carried out through the establishment or strengthening of specialized institutions. Other priority areas included strengthening or establishment of regional information networks on technologies and their application, organization of joint research and development and information exchange activities, support of regional efforts for technology transfer, and undertaking of joint industrial activities for the production of energy-related capital goods.

The importance of strengthening regional centres was stressed in February<sup>(3)</sup> by the Synthesis Group (p. 695), which pointed to the need to develop regional co-operative network programmes based on regional needs and linking national and regional centres for new and renewable energy sources.

In its 17 December resolution on the Nairobi Conference,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly requested the United Nations regional commissions to undertake immediately, as necessary, the development of regional plans and programmes, and to report thereon to the Interim Committee in 1982. In the draft resolution submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee, on which the final text was based, the words "as necessary" were added to the original draft<sup>(1)</sup> submitted on behalf of the Group of 77.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77. A/C.2/36/L.126.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(3)</sup>Synthesis Group, A/CONF.100/PC/41.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/193, sect. V, 17 Dec. (p. 693).

#### Co-operation among developing countries

When the Committee for Development Planning discussed economic and technical co-operation among developing countries (p. 383), it stated, in the report on its March/April 1981 session, <sup>(2)</sup> that the most effective form of regional and subregional co-operation would be for oil-exporting countries to make soft loans to oil-

importing developing countries to cover the incremental cost of oil imports. Alternatively, there could be a rebate in the form of a grant from the exporter to the importer, on condition that the benefiting country would fix its domestic oil prices at world parities so as to discourage waste. Other arrangements might include a supply guarantee by oil exporters to importers, joint development of hydroelectric and other renewable energy sources, interconnection of electric power grids, and establishment of regional and subregional energy bodies. It also urged regional and subregional research and development on alternative energy systems.

The Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, in its Nairobi Programme of Action adopted on 21 August,<sup>(3)</sup> stated that the international community would provide support and assistance to efforts by developing countries to accelerate mutual co-operation in new and renewable energy sources. Among such efforts mentioned were information exchange; joint ventures in project development; joint efforts in research, development, demonstration and adaptation of technologies; and technical assistance.

The General Assembly, in its 17 December resolution on the Conference,<sup>(4)</sup> recognized that developing countries sought to enhance their collective self-reliance in various areas of mutual interest, and called on the international community to provide support and assistance to their efforts to accelerate mutual co-operation on new and renewable energy sources. The resolution mentioned the kinds of co-operation listed in the Nairobi Programme and said they should supplement action by the international community.

The original draft by the Group of 77<sup>(1)</sup> did not contain the paragraph listing co-operative activities among developing countries, and would have had the Assembly call on both the international community and the United Nations system to extend assistance.

Draft resolution withdrawn: "Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.126.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27; <sup>(3)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24).

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/193, sect. VI, 17 Dec. (p. 693).

## Financing

Noting that financial requirements for energy investment would continue to grow at a fast rate, the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, in its Nairobi Programme of Action adopted on 21 August 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> stated that implementation of the Programme would require additional and adequate resources. It cited a World Bank expert group study to the effect that the annual energy needs of developing countries

would total about \$54 billion during the period 1981-1985. Each country would continue to bear the main responsibility for developing its own resources, the Programme declared, but efforts should also be made to increase concessional flows for financing projects and programmes in developing countries. The financial requirements were of a very significant magnitude and were expected to grow as exploitation of new and renewable energy sources became more feasible economically and technically.

The Conference also stated that additional and adequate funds should be provided to the financial mechanisms and institutions of the United Nations system, and suggested that the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) be invited to submit a joint estimate of the supporting actions and pre-investment requirements for new and renewable energy sources in the developing countries during the 1980s.

In order to generate additional funding and to encourage co-financing, the Conference further recommended that multilateral and bilateral donors and interested recipient countries consider convening consultative meetings to review and facilitate concerted action. Such meetings should deal particularly with financing the promotion of research, demonstration and development activities. Finally, the Conference urged interested parties to accelerate consideration of other avenues, including mechanisms under examination in the World Bank, such as an energy affiliate.

In its contribution to Conference preparations, the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Financing of New and Renewable Sources of Energy,<sup>(3)</sup> which met in December 1980, recommended that the task of developing the technologies for new and renewable energy sources be undertaken by the entire range of United Nations institutions, particularly the World Bank, UNDP and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, as well as regional development banks and the proposed energy affiliate of the World Bank. It believed that the energy affiliate could make a major contribution through information dissemination, development of a cadre of trained personnel, delineation of projects and provision of project loans. Expansion of the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration to cover new and renewable energy resources might also be considered.

In February 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the Synthesis Group (p. 695) cited an estimate by the World Bank that developing countries might need as much as \$12 billion for investment in new and renewable energy sources other than large hydropower projects during the period 1981-1985. At the national

level, financial incentives such as subsidies and tax rebates might help stimulate user and producer interest in new and renewable energy sources. Countries should endeavour to mobilize domestic investment resources and pursue innovative policies to finance small-scale schemes. At the international level, the Group suggested that: developed countries should increase their official development assistance and non-concessional flows for new and renewable energy sources; developing countries in balance-of-payments surplus should recognize this area as an important focus in their assistance efforts; socialist countries should pay more attention to needs of developing countries in this regard; and multilateral institutions should increase their support for these energy sources, in particular for rural energy needs.

Emphasizing the primary responsibility borne by each country for the development of its new and renewable energy sources, the General Assembly, in its 17 December resolution on the Conference,<sup>(5)</sup> requested that financial mechanisms of the United Nations system be provided with adequate funds to meet the growing requirements, and reaffirmed that additional resources should be directed through such channels as UNDP, the Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, the financial arrangements for science and technology, and the UNDP Energy Account. It urged financial institutions, particularly the World Bank, to provide additional and adequate resources, and also urged interested parties to accelerate consideration of other possible avenues to increase energy financing, such as a World Bank energy affiliate. It requested that the World Bank/UNDP study of supporting actions and pre-investment requirements for new and renewable energy sources in developing countries be submitted to the Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy.

This text included three provisions not in the original draft resolution by the Group of 77:<sup>(1)</sup> a paragraph stating that each country continued to bear the main responsibility for developing its new and renewable energy resources; a phrase stating that developing countries in a position to do so should continue to assist other developing countries; and a paragraph calling for more effective response by financial institutions to requests from countries and international organizations. Further, a paragraph in the Group of 77 draft that would have had the Assembly request the executive heads of financial institutions of the United Nations system to mobilize additional and adequate funds was replaced by one requesting that those institutions should be provided with additional and adequate funds.

During the Second Committee's debate on de-

velopment and international economic cooperation, Afghanistan said it welcomed, despite their inadequacy, the initiatives undertaken by multilateral financial institutions to promote the development of energy resources in the developing countries. The German Democratic Republic believed new activities should be financed through existing United Nations funds, including voluntary assistance programmes, with transnational corporations and other capitalist firms drawing maximum profits from exploiting the natural resources of developing countries to be obliged to contribute additional funds. The Byelorussian SSR, Hungary and the Ukrainian SSR favoured the principle of voluntary contributions in respect of financial support for the Nairobi Programme of Action.

Austria, Canada, New Zealand, Norway (speaking for the Nordic States), the Philippines and Senegal supported the establishment of a World Bank energy affiliate. Austria remarked that it was not enough to offer incentives to private enterprise for the development of energy resources in developing countries; large amounts of capital and expertise would also have to be supplied. Canada added that it was prepared to provide funds for energy purposes, and Norway said the Nordic countries were ready to increase their support. Japan favoured the convening of regional consultative meetings to secure funding, and said it was ready to co-operate towards increasing self-help efforts for energy surveys and policy planning. The United States said it could not support the establishment of a World Bank energy affiliate or participate in it.

Guyana regretted that the Nairobi Conference had been unable to reach agreement on the establishment of an energy affiliate. Strongly urging the creation of such an affiliate, Zimbabwe considered it unfortunate that the World Bank's finding that developing countries would need at least \$54 billion to develop new energy sources was not taken seriously by a country that had always regarded the Bank as a credible institution.

Kenya suggested that funds be mobilized through voluntary contributions by all United Nations Members, additional contributions representing a certain percentage of gross national product, release of some money earmarked for armaments, reallocation of funds within existing budgets of the United Nations system, increased contributions to financing bodies and granting of soft loans to energy-deficient developing countries. The Philippines, observing that substantial public and private resources would be required, said it would like to participate in consultations between donor and recipient countries.

The World Bank informed the Second Committee of its intention to increase its energy loans

from slightly over \$2 billion in fiscal year 1981 (through 30 June) to up to \$3 billion in fiscal year 1982, giving more emphasis to new and renewable energy sources while continuing to pursue oil and gas exploration and development.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.126.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(3)</sup>Expert Group on financing, A/CONF.100/PC/29; <sup>(4)</sup>Synthesis Group, A/CONF.100/PC/41.

Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>GA 36/193, sect. VII, 17 Dec. (p. 693).

## Sectoral uses of energy

### Industrial and transport uses

CONFERENCE ACTION. The Nairobi Programme of Action (p. 689), adopted on 21 August 1981 by the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy,<sup>(2)</sup> identified four priority areas for research and development in regard to urban and industrial energy: solar technologies for domestic and industrial use, including heat and power generation, solar passive architecture, solar refrigeration, air conditioning and water desalination; fuel production from biomass, and processing and use of urban and agro-industrial wastes for energy and other purposes; multipurpose development of hydro and geothermal energy, including drilling technologies; and energy efficiency, conservation and storage systems.

The Conference stated that, in order to help meet the growing industrial and urban energy demand and to diversify the energy supply base, efforts were needed to increase significantly the contribution of new and renewable energy sources. To that end, it was necessary to: expand the use of hydro and geothermal resources and transmission systems; initiate and encourage wider application of active and passive solar heating and cooling systems; promote the use of urban and industrial wastes for energy and other purposes; and accelerate the incorporation of cogeneration and total energy systems in the industrial sectors and implement other energy efficiency and conservation programmes.

Expressing the view that the potential of new and renewable energy resources in developing countries was greater than popularly believed, the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Industrial Issues including Utilization of Energy in Transportation and Allied Sectors (Vienna, Austria, 12-16 January) recommended<sup>(3)</sup> that international financial institutions provide highly concessional financial assistance and risk capital to developing countries for pioneer experimentation and commercialization of specific energy sources. It also suggested that an international task force be set up to examine the development and produc-

tion of usable fuels and other industrial products using biotechnology, and that the United Nations system expand industrial information and technology services to small and medium-size enterprises in the field of new and renewable energy sources.

The Synthesis Group (p. 695), in February,<sup>(5)</sup> considered that in order to ease the pressure on conventional energy sources it might be necessary to review national industrialization strategies in terms of available energy supplies, including the potential contribution of new and renewable energy sources to industrial development. The Group also observed that, in addition to the development of new energy resources, conservation was an essential element in short- and long-term planning in all countries.

UNIDO ACTIVITIES. In 1981, energy-related activities of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) focused on the production of biofuels and synthetic fuels from petroleum, coal, natural gas and biomass; conservation; hydroelectric power plants; and industrial energy conservation, management and planning.

The number of energy-related technology projects assisted by UNIDO increased to over 50 during the year. In one of them, 84 policy makers in government and industry participated in a training programme in industrial energy management and planning. A symposium on project design and installation of small hydropower plants (Vienna, Austria, 29 June-3 July) provided an opportunity for the exchange of technical knowledge. A training workshop on energy conservation in the silicate industries, held in Czechoslovakia in October, offered training to specialists from least developed countries in the high-energy-consumption cement, ceramics and glass industries.

UNIDO initiated an energy-conservation project for the establishment of a pilot plant for ethanol production in Guatemala, and helped to develop mini hydroelectric generating plants in Costa Rica, Cuba and Uruguay. The first phase of a large-scale project for the development of biogas technology in China came to an end, as did a project which assisted India to establish a testing laboratory for the refinery industry. Assistance in regard to alternative energy sources and conservation was provided to the Comoros, Mali, the Niger, Seychelles and Turkey.

The UNIDO Executive Director reported to the Industrial Development Board in March<sup>(6)</sup> that the Special Advisory Group on Energy, located in his Office, had been strengthened, and that an Industrial Energy Engineering Unit had been established. Recognizing that energy-related industrial technology constituted a

priority area for UNIDO, the Board, on 20 May, urged him to keep under continuing review the secretariat's organizational framework for handling energy-related matters and to take account of the results of the Nairobi Conference in planning future activities.<sup>(4)</sup>

In a 24 July resolution on industrial development co-operation,<sup>(7)</sup> the Economic and Social Council requested the Executive Director to submit specific action proposals in planning future activities in the energy-related technology sector, on the basis of agreements reached at the Nairobi Conference. The original draft, submitted by Venezuela on behalf of the Group of 77, would have had the Council ask for such proposals "to take account" of the Conference's results. The Federal Republic of Germany stated its understanding that any action under this paragraph would be financed exclusively from extrabudgetary resources.

When the General Assembly acted on the subject on 17 December,<sup>(8)</sup> it asked the Executive Director, at the request of developing countries, to increase technical co-operation and programmes and projects in energy-related industrial technology on the basis, *inter alia*, of agreements reached at the Conference. The text originally presented by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77<sup>(1)</sup>—later withdrawn in favour of a draft based on informal consultations—contained no reference to requests from developing countries and did not include the word "industrial".

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.82.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(3)</sup>Expert Group on industrial issues, A/CONF.100/PC/36; <sup>(4)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(5)</sup>Synthesis Group, A/CONF.100/PC/41; <sup>(6)</sup>UNIDO Executive Director. ID/B/261 & Add.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(7)</sup>ESC, 1981/75, para. 7, 24 July (p. 578); <sup>(8)</sup>GA, 36/182, sect. I, para. 10, 17 Dec. (p. 579).

#### Energy use in rural areas and agriculture

The Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy<sup>(1)</sup> identified six priority areas for research and development in regard to rural energy: identification of fast-growing species for fuelwood production, reforestation and afforestation (p. 707); development of more efficient low-cost stoves and charcoal production processes; development of economical, ecologically sound and socially acceptable technologies for cooking, crop drying, pumping and agro-industries; improvement of equipment used in conjunction with draught animals (p. 710); evaluation and development of energy-generating processes based on manure and other organic materials; and development of technologies for

harvesting, preserving and processing food, and using agricultural and forest residues for energy.

The Conference also suggested: widespread application of improved practices and technologies for conservation and more effective use of forest resources; establishment and acceleration of programmes for large-scale reforestation and afforestation, as well as for smaller-scale woodlots and plantations of energy crops; generalized rural application of locally available new and renewable energy sources; and expanded application of improved techniques for utilizing draught animal power.

In a separate action on 21 August 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the Conference urged acceleration of afforestation and reforestation programmes for fuelwood, as well as programmes to develop and use such sources as biogas, wind, solar, hydro and geothermal energy and peat where they were economically viable, so as to reduce pressure on fuelwood supplies and improve the rural standard of living. This resolution was sponsored by Angola, China, Colombia, India, Kenya, Nepal, the Philippines, Rwanda, Sweden, Tunisia and Zimbabwe.

The principal recommendation of the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Rural Energy including Utilization of Energy in Agriculture (Nairobi, Kenya, 26-30 January)<sup>(2)</sup> was that Governments, the United Nations system, and other regional and international agencies should commit themselves to strengthening the position of rural people in their access to sufficient energy supplies, given the current competition for scarce supplies of useful energy. The Group recommended specific actions to: develop and sustain policies and programmes for the provision of adequate energy supplies for rural development; create or strengthen institutions for identification of rural energy development needs and design and execution of programmes; commit greater financial resources commensurate with the urgency and scale of the rural energy problem; expand research on rural energy needs, the local potential of energy sources, and technologies for converting and using them; intensify or organize the training of technical staff; strengthen the extension capability of rural energy systems and technologies; and raise rural people's awareness and stimulate their capability to utilize renewable energy sources.

The Synthesis Group (p. 695), meeting in February,<sup>(3)</sup> considered that agricultural development could take advantage of new energy sources for additional irrigation, crop-drying, fertilizer and other purposes, in conjunction with more effective use of such conventional renewables as draught animal power, fuelwood and biomass. The problem of inefficient production,

conversion and use of fuelwood and biomass required immediate attention, including production of more efficient equipment.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Expert Group on rural energy, A/CONF.100/PC/38; <sup>(3)</sup>Synthesis Group, A/CONF.100/PC/41.  
Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>Conference, 5, 21 Aug.

Energy requirements for human settlements

On 24 July 1981, the Economic and Social Council requested the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements to initiate research and development, technical co-operation and information dissemination activities on energy for human settlements.<sup>(1)</sup> On 4 December, the General Assembly requested the Centre to implement those recommendations of the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy that were within the Centre's mandate.<sup>(2)</sup>

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/69 C, 24 July (p. 853); <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/72 B, 4 Dec. (p. 853).

## Energy resources

### Fuels

#### Fuelwood and charcoal

The Nairobi Programme of Action (p. 689), adopted on 21 August 1981 by the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy,<sup>(1)</sup> noted that fuelwood, including charcoal, was an important energy source for large populations, especially in the rural areas of developing countries. It pointed to the importance of: assessment and evaluation of forest resources to estimate yields and identify deficit areas and reforestation needs; research and development on productive species, efficient stoves and cooking utensils, pre-processing of twigs and dry leaves for direct combustion, and fuelwood and charcoal substitutes using other new and renewable energy sources; and transfer, adaptation and application of technologies for forest management, reforestation and afforestation, large plantations, distribution and pricing policies, charcoal production and gasification, kilns and ovens.

In a resolution of 21 August on new and renewable energy sources for rural development (p. 706), the Conference urged the immediate acceleration of reforestation and afforestation programmes so as significantly to enhance the production and availability of fuelwood, and in seriously affected areas, as part of efforts to increase tree-planting fivefold by the year 2000.<sup>(4)</sup>

In its contribution to Conference preparations, the Technical Panel on Fuelwood and Charcoal, in a February report,<sup>(3)</sup> cited a study by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations showing that 100 million people were

unable to obtain sufficient fuelwood for their minimum energy needs, that 1 billion others were affected by shortages, and that, by the year 2000, over 2.5 billion rural people would need other cooking fuels to replace charcoal. Urging prompt action by Governments and international organizations, the Panel said fuelwood production should be given a priority in national forest policies equal in importance to water and soil conservation or timber production.

The Synthesis Group (p. 695), in February,<sup>(2)</sup> concluded that it was essential to promote a more efficient production and use of fuelwood by intensifying the productivity of existing resources, creating new forest resources, pre-processing residues from logging operations for fuel use, organizing fuelwood distribution, and developing and introducing improved stoves. As a general rule in fuel-deficient areas, charcoal-making should be discouraged because it wasted wood; where fuel had to be transported over long distances, more efficient charcoal production methods such as the use of brick or portable steel kilns should be promoted.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Synthesis Group, A/CONF.100/PC/41; <sup>(3)</sup>Technical Panel, A/CONF.100/PC/34.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>Conference, 5, para. 1, 21 Aug.

#### Oil shales and sands

Bearing in mind the vast proven and prospective reserves of oil shale and tar sands and the technology available for exploiting them as energy sources, the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, in its Nairobi Programme of Action,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended improved assessment by reviewing possible occurrences and standardizing evaluation and measurement procedures; expanded research and development on shale retorting, environmental consequences, and extraction and recovery methods; and initiation or support of national programmes for widespread use of existing technologies.

The Technical Panel on Oil Shale and Tar Sands, in a January 1981 report,<sup>(2)</sup> foresaw a possibility for these energy resources to play a significant role in four areas: large-scale synthetic crude oil production from oil shale; direct combustion of oil shale for electrical-power generators; small-scale liquid fuel production from oil shale for local consumption; and large-scale synthetic crude-oil production from tar sands. However, it identified limited knowledge of resources as a most serious constraint, particularly for developing countries, adding that, to reach production capability, processing technologies required substantial development time and field experimentation.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Technical Panel, A/CONF.100/PC/26.

Establishment of the UNITAR/UNDP Information Centre on Heavy Crude and Tar Sands. In May 1981 the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) established an Information Centre on Heavy Crude and Tar Sands. Based in New York, the Centre's aim was to promote the development of these resources by the systematic collection of information on exploration, production, upgrading, refining, transportation and other aspects. It was to be financed from subscription fees from participating Governments and organizations, including national and international petroleum companies, as well as other income from publications and seminars. An initial grant of \$20,000 was earmarked from the UNDP Energy Account (p. 711). The Centre's Advisory Board met for the first time in August.

#### Peat

The Nairobi Conference, noting that small- and large-scale peat technology was well established, site-specific and offered a viable alternative to fuelwood for heat or power generation, suggested in its Programme of Action<sup>(2)</sup> that countries improve the data base on availability, support the selection of production areas, develop and improve technologies for production and processing, study alternative uses, promote research in the use of cutaway peat-lands for fuelwood and timber production, and promote measures to encourage industrial and domestic use, particularly to replace fuelwood and charcoal.

A report on the use of peat for energy,<sup>(1)</sup> prepared for the Conference by Finland and issued in March 1981, stated that at least 40 to 50 countries were known to have peat and that the total amount of fuel-peat resources world-wide was estimated at 100 billion tons of oil equivalent, close to half the known global natural gas resources. It was recommended that developing countries with unexploited peat resources seriously consider peat as an energy alternative and that the United Nations system include peat energy in its development and lending programmes.

A United Nations Workshop and Study Tour on the Energy Use of Peat (Helsinki, Finland, 8-12 June),<sup>(3)</sup> organized in co-operation with Finland as a contribution to the Nairobi Conference, concluded that peat technology was well established, mature, commercialized and readily available but needed to be adapted to local con-

ditions, and that bilateral and multilateral technical and financial co-operation would have to be intensified to effect the energy use of peat in developing countries.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference S-G, A/CONF.100/PC/32.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24);

<sup>(3)</sup>Workshop and Study Tour, TCD/SEM.81/6.

#### Non-conventional energy sources

##### Biomass energy

The crucial role that could be played by recycling organic matter was cited by the Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy<sup>(1)</sup> in its recommendations on biomass energy-produced by the conversion of agricultural and forest residues, standing vegetation, energy crops, municipal and industrial solid wastes, and sewage sludge.

In its Programme, the Nairobi Conference suggested that biomass resources be assessed and evaluated, with special attention to the identification and development of plants for energy conversion, and that basic and applied research and development be carried out on biotechnology and bio/thermochemical conversion systems and on the use of by-products as fertilizers and animal feed. Demonstration schemes should be devised for such processes as biomethanation of manures, agricultural residues and other organic materials; integration of biomethanation and ethanol production; small-scale gasifiers and stationary engines; electricity production; and gasification and indirect liquefaction to produce synthetic liquid fuels. Existing technologies should be employed to promote direct combustion, gasification, biomethanation of manure and municipal and industrial waste, alcohol production from sugars and starches, anaerobic microbiological processes and fuel production from vegetable oils.

The Technical Panel on Biomass Energy, in a January 1981 report,<sup>(3)</sup> observed that biomass provided between 6 and 13 per cent of the world's total energy needs, equivalent to about 8.5 million barrels of oil per day. As the major source of energy in rural areas of developing countries, it was easily adaptable with minimum social constraints and also environmentally acceptable. Its wider use could result in a cleaner environment, with only minimal ecological imbalance, and provide means to recycle nutrients and atmospheric carbon dioxide.

The Ad Hoc Expert Group on Research and Development and Transfer of Technology recommended in a February report<sup>(2)</sup> that an internationally funded and co-ordinated research pro-



gramme on biomass energy be established and a task force assembled to assess scientific and technological capabilities and diagnose requirements, and draw up regional priority programmes.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Expert Group on Research and Development and Transfer of Technology, A/CONF.100/PC/37; <sup>(3)</sup>Technical Panel, A/CONF.100/PC/28.

#### Geothermal energy

In the Nairobi Programme of Action,<sup>(2)</sup> the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy recognized that substantial effort was needed to develop the energy potential of unevaluated geothermal resources. It recommended that resources be identified and evaluated through the use of geological, geochemical and geophysical techniques, using oil and gas exploration data where appropriate. It suggested that research and development be carried out on drilling technology, stimulation techniques, geopressurized systems, chemical recovery and effluent disposal, and environmental impacts. To promote geothermal applications, it recommended support and encouragement for initial stages of exploration, integrated heat and power projects, and small-scale uses, especially for small or remote resource sites.

The Technical Panel on Geothermal Energy, reporting in December 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> noted that bathing was one of the major uses of this energy source, but that it could also be used in agriculture for drying and in industry for heating purposes. It recommended establishment of training centres in major regions where there were none, and of an international documentation centre on geothermal energy linked to national and other data banks. In addition, energy-importing countries should accord special status to geothermal energy, offering incentives to outside investors in the form of loans at preferential rates, exploration insurance, equipment priorities or special tax treatment.

On 23 June, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), following its examination of the work of the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration (p. 674), decided to review in 1982 the possible expansion of the Fund's activities to include geothermal energy, and requested the UNDP Administrator to report at that time on the nature and scope of requests for assistance in that field and the Fund's capacity to respond.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/24, paras. 5 & 6, 23 June.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(3)</sup>Technical Panel, A/CONF.100/PC/23 & Corr.1.

#### Marine energy resources

Addressing the use of ocean energy resources such as thermal sea power and tidal energy for the generation of electric power, the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, in its Nairobi Programme of Action,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended that likely sites be identified and that research and development be carried out in such areas as aquaculture for the production of electricity, fresh water and energy-intensive products, and ocean wave systems including technical solutions suited for the trade wind belts.

The Technical Panel on Ocean Energy, in a January 1981 report,<sup>(2)</sup> focused on ocean thermal energy conversion as the most significant aspect of this subject. It noted that cost estimates showed early promise for this source as an economical replacement for oil in electricity generation. The technology was not dependent on any new scientific advance; it could be designed in a wide range of sizes appropriate to multiple applications, and large accessible resources were available in the equatorial belt. The Panel placed secondary emphasis on tidal energy, which it found to be a proven system but usable at only a limited number of sites. It considered wave energy not of immediate applicability. The Panel suggested that a thermal energy demonstration project be initiated in a developing country and that a development fund be established to support increased international awareness of this energy source, along with an information, education and training programme.

Reports: ("Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Technical Panel, A/CONF.100/PC/25 & Corr.1,2.

#### Solar energy

Bearing in mind that solar energy technologies were rapidly evolving and that some were on the threshold of large-scale and extensive application, the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, in its Nairobi Programme of Action,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended: that the resource be evaluated through the use of existing data, supplemented by support for meteorological surveys, radiation and other data collection; development and application of methodologies to estimate radiation data; preparation of guidelines for assessment in various climatic zones; and preparation of national solar resources maps and data to be incorporated in a world solar atlas. The Conference also recommended research, development and demonstration of promising applications, such as solar cooking, electricity production, industrial process heat, synthetic fuel production and crop drying. Finally, it suggested study of such problems as right of access to sunlight, transfer of development rights, building

codes and warranties, and insurance of solar devices.

The Technical Panel on Solar Energy, in a report of February 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> concluded that this resource was so plentiful that, when used with existing technologies, it could make a significant contribution towards meeting global energy requirements and held the promise of being one of the few clean and reliable energy sources available. Because of daily and seasonal variations in atmospheric conditions, some applications might require energy storage and stand-by systems, though others, such as water-pumping, might not.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Technical Panel, A/CONF.100/PC/27 & Corr.1.

#### Wind power

In the Nairobi Programme of Action,<sup>(1)</sup> the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy noted that wind energy had been one of the few forms of renewable energy which had traditionally been practical and cost effective, and that its wider use, based on technological advance and changes in energy structures, could make an important contribution to meeting future energy needs. The Conference suggested increased collection, by standardized procedures, of wind data for all climatic conditions, and encouraged preparation of national wind power resource maps and data to be incorporated in a world wind atlas, including data on the occurrence of extreme wind speeds. It also recommended research, development and demonstration on wind machines for water pumps and large wind turbines and arrays, wind characteristics for siting, windmill design and operation, rotor design, materials, storage systems, environmental impact, safety standards and social acceptability.

The Technical Panel on Wind Energy, reporting in December 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> said that small- and medium-sized wind-powered electric generation systems were expected to be economically viable on a significant scale within five years, and that supplying electric power from land-based wind turbines into power networks could become commercially viable in 5 to 10 years' time. It recommended that countries having wind-energy prospects undertake a preliminary wind-resource inventory, establish a national focal point within a government department, create national centres for wind-energy technology and include wind-powered pumps in rural development programmes as appropriate.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Technical Panel, A/CONF.100/PC/24 & Corr.1.

#### Other energy sources

##### Hydroelectric power

Mindful of the immense and unused hydro potential, and the availability and widespread use of hydrotechnology for multipurpose water resources exploitation, the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, in its Nairobi Programme of Action,<sup>(1)</sup> called for the evaluation of river hydro potential and the establishment of criteria for the evaluation and integration of hydro resources within overall energy development. Also recommended was support for government research and development capacities, and intensified research into ecological consequences. Further, the Conference suggested standardizing design and performance specifications for equipment and facilities, accelerating the widespread utilization of small hydropower systems, identifying projects in developing countries for the production of equipment, supporting the design and production of equipment and civil engineering survey and design procedures, and supporting the collaborative efforts of developing countries in large-scale joint projects.

The Technical Panel on Hydropower, in a January 1981 report,<sup>(2)</sup> pointed out that only a small portion of the economic potential of hydropower resources was being utilized. The technology was well developed, considerable experience had been gained in its use and much of the equipment was highly efficient. Among the restraints on its use in developing countries were lack of physical and economic data, skilled personnel, financing, and legal standards to govern the joint construction and operation of hydropower installations on international rivers.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24); <sup>(2)</sup>Technical Panel, A/CONF.100/PC/30.

##### Draught animals

In view of the fact that draught animal power remained a major source of energy, particularly in rural areas of some developing countries, the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, in its Nairobi Programme of Action,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended that basic data be collected on distribution of species, breeds, draught capabilities, agricultural implements, harnessing devices and existing technologies. It suggested research and development aimed at enhancing the productivity of draught animals and improving animal management and support of draught animal programmes in developing countries.

The Ad Hoc Working Group on Draught Animal Power, which met in February 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> observed that many countries would continue to depend on draught animal power for a long

time. Four hundred million draught animals in the developing countries, valued at \$100 billion, made available 150 million horsepower, which might cost \$250 billion to replace. The Group proposed that the United Nations arrange for the initiation and co-ordination of projects, and recommended the establishment of five regional centres, two each in Asia and Africa and one in Latin America, to serve those regions through research, technology transfer, information dissemination, and education and training.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, A/CONF.100/11 (Sales No. E.81.I.24);

<sup>(2)</sup>Working Group, A/CONF.100/PC/39.

#### Energy reserves, supply and demand

An Ad Hoc Group of Energy and Petroleum Experts, convened in New York from 14 to 18 December 1981 by the United Nations Secretariat, examined the implications of prospective energy supply/demand balances during the 1980s.

According to the Group's report,<sup>(1)</sup> it was emphasized in the discussion that energy was not scarce in physical terms, that heavy dependence on petroleum would persist, and that there were serious doubts about the capacity of alternative energy sources and conservation substantially to replace conventional energy sources within the next generation. Efforts should be made to assist oil-deficient developing countries towards greater self-sufficiency in meeting their oil and energy requirements. Among other suggestions emerging from the meeting were the launching of a programme of international co-operation for energy conservation, the establishment of an energy information centre, and the undertaking of an analysis of the comparative economics of nuclear energy.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Energy in the Eighties: Highlights of the meeting of the Ad Hoc Group of Energy and Petroleum Experts, United Nations Headquarters, 14-18 December 1981 (ST/ESA/130), Sales No. E.83.II.A.16.

#### UNDP Energy Account

During 1981, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) helped underwrite some 386 energy projects at a cost of over \$127 million, together with nearly \$180 million worth of related forestry activities. Thirteen projects were approved during the year under the UNDP Energy Account, established in accordance with a decision by the UNDP Governing Council in June 1980.<sup>(4)</sup> The largest of these involved a series of energy assessment missions to developing countries, in co-operation with the World Bank. Another was a grant to the Information Centre on Heavy Crude and Tar Sands, a joint project of UNDP and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (p. 708).<sup>(3)</sup>

The Energy Account received contributions in 1981 totalling \$2,843,887, from the Netherlands (\$1,923,077) and Sweden (\$920,810). Finland made a \$465,116 pledge for 1982. Expenditures from the Account in 1981 amounted to \$927,702, all spent on project costs.

After receiving a progress report from the UNDP Administrator issued in March 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Governing Council, on 23 June,<sup>(1)</sup> expressed satisfaction with the progress made in assisting Governments in priority energy projects. It authorized him in principle to accept the administration and management of any new funding mechanism for energy-related activities, if so requested by the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy and endorsed by the General Assembly.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/10, 23 June.

Reports: UNDP Administrator, <sup>(2)</sup>DP/540, <sup>(3)</sup>DP/1982/44. Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 704.

## Nuclear energy

#### Annual report of IAEA

The report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) covering its activities in 1980<sup>(1)</sup> was presented to the General Assembly on 10 November 1981 by its Director-General, Sigvard Eklund.

Describing the work of IAEA in 1980<sup>(4)</sup> and the first part of 1981, the Director-General stated that the Agency's technical co-operation activities were anticipated nearly to double in scope from 1980 (\$10.5 million) to 1983 (\$19 million). More than 95 per cent of all nuclear material outside the nuclear-weapon States was under IAEA safeguards, and the Agency had concluded, on the basis of a detailed statistical analysis and evaluation of the past five years that the safeguarded material remained in peaceful nuclear activities or had been otherwise adequately accounted for. Nevertheless, it encountered verification difficulties in a few cases of on-load nuclear power reactors, and discussions were under way with the States involved.

He expressed concern over those significant nuclear activities not subject to IAEA safeguards that were conducted by States not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).<sup>(2)</sup> International efforts to limit nuclear proliferation beyond the five nuclear-weapon Powers had been successful to date, but co-operation on all sides remained indispensable for overcoming any proliferation problems that might arise and for the efficient conduct of the IAEA task of ensuring that nuclear

materials were not diverted from peaceful purposes.

Stressing the dangerous consequences of attacks on civilian nuclear research reactors, the Director-General suggested that one preventive measure might be to enlarge the scope of the 1977 Additional Protocol to the 1949 Geneva Convention, which prohibited military attacks against nuclear power plants but did not cover research reactors.

On 11 November; the General Assembly, in a resolution on the IAEA report,<sup>(3)</sup> commended the Agency for its continuing efforts to ensure safe and secure use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, urged States to support those efforts and noted with satisfaction the steady improvement of the IAEA safeguards system (p. 69). The Assembly also noted with satisfaction various IAEA activities on technical assistance, nuclear power and nuclear science and technology, supply of nuclear materials, and plutonium storage and spent fuel management, as well as the Agency's readiness to contribute to the 1983 United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (p. 714). The Assembly also called on States to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, including an armed attack on nuclear installations. It paid tribute to the departing Director-General and extended good wishes to his successor, Hans Blix.

The original text was sponsored by Czechoslovakia, Indonesia and Japan. It was adopted with two amendments by Iraq. The first, adding a preambular paragraph characterizing the June Israeli air attack on Iraqi nuclear installations (p. 279) as a serious threat to IAEA safeguards and to the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, was adopted by 119 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions. The second amendment, adding an operative paragraph calling on States to refrain from the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, including an armed attack on its nuclear installations, was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 2 abstentions. The Assembly then adopted the amended text by a vote, requested by the United States, of 128 to 1, with 4 abstentions. At the request of Iraq, all three votes were recorded.

Introducing its amendments, Iraq said that a resolution aspiring to strengthen the effectiveness of IAEA could not ignore a serious act that undermined the objectives of the resolution.

Voting against the text as a whole, Israel described the Iraqi amendments as discriminatory, arbitrary and totally incompatible with the resolution.

Explaining their favourable votes for the amendments as well as the final text, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Canada, Finland and the United Kingdom, the last speaking on behalf of European Community (EC) members, expressed regret that the consensus which the resolution on IAEA traditionally enjoyed had been broken by the introduction of a politicizing element, superfluous in an essentially technical resolution. Sharing that view, the United States abstained on the text as a whole while opposing the preambular paragraph referring to the attack and voting for the other amendment, which it described as superfluous but unobjectionable. Argentina also objected to the text's specific reference to a United Nations Member State, as well as its mention of NPT and what Argentina regarded as an incorrect proportion between IAEA technical assistance and safeguards activities.

India, which voted affirmatively in all votes, recalled its condemnation of the Israeli attack.

Brazil, voting in favour, expressed reservations on the preambular paragraph mentioning NPT, which it understood as applicable only to the parties to that Treaty; it also stated its understanding that operative paragraph 2 (a) on IAEA technical assistance, endorsed a September resolution of the IAEA General Conference urging financial support for such assistance to developing countries.

In the Assembly debate, many speakers stressed the parallel importance of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the maintenance of the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and several expressed strong support for the Agency's safeguards operation and its improvement. Bulgaria and Canada were among those which endorsed efforts by IAEA to improve the effectiveness of its control machinery. Finland and Hungary expressed concern over the continued existence of unsafeguarded facilities in a number of countries. Yugoslavia, supporting the Agency's effort, asserted that the safeguards system would be widely accepted only if it was non-discriminatory and internationally agreed upon.

Australia said it was entering the international uranium market as a major supplier but sales to non-nuclear-weapon States would be limited to parties to NPT which complied with IAEA requirements. Czechoslovakia and the USSR, among others, stressed the need to strengthen non-proliferation by increasing the number of parties to NPT. Egypt noted that it had ratified the Treaty in February and had concluded a safeguards agreement with IAEA in June. The United Kingdom, speaking for EC members, hoped the non-nuclear States that had not signed safeguards agreements with IAEA would do so, as it

would be of paramount importance to the continued expansion of nuclear trade and development of nuclear power that the Agency continue to be able to affirm that no diversion had taken place from a safeguarded facility.

The inalienable right of every State to peaceful uses of nuclear energy under effective and non-discriminatory non-proliferation arrangements was upheld by the German Democratic Republic, Pakistan, Romania, the United Kingdom (on behalf of EC members) and Yugoslavia. Some of these added that the concern for non-proliferation should not militate against that right.

Some speakers were dissatisfied with the current balance between the regulatory and promotional activities of IAEA. India stated that there was an imbalance in expenditures, that the guidelines for promotional activities were discriminatory and that the Agency must not be used to further the nuclear objectives of a group of countries. Mexico said IAEA had been politicized by attempts to limit its role to the application of increasing restraints under the banner of nuclear non-proliferation, whereas the developing countries wanted to see it carry out fully its function of fostering the contribution of nuclear energy to peace and prosperity. Yugoslavia also saw an imbalance in this regard. Turkey viewed the two activities as equally important, observing that energy scarcities and the needs of a growing world population would have a disruptive effect on the international order and create serious dangers for every State.

Egypt and Yugoslavia hoped to see the technical assistance programme included in the Agency's regular budget, while the EC members, the German Democratic Republic and Poland regarded voluntary contributions as the appropriate means for this purpose.

Some developing countries, including the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Yugoslavia, called for a geographical representation on the Board of Governors and in the IAEA secretariat that more equitably represented the developing countries.

Japan, introducing the resolution adopted by the Assembly, noted that the reference to the Committee on Assurances of Supply established by the Board of Governors in June 1980 to advise on ways in which the provision of nuclear material, equipment and technology could be assured on a more predictable basis<sup>(4)</sup>—was a new element. The Committee's work was welcomed by Australia, the EC members, Pakistan, Sweden, the USSR and the United States. In the view of the German Democratic Republic, any recommendation by the Committee must be seen in the light of the non-proliferation régime. India said any multilateral solution for supply

assurances should take into account existing bilateral rights and obligations. Romania asserted that the Committee's activities should be based on the principle of non-discriminatory access to all peaceful applications of nuclear science and technology. The United States said it was committed to the re-establishment of its role as a dependable supplier of nuclear items under non-proliferation safeguards.

Austria mentioned its suggestion that IAEA set up a technical working group to discuss safety criteria for nuclear power stations near international frontiers and to elaborate minimum standards which could be applied in negotiations between neighbouring States. Sweden considered that an IAEA research centre could contribute to the development of new alternative energy technology.

Pakistan objected to what it called an orchestrated propaganda campaign against its peaceful nuclear programme and declared that it was discussing with IAEA the Agency's proposals to augment surveillance equipment at the Karachi nuclear power plant.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/424 (transmitting IAEA report).

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2373(XXII), annex, 12 June 1968 (YUN 1968, p. 17); <sup>(3)</sup>36/25, 11 Nov. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 1251.

Meeting records: GA, A/36/PV.50-52 (10, 11 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/25

128-1-4 (recorded vote) Meeting 52 11 November 1981

3-nation draft (A/36/L.10), amended by Iraq (A/36/L.12); agenda item 14 (a).

Sponsors: Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Japan.

Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency

The General Assembly,

Having received the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency to the General Assembly for the year 1980,

Taking note of the statement by the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency of 10 November 1981, which provides additional information on developments in the Agency's activities during 1981,

Conscious of the urgent need to develop all sources of energy, with a view to helping both developing and industrialized countries to mitigate the effects of the energy crisis, and bearing in mind the fact that nuclear energy remains the main readily available alternative to fossil fuel for the generation of large amounts of electric power,

Recognizing the importance of enhancing the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency in the promotion of the application of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes,

Considering that the International Atomic Energy Agency will be called upon to play an increasingly important role in making the benefits of nuclear energy available to all nations, in particular the developing countries,

Conscious of the continuing need to protect mankind from the perils resulting from the misuse of nuclear energy and noting with appreciation in this connection the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency in the implementation of the relevant provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and other international treaties, conventions and agreements designed to achieve similar objectives.

Noting the excellent safety record of nuclear power generation, but aware of the need to pay continuing attention to the questions of nuclear safety and waste management,

Bearing in mind the special needs of developing countries for technical assistance by the International Atomic Energy Agency in order to benefit effectively from the application of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes as well as from the contribution of nuclear energy to their economic development, and the need to assure a satisfactory and effective source of financing to implement adequate and effective technical assistance programmes,

Considering that the premeditated Israeli air attack on Iraqi nuclear installations on 7 June 1981 constitutes a serious threat to the entire International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and to the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes,

Conscious of the importance of developing ways and means in which supplies of nuclear material, equipment and technology and fuel cycle services could be assured on a more predictable and long-term basis, in accordance with mutually acceptable considerations of non-proliferation, and of the importance of the role and responsibilities of the International Atomic Energy Agency in that regard,

Noting that the present Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Dr. Sigvard Eklund, will retire on 30 November 1981 after twenty years of service as Director-General and that the General Conference of the Agency has decided to confer upon him the title of Director-General Emeritus of the International Atomic Energy Agency,

Noting further that the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency approved the appointment by the Board of Governors of the Agency of Dr. Hans Blix as Dr. Eklund's successor,

1. Takes note of the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency;

2. Notes with satisfaction that:

(a) The International Atomic Energy Agency is continuously making efforts to strengthen its activities in the field of technical assistance to the developing countries;

(b) Assistance provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency is playing a significant role in the introduction of nuclear power for peaceful purposes as well as in the application of nuclear science and technology, particularly in the fields of agriculture, medicine and industry in the developing countries;

(c) The International Atomic Energy Agency is considering appropriate measures for funding technical assistance through predictable and assured resources and for enabling progress in technical assistance to keep pace with progress in other main activities of the Agency;

3. Commends the International Atomic Energy Agency for its continuing efforts to ensure the safe and secure use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes throughout the world, notes with satisfaction the steady improvement of the Agency's safeguards system and welcomes the conclusion that in 1980, as in previous years, nuclear material under Agency safeguards remained in peaceful nuclear activities or was otherwise adequately accounted for;

4. Notes with appreciation the steps taken by the International Atomic Energy Agency to expand and strengthen its programmes in nuclear safety and enhance its ability to deal with emergencies;

5. Urges all States to continue to support the endeavours of the International Atomic Energy Agency, pursuant to its statute, in furthering the peaceful uses of nuclear power, improving the effectiveness of safeguards and promoting nuclear safety;

6. Urges all States that have not already done so to ratify the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, which was opened for signature on 3 March 1980;

7. Calls upon all States to respect fully their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, including in particular any armed attack on its nuclear installations;

8. Notes with satisfaction that:

(a) Substantive work has commenced in the Committee on Assurances of Supply, established by the Board of Gover-

nors of the International Atomic Energy Agency in June 1980, and expresses the hope that progress in the work of the Committee will greatly contribute to the success of the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, to be held in 1983;

(b) The International Atomic Energy Agency will convene a conference on nuclear power experience at Vienna in September 1982, which could also provide a useful technical input to the United Nations Conference;

(c) The International Atomic Energy Agency is prepared, in response to paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 35/112 of 5 December 1980, to fulfil its appropriate role within the scope of its responsibilities at all stages of preparation of the United Nations Conference, and during the Conference itself, by contributing to the discussion of relevant issues, by providing technical data and documentation as needed, particularly in relation to the progress of the work of the Committee on Assurances of Supply, and by participating in the secretariat of the Conference;

(d) There is continuing progress in the studies by the International Atomic Energy Agency aimed at establishing a system of international storage of plutonium and the international management of spent fuel;

9. Notes that the matter referred to in paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 35/17 of 6 November 1980 was considered by the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency at its twenty-fifth regular session and expresses the hope that it will be brought to an early conclusion;

10. Pays tribute to Dr. Sigvard Eklund for his distinguished service in guiding and directing the successful evaluation of the International Atomic Energy Agency during the past twenty years and for the outstanding contribution he has made to the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the cause of peace;

11. Extends its congratulations and good wishes to Dr. Hans Blix who has been appointed to succeed Dr. Sigvard Eklund;

12. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency the records of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly relating to the Agency's activities.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamshiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Guatemala, Jamaica, Malawi, United States.

#### Preparations for the Conference on nuclear energy

On 9 December 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly, without vote, endorsed recommendations made by the Preparatory Committee for the

United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy,<sup>(1)</sup> including the recommendation that the Conference take place at Geneva from 29 August to 9 September 1983.

Meeting at Vienna, Austria, from 3 to 7 August 1981, the Preparatory Committee also recommended that a small Conference secretariat be established, that IAEA play an active role in all phases of preparation, and that the Secretariat prepare draft rules of procedure of the Conference for the Committee's consideration. It also decided to hold one or two sessions in 1982 and a final one in 1983.

In addition to endorsing these recommendations, the Assembly stated that the outcome of the Conference should be embodied in appropriate documents on ways of promoting international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and that the Committee might have to extend its next session and hold a further one in 1982 in order to advance its work, including preparation of those documents. The Assembly urged Governments to provide information on their achievements and experiences in this field, invited IAEA to provide technical data and documents and to participate in the Conference secretariat, and invited other United Nations organizations to make documents available. It requested the Assembly President to finalize the appointment of Committee members.

The resolution was sponsored by 26 States and was adopted as revised by them following consultations. Introducing the original draft, Yugoslavia suggested that the Conference agenda should cover the development and use of nuclear energy for economic and social advancement, particularly in developing countries, and that the Committee should prepare a declaration and a programme of action for adoption at the Conference.

Explaining the position of the EC members, the United Kingdom said the final text of the resolution, unlike the original version, made it clear that the Preparatory Committee was to take all decisions on Conference preparations. Those countries and Finland added that maintenance of the consensus principle was fundamental to the success of the Conference.

The EC countries, Finland and the United States welcomed the references in the resolution to the IAEA Committee on Assurances of Supply (p. 713), to whose work they attached particular importance. Canada interpreted references in the preamble to nuclear energy needs as pertaining only to peaceful and non-explosive uses of nuclear energy. Referring to the mention in the text of a 1977 Assembly resolution on the peaceful use of nuclear energy for economic and social

development,<sup>(2)</sup> the United States recalled its view at the time that it would have preferred a resolution which acknowledged more fully the dangers of nuclear proliferation accompanying the spread of nuclear technology.

In the debate, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Pakistan and the USSR believed the Conference should contribute to a wider use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes on the basis of strengthening the non-proliferation regime and effective safeguards. India opposed attempts to list divergent suggestions and topics with varying emphasis on individual subjects. Romania believed the central goal of the Conference should be to mobilize the will of States to use nuclear energy as a basic constituent of programmes for economic and social progress. Australia and Canada expressed the view that the work of the Committee on Assurances of Supply could make an important contribution to the Conference.

In regard to the membership of the Preparatory Committee, Yugoslavia, Chairman of the 70-member body, noted that only 54 States had been nominated and expressed hope that the full membership would be appointed by its next session.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Preparatory Committee, A/36/48.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>32/50, 8 Dec. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 106); <sup>(3)</sup>36/78, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: ACABQ report, A/36/7/Add.13, Parts I, II; 5th Committee, A/36/798; S-G statements, A/C.5/36/56 & Corr.1,2 & Rev.1.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/36/PV.50-52, 90 (10 Nov.-9 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.67 (8 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/78

Adopted without Meeting 9 December 1981 vote 26-nation draft (A/36/L.11/Rev.1); agenda item 14 (b).

Sponsors: Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Turkey, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

United Nations Conference for the Promotion  
of international Co-operation  
in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 33/4 of 2 November 1978, 34/63 of 29 November 1979 and 35/112 of 5 December 1980, in which it decided to convene in 1983 the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of international Co-operation In the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy.

Reaffirming the principles and provisions of its resolution 32/50 of 8 December 1977 on the peaceful use of nuclear energy for economic and social development,

Stressing, in particular, the relevance of the principles set forth in paragraph 1 of resolution 32/50 for the preparation of the Conference and for the Conference itself,

Recalling a/s/o the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament,

Recalling further the role of the international Atomic Energy Agency set out in General Assembly resolution 34/63,

Recognizing the increasing significance of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for economic and social development.

In particular its important role in accelerating the development of the developing countries.

Reaffirming the responsibility of States that are advanced in the nuclear field to promote the legitimate nuclear energy needs of the developing countries by participating in the fullest possible transfer of nuclear equipment, materials and technology under agreed and appropriate international safeguards applied through the International Atomic Energy Agency on a non-discriminatory basis in order to prevent effectively the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Expressing its conviction that the Conference, through the promotion of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, should contribute greatly to meeting the increasing energy and other requirements of many countries, particularly developing ones.

Further expressing its conviction that progress in the work of the Committee on Assurances of Supply, established by the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency in June 1980, will greatly contribute to the success of the Conference,

Stressing the need for timely and adequate preparations for the Conference,

Having considered the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy;

2. Endorses the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee contained in the annex to its report;

3. Decides that the Conference shall be held at Geneva from 29 August to 9 September 1983;

4. Considers that the outcome of the Conference should be embodied in appropriate documents, in a suitable format, pertaining, *inter alia*, to ways and means of promoting international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy;

5. Recognizes that the Preparatory Committee, in order to advance its work, including as appropriate the preparation of the documents referred to in paragraph 4 above for submission to and approval by the Conference, may need to extend the duration of its second session, to be held at Vienna in 1982, and also to hold a further session of appropriate duration in 1982;

6. Reaffirms its decision, as embodied in paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 35/112, to take account of the

results of the work of the Committee on Assurances of Supply;

7. Requests the President of the General Assembly to finalize the appointment of the members of the Preparatory Committee, in accordance with the principle of equitable geographical representation, not later than 30 April 1982;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for the establishment, at the appropriate time, of a small secretariat for the Conference, to be headed by a Secretary-General of the Conference;

9. Urges all States to contribute to the successful preparation of the Conference by, *inter alia*, making available, in conformity with international obligations, information on their scientific and technological achievements and practical experiences in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy;

10. Calls upon all States which have not yet done so to communicate to the Secretary-General, not later than 30 April 1982, their views on the matters relevant to the preparation and organization of the Conference;

11. Invites the International Atomic Energy Agency to fulfil its appropriate role within the scope of its responsibilities at all stages of preparation of the Conference, and during the Conference itself, by contributing to the discussion of relevant issues, by providing technical data and documentation as needed, particularly in relation to the progress of the work of the Committee on Assurances of Supply, and by participating in the secretariat of the Conference;

12. Further invites specialized agencies and other relevant organizations of the United Nations system to contribute effectively to the preparations for the Conference by, *inter alia*, making available studies, reports and other appropriate documents concerning the applications of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, as well as the results and future prospects of such applications;

13. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the Preparatory Committee all the communications received from Member States and to assist the Committee by providing it with all necessary facilities for its work;

14. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item entitled "Preparation of the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy: report of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy".

## Chapter XI

### Food

The deteriorating world food situation, particularly in low-income developing countries where increasing numbers of people continued to suffer from chronic hunger and malnutrition, was scrutinized by several organs of the United Nations system throughout 1981, with both the World Food Council (WFC) and the World Food Programme (WFP) taking steps to try to resolve food problems.

Disturbed about growing hunger, unsatisfactory progress in food and agriculture, inadequate investment and aid levels, and an increasingly difficult economic climate, WFC proposed national and international measures encompassing financial and technical support for action to

expand agricultural production and food storage and distribution facilities in food-deficit countries, reduction of trade barriers for agricultural products, co-operation among developing countries and increased food aid. WFC took these actions at its seventh ministerial session, held at Novi Sad, Yugoslavia, from 25 to 29 May.<sup>(2)</sup>

Resolutions in support of the measures proposed by WFC, calling for urgent action on the world food situation by the international community, were adopted by the Economic and Social Council in July<sup>(4)</sup> and the General Assembly in December.<sup>(6)</sup>

During 1981, WFP continued its food aid to developing countries (p. 726), with development



assistance and emergency operations reaching \$579 million and some 1.5 million metric tons of food being shipped for the world's needy.<sup>(1)</sup>

On the recommendation of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes (CFA), the governing body of WFP, the General Assembly, in December, set a target of \$1.2 billion for pledges to the Programme for the 1983-1984 biennium.<sup>(7)</sup> The Economic and Social Council, in November, adopted a CFA proposal urging that preparations be made to announce pledges.<sup>(5)</sup>

Pledges towards the \$1 billion target for 1981-1982 amounted to \$771 million by the end of 1981. CFA pointed out that, unless new donors contributed, the minimum aid target might not be met.

World Food Day, 16 October, was observed for the first time in 1981 to call public attention to global food and agricultural problems. The observance, initiated by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), was endorsed in July by the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(3)</sup>

During the year, the United Nations mounted special efforts to aid African countries where over the past two decades the food and agriculture situation had worsened drastically (p. 624). Assistance to meet the nutritional needs of children and mothers was provided by the United Nations Children's Fund, with expenditures reaching \$14 million (p. 1005).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>CFA, E/1982/73, <sup>(2)</sup>WFC, A/36/19.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(3)</sup>1981/70 (p. 725), <sup>(4)</sup>1981/71 (p. 721) 24 July; <sup>(5)</sup>1981/85, 2 Nov. (p. 728). GA: <sup>(6)</sup>36/185 (p. 723), <sup>(7)</sup>36/202 (p. 728), 17 Dec.

## Food problems

WFC ACTION. The seventh ministerial session of the World Food Council was held at Novi Sad, Yugoslavia, from 25 to 29 May 1981, preceded by a preparatory meeting at Rome, Italy, from 21 to 24 April. It reviewed world food prospects and adopted conclusions and recommendations on specific priorities and comprehensive measures to improve the world food situation.<sup>(5)</sup>

Despite increased production and improved distribution in some countries, WFC noted, millions in developing countries faced an extremely precarious food situation. Although advances had been made, such as the inclusion of cereal import financing in the facilities of the International Monetary Fund (p. 1447), fully adequate world food security measures were still to be adopted. Global cereal production had fallen since 1978/1979 and world grain stocks, as a pro-

portion of consumption, were at their lowest level since 1975/1976. Moreover, the economic environment had become increasingly difficult, with mounting costs for energy, fertilizer and other essential agricultural inputs, accompanied by high interest rates, seriously hampering efforts to accelerate food production. In low-income countries, the number of chronically hungry and malnourished was steadily increasing, and in most of Africa, as nutritional standards continued to deteriorate, the situation had assumed major crisis proportions.

Calling for redoubled efforts to eliminate hunger, WFC saw hope in the widespread awareness of the magnitude of the problem and the growing determination of Governments to address it effectively. It welcomed the increased recognition of the need for food strategies and urged that efforts in that direction be stepped up and receive sustained international support.

Observing that within national food strategies there were areas in which relatively low investment could yield large and often short-term returns, WFC called on development assistance agencies to increase their support to developing country research and extension services, and to renew their efforts in such areas as incentives to producers, improvements in transport and storage infrastructure, provision of technological packages, and rational energy use and alternative sources which avoided negative environmental effects. Pointing out that the lack of adequately trained local personnel could impede implementation of food strategies, it urged increased training of national staff and encouragement to agricultural specialists to remain in or return to developing countries.

Substantial new investment in infrastructure - particularly land and water resources - was essential to meet food targets, WFC said. It therefore urged that major projects be completed by the decade's end. It also pointed to the need to link production and consumption, stating that national food plans should take mainly into account peasants and small farmers, particularly the needs of women producers, and be geared to creating employment, possibly by co-operative production and direct consumption intervention.

It noted the increasing importance of economic and technical co-operation among developing countries, and urged international support for such efforts in food and agriculture.

Noting that those countries needed increased export earnings to finance economic development, food and agricultural inputs, WFC called for reduced trade barriers, especially those affecting agricultural trade. It urged industrialized countries to adopt or extend the generalized system of preferences (GSP) to cover a wide range

of agricultural commodities, particularly semi-processed and processed ones.

There was wide acceptance, WFC said, of the need for measures which, taken together, would comprise a world food security net to ensure international market stability and continuity of world food supplies, especially for developing countries, at reasonable prices and on affordable terms. Concerned by lack of progress on a new Wheat Trade Convention (p. 729), WFC urged its speedy conclusion and the inclusion of substantial economic provisions to safeguard both exporters and importers and to recognize developing countries' needs. It also urged avoidance of policies affecting their capacity to meet essential grain needs during production shortfalls.

Greater efforts were required to raise the level of the 1980 Food Aid Convention, <sup>(10)</sup> extended until June 1983 (p. 729), from the current 7.6-million-ton level to a 10-million-ton minimum; to attain the pledging target of WFP (p. 728); and to replenish the International Emergency Food Reserve (IEFR) annually at 500,000 tons (p. 729). WFC also urged additional aid to help developing countries improve their distribution, transport and storage infrastructure and their reserve stock management.

WFC expressed concern that, after encouraging increases in 1977 and 1978, official external assistance commitments to food and agriculture had declined in 1979 while military expenditure had grown apace. Although primary responsibility for solving their food problems rested with developing countries, WFC noted that massive increases in external commitments would be required—more than \$12.5 billion (in 1975 prices) by 1990, according to an FAO estimate. Therefore, it welcomed the planned increase in commitments by multilateral agencies.

It suggested that each country able to contribute should strengthen its own national support strategy embracing all facets of world food problems, including development assistance, trade policies and world food security. Within the total assistance effort, special attention should be devoted to low-income, food-deficit countries, particularly the least developed. It also called for maximum efforts to replenish the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the International Development Association (IDA).

Commenting on the conclusions and recommendations after their adoption, Canada believed the efforts of developing countries must be stepped up and receive sustained international support, even if that meant reordering priorities and reallocating resources; it also commented on a decision by WFC to gather information on food and agricultural assistance to Africa

(p. 624). The United States reserved its position on the recommendation for a world food security net, believing that concentrating measures into a package would detract attention from the fundamental problem of production; it also urged countries to establish their own food reserves instead of waiting for a new Wheat Trade Convention or other international action, and it said the concept of national support strategies needed to be clearly defined.

Although accepting the text, the USSR reaffirmed that it would continue to render economic and technical assistance to interested developing countries, including aid for agriculture and food production, in forms corresponding to its own social and economic structures and which had demonstrated their practical effectiveness.

ACC TASK FORCE CONSIDERATION. Food problems were among the topics addressed in a March 1981 report <sup>(4)</sup> by the Task Force on Long-Term Development Objectives, a subsidiary body of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (p. 388). The Task Force pointed to a need for action in five main areas: provision of a world food security net, to help developing countries resolve food problems; establishment of national food plans or strategies; improvement of the contribution of international trade to the solution of food problems; substantive increases in development assistance and investment in developing countries; and realization of the large potential for economic co-operation among those countries.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. On 24 July, the Economic and Social Council adopted a resolution on food and agriculture, expressing grave concern at the precarious food situation in low-income developing countries with food deficits, and recognizing that elimination of hunger and malnutrition was an international responsibility. It urged increased external aid to the food sector, replenishment of IFAD and IDA, and support for developing countries' efforts to strengthen mutual co-operation in food and agriculture. It called on donor countries to facilitate the increased transfer of resources to enable developing countries to accelerate food and agricultural production and achieve greater self-reliance in grain production. The Council also urged reduction and, where appropriate, elimination of trade barriers, especially those affecting developing countries' agricultural exports; adoption or extension of GSP to cover agricultural commodities; and the speedy conclusion of a new Wheat Trade Convention.

The Council called on donor countries to achieve without delay the minimum targets of the Food Aid Convention and IEFR (p. 729),

emphasized the need to assist African agriculture and food development (p. 624), and called on Governments to implement agrarian reform and rural development (p. 400).

The resolution was adopted without vote. It had been similarly approved on 22 July by the Council's First (Economic) Committee, where the draft had been submitted by the Chairman after informal consultations on a text put forward by Venezuela on behalf of the Group of 77.<sup>(1)</sup> Venezuela also made further oral drafting changes to the text before its approval.

In the Committee, Australia said it attached particular importance to the call for reduction of trade barriers, especially those affecting developing countries. The USSR, speaking also for Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, the German Democratic Republic and Poland, reiterated their position as described to WFC (p. 718). The United Kingdom, speaking for the members of the European Economic Community (EEC), said they were the most important and accessible market for developing countries' agricultural exports and would continue their efforts within their Common Agricultural Policy. The United States reaffirmed its position on national reserves and a Wheat Trade Convention.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 17 December,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Assembly, welcoming the WFC recommendations, repeated points in the Economic and Social Council resolution regarding external aid to the food sector, replenishment of IFAD and IDA, an international wheat agreement and co-operation among developing countries. In addition, the Assembly, characterizing food as a human right and not an instrument of political pressure, reaffirmed the international commitment to overcoming hunger and malnutrition and the need to support agricultural development and food production and distribution in developing countries. It reaffirmed also that they should accelerate production to improve self-sufficiency, and called for increased technical and capital assistance. It called for urgent action against agricultural trade barriers, recommended expansion of GSP (p. 546) and urged developed countries to facilitate access to their markets by exports from developing countries. It requested WFC to consider measures for a world food security net to ensure international market stability and continuity of food supplies.

Other provisions of the resolution concerned food aid (p. 725), including the work of CFA (p. 727) and contributions under the Food Aid Convention and IEFR, as well as agrarian reform and rural development.

The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Second (Economic

and Financial) Committee. On 10 December, the Committee had approved the draft in like manner, on the basis of a text submitted by a Vice-Chairman after informal discussions on a draft put forward by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77.<sup>(1)</sup> Oral drafting changes by Canada and the United States were accepted. The Group's text was then withdrawn.

Also on 17 December, the Assembly decided without vote<sup>(8)</sup> to transmit to its 1982 regular session a draft resolution by the Philippines,<sup>(2)</sup> which would have had the Assembly invite the Secretary-General, in consultation with FAO, WFC, IFAD and other organizations, to develop short-, medium- and long-term strategies for solving global food problems. The Assembly acted on the recommendation of the Second Committee, made without vote on 7 December as orally proposed by its Chairman at the suggestion of the Philippines.

The final text of the Assembly's resolution on the WFC report had several paragraphs not in the Group of 77 version, in addition to other differences.

The added paragraphs were those by which the Assembly: called for agrarian reform and rural development (paragraph 5); noted with deep concern the limited progress in resolving agricultural trade problems (paragraph 6); called for urgent action against agricultural trade barriers (paragraph 7); reaffirmed that developing countries should accelerate food and agricultural production in order to improve self-sufficiency (paragraph 11); reiterated its belief that food aid for the least developed countries should be provided as far as possible in the form of grants or on highly concessional terms (paragraph 13); reaffirmed that policies and incentives to accelerate food and agricultural development should continue to be pursued (paragraph 15); and requested WFC to consider measures for a world food security net (paragraph 20).

Changes in other paragraphs included the following: In paragraph 2, instead of expressing concern at unsatisfactory progress in international efforts to improve food production and consumption, the Assembly affirmed that those efforts should be intensified. In paragraph 3, a clause was added recognizing that the long-term solution depended on increased self-sufficiency in food. A paragraph of the Group of 77 text reaffirming that, since access to food was a fundamental necessity and a human right, it should not be used as an instrument of political pressure was rephrased in paragraph 10 to state that food was a human right which Governments endeavoured to guarantee and that the Assembly stressed its belief in the general principle that food should not be used as a political instrument.

In paragraph 12, with regard to food-sector strategies adopted by developing countries, the phrase "within the framework of respect for national sovereignty" was changed to "within the context of national plans and policies". A phrase calling for the early establishment of a world food security net was dropped from paragraph 19, on assistance by developed countries. The request in paragraph 25 that WFC continue to support meetings by interested Governments to facilitate exchange of experience in the food sector was supplemented with the phrase "in accordance with its programme of work and within available resources".

Another change was the omission of a proviso urging developed countries promptly to eliminate protectionism affecting developing countries through the phasing out of tariff and non-tariff barriers, so as to remove distortive production patterns maintained by subsidies and protectionism. This was replaced by clauses urging developed countries to make their best efforts to adjust economic sectors which required protection against exports from developing countries, thus facilitating market access for their food and agricultural products, and recommending expansion of information on the use of GSP. There were also changes in the paragraphs on CFA and IEFR.

Among changes in the preamble, paragraphs were added: expressing deep concern that substantial resources continued to be diverted to armaments and calling for disarmament measures that would increase the possibilities of reallocating resources to economic and social development and upgrading food Conditions in developing countries; noting with great concern the precarious food situation in many developing countries; and noting the need for policies to avoid disruption of international trade and to facilitate market access for agricultural exports, particularly from developing countries.

Omitted was a preambular paragraph noting with deep concern the increasing domestic subsidies to agricultural production in developed countries and lack of progress towards resolving agricultural trade problems which seriously affected production in and exports from developing countries, and disrupted international trade.

Several delegations explained their positions on the text in the Committee or in the Assembly.

Canada joined the consensus on the understanding that the world food security net concept would not detract from the integrity of existing bodies and would emphasize the need to strengthen national production and distribution systems. The United States reserved its position on such a net and on the conclusion of a new international wheat agreement, pointing out that

it was the largest donor of food aid and the largest bilateral donor of agricultural development assistance; it also believed strongly in an open market system, held that it was in the interest of all to establish grain reserve policies and said world food security depended on increased food production in developing countries.

New Zealand was disappointed at the lack of more explicit reference to world trade problems in agricultural products since, it said, there was abundant proof that certain national policies, particularly on subsidies, had a prejudicial effect on international markets. Australia, expressing the same view, added that subsidy systems not only increased world price instability and generally depressed prices received by exporters but also caused efficient producers to leave the market. Japan said its position expressed in 1979 with regard to trade in agricultural products had not changed.<sup>(9)</sup>

The USSR maintained its position as stated in WFC (p. 718).

During the discussion in the Second Committee, deep concern was expressed by many delegations that, despite increases in world agricultural production and food aid, millions continued to suffer from hunger and malnutrition. The developing countries generally shared the concern of WFC that the goal of eradicating hunger within a decade had had to be postponed. Many stressed the critical food situation in Africa (p. 625) and also voiced concern that, despite the international community's efforts, agreed food-aid targets had not been met.

A number of developed market-economy countries felt that it was of primary importance for each developing country to adopt concrete self-help plans in agriculture to increase food production, and agreed that more bilateral aid should be directed to this end. Japan observed that emphasis should also be laid on developing human resources by organizing farmers and experts in the diffusion of agricultural technologies and by training local agrarian leaders. Austria added that, although the primary goal must be to increase developing countries' food production, it was essential to step up food aid to the world's poorest sectors. Israel stressed the need to increase agricultural yields by radically improving production methods and generating employment opportunities through more intensive and efficient use of land and water, obtaining several harvests a year and developing arid lands.

Bulgaria said the first necessity was for developing countries to mobilize internal resources and draw up national programmes for intensification of agriculture to bridge the gap between needs and production. Romania spoke in like

manner, adding that solutions also depended on international measures. Hungary suggested that the example of the socialist countries had demonstrated that large-scale farming was the best way of introducing modern agricultural methods and lessening the impact of adverse weather conditions.

Guyana, pointing out that it had become a net exporter of food in 1980, was joined by Mauritania, the Sudan, Turkey and Viet Nam in calling for international efforts to complement national ones. Suriname was among many developing countries which urged that priority attention be given to food and agriculture. Nigeria mentioned problems caused by pre-harvest and post-harvest losses and the lack of crop protection and storage facilities. Togo asked for help to solve food storage and preservation problems.

Tunisia stated that building food stocks sufficient to establish an infrastructure should be everyone's concern; together with EEC, it was trying to solve that problem by long-term contracts for the supply of staple foods. The United Republic of Cameroon said it welcomed a Philippine proposal to have an expert group draw up a plan for the purchase of world food reserves.

Indonesia noted that in developing countries record food imports and rising costs of agricultural inputs were aggravating external food dependency and eroding scarce foreign exchange reserves. The Philippines noted that high interest rates had made the crisis worse.

Guinea, the Philippines, Poland and Uruguay saw the world food situation as an important item for the proposed global negotiations on development and international economic co-operation.

Most developing countries supported the WFC appeal for removal of trade barriers and protectionism, which they saw as an obstacle to agricultural exports.

Poland, Spain and Yugoslavia also agreed that it was necessary to reduce barriers hampering such trade. Uruguay stated that it had considerable resources which could be used to feed the world's population but was faced with marketing problems because of subsidized exports from industrialized countries. Costa Rica and the United Arab Emirates expressed concern that, while hunger haunted the developing countries, enormous quantities of surplus agricultural produce were destroyed on the pretext of obeying the laws of the market-place. Hungary remarked that socialist countries were also affected by the protectionist agricultural policies of EEC.

Nepal said that even though informal agreement had been reached on replenishment of IFAD, multilateral agencies must ensure continuing and adequate replenishment; the \$1 billion WFP pledged

target should be met and the resources of FAO expanded. Sierra Leone, also urging support for those institutions, remarked that countries in a position to help were haggling over percentages of contributions or budget growth while wasting resources on weapons. Australia commented that, instead of continually haggling over percentages with regard to IFAD, efforts should focus on securing its future.

China and Viet Nam were among those which urged the setting up of a world food security network. Cyprus spoke similarly. Kenya thought this should be coupled with a global alert system and large-scale investment in food and agriculture with no strings attached. Zimbabwe believed that a world food security system should be legally enforceable. Zambia offered to join in the formulation of a global plan of action on food and agriculture up to the year 2000—an approach also suggested by the Philippines. Bangladesh favoured an international agreement to avoid measures which might hinder developing countries from covering their essential grain needs at times of international shortage.

Afghanistan was alarmed by intentions expressed by some countries to use food as an international weapon. Cuba said it condemned the United States practice in that respect, particularly against countries introducing structural changes designed to benefit the society as a whole. The German Democratic Republic said the United States, backed by some Western States, had recently blocked a \$5-million, rice-irrigation project for Viet Nam proposed by WFP. Bangladesh and Malaysia were also against the use of aid for political leverage.

Many comments in the debate were addressed to ways of improving the provision of food aid (p. 725).

Draft resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for A/C.2/36/L.14 (withdrawn); <sup>(2)</sup>Philippines, A/c.2/36/L.136 (postponed); <sup>(3)</sup>Venezuela, for Group of 77, E/1981/C.1/L.16 (superseded).  
 Reports: <sup>(4)</sup>Task Force on Long-Term Development Objectives, E/1981/71; <sup>(5)</sup>WFC, A/36/19.  
 Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(6)</sup>ESC, 1981/71, 24 July, text following; <sup>(7)</sup>GA, 36/185, 17 Dec., text following.  
 Dec.: <sup>(8)</sup>GA, 36/444, 17 Dec., text following.  
 Yearbook references: <sup>(9)</sup>979, p. 662; <sup>(10)</sup>1980, p. 691.  
 Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.10, 11, 15, 17, 18 (10-22 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-24, 25, 26, 28-32, 45, 46, 47 (24 Sep.-10 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).  
 Statement: NGOs, E/1981/NGO/6.

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/71

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/108) without vote, 22 July (meeting 18): draft by Chairman (E/1981/C.1/L.16/Rev.1), based on draft by Venezuela for Group of 77 (E/1981/C.1/L.16) and Orally amended by Venezuela; agenda item 10.

## Food and agriculture

## The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, contained in General Assembly resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, contained in Assembly resolution 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, Assembly resolution 3362 (S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation, and the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, contained in Assembly resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, which laid the foundations for the new international economic order,

Reaffirming General Assembly resolutions 35/68 on the report of the World Food Council and 35/69 on the situation of food and agriculture in Africa, adopted on 5 December 1980.

Welcoming the report of the World Food Council on its seventh ministerial session, held at Novi Sad, Yugoslavia, from 25 to 29 May 1981.

Expressing its appreciation to the Government and people of Yugoslavia for acting as hosts to the Council at that session and for the generous hospitality accorded to the participants,

Emphasizing the need for the implementation of effective measures at the national and international levels for accelerating the rate of growth in food and agricultural production in developing countries, with a view to achieving the 4 per cent growth rate in food production, as envisaged in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recognizing that the long-term solution to the problems of food and agriculture in the developing countries involves the over all development of those countries within the framework of the reordering of economic conditions on a world-wide basis,

Noting with concern the lack of progress in the negotiations for a new Wheat Trade Convention and recognizing the implications of such a convention for world food security,

Noting also the sixth annual report of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes,

Considering that food is a requisite for human survival and well-being and a fundamental human necessity,

Recognizing that the long-term solution in respect of food security rests upon increased food production and the accelerated development of the developing countries,

Recognizing also that a substantial increase in the export earnings of developing countries is essential if they are to finance adequately their overall economic development and their imports of food and of agricultural inputs, and that trade barriers constitute a serious handicap to the international community in its efforts to overcome recession and inflation and to expand overall productivity, and in particular to the developing countries in their efforts to realize their economic potential,

Taking note with satisfaction of the efforts made by food-exporting developing and developed countries in contributing to the Food Aid Convention,

Bearing in mind paragraph 5 of the report of the World Food Council on its seventh ministerial session,

1. Expresses its grave concern at the continuing precarious nature of the food situation in low-income developing countries with food deficits, particularly the least developed countries;

2. Emphasizes that the various measures of international assistance in favour of African agriculture and food development, specified by the General Assembly in resolution 35/69, demand the continued and increased efforts of the international community and, in particular, of the appropriate organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system;

3. Notes that the World Food Council, at its seventh ministerial session, emphasized the need to adopt, according to priorities identified in the field of food, comprehensive na-

tional and international measures, with a view to attaining the aims and objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade concerning the promotion of food and agricultural development in the developing countries;

4. Recognizes that the elimination of hunger and malnutrition is the common responsibility of the international community and that immediate action should concentrate on the food problems of those developing countries with inadequate food production, and also that the solution of food problems requires, in the first instance, determined action by the developing countries and that in this context they need the increased support of the international community;

5. Welcomes the decision of the International Monetary Fund to integrate compensation for excesses in the costs of cereal imports with that for shortfalls in receipts from exports under its compensatory financing facility;

6. Calls upon existing and new donor countries to achieve without delay the minimum target of the Food Aid Convention of 10 million tons of cereal aid annually, as well as the minimum target of 500,000 tons of grains for the international Emergency Food Reserve, as agreed upon in the relevant decisions of the General Assembly;

7. Urges developed countries, international institutions, and others able to provide development assistance, to increase external assistance to the food sector, for which an estimated necessary element of external assistance is \$8.3 billion, increasing to \$12.5 billion by 1990 (both amounts in 1975 prices), to take urgent steps for the adequate and equitable replenishment of the resources of the International Fund for Agricultural Development and to conclude the replenishment of those of the International Development Association;

8. Calls upon all countries to consider, within the framework of their national priorities, strengthening national food security;

9. Calls upon all donor countries to facilitate the increased transfer of resources in support of the efforts of developing countries to increase their food and agricultural production, so as to enable them to achieve self-reliance in the production of grain and to set up the corresponding infrastructure;

10. Urges, in the context of the present resolution on food and agriculture, effective measures to move towards the reduction, and the elimination, where appropriate, of barriers to trade, especially those affecting agricultural products of export interest to developing countries, and that in this connection all industrialized countries should consider the adoption or extension of the generalized system of preferences or of other preferences to cover, as appropriate, a wide range of agricultural commodities, particularly semi-processed and processed ones;

11. Urges the international community, in adopting multi-lateral measures in the food sector, to take into account, in particular, the problems and interests of food-producing and food-exporting developing countries;

12. Urges the conclusion as soon as possible of a new Wheat Trade Convention, which will include substantial economic provisions to safeguard the interests of both exporters and importers and will recognize the need for the application of special provisions to developing countries;

13. Urges the World Food Council, within the context of its mandate from the General Assembly and in an effort to mobilize and sustain greater efforts in the struggle to overcome hunger, to continue to review major problems and policy issues and the steps being taken to resolve them, and to continue to serve as a mechanism to provide overall, integrated and continuing attention to the successful co-ordination and follow-up of policies concerning food production, nutrition, food security, food trade and food aid, as well as other related matters, by all the agencies of the United Nations system;

14. Reaffirms that food objectives are intimately related to global development and that positive progress in this area

could strongly influence the prospects for progress in other areas of the International Development Strategy;

15. Expresses satisfaction at the growing number of countries adopting a more integrated approach to food policy as one of the means for interested developing countries to transfer their own priorities into effective action, to mobilize, within the context of their national development plans and priorities, increased technical and financial resources and to secure co-operation from international development assistance agencies;

16. Reaffirms that food strategies and policies, in accordance with the principle of respect for national sovereignty, remain the concern of the countries adopting them;

17. Calls upon the international community to encourage and accord high priority to support for the efforts of developing countries to strengthen and supplement their programmes of mutual co-operation in the field of food and agriculture;

18. Calls upon Governments concerned to implement agrarian reform and rural development within the framework of their national plans and objectives, in accordance with the recommendations as adopted at the World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development;

19. Notes the suggestion made by the World Food Council at its seventh ministerial session that national and international efforts should be stepped up for the training of skilled national staff, that the maximum encouragement should be given to highly qualified agricultural specialists from developing countries to continue working in or to return to those countries, and that measures to avoid the drain of such personnel to developed countries should be considered.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/185

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.6) without vote. 10 December (meeting 47); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.148), based on informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.14), orally revised, and orally amended by Canada and by United States; agenda item 69 (g).

#### Report of the World Food Council

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New international Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation.

Recalling also its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recalling further its resolutions 34/110 of 14 December 1979 and 35/68 of 5 December 1980 on the report of the World Food Council and 35/69 of 5 December 1980 on the situation of food and agriculture in Africa,

Recalling also the Declaration of Principles and the Programme of Action, as adopted by the World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development,

Bearing in mind Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/71 of 24 July 1981 on food and agriculture,

Expressing its appreciation to the Government and people of Yugoslavia for the excellent facilities and generous hospitality provided to the World Food Council at its seventh ministerial session,

Noting that the World Food Council emphasized the need to adopt, according to priorities identified in the field of food, comprehensive national and international measures with a view to realizing the aims and objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade in the promotion of food and agricultural development in the developing countries.

Recognizing that a substantial increase in the export earnings of developing countries is essential for adequate financ-

ing of their overall economic development and their imports of food and agricultural inputs.

Expressing concern that trade barriers constitute a serious handicap to the efforts of developing countries. In particular, to realize their economic potential, and of the International community to overcome recession and inflation and expand overall productivity.

Noting, in that context, the need for adoption by all countries of policies designed to avoid disruption of international trade and to facilitate access to international markets of agricultural exports, particularly those from developing countries,

Noting with great concern that the food situation remains extremely precarious for many developing countries despite significant increases in production and improved distribution in some countries in the past year,

Noting also with great concern the growing hunger and malnutrition in many developing countries, especially in the least developed countries, particularly those in Africa,

Expressing its deep concern at the fact that a substantial part of world resources, material as well as human, continues to be diverted to armaments with a detrimental effect on international security and on efforts to achieve the new international economic order, including the solution of food problems, and calling upon Governments to take effective measures in the field of real disarmament that would increase the possibilities of allocation of the resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, especially development of developing countries, and to upgrading their food conditions,

1. Welcomes the conclusions and recommendations of the World Food Council as adopted at its seventh ministerial session, and calls upon all Governments and appropriate international organizations to give earnest attention to their implementation;

2. Expresses its concern at the critical deterioration of the food outlook for many developing countries in the 1980s, especially in the least developed countries and particularly those in Africa, and affirms that international efforts should be intensified to support improved production of food in developing countries;

3. Recognizes that the long-term solution to the problems of food and agriculture in the developing countries depends on increased self-sufficiency in food as part of the overall development of those countries within the framework of structural changes in international economic relations;

4. Reaffirms the strong commitment of the international community to overcoming hunger and malnutrition and, in that context, the need for more effective international action to support agricultural development and food production and distribution in developing countries, particularly in low-income countries with food deficits;

5. Calls upon the Governments concerned to implement agrarian reform and rural development within the framework of their national plans and objectives and in accordance with the recommendations as adopted by the World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development;

6. Notes with deep concern that only limited progress has been achieved towards the solution of the long-standing problems of international trade in agricultural products, including access to international markets of agricultural exports, which adversely affect production and exports, particularly of developing countries, and the solution of which could make an important contribution to improving overall food production in the world;

7. Calls for urgent action in the different negotiating forums to move towards the approval and implementation of proposals to bring about the reduction and elimination of barriers to trade in agricultural products, in particular in relation to those of export interest to developing countries, and thus to facilitate, inter alia, more efficient patterns of production;

8. Urges developed countries to make their best efforts to adjust those sectors of their agricultural and manufacturing economies which require protection against exports from

developing countries, thus facilitating access to the markets of food and agricultural products;

9. Recommends that the generalized system of preferences should be expanded to cover a wider range of processed and semi-processed products and, whenever possible, agricultural commodities, and that the system of information on using the generalized system of preferences, by providing technical assistance-including assistance in the field of research, development and marketing-should be enlarged and improved to enable developing countries to take full advantage of such preferences;

10. Reaffirms that food is a universal human right which Governments endeavour to guarantee their people and, in that context, stresses its belief in the general principle that food should not be used as an instrument of political pressure;

11. Reaffirms that developing countries, in the context of their national development plans and priorities, firmly supported by the international community, should take all necessary measures to accelerate food and agricultural production in order to improve national and collective self-sufficiency as early as possible;

12. Calls upon the international community to support the national efforts of developing countries to increase their food and agricultural production by increased technical and capital assistance, in particular for the food-sector strategies that have already been adopted by interested developing countries, within the context of national plans and policies, and the recognition that food strategies and policies remain the concern of the countries adopting them;

13. Reiterates its belief that food aid for the least developed countries should be provided, in so far as possible, in the form of grants or on highly concessional terms and that donors should consider paying relevant transport costs;

14. Expresses its satisfaction at the growing number of countries that are adopting a more integrated approach to food policy, including food-sector strategies, as one of the means for interested developing countries to translate their own priorities into effective action and to mobilize, within the context of their national plans and priorities, increased technical and financial resources and co-operation from international development assistance agencies;

15. Reaffirms that, in the context of national development plans and priorities, effective policies and incentives should continue to be pursued and invigorated with a view to accelerating food and agricultural development;

16. Takes note of the renewal of the Food Aid Convention, and calls upon existing and new donor countries to achieve without delay the minimum target of the 1974 World Food Conference of 10 million tons of cereal aid, as agreed upon by the General Assembly in relevant decisions;

17. Takes note of the attainment of the minimum target of 500,000 tons of grain for the international Emergency Food Reserve in 1981 and expresses its appreciation to those countries whose contributions have made this possible;

16. Welcomes the decision of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes to carry out a review of food aid requirements in the 1980s, in the context of paragraph 88 of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, which calls for urgent consideration to be given to a revision of the target of the Food Aid Convention, taking into account the estimated requirements of 17 to 18.5 million tons of cereals, which provide a useful indicator of the overall requirement of food aid by 1985, as agreed in the Strategy;

19. Urges developed countries, international institutions and others able to provide development assistance to increase external assistance to the food sector, for which the estimated necessary element of external assistance is \$8.3 billion, growing to \$12.5 billion by 1990, both figures at 1975 prices, to take urgent steps for the adequate and equitable replenishment of the International Fund for Agricultural Development, to conclude the sixth replenishment of the International Development Association, and to grant increased de-

velopment assistance to the developing countries in order to help them become self-sufficient at the national or regional level in food production;

20. Requests the World Food Council to give further consideration to a series of feasible measures which, taken together, comprise a world food security net to ensure international market stability and continuity of world food supplies, especially for developing countries, at reasonable prices and on the conditions they can afford, and to make recommendations thereon;

21. Calls upon all States to consider strengthening their national food security within the framework of their national priorities;

22. Urges the conclusion, as soon as possible, of a new international wheat agreement that includes substantial economic provisions for safeguarding the interests of both exporters and importers and that recognizes the need for special provisions for developing countries;

23. Welcomes the decision of the International Monetary Fund to integrate compensation for excesses in the costs of cereal imports with that for shortfalls in receipts from exports under the Fund's compensatory financing facility;

24. Calls upon the international community to encourage and accord high priority to support for the efforts of developing countries to strengthen and supplement their programmes of mutual co-operation in the field of food and agriculture;

25. Urges the World Food Council, in accordance with its programme of work and within available resources, to continue to support meetings requested by interested Governments at the national and regional levels in order to facilitate the exchange of experience in the food sector;

26. Urges the World Food Council, within the context of its mandate, to mobilize and sustain greater efforts in the struggle to overcome hunger, to continue to review and report on major problems and policy issues and the steps being taken or proposed to resolve them, and to continue to serve as a co-ordinating mechanism to provide overall integrated and continuing attention for the successful co-ordination and follow-up of policies concerning food production, nutrition, food security, food trade, food aid and other related matters, by all organizations and bodies of the United Nations system;

27. Urges the international community, in adopting multilateral measures in the food sector, to take particularly into account the problems and interests of food-producing and food-exporting developing countries.

#### General Assembly decision 36/444

##### Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/695/Add.6) without vote, 7 December (meeting 46); oral proposal by Chairman on suggestion by Philippines; agenda item 69 (g).

#### Food and agriculture

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, decided to transmit to its thirty-seventh session for consideration the following draft resolution:

#### "Food and agriculture

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation, which laid the foundations for the establishment of the new international economic order, and 35/56 of 5 December 1980, containing the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

"Considering that food is a requisite for human survival and well-being and a fundamental human necessity,



"Reiterating its conviction that hunger and malnutrition must be eliminated as soon as possible and certainly by the end of this century,

"Taking note of the 'Elements of a global food programme' proposed by the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

"Considering that a co-ordinated strategy to eliminate hunger would play an important role in promoting the well-being of all peoples,

1. Invites the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the officers of the World Food Council, of the International Fund for Agricultural Development and of other relevant and concerned organizations, and taking into account the 'Elements of a global food programme' and 'Agriculture: toward 2000 and other relevant documentation, to develop short-term, medium-term and long-term strategies, plans and measures for a solution of global food problems:

2. Requests the Secretary-General to submit the short-term, medium-term and long-term global food strategies, through the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982, to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session."

### World Food Day

The first annual observance of World Food Day was held on 16 October 1981, the anniversary of the founding of FAO in 1945.<sup>(3)</sup> The decision to mark the day each year was taken by FAO in 1979,<sup>(6)</sup> in order to increase public awareness of the nature of world food and agricultural problems.

The Day was marked by ceremonies at United Nations Headquarters and at FAO headquarters in Rome. Events also took place in some 150 countries, including addresses by heads of government and ministers on national priorities in food and agricultural development.

On 24 July 1981, the Economic and Social Council, as the General Assembly had done in December 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> urged Governments and national, regional and international organizations to contribute to the celebration of the Day. It acted by adopting, without vote, a resolution<sup>(1)</sup> recommended by its First Committee.

The text had been approved by the Committee on 21 July, also without vote, on a draft submitted by Venezuela on behalf of the Group of 77. After informal discussions, the draft was orally revised to delete two preambular paragraphs describing access to food as a basic and universal human right and reaffirming support for FAO in the execution of its mandate as evolved in resolutions of the 1974 World Food Conference<sup>(4)</sup> and the 1979 World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development.<sup>(5)</sup>

In the Assembly's Second Committee, Hungary said it was pleased to note that FAO had responded to a Hungarian proposal by proclaiming World Food Day.

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/70, 24 July, text following; <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 35/70, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 695).

Yearbook references: <sup>(3)</sup>1946-47, p. 685; <sup>(4)</sup>1974, p. 488; 1979, <sup>(5)</sup>p. 500, <sup>(6)</sup>p. 1253.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.10, 11, 15, 17 (10-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/70

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/108) without vote, 21 July (meeting 17); draft by Venezuela, for Group of 77 (E/1981/C.1/L.13), orally revised In informal consultations; agenda item 10.

### World Food Day

The Economic and Social Council,

Considering that food is a requisite for human survival and well-being and a fundamental human necessity.

Recalling resolution 1/79 of 28 November 1979, adopted by the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations at its twentieth session, and General Assembly resolution 35/70 of 5 December 1980, calling for the annual observance of World Food Day on 16 October, the anniversary of the founding of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in 1945.

Recalling also that the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations was established to take all necessary and appropriate action for "ensuring humanity's freedom from hunger",

Urges Governments and national regional and international organizations to contribute to the greatest possible extent to the effective celebration of World Food Day on 16 October 1981.

### Food aid

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December 1981 on the activities of the World Food Council (WFC),<sup>(1)</sup> urged developed countries, international institutions and other donors to increase external aid to the food sector. It cited an estimate that \$8.3 billion was needed in external assistance for food aid, and that the requirement would rise to \$12.5 billion by 1990, both figures at 1975 prices. It reiterated that food aid for the least developed countries should be provided as grants or on highly concessional terms and that donors should consider paying transport costs.

WFC, in May 1981, also called for increased efforts to expand and strengthen food aid (p. 717), especially through three main multi-lateral channels: the World Food Programme (p. 726), the Food Aid Convention (p. 729) and the International Emergency Food Reserve (IEFR) (p. 729).

The world system for the provision of food aid to food-deficit countries was discussed in the Assembly during the Second Committee's debates on development and international economic co-operation and on the work of the Economic and Social Council.

Pakistan, stressing the need to launch developing countries on the path of self-reliance and self-sufficiency, said that what they sought was a strengthened resolve to meet the shortfalls that had plagued internationally agreed objectives. Cape Verde, urging an increase in the amount of

food aid, pointed out that, although it had intensified its efforts towards agricultural self-sufficiency, it would have to rely on international aid for food security. Canada felt that food aid should be temporary to complement, not supplant, increased production efforts.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Malaysia were among those which urged countries with surpluses to grant food aid to the needy. Thailand favoured the use of triangular transactions, in which developed countries purchased food from low-income, food-surplus developing countries for shipment as food aid to food-deficit developing countries.

A number of States announced increases in their food aid to developing countries. Argentina said its contribution of cereals under the Food Aid Convention had risen to 35,000 tons. Australia had raised its aid by more than 20 per cent and was currently spending more than \$120 million a year; it called for additional financing from the members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries and said it was time that Soviet bloc countries played a more realistic role. New Zealand said that, during 1980, 22 per cent of its bilateral aid had gone to the agricultural sector as compared with 17 per cent two years previously. Spain said it had provided 20,000 tons of cereals under the Food Aid Convention in 1980 and again in 1981, and for the least developed countries it would provide an additional 10,000 tons as well as experts for preparation of food strategies.

India indicated that it had almost achieved food self-sufficiency and would do all it could to assist poorer countries.

A number of countries called for increases in assistance provided under the Food Aid Convention (p. 729) and IEF (p. 730).

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/185, paras. 13 & 19, 17 Dec. (p. 724).

### World Food Programme

During 1981, the World Food Programme (WFP), a joint venture of the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), continued providing food aid in support of development projects and to meet emergency needs.

Since commencing operations in 1963,<sup>(3)</sup> WFP had, by the end of 1981, provided support for some 1,106 development projects and 556 emergency operations at a total value of about \$5.6 billion. Currently some 118 countries were being assisted.

The 30-member Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes (CFA), the governing body of WFP, provided general guidance on policy, administration and operations; it presented its

annual reports to the Economic and Social Council and the FAO Council covering 1980<sup>(1)</sup> and 1981.<sup>(2)</sup>

The resources of WFP continued to come mainly from voluntary contributions in commodities, cash or services pledged by Governments at biennial pledging conferences. The next such conference, for which a target of \$1.2 billion for 1983-1984 was established by the General Assembly in December 1981 (p. 728), was scheduled for 1982.

Reports: CFA, <sup>(1)</sup>E/1981/84, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1982/73.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1963, p. 211.

### WFP activities

The seventh annual report of CFA<sup>(3)</sup> recorded the total expenditure of WFP in 1981 as \$579 million, compared with \$571 million in 1980. Of the 1981 total, \$400 million was for development projects (including \$30 million from WFP resources and \$114 million from the International Emergency Food Reserve (IEFR)). Another \$144 million was spent on emergency operations and \$34 million was for administrative costs. Of its cash resources, \$141.6 million was disbursed or obligated: transport accounted for \$94.2 million, special measures to help the least developed countries meet internal costs related to WFP food aid amounted to \$10.8 million, and commodity purchases from regular WFP resources came to \$6.7 million.

Commitments for the purchase of commodities, made where possible and economical in developing countries, amounted to \$91 million, compared with \$117.5 million in 1980.

For the second consecutive year, some 1.5 million metric tons of food were shipped, with close to 1.3 million tons coming from WFP resources, including contributions to the 1980 Food Aid Convention and IEF channelled through WFP; the remaining 200,000 tons were shipped on behalf of bilateral donors and other United Nations agencies. Sixty-nine per cent went to development projects and 31 per cent to emergency operations.

In 1981, commitments for new development projects, including expanded assistance to previously approved projects and budget increases approved by CFA for operational projects, amounted to about \$543 million, while an additional amount of some \$178 million went to 53 emergency operations (p. 727).

CFA ACTIVITIES. The eleventh and twelfth sessions of CFA were held in 1981 at Rome, Italy, from 11 to 21 May<sup>(1)</sup> and from 19 to 29 October.<sup>(2)</sup>

In May, following its sixth annual review of food aid policies and programmes, CFA reported its conclusions and recommendations to the

Economic and Social Council.<sup>(3)</sup> It concluded that food aid in both cereal and non-cereal products had declined during the previous two years in the face of developing countries' rising food import requirements. It urged enlistment of new aid donors, including non-governmental organizations, and an increase in current contributions to attain the minimum 10-million-ton target of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.<sup>(4)</sup>

It encouraged further use of triangular transactions involving purchases from developing countries other than recipients. Such purchases by WFP and bilateral donors, CFA said, had greatly facilitated emergency operations. It added that Governments in recipient countries should develop programmes explicitly establishing an interrelationship between increased food production, food security and the use of food aid.

In October, the Committee reached substantial agreement on recommendations to improve emergency operations.

By its 17 December resolution on the activities of the World Food Council,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly welcomed the CFA decision to review food aid requirements in connection with the target of the Food Aid Convention (p. 729).

In the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, Finland, speaking for the Nordic States, believed that a larger share of food aid contributions should be channelled through WFP.

Reports: CFA, <sup>(1)</sup>WFP/CFA:11/19, <sup>(2)</sup>WFP/CFA:12/22, <sup>(3)</sup>E/1982/73.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/56, annex, para. 88, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 511); <sup>(5)</sup>36/185, para. 18, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 724).

#### Development assistance

In 1981, CFA approved 39 new assistance projects for economic and social development at a total cost to WFP of \$422 million. In addition, the Executive Director approved WFP assistance for a further 29 projects at a cost of \$48 million, bringing the number of projects approved to 68 at a total value of over \$470 million. (For list of development projects approved, see table on p. 730.) Expanded assistance for previously approved projects and increases approved by CFA for operational projects raised total commitments to \$543 million.

In accordance with its 1979 guidelines for food aid,<sup>(1)</sup> CFA continued to give priority to low-income food-deficit countries, allocating to them some \$452 million (83 per cent) of the total for new commitments. Assistance to countries identified by the United Nations as least developed (p. 401) reached \$190 million, or 35 per

cent of total commitments to development projects. During 1981, the regional distribution of new commitments was: Africa south of the Sahara, 44.5 per cent; Asia and the Pacific, 28.8 per cent; North Africa and the Near East, 20.1 per cent; and Latin America, 6.6 per cent.

About 80 per cent of new commitments was earmarked for agricultural and rural development, including refugee settlement projects, and 10 per cent went to pre-school and primary school children. The rest was divided among vulnerable groups such as pregnant women and nursing mothers, refugee assistance, hospital feeding, and secondary and higher education and training.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(1)</sup>1979, p. 666.

#### Emergency operations

On the recommendation of the WFP Executive Director, the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations approved assistance for 53 emergency operations (one was subsequently cancelled in 30 countries, benefiting about 14 million people. These operations involved some 480,000 tons of food commodities valued at \$178 million. About 74 per cent of the aid went to refugees and displaced persons following man-made disasters and civil disturbances, 22 per cent to people affected by drought and crop failure, and 4 per cent to victims of sudden natural disasters. Over half (56 per cent) of the assistance was for 19 operations in Asia and the Pacific, 35 per cent for 28 operations in Africa south of the Sahara, 6 per cent for 3 operations in North Africa and the Near East, and 2 per cent for 3 operations in Latin America. (For list of emergency operations approved, see table on p. 731).

Throughout 1981, WFP also maintained its world-wide humanitarian relief operations. In co-operation with other United Nations agencies and voluntary organizations, it continued to co-ordinate and distribute food shipments for the Kampuchean emergency operation (p. 494), involving 66,000 tons of rice and 2,000 tons of other food, 15,000 tons of seeds and 54,000 tons of fertilizers. Assistance was also provided in the Thai/Kampuchean border areas, with shipments amounting to 88,000 tons going to approximately 360,000 people.

In Pakistan, WFP again co-ordinated emergency food supplies to some 1.5 million Afghan refugees and its total commitment was raised to 352,041 tons estimated at \$114.6 million. The commitment to the relief operation in Somalia from December 1979 to the end of 1981 amounted to some 41,000 tons valued at about \$26.9 million. In the north-eastern province of Karamoja in Uganda an estimated 265,000 persons affected

by war and famine had been helped by WFP since August 1979, with commitments at the end of 1981 of about 28,900 tons of food costing \$15.9 million.

#### Contributions to WFP

##### Contributions for 1979-1982

The report of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes (CFA)<sup>(1)</sup> pointed out that, by the end of 1981, total pledges to WFP for the biennium 1979-1980 had reached \$824 million, representing 87 per cent of the \$950 million target established by the General Assembly in 1977,<sup>(2)</sup> while pledges for 1981-1982 amounted to \$771 million-77 per cent of the \$1 billion target set by the Assembly in 1979.<sup>(3)</sup> Unless potential new donors contributed, CFA stated, the minimum target for 1981-1982 might not be reached. (See table on p. 732.)

The total resources of WFP increased by \$1,067 million during 1981, compared with an increase of \$990 million the previous year. Pledges to regular WFP resources accounted for 75 per cent of the increase; contributions to the International Emergency Food Reserve channelled through WFP, 17 per cent; contributions under the Food Aid Convention, 6 per cent; and other resources, 2 per cent.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>CFA, E/1982/73.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>32/112, para. 1, 15 Dec. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 471); <sup>(3)</sup>34/108, para. 1, 14 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 671).

##### Pledging target for contributions, 1983-1984

The General Assembly, in December 1981, established a \$1.2 billion target for contributions to WFP in the 1983-1984 biennium. It acted on a CFA recommendation, submitted through the Economic and Social Council.

The figure had been proposed by the WFP Executive Director, supported by the Secretary-General and the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). It was discussed by CFA in May and approved after further discussion in October. The Committee reported<sup>(1)</sup> that, while different views were expressed on the target's feasibility and adequacy, all delegations had agreed not to stand in the way of consensus.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. On 2 November, the Economic and Social Council adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(2)</sup> proposed by CFA, by which it urged United Nations Members and FAO members and associate members to prepare to announce pledges at the 1982 Pledging Conference for WFP. The Council also submitted the draft resolution on the 1983-1984 pledging target proposed by CFA.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 17 December, the draft-annexed to the Economic and Social Council's resolution-was adopted by the General Assembly.<sup>(3)</sup>

By this resolution, the Assembly established for the 1983-1984 biennium a voluntary contribution target of \$1.2 billion, of which not less than one third was to be in cash and/or services. It urged United Nations Members and FAO members and associate members to ensure the target's full attainment and requested that a pledging conference be convened in early 1982. The Assembly also decided that the pledging conference for 1985-1986 be convened early in 1984 at the latest.

The resolution was adopted without vote, having been approved in like manner by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 27 November.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>CFA, E/1981/116 (extract).

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/85, 2 Nov., text following; <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/202, 17 Dec., text following

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.43 (2 Nov.). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3, 6, 33-39, 44 (24 Sep.-27 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/85

Adopted without vote Meeting 43 2 November 1981

Draft by CFA (E/1981/116); agenda item 10.

##### Target for World Food Programme pledges for the period 1983-1984

The Economic and Social Council,

Having considered the sixth annual report of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes,

Noting the comments of the Committee concerning the minimum target for voluntary contributions to the World Food Programme for the period 1983-1984,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 2462(XXIII) of 20 December 1968 and 2682(XXV) of 11 December 1970 on multilateral food aid, which recognized the experience gained by the Programme in that field,

1. Submits to the General Assembly for consideration and approval the draft resolution annexed to the present resolution;

2. Urges States Members of the United Nations and members and associate members of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to undertake the necessary preparations for the announcement of pledges at the Tenth Pledging Conference for the World Food Programme.

#### ANNEX

Draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly on the target for World Food Programme pledges for the period 1983-1984

[Text as in General Assembly resolution 36/202 below]

#### General Assembly resolution 36/202

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/812) without vote, 27 November (meeting 44); draft by Economic and Social Council (resolution 1981/85, annex); agenda item 70 (i).

##### Target for World Food Programme pledges for the period 1983-1984

The General Assembly,

Recalling the provision of paragraph 1 of its resolution 2095(XX) of 20 December 1965 to the effect that the World

Food Programme Ia to be reviewed before each pledging conference.

Recalling also the provision of paragraph 4 of Its resolution 34/108 of 14 December 1979 specifying that, subject to the review of the Programme provided for in resolution 2095(XX), the next pledging conference should be convened at the latest early in 1982, at which time Governments should be invited to pledge contributions for 1983 and 1984, with a view to reaching such a target as may then be recommended by the General Assembly and the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Recalling further the recommendation contained in paragraph 90 of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade that the resources of the World Food Programme should be augmented and that every effort should be made to reach the target agreed upon for each biennium during the Decade for the regular resources of the Programme,

Noting that the review of the Programme was undertaken by the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes at Its eleventh session and by the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1981.

Having considered Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/85 of 2 November 1981 and the recommendations of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes contained in its sixth annual report,

Recognizing the value of multilateral food aid as furnished by the World Food Programme since its inception and the necessity for continuing its action both as a form of capital investment in economic and social development projects and as a means of meeting emergency food needs,

1. Establishes for the two years 1983 and 1984 a target for voluntary contributions to the World Food Programme of \$1.2 billion, of which not less than one third should be in cash and/or services in the aggregate;

2. Urges States Members of the United Nations and members and associate members of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to make every effort to ensure the full attainment of the target;

3. Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, to convene a pledging conference for this purpose at United Nations Headquarters early in 1982;

4. Decides that, subject to the review provided for in its resolution 2095(XX), the subsequent pledging conference, at which Governments should be invited to pledge contributions for the biennium 1985-1986 with a view to reaching such a target as may then be recommended by the General Assembly and the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, should be convened at the latest early in 1984.

#### Contributions under the 1980 Food Aid Convention

The 1980 Food Aid Convention,<sup>(5)</sup> establishing minimum annual contributions by its parties of 7.6 million metric tons in wheat and other grains, was extended in 1981 at its current level for two years, until 30 June 1983. The Convention's objective was to reach the 1974 World Food Conference target of at least 10 million tons of food aid annually to developing countries.<sup>(4)</sup> Protocols for an extension of the Food Aid Convention and the 1971 Wheat Trade Convention were approved on 6 March 1981 by the parties to the International Wheat Agreement, made up of the two conventions.

For the crop year 1980/1981, contributions under the Convention channelled through WFP increased to 302,080 tons of grain, valued at over

\$50 million. Contributors also provided \$16.9 million in cash grants for transportation and related costs. By the end of 1981, contributions announced for the 1981/1982 crop year totalled 151,863 tons valued at \$27.8 million; an additional \$9.1 million was provided for transportation.<sup>(1)</sup> (See table on p. 731.) All these figures excluded contributions for the International Emergency Food Reserve (see below).

In May 1981, the World Food Council urged greater efforts to raise the level of food-aid flows to 10 million tons by renewing the Food Aid Convention at that level for a longer period (p. 718).

The General Assembly, in its 17 December resolution on the work of the Council,<sup>(3)</sup> took note of the renewal of the Convention and called on donors to achieve the 10-million-ton target without delay. It also welcomed the decision of CFA to review food aid requirements in the context of the call for urgent revision of the Convention target in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,<sup>(2)</sup> taking into account estimated requirements of 17 to 18.5 million tons of cereals as an indicator of 1985 requirements.

In the Second Committee, the Gambia expressed concern at the continued failure to supply the aid called for in the Convention. Nepal added that the 10-million-ton target was insufficient considering the population increase since 1974. Guinea, Mauritania and the Niger thought the target should be raised to 18 million tons by the mid- 1980s.

Appeals for the negotiation of a new wheat trade agreement were made by Australia, Canada, Malaysia and Pakistan. For the Nordic States, Finland regretted the breakdown of talks on a new agreement at a time when a consensus had been close on a solution involving internationally co-ordinated national stocks. The United States, stressing its belief in an open-market system, said it would support the search within the International Wheat Council for a universally acceptable approach to a new wheat trade convention which took into account the merits of national market-oriented reserves.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>CFA, E/1982/73.

Resolutions: GA: (2)35/56, annex, para. 88, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 511); <sup>(3)</sup>36/185, paras. 16 & 18, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 724).

Yearbook references: <sup>(4)</sup>1974, p. 496; <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 691.

#### Contributions under IEFRR

The annual minimum target of 500,000 metric tons of grain under the International Emergency Food Reserve (IEFR) was surpassed in 1981 for the first time. Contributions of 603,067 tons were announced, consisting of 587,944 tons of cereals and 15,123 tons of other commodities such

as pulses, vegetable oil and milk products.<sup>(1)</sup> (See table on p. 732.)

The World Food Council urged in May that IEF be replenished to maintain the 500,000-ton level and that assured commitments be made to it, especially for increased multilateral aid for food emergencies (p. 718). The General Assembly, in its 17 December resolution on the Council's activities, took note of the attainment of the

target and expressed appreciation to the countries which had made it possible.<sup>(2)</sup>

In the Second Committee, Mali and Nepal, among others, called for IEF to be replenished at the 500,000-ton level. Ethiopia believed the target was inadequate and asked WFC to examine the matter in 1982.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>CFA, E/1982/73.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/185, para. 17, 17 Dec. (p. 724).

### FOOD AID FOR DEVELOPMENT (Projects approved in 1981 by CFA and the WFP Executive Director)

Country	Field of activity	Amount (in US dollars)	Country	Field of activity	Amount (in US dollars)
Algeria	Improvement of fruit tree production	13,210,000	Indonesia	Regional development through transmigration, South Sumatra and South-East Sulawesi provinces	27,109,000
	Reconstruction of houses, El Asnam province*	1,947,000		Development training and income-generating activities for women.	1,558,700
	Food aid for school children.			Dairy development	23,116,000
	El Asnam disaster area*	1,734,000	Kenya	Rural development and settlement	
Bhutan	Forestry development*	673,100		In arid and semi-arid areas	5,512,300
	Irrigation development In south*	482,700		Rural development and settlement in arid and semi-arid areas	2,025,000
Burundi	Rural development, East Mpanda*	2,802,100		Rehabilitation of sericulture	1,480,000
China	Erosion control, Ningxia		Lebanon	Primary school feeding	15,721,000
	Hui autonomous region	24,079,000	Lesotho	institutional feeding	4,358,800
	Irrigation development, Gensu province	6,957,800		Primary school feeding and agricultural programme within rural educational reform	6,711,000
	Farm development by sugar cane and tea production, Guangxi			Dairy industry development*	1,994,600
	Zhuang autonomous region	4,690,100		Aid to price stabilization scheme	8,520,000
	Tidal land reclamation, Guangdong province	4,439,600		Vocational training centres in rural areas	3,642,100
	Tidal land reclamation, Fujian province	3,999,500		Soil protection and restoration and dune stabilization*	1,817,600
	Wasteland reclamation, reservoir and pond construction.			Tea industry agricultural and social development	22,645,500
	Yunnan province	3,552,700		Dairy development*	1,745,500
	Farm development and refugee resettlement by construction of Chenzhangwan reservoir and power station.			Integrated land management, Kashmir*	1,890,000
	Guangdong province.	2,276,000		Primary school feeding.	
	Flood control Hubel province*	1,591,400		Mindanao	9,679,600
Colombia	Complementary feeding and promotion of small income-generating associations	3,804,100		Rural water supply improvement	15,546,700
	Rural and suburban area community development*	1,484,000	Republic of Korea		
Costa Rica	Transportation infrastructure development	12,263,900	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Supplementary feeding of vulnerable groups*	1,843,100
	Food aid to schools for Bedouin children	8,050,000		Integrated agricultural development, Sine Saloum	3,581,500
	Rehabilitation of flood-damaged areas), Abyen*	1,787,300	Senegal	Aid to Mahawell Gange development programme	9,681,700
Djibouti	Refugee assistance	4,013,500		Afforestation of water Catchments and degraded lands*	1,297,900
	Campaign against tuberculosis	2,678,500		Water-related disease control In irrigation schemes*	1,575,900
Egypt	Agricultural development, north-western zone	13,374,000	Sudan		
	Vulnerable group feeding*	1,979,000	Syrian Arab Republic	Milk industry development	12,049,400
	Primary school feeding.	1,725,000	Togo	Multi-purpose rural development	8,303,500
	Wheat flour price stabilization/supply scheme*	1,701,500	Tunisia	Integrated development in the north-west	18,839,000
Ethiopia	Resettlement scheme	31,514,360			
	Dairy development	6,199,000	United Republic of Tanzania	Housing rehabilitation on sisal estates	9,450,000
	Food security reserve	3,723,000		Rubber development, Zenzibar*	1,047,700
	Basic food-crop production by small farmers	5,767,500		Multi-purpose rural development	33,293,000
	Income-generating activities for rural women	4,968,100		Secondary school feeding*	1,267,800
	Agricultural development, Franja Transversal del Norte*	2,015,500		Aid to technical institute students	7,992,000
Guyana	Assistance to small farmers.			Resettlement of Ugandan refugees, upper Zaire*	4,670,000
	upper Berbic River*	509,300		Rehabilitation of agricultural feeder roads, upper Zaire*	996,000
Honduras	Basic food-crop production by organized farmer's groups	5,509,900		Assistance to Namibian refugees and United Nations Institute for Namibia*	1,178,000
India	Food aid for new settlers.				
	Rajasthan canal area	13,108,800			
			Total		470,751,160

\*Projects approved by the WFP Executive Director; others approved by CFA

## EMERGENCY ALLOCATIONS APPROVED IN 1981

Amount (in us dollars)					Amount (in us dollars)				
Country or region	Nature of emergency		IEFR	WFP	Country or region	Nature of emergency		IEFR	WFP
Angola	Drought		1,976,200	297,600	Niger	Drought		1,113,000	411,300
	Dlplaced	Persons	-	3,281,100	Pakistan	Refugees		24,208,000	
Central America	Refugees		-	134,600		Refugees		17,153,000	-
Chad	Refugees		3,080,000	138,000		Refugees		10,384,000	-
	civil war		1,78,700	482,500		Refugees		6,752,000	-
China	Drought		2,535,000	-				5,652,400	
Comoros	Cyclone		-	555,000		Refugees		4,024,000	-
Democratic Kampuchea						Refugees		-	3,342,000
	Displaced	persons	8,047,000	-		Refugees		1,501,000	
	Displaced	persons	6,611,000	-		Refugees		900,500	-
	Displaced	persons	1,979,200	-	Philippines	Flood		-	666,000
	Displaced	persons	1,456,000	-		Typhoon		-	211,600
	Displaced	persons	485,200	-	Somalia	Refugees		2,023,600	5,435,000
Democratic Yemen						Refugees		4,276,000	1,852,000
	Flood		610,600	711,700		Refugees		728,000	1,797,000
	Flood		37,300	24,100		Refugees		-	2,208,000
El Salvador	Displaced	persons	-	2,319,200		Drought		1,795,000	-
Ethiopia	Drought		1,940,800	1,150,200	Sri Lanka	Drought		1,718,000	-
Gambia	Drought		-	932,600	Uganda	Drought		223,100	3,675,500
	Civil strife		-	714,600	United Republic of Tanzania	Drought		-	2,570,000
Guinea-Bissau	Drought		1,152,000	-	Upper volta	Drought		-	1,454,000
Kenya	Drought		1,346,000	-	Viet Nam	Flood		2,852,000	-
Lebanon	Civil war		615,800	234,200	Zaire	Refugees		2,035,800	772,200
Madagascar	Drought		1,650,000	-		Refugees		1,240,500	243,800
Mali	Drought		2,526,000	-	Zambia	Displaced persons		464,000	119,500
Mauritania	Drought		3,077,000	-		Refugees		726,400	1,355,500
Morocco	Flood		3,710,000	1,680,000					
	Drought		-	4,438,400					
Nicaragua	Flood		-	125,500	Total			134,344,100	43,332,700

## CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER THE FOOD AID CONVENTION MADE AVAILABLE TO WFP

(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollars)

CONTRIBUTOR	CROP YEAR 1980/81			CROP YEAR 1981/82		
	Commodity (metric tons)	Value	CASH	Commodity (metric tons)	Value	CASH
Food Aid Convention net						
Australia	70,000	11,620,000	4,200,000	80,000	14,640,000	4,800,000
Belgium	8,000	1,328,000	456,000	-	-	-
EEC	55,000	9,130,000	3,025,000	-	-	-
Finland	20,000	3,320,000	1,013,970	-	-	-
Ireland	4,080	677,280	244,800	-	-	-
Netherlands	25,000	4,150,000	1,500,000	-	-	-
Norway	30,000	4,980,000	1,800,000	30,000	5,490,000	1,800,000
Sweden	40,000	6,640,000	2,000,000	40,000	7,320,000	2,400,000
Switzerland	-	-	-	1,863	340,931	108,800
United Kingdom	50,000	8,300,000	2,657,480	-	-	-
Subtotal	302,080	50,145,280	16,897,250	151,863	27,790,931	9,108,800
IEFR through the Convention						
Australia	10,000	1,950,000	700,000	1,700	331,500	61,500
EEC	30,000	5,850,000	2,100,000	-	-	-
Germany, Federal Republic of	35,000	6,825,000	2,450,000	-	-	-
Switzerland	9,985	1,989,975	493,725	1,301	347,900	84,250
United Kingdom	5,000	975,000	350,000	-	-	-
Subtotal	89,985	17,589,975	6,093,725	3,001	679,400	145,750
Total	392,065	67,735,255	22,990,975	154,864	28,470,331	9,254,550

\*Under IEFR, donor countries cover all transportation costs

**CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY FOOD RESERVE**  
(as at 31 December 1981)

Contributor	Contribution	Quantity (in metric tons)	Estimated value (including costs for transportation) (in US dollars)	Contributor	Contribution	Quantity (in metric tons)	Estimated value (including costs for transportation) (in US dollars)
Australia	Grain*	45,000	11,867,500	Netherlands	f.5,000,000**	5,646	1,850,000
Austria	Grain	5,000	1,325,000	Norway	NKr 12,100,000**	7,595	2,051,954
Belgium	Grain	5,000	1,325,000	OPEC	SUS 3,664,600**	16,000	3,664,000
Denmark	DKr 10,000,000**	5,795	1,316,222	Spain	Grain	10,000	2,650,000
EEC	Grain	130,000	29,502,130	Sweden	Grain***	40,000	10,600,000
	SUS 2,850,000**	8,000	2,850,000	Switzerland	SUS 1,976,200**	8,300	1,976,200
Finland	Dried skimmed milk	180	657,895		Dried skimmed milk	300	968,288
	Fmk 450,000**	373	98,901		Wheat flour	1,450	612,250
France	Grain	10,000	2,846,000	United Kingdom	Grain	5,000	1,325,000
Germany, Federal				United States	Various commodities	257,075	92,989,800
Republic of	Grain	34,445	9,353,450				
Italy	SUS 645,600**	3,191	845,600				
Japan	SUS 1,250,000**	4,717	1,250,000	Total		603,067	181,925,190

\*Includes 33,300 tons of grain for bilateral aid.

\*\*WFP purchase.

\*\*\*Includes 10,000 tons of grain for bilateral aid.

**STATEMENT OF PLEDGES TO THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME, 1981-1982**  
(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Contributor	Commodities	Cash and services	Total	Contributor	Commodities	Cash and services	Total
Afghanistan	-	3,000	3,000	Lebanon	-	45,000	45,000
Algeria	-	132,250	132,250	Liberia	-	4,000	4,000
Argentina	2,500,000	-	2,500,000	Libyan Arab	-	-	-
Australia	8,045,977	6,345,244	14,391,221	Jamahiriya	-	100,000	100,000
Austria	4,500,000	500,000	5,000,000	Luxembourg	-	33,910	33,910
Bangladesh	600,000	-	600,000	Malawi	-	6,250	6,250
Bahamas	-	500	500	Malaysia	18,018	9,009	27,027
Barbados	-	13,000	13,000	Malta	-	2,200	2,200
Belgium	1,777,778	888,888	2,666,666	Mauritania	-	4,980	4,960
Benin	-	4,500	4,500	Meuritiut	4,421	-	4,421
Bhutan	-	1,000	1,000	Morocco	-	30,769	30,769
Botswna	-	15,090	15,090	Nepal	-	6,000	6,000
Brazil	50,000	150,000	200,000	Netherlands	28,856,054	14,781,692	43,637,746
Canada	144,067,796	16,803,938	160,871,734	New Zealand	444,444	222,223	666,667
Canadian Mennonite Committee	360,000	-	360,000	Nigeria	-	250,000	250,000
Chile	-	30,000	30,000	Norway	30,978,826	11,818,635	42,797,461
China	-	400,000	400,000	OPEC	16,700,000*	-	16,700,000
Colombia	400,000	9,708	409,708	Pakistan	900,000	-	900,000
Costa Rica	-	20,000	20,000	Panama	-	2,000	2,000
Cuba	2,500,000	-	2,500,000	Paraguay	-	10,000	10,000
Cyprus	-	2,011	2,011	Philippines	-	88,050	88,050
Democratic Yemen	-	8,858	8,858	Portugal	-	90,000	90,000
Denmark	23,385,441	12,769,953	36,155,394	Qatar	-	50,000	50,000
Ecuador	-	50,000	50,000	Republic of Korea	-	100,000	100,000
Egypt	400,000	-	400,000	Rwanda	-	1,500	1,500
Ethiopia	-	2,000	2,000	Saudi Arabia	25,000,000**	30,000,000	55,000,000
E E C	31,885,581	4,080,000	35,965,581	Somalia	-	1,605	1,605
Fiji	-	4,000	4,000	Spain	-	400,000	400,000
Finland	5,198,255	505,546	5,703,801	Sri Lanka	97,087	-	97,087
France	-	4,087,977	4,087,977	Sudan	10,000	-	10,000
Germany, Federal				Suriname	-	7,500	7,500
Republic of	25,996,960	12,948,679	38,945,639	Sweden	17,434,009	8,544,901	25,978,910
Greece	200,000	-	200,000	Switzerland	4,971,932	2,051,790	7,023,722
Honduras	-	10,000	10,000	Syrian Arab Republic	-	102,564	102,564
Hungary	400,000	-	400,000	Thailand	30,000	-	30,000
Iceland	12,000	6,000	18,000	Turkey	180,000	-	180,000
India	1,310,000	-	1,310,000	United Kingdom	2,624,671	1,304,685	3,929,356
Indonesia	395,900	-	395,900	United Republic of Cameroon	-	16,826	16,826
Iraq	266,667	133,333	400,000	United Republic of Tanzania	-	22,424	22,424
Ireland	1,578,673	775,809	2,354,482	United States	165,000,000	55,000,000	220,000,000
Israel	-	10,000	10,000	Upper Volta	-	3,765	3,765
Italy	18,655,462	3,361,344	22,016,806	Venezuela	-	93,457	93,457
Ivory coast	-	24,571	24,571	Viet Nam	-	10,000	10,000
Jamaica	-	10,103	10,103	Yemen	-	6,032	6,032
Japan	8,333,333	4,166,667	12,500,000	Yugoslavia	450,000	-	450,000
Jordan	-	55,167	55,167				
Kenya	-	970	970				
Kuwait	-	500,000	500,000				
Lao People's Demo- cratic Republic	-	1,000	1,000	Total	576,519,285	194,052,873	770,572,158

\*Cash for purchase and transportation of commodities.

\*\*Cash for purchase of commodities.



## Chapter XII

## Science and technology

The General Assembly, in December 1981, decided to establish long-term arrangements for the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development, and set up an intergovernmental group to work out details in 1982.<sup>(7)</sup> The System, designed to help developing countries strengthen their scientific and technological capacities, was to become operative on 1 January 1982, replacing the United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development, established in 1979. The Financing System and its initial stage, the Interim Fund, were originally proposed in the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development, adopted in 1979 by the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development.<sup>(9)</sup> Also in December 1981, the Assembly authorized increases in the staff and other resources of the Financing System.<sup>(8)</sup>

Resources pledged to the Interim Fund fell considerably short of the established 1980-1981 target of \$250 million (p. 742). With \$25 million in cash on hand at the end of 1981, the Fund approved 65 projects in developing countries, costing more than \$35 million (p. 742).

An operational plan suggesting concrete actions to help make the advantages of science and technology more accessible to developing countries was drawn up in 1981 by the United Nations Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation (DIEC) and was approved in June by the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development,<sup>(1)</sup> as a framework for future action. Its purpose was to implement the Vienna Programme of Action (p. 734).

The assistance provided by the United Nations system in connection with the eight major programme areas of the operational plan was described by the Secretary-General in a report of May 1981 to the Intergovernmental Committee (p. 743).<sup>(3)</sup> The Task Force on Science and Technology for Development, set up in 1980 by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) as a primary instrument for inter-agency co-ordination in this field, held its first two sessions in 1981 (p. 749). One of its tasks was to discuss the draft of a study by the Secretary-General of the efficiency of the United Nations system in the field of science and technology, later submitted to the Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup> As proposed by the Intergovernmental Committee, the Assembly requested that recommenda-

tions and cost estimates based on the proposals in the study be submitted in 1982 (p. 750).

The Advisory Committee on Science and Technology for Development held its first session in New York from 23 to 27 February 1981 and made suggestions on the draft operational plan (p. 752). The Intergovernmental Committee met three times in New York-at a resumed second session on 29 January to appoint the Advisory Committee's 28 members, and at a two-part third session from 26 May to 5 June and from 25 to 31 August (p. 750). During 1981, its second year of operation, the United Nations Centre for Science and Technology for Development carried out activities in various areas, such as analysis and research, co-ordination and monitoring, and promotion of national and regional activities (p. 752).

Several United Nations organizations were active in the regulation and promotion of the flow of technology from industrialized to developing countries (p. 753). In the area of regulation, work continued at the fourth session of the United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology (Geneva, 23 March-10 April) but, when no agreement was reached on issues such as dispute settlement and restrictive practices, the General Assembly, to accelerate finalization of the code, decided in December to establish an Interim Committee of the Conference to seek solutions to the unresolved questions.<sup>(5)</sup>

Aspects of the reverse transfer of technology-the so-called brain drain of skilled personnel from developing to developed countries-were under study in 1981 (p. 757). The Trade and Development Board, in March, authorized the convening of an intergovernmental group of experts to examine the feasibility of measuring human resource flows, and the Assembly, in December, urged active participation in the group's meeting.<sup>(6)</sup>

In relation to the application of information science to development, the Economic and Social Council recommended in July that Member States collaborate in preparations for the Second Intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for Informatics, being organized by the Intergovernmental Bureau for Informatics and scheduled for 1983.<sup>(4)</sup> In the area of marine science and technology, an expert group meeting examined the links between reducers and users of marine technologies (p. 760).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Inter governmental Committee, A/36/37; S-G, <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/240, <sup>(3)</sup>A/CN.11/18.  
 Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC: 1981/52, 22 July (p. 760). GA: <sup>(5)</sup>36/140 (p. 756) <sup>(6)</sup>36/141 (p. 758), 16 Dec.; <sup>(7)</sup>36/183 (p. 740), <sup>(8)</sup>36/18k (p. 741), 17 Dec.  
 Yearbook reference: <sup>(9)</sup>1979, p. 640.

## Vienna Programme of Action

### Implementation of the Programme

An operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development was approved on 5 June 1981 by the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development as a framework for further action by the Committee.<sup>(5)</sup> The plan had been submitted in May by the DIEC Director-General, assisted by the Executive Director of the Centre for Science and Technology for Development,<sup>(2)</sup> in accordance with a request made by the Committee in June 1980.<sup>(6)</sup> A draft was reviewed in February 1981 by the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology for Development, which made general comments as well as specific suggestions in connection with each programme area.<sup>(1)</sup>

The plan followed the structure of science and technology activities of the United Nations as defined in the Vienna Programme. It was divided into eight major programme areas identified by the Intergovernmental Committee in 1980: scientific and technological policies and plans for development (p. 743); the creation and strengthening of scientific and technological infrastructure (p. 745); the choice, acquisition and transfer of technology (p. 753); the development of human resources for science and technology (p. 746); financing (p. 737); scientific and technological information (p. 746); the strengthening of research and development in and for developing countries and their linkage to the production system (p. 747); and the strengthening of co-operation in science and technology among developing countries and between developing and developed countries (p. 748).

In addition to approving the plan, the Committee identified 31 areas of concentration covering all programme areas except for the one on financing. The plan included over 100 proposals for action to strengthen science and technology in developing countries.

According to the General Assembly's resolution of 17 December 1981 on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development,<sup>(4)</sup> the plan was due to be completed by concrete and specific action proposals by the Intergovernmental Committee in 1982.

A draft outline of the plan had been submitted for comments and proposals to the executive heads of organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system. The draft plan was reviewed at the first session (Geneva, 10-13 March 1981) of the inter-agency Task Force on Science and Technology for Development, a body of ACC (p. 749).

In an introduction to the plan, the Director-General pointed out that it was primarily addressed to developing countries. The United Nations system should support their efforts by providing experts to assist in programme and project preparation, by consulting with Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations on assistance for implementation, and by giving practical help in the implementation of projects. Consultations could also be planned with governmental and intergovernmental organizations in developed countries.

The introduction suggested activities to be carried out by national focal points for science and technology, including: information dissemination; keeping abreast of administrative, institutional and financial developments relevant to international implementation of the Vienna Programme; participation in the preparation and implementation of national scientific and technological activities; and promotion of international co-operation. It also suggested that intercountry consultations be held to assess scientific and technological resources in a region and to identify areas that could be handled regionally and subregionally.

To promote the Vienna Programme and the operational plan, the Director-General suggested that, as a first step, they be disseminated among States and organizations, and that informational meetings be held, possibly in subregions, to elaborate national and regional scientific and technological activities and to discuss United Nations assistance. The time-frame envisaged for the implementation was 1982-1990. Progress might be reviewed in 1983 by the regional commissions and globally in 1985.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION. In its general comments on the plan, contained in the report on its February session, the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology for Development stated that it should be more explicitly oriented towards the goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.<sup>(3)</sup> Consideration should be given to assigning priorities among major programme areas and among proposals within each area, with particular attention to the needs of the least developed countries (LDCs). The use of universities in implementing operational activities should also be

considered. The impact of the plan's proposals on such factors as employment, rural-urban migration, population growth and distribution patterns, utilization of the capacities of women and ecological conditions needed to be analysed. Also, a number of proposals contained in the plan required detailed case studies before they could be evaluated.

The Advisory Committee made specific suggestions in connection with each of the plan's programme areas.

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ACTION.** The Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development, by a resolution of 5 June, approved the operational plan as a framework for further actions to be decided by the Committee for implementation of the Vienna Programme. The Committee decided that the Director-General, assisted by the Executive Director of the Centre, should: define, with the assistance of the ACC Task Force, the roles of the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, including lead-agency roles for joint activities, in respect of the operational activities in the plan; compile a summary of the plan's proposals, indicating the executive role of specific organs, organizations and bodies, and disseminate the information to all national focal points; invite those focal points to inform the Committee on action taken and progress achieved by their countries in executing the plan; and promote and co-ordinate activities of the United Nations system in connection with the plan.

The Committee decided that the United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development (p. 742) should give particular emphasis to the areas of concentration identified in the plan. It invited the Director-General, with the assistance of the Centre's Executive Director, to prepare proposals for optimizing the activities of the United Nations system, stressing particularly the strengthening of the scientific and technological infrastructure of developing countries, and to present a biennial review and appraisal of progress. The special efforts needed to assist LDCs were to be borne in mind. The Advisory Committee was asked to provide additional suggestions on the proposals contained in the plan.

Governments, particularly those of developed countries, were urged to co-operate in providing facilities and resources, including funds. Countries were urged to take the plan into account in their national plans and programmes and in their bilateral and multilateral co-operation activities. Intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations were urged to contribute to the plan's implementation.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION.** During the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, the operational plan was endorsed or welcomed by a number of countries, such as Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Nigeria, Romania and the United Kingdom, the last speaking for the members of the European Community (EC).

The United Kingdom said the EC members felt that special attention should be given to the programme areas concerned with scientific and technological infrastructure, human resources development, research and development, and international co-operation; specific proposals must be prepared for the Intergovernmental Committee in 1982, and account must be taken of the activities of other bodies concerned with science and technology for development.

Emphasizing the importance of the operational plan, the Ukrainian SSR said it nevertheless accorded too much importance to the role of external economic factors such as private investment and did not deal with co-operation between countries with different economic systems. The USSR reaffirmed its position on those provisions of the Vienna Programme which it regarded as exaggerating the role of external economic factors, particularly foreign private investment. The German Democratic Republic said that some fundamental aspects of the Programme, such as disarmament and development, control of the activities of transnational corporations and technology transfer, were the target of obstructionist tactics by capitalist industrialized countries.

The Republic of Korea hoped that specific proposals for implementing the Programme would be submitted to the Intergovernmental Committee in 1982, giving special attention to human resources development, the linking of such resources to the production system and the strengthening of co-operation among developing countries through the establishment of on-the-job training systems. The Sudan said it was alarmed at the failure of the Intergovernmental Committee to adopt a detailed and comprehensive operational plan.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19; <sup>(2)</sup>DIEC Director-General, A/CN.11/12.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/56, annex, sect. III.G, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 513); <sup>(4)</sup>36/183, sect. I, para. 2.1, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 740). <sup>(5)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37); 2(III), 5 June.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 675.

Proposed amendments to the Programme

The Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development continued in

1981 to consider several topics left unresolved in 1979 when the Vienna Programme of Action was approved. An in-session working group of the whole agreed on five minor provisions to be added to the Programme, but the Committee did not agree on how it should resume consideration of the matter in 1982.

The unresolved issues included aspects of technology transfer, scientific and technological information systems, financial arrangements, and scientific and technological co-operation. A May 1981 report to the Committee by the Secretary-General updated information on action taken by United Nations organizations and bodies in negotiations related to these issues.<sup>(3)</sup>

The five paragraphs on which agreement was reached by the working group provided that: the Financing System for Science and Technology for Development should provide financial resources to supplement national financing capacities; establishment of a Financing System was essential for the scientific and technological development of developing countries; regional financial mechanisms should be considered as important complements to the funding mechanism recommended under the Programme of Action; developed and developing countries should eliminate restrictions on the reproduction and translation of scientific and technical materials; and the implementation of international agreements should be conducted and/or supported by national institutional arrangements.

The Chairman proposed that the General Assembly be asked to add these provisions to the Vienna Programme. Following informal consultations, the Committee, on 5 June, decided to defer consideration of the matter until August.<sup>(1)</sup> In August, Venezuela, on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries, proposed instead that the Committee's 1982 session be extended for one week to be devoted exclusively to the unresolved issues. After the United States objected to such an extension, the Committee, on 31 August, decided to annex the Group of 77 proposal to its report.<sup>(2)</sup> The General Assembly took no action on the matter.

Speaking during the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the Assembly's Second Committee, Japan expressed the view that a one-week extension of the Committee session for the sole purpose of discussing unresolved issues was unnecessary. Similarly, the Ukrainian SSR thought the Committee should settle the outstanding questions at its regular session and should not extend that session or hold special sessions. The United States said it would prefer to see unresolved issues discussed in other forums, without burdening the

Intergovernmental Committee and the Centre for science and technology with additional functions.

Venezuela, on the other hand, expressed concern that several developed countries did not wish to reconsider unresolved issues, the solution of which could not continue to be deferred indefinitely; the Intergovernmental Committee should devote sufficient time to them in 1982.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee, 2(III), 5 June.  
Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee, A/36/37;  
<sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/CN.11/14.

## Financing of science and technology

The two major funding organizations of the United Nations system, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank, continued in 1981 to finance technical co-operation activities in science and technology.

According to an April 1982 report of the Secretary-General to the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development,<sup>(3)</sup> UNDP spent slightly less on science and technology projects in 1981 than in 1980 (\$140,681,000 as compared to \$156,600,000), though the proportion of total expenditures rose from 41 to 51 per cent. Of this amount, expenditures for scientific and technological infrastructure accounted for \$41,689,000, while \$38,398,000 was spent on human resources development, \$36,334,000 on research and development and \$14,320,000 on technology transfer. Expenditures on other programme areas were \$5,222,000 for scientific and technological policies, \$2,566,000 for international co-operation, and \$2,152,000 for scientific and technological information.

UNDP expenditures for scientific and technological projects in various regions were: \$60,670,000 for Asia and the Pacific; \$43,401,000 for Africa; \$9,466,000 for Arab States; \$8,715,000 for Latin America; and \$901,000 for Europe. Global and interregional projects financed by UNDP accounted for \$17,528,000.

Out of total World Bank expenditures of \$979 million for technical co-operation in 1981, amounts spent on technological and human resources development and technology transfer included \$83 million on energy, \$17.7 million on water supply and sewerage, \$14.7 million on industry and \$14 million on transportation. Project lending for scientific and technological education totalled \$490.2 million. Over 9 per cent of the \$3,763 million in Bank lending for agri-

culture and rural development was allocated for research and extension.

In his proposed operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action,<sup>(2)</sup> the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation stated that, with respect to financing science and technology for development (programme area V), developing countries spent an average of 0.38 per cent of their gross national product on research and development, compared with about 2 per cent in developed market-economy countries and 2.8 per cent in centrally planned economies, excluding China.

Activities proposed to rectify this situation included: at the national level, setting targets for scientific and technological financing, reorienting national sources and methods of financing, introducing incentives and disincentives to technology users, involving national financing institutions more deeply in scientific and technological capacity-building, and encouraging transnational corporations (TNCs) to provide research and development financing; and at the regional and international levels, a review of sub-regional sources and mechanisms of financing, consultations with regional financing institutions, and strengthening regional, interregional and international financing mechanisms. Another suggestion was that the impact of external aid on scientific and technological capacity-building be strengthened.

Commenting on this part of the plan, the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology for Development<sup>(1)</sup> suggested that developing countries establish expenditure targets for science and technology efforts in particular fields such as industrialization or food, commensurate with their capacity to absorb new technology. It also suggested studies of the efficiency of external aid for science and technology, the mechanisms through which financial institutions dispersed their aid, and the ways in which TNCs could contribute.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN. 11/19; <sup>(2)</sup>DIEC Director-General, A/CN.11/12; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/CN.11/24.

#### UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development

As the Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development, set up by the General Assembly in 1979,<sup>(3)</sup> was to expire at the end of 1981, long-term arrangements were established by the Assembly in December for the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development. The main objective of the System, as defined by the Assembly in 1979, was the financing of a broad range of activities to strengthen the endogenous scientific

and technological capacities of the developing countries, in particular to assist in implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action.

Recommendations on the structure and framework of the System were made by the Intergovernmental Group of Experts on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development, set up in June 1980 by the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development<sup>(7)</sup> in accordance with a 1979 Assembly decision.<sup>(4)</sup> They were discussed by the Committee in August 1981. In the view of the Group of Experts, the Financing System should be both a channel for the transfer of resources to developing countries and a framework for scientific and technological co-operation to the benefit of all countries.

REPORT OF THE GROUP OF EXPERTS. The 27-member Intergovernmental Group of Experts adopted its report on the Financing System<sup>(1)</sup> at its fourth and final session, held in New York from 8 to 19 June. The Group had held its third session at Geneva from 6 to 16 April.

The Group recommended a target of \$1.2 billion for 1983-1985. Of that amount, \$600 million would constitute the "core" resource component of the System, comprising contributions from Governments in freely convertible currencies, obtained through a mix of assessed contributions and negotiated "instruments of commitment", with three-year subtargets for different groups of countries participating in the System. The assessed portion-no more than 5 per cent of the total to meet administrative costs-would be obtained from all States that joined the System, and would be based on the scale of assessments for the United Nations budget. The remaining \$600-million "non-core" component would be a basket of funds and sources made up of bilateral contributions, contributions in kind, contributions in not-so-freely convertible currencies, private funds, co-financing and complementary sources.

As to the mode of financing, the Group agreed that the System should be authorized to provide loans on concessionary terms as well as grants. The proportion of grants should be a fixed percentage of the annual budget and should be mainly for the least developed countries and a limited number of high-risk research and development projects. Loans with maturities up to 40 years would be the normal mode of financing.

With regard to the institutional structure of the System, the Group recommended that it should comprise three basic elements: the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development as the Governing Body, an Executive Board and a secretariat. The

functions of the Governing Body would include decisions on fundamental policies and priorities, admission of members, election of members of the Executive Board, general review and assessment of activities, decisions on recommended levels of funds to be raised and decisions on the administrative budget. The Executive Board would focus on fund raising, project approval, financial management and monitoring. It would have between 12 and 16 members, reflecting an appropriate balance between developed and developing countries and between donor and recipient countries, and with size of contributions being taken into account in determining representation.

Detailed proposals were made concerning transitional arrangements for 1982 (p. 742), including the establishment of a transitional Executive Board and the setting of a \$200-million target to be raised by voluntary contributions at a pledging conference early in the year. The Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation would oversee preparatory work. The projects and programmes financed by the Interim Fund would be transferred to the Financing System on 1 January 1982, and administrative expenses would be funded from the United Nations regular budget subject to later reimbursement.

The Group proposed that, during the transitional phase, consideration be given to finalizing details of the core and non-core components of the System, including contributions in kind, contributions in not-so-freely convertible currencies, and the precise terms and conditions of financing, including the terms of grants and loans.

Annexed to the Group's report were: an assessment of future funding requirements for some scientific and technological activities in developing countries; an inventory of multilateral and bilateral programmes for providing financial support for scientific and technological activities in developing countries; guidelines for the composition of the transitional Executive Board, prepared by the Group; an overview of the Group's membership and work; and letters exchanged between the expert from the USSR and the Group Chairman. In his letter, the USSR member said he could not support the Group's recommendations because they did not reflect the principle of voluntary participation.

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.** In August, at a resumed third session of the Intergovernmental Committee convened mainly to consider the Financing System, the Group of 77 submitted a proposal on long-term arrangements for the System, outlining guiding principles, general economic provisions, forms of operation, structure and transitional arrangements.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Group of 77 proposed that all members should contribute to the System in a manner consistent with their capacities as well as the asymmetry of the technological capacity between developed and developing countries, and should participate collectively in the direction of the System and the administration of its resources. Agreeing with the \$1.2-billion target suggested by the Group of Experts for 1983-1985, the proposal provided that the core resources of \$600 million be composed of assessed contributions and grants in freely convertible currencies, obtained through "instruments of commitment", and that the target for the core component be established by the Intergovernmental Committee, as the Governing Body, at intervals of not less than three years. The instruments of commitment would constitute the collective agreement between developed and developing countries to contribute to the System, the details to be worked out during the transitional period. The assessed contributions, as well as the administrative expenses of the System, should not exceed 5 per cent of the core resources.

The concept and methods of obtaining the non-core resources, including the issue of contributions in kind and not-so-freely convertible currencies, would be studied in detail by the transitional Executive Board, with a target established by the Intergovernmental Committee at intervals of not less than three years.

Concerning the operation and structure of the System, as well as arrangements for the transitional period, the Group of 77 proposal contained recommendations similar to those by the Group of Experts.

The Intergovernmental Committee, on 31 August,<sup>(6)</sup> took note of the report of the Group of Experts and decided to transmit it to the General Assembly together with the comments made in the Committee. It annexed the Group of 77 proposal to its report and requested the Assembly to decide on the long-term arrangements.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 17 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly decided to establish long-term arrangements for the Financing System, to become operative on 1 January 1982. Among the guiding principles for the System were that it would finance a broad range of activities to strengthen the endogenous capacities of developing countries, within the framework of the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action (p. 734); all member States would contribute funds in a manner consistent with their capacities, and all would participate in the System's direction. The Assembly designated 1982 as the transitional year for the System and requested the Secretary-General to convene a Pledging Conference. It set up an Ad Hoc Intergovern-

mental Group on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development, open to all States, to submit recommendations to the Intergovernmental Committee in 1982 on institutional, organizational and financial arrangements. The resources, organization and management of the Interim Fund were to be transferred to the System (p. 742).

The resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 7 December. The draft was submitted by a Vice-Chairman as a result of informal consultations.

Explaining the position of the member States of the European Community (EC), the United Kingdom said they welcomed the consensus on the System, even if important aspects remained to be worked out the following year. Poland, speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, voiced doubts about the usefulness of establishing an ad hoc group to consider a matter that could be dealt with by the Intergovernmental Committee, but said they had decided not to oppose it on the understanding that no significant additional expenditure would be involved. The United States expressed its understanding that secretariat expenses for the Ad Hoc Group should be met from available resources.

During debate in the Second Committee on development and international economic co-operation, several countries, including the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Nigeria, Romania, the Syrian Arab Republic and the Ukrainian SSR, expressed regret that no agreement had been reached earlier in 1981 on the establishment of a long-term financing system. Democratic Yemen believed that the policies of the capitalist countries preventing its establishment were slowing progress in the developing countries. The Sudan feared that lack of agreement would mean a break in the execution and follow-up of many projects, with serious consequences particularly for African countries.

Ecuador viewed the Financing System as indispensable for mobilizing international financial resources. Egypt said the commitment of States to the Vienna Programme of Action must become effective through the establishment of the System.

Mexico recalled that a group of countries headed by Tunisia had been pursuing efforts to establish a financing system by organizing a series of goodwill missions and consultations with both developing and developed countries; the result of the first phase of that process had been the Caracas Declaration of October 1981,

by which 20 developing countries had reaffirmed their commitment to establishing a financing system with initial funding of \$1 billion within three to five years. Supporting this initiative, Senegal said it had increased the awareness of States at the highest level with regard to the need for a long-term financing system.

Support for the views and recommendations of the Group of Experts on long-term arrangements for the System was expressed by a number of States, including Austria, Chile and Sri Lanka. New Zealand regarded the Group's report as innovative and constructive, and hoped the international community would agree to increase its efforts in science and technology for development. Others, such as Egypt, India, Kenya and Madagascar, favoured discussions on the basis of the Group of 77 proposal in the Intergovernmental Committee.

Several speakers, including China, the Congo, Romania, the Syrian Arab Republic and Tunisia, expressed the hope that the long-term Financing System would soon be established, preferably in 1982. Argentina thought the idea of transitional arrangements might facilitate agreement in principle that would make possible the immediate initiation of the System. The Philippines thought that, because of uncertainties, severe budget cutbacks and difficulties in obtaining contributions, the interim arrangement might have to be continued for some time.

Japan said that, in view of the complexity and diversity of the problems touched on by the Group of Experts, there was no time at the 1981 Assembly session to arrive at an arrangement acceptable to all parties; a temporary transitional arrangement should be considered, possibly in the shape of a one-year extension of the Interim Fund. The United States thought continuation of the Interim Fund into 1982 would be the best choice for the time being, pending consultations among Governments in 1982 on approaches other than that taken by the Group of Experts.

Concerning the organization of the System, Norway, speaking for the five Nordic States, expressed the opinion that existing organizations and institutions should be used as far as possible and co-operation with UNDP should be maintained; it would be premature to consider new arrangements before agreement was reached on financing. The EC members considered that the institutional arrangements should not prejudice the role of UNDP in relation to the operational activities of the United Nations system.

With regard to financial arrangements for the System, the EC members, the German Democratic Republic, Japan, the Ukrainian SSR, the United States and others emphasized that they must be based strictly on voluntary contributions. Japan stressed the importance of setting a

realistic target figure and said it could not accept the idea of negotiated instruments of commitment as proposed by the Group of Experts. Austria, on the other hand, regarded that idea as a significant improvement over the Interim Fund's dependence on voluntary contributions. Speaking for the Nordic States, Norway expressed the view that any financing system should be based on predictability and burden-sharing; the experience of the Interim Fund had shown that voluntary contributions could not be relied upon unless they were co-ordinated.

The Republic of Korea urged both developed and capital-surplus developing countries to contribute willingly. In the view of the Ukrainian SSR, additional funds for scientific and technological development could be obtained only through the release of resources being expended on the arms race.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Group of Experts, A/CN. 11/21; <sup>(2)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee, A/36/37.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>34/218, sect. VI.D and annex, 19 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 646); <sup>(4)</sup>ibid., sect. VI.D, para. 8 (b) (p. 647); <sup>(5)</sup>36/183, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

<sup>(6)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee: 4(III), 31 Aug.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1980, p. 679.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 46 (24 Sep-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/183

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.5) without vote, 7 December (meeting 46); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.144), resulting from informal consultations; agenda item 69 (e).

#### United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development

The General/Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation.

Recalling a/so its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, in particular paragraph 36 thereof in which the General Assembly provided that the international community would implement the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development principally in order to strengthen the scientific and technological capacities of developing countries, to restructure the existing pattern of international scientific and technological relations and to strengthen the role of the United Nations system in science and technology and the provision of increased financial resources,

Recalling further the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development adopted by the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development,

Recalling the urgent need to develop and strengthen the endogenous scientific and technological capacities of the developing countries in order to enable them to apply science and technology to their own development with a view to the elimination of the existing inequality between developed and developing countries in science and technology,

Reaffirming the need to strengthen further the role of the United Nations system in the field of science and technology through, *inter alia*, new and substantial resources in addition to those which already exist.

Recognizing the need to define specific and concrete proposals for action designed to strengthen the effectiveness of the United Nations system, with particular emphasis on the strengthening of the scientific and technological capacities of the developing countries.

Recalling its resolution 34/218 of 19 December 1979, in which it decided to establish a United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development,

Recalling further its decision that the long-term arrangements for the Financing System should start in 1982 and that the establishment of interim arrangements should not prejudice the ultimate decision with regard to long-term arrangements.

Taking note of the report of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development, concerning the report of the Intergovernmental Group of Experts on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development,

Considering that, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 34/218, the United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development shall be terminated on 31 December 1981,

Reaffirming the role of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development, as specified in General Assembly resolution 34/218,

1. Decides to establish, in accordance with the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development and General Assembly resolution 34/1218, long-term arrangements for the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development, which will become operative on 1 January 1982;

2. Decides that the guiding principles of the Financing System shall be as follows:

1. The Financing System shall, at the request of Governments, finance a broad range of activities intended to strengthen the endogenous scientific and technological capacities of developing countries. Adequate resources should be allocated to the various activities identified in the Vienna Programme of Action, including national, sub-regional, regional, interregional and international activities. Particular attention should be paid to the implementation of different types of projects and programmes of direct relevance to developing countries. Those activities should be complementary to bilateral and multilateral programmes for science and technology and supportive of the national efforts of developing countries. Due attention should be given to effective co-ordination of activities of the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system in science and technology for development. The operational plan for the implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action, due to be completed by concrete and specific action proposals by the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development at its fourth session, including the areas of concentration as adopted by the Committee at its third session, will constitute the general framework for the activities of the Financing System.

2. In determining the nature and level of the resources of the Financing System, the following considerations should be taken into account:

(a) Asymmetry of the technological capacity between developed and developing countries;

(b) Need for predictability and continuous flow of financial resources;

(c) Need for substantial resources in addition to those that currently exist within the United Nations system;

(d) Need for untied external resources for the scientific and technological development of the developing countries.



3. The Financing System shall be a vehicle for the mobilization, co-ordination, channelling and disbursement of financial resources. The Financing System should be organized on a voluntary and universal basis, open to the participation of all States as full members. The resources of the Financing System will be constituted by contributions from States and through financial arrangements which the Financing System may enter into with International, regional and other public and private financial institutions. All member States should contribute to the Financing System in a manner consistent with their capacities. All member States should participate in the direction of the Financing System.

4. The Financing System should be endowed with an amount of resources to be agreed upon and contributed by participating countries in order to provide a stable base for its operations and should have the flexibility needed to attract resources from various sources.

5. In determining the forms of operation of the Financing System the experience gained in the operation of the United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development should be taken into account.

3. Takes note with great interest of the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Group of Experts on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development and, in particular, notes that, in accordance with the criteria set forth in section VI, paragraph 3, of General Assembly resolution 34/218, the core resources of the Financing System should amount to \$200 million per annum for the period 1983-1985;

4. Decides that the institutional arrangements should be determined, *inter alia*, in the light of the magnitude of the financial resources and the nature of operations of the Financing System;

5. Further decides that those institutional arrangements shall be agreed during the transitional year, 1982, in accordance with the relevant provisions of section II of the present resolution;

## II

1. Decides that the year 1982 shall be considered the transitional period of the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to convene a Pledging Conference for the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development in the first quarter of 1982 to receive pledges for the transitional year and, in that context, urges all States to make generous contributions, bearing in mind the recommendations in that regard of the Intergovernmental Group of Experts on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development;

3. Decides that, without prejudice to the final agreement on the long-term institutional and financial arrangements for the Financing System, the general operational provisions of the United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development, including its resources, organization and management, as well as the procedures set forth in the annex to General Assembly resolution 34/218, will apply and be transferred to the Financing System during the transitional period;

4. Decides that an Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Group on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development, open to the participation of all States, should hold two sessions, the first, lasting one week, from 1 to 5 March 1982, the second, lasting two weeks, from 12 to 23 April 1982, and further decides that the time before and between those sessions should be fully utilized for consultations in order to ensure the successful conclusion of the work of the Group;

5. Urges Governments to ensure that representation at those two sessions shall be at a high level and include experts in the field of finance;

6. Requests the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Group to pre-

pare its recommendations on the institutional, organizational and financial arrangements for the Financing System and to submit them to the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development at its fourth session;

7. Requests the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development to submit its recommendations, through the Economic and Social Council, to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session for consideration and decision.

## Secretariat of the Financing System

By a resolution of 17 December 1981, adopted without vote, the General Assembly authorized the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to approve further increases in the staff and other resources of the Financing System up to levels proposed by the Administrator of UNDP.<sup>(1)</sup>

His proposal, submitted by the Secretary-General in December to the Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, was that administrative and support costs be raised from \$1,145,140 for the Interim Fund in 1981 to \$1,892,115 for the Financing System in 1982, to be increased to a maximum of \$2,700,000 if the level of 1982 contributions warranted. This would allow for two additional posts at the start of the year, raising the complement to 23 posts, and for up to 19 more should circumstances warrant.

The Committee approved the resolution without vote on 14 December, as orally proposed by the Chairman.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/184, 17 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.5/36/99/Add.1; S-G statements, A/C.2/36/L.145, A/C.5/36/99 & Add.2 (of draft by 2nd Committee Vice-Chairman, A/C.2/36/L.144).

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.74 (14 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/184

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/827) without vote, 14 December (meeting 74): draft orally proposed by Chairman; agenda items 69 (e) and 100.

## Secretariat of the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development

The General Assembly,

Having noted the proposal of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme for the 1982 administrative budget of the secretariat of the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development and the related oral report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions,

Authorizes the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to approve further increases in the staff and other resources of the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development up to the levels indicated in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the proposal of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, after the Pledging Conference to be held in 1982, in the light of requests made by the Administrator and of information on the expected level of operations each time such a request is made.

#### UN Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development

The United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development, established by the General Assembly in 1979 to finance scientific and technological activities until the establishment of a long-term financing system,<sup>(1)</sup> became operational in May 1980<sup>(3)</sup> and ended its operations on 31 December 1981 with a transfer of resources to the Financing System as authorized by the Assembly on 17 December.<sup>(2)</sup>

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>34/218, sect. VI.D and annex, 19 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 646); <sup>(2)</sup>36/183, sect. II, para. 3, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 741).  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 678.

#### Activities of the Fund

In its 19 months of operation through 31 December 1981, and despite financial constraints, the Interim Fund received and reviewed 800 proposals and project concepts, and approved 65 projects from developing countries, costing over \$35 million.

The regional distribution of the projects approved was: Asia and the Pacific, 32 per cent; Africa, 31 per cent; Latin America and the Caribbean, 21 per cent; and Arab States, 12 per cent. In addition, there were three interregional projects (4 per cent). The Fund provided financing for national projects in 18 African countries, 13 Asian countries, 10 Latin American countries and 8 Arab States. Of the projects approved, 49 per cent were government executed; the rest were to be carried out by United Nations organizations.

Of the 65 projects approved, 25 were for research and development, 15 for science and technology policy, 9 for scientific and technological infrastructure, 7 for human resources development, 6 for technology transfer, and 3 fell in the area of scientific and technological information.

Expenditures of the Fund in 1981 totalled \$5,711,364 against income of \$17,924,915, mostly from Governments (see below).

A summary of the operations of the Interim Fund up to its termination on 31 December 1981 was given in a report of the UNDP Administrator in consultation with the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, submitted to the Intergovernmental Committee in May 1982.<sup>(1)</sup>

During the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, Egypt expressed the view that the Interim Fund had worked effectively and that, for reasons of continuity, projects already approved or appraised by the Fund should be carried out.

The Philippines said it had been impressed by the Fund's utilization of national expertise and government execution of projects.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Administrator in consultation with DIEC Director-General, A/CN.11/28.

#### Transitional arrangements

In order to ensure an orderly transition of the functions and responsibilities of the Interim Fund to the Financing System, the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), on 23 June 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> authorized the UNDP Administrator to arrange for: the transfer of assets, resources and commitments; the acceptance of additional pledges and payment of past pledges; if needed, continued administration and monitoring of approved projects and approval of new ones; and extension of contracts of Interim Fund staff beyond 31 December. The Administrator was authorized to assist the Financing System in the preparation of articles of agreement, a prospectus and other documents.

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 17 December on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development, <sup>(1)</sup> decided that, without prejudice to the final agreement on long-term arrangements for the System, the general operational provisions of the Interim Fund, including its resources, organization, management and procedures, would be applied and transferred to the Financing System during the transitional period of 1982. The Assembly also decided that, in determining the forms of operation of the System, the experience gained in the operation of the Fund should be taken into account.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/183, 17 Dec. (p. 740). Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/9, 23 June.

#### Contributions to the Fund

Cash on hand in the Interim Fund for 1980 and 1981 amounted to \$25,168,569, of which Governments paid \$23,215,172 out of the target of \$250 million fixed by the General Assembly in 1979.<sup>(1)</sup> Of this amount, 33 countries paid \$16,239,979 in 1981 (see table opposite).

On 5 June 1981, the Intergovernmental Committee noted with deep concern that the amounts pledged to the Fund were about one sixth of the target and that only a fraction of pledges had been paid, as a result of which it had not been possible to support a number of important proposals from many developing countries to strengthen their scientific and technological capabilities.<sup>(3)</sup>

As decided by the General Assembly in its resolution of 17 December on the Financing

System,<sup>(2)</sup> the balance of resources remaining at the end of the interim period (\$26,106,398 paid or pledged during 1980-1981 less expenditures) was transferred to the Financing System on 1 January 1982. The Assembly also decided that a Pledging Conference be convened in the first quarter of 1982 for the transitional year of the Financing System. By the end of 1981, 17 countries had pledged the equivalent of \$2,011,784 for 1982.

Speaking during the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, a number of countries, including China, the Congo, Indonesia, the Sudan, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, expressed regret that the target had not been reached. Guinea contrasted the amount pledged to the Fund with the fact that 500,000 scientists throughout the world were reportedly engaged in military research. Indonesia urged that financial commitments be met so that the technology gap would not be indefinitely perpetuated.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTERIM FUND FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT, 1981 AND 1982

(as at 31 December 1981; In US dollar equivalent)

country	1981 payment	1982 pledge
Argentina	250,000	-
Austria	1,000,000	-
Bangladesh	2,000	2,000
Bhutan	-	1,000
Botswana	-	1,143
Chile	20,000	-
Cuba	74,830	-
Denmark	774,648	774,648
Egypt	17,143	6,085
Fiji	1,000	1,000
Finland	919,540	930,233
France	-	176,991
Greece	50,000	-
Guinea	5,006	-
Guyana	2,667	2,684
Honduras	2,000	2,000
India	(51,883)	-
Indonesia	12,029	12,000
Italy	6,584,362	-
Jamaica	7,964	-
Jordan	15,000	17,000
Malawi	1,000	1,000
Netherlands	914,478	-
Nigeria	250,000	-
Norway	1,941,747	-
Pakistan	20,202	-
Papua New Guinea	-	1,500
Republic of Korea	30,000	-
Samoa	2,000	-
Seychelles	-	500
Sierra Leone	5,000	-
Singapore	1,000	-
Sweden	2,500,000	-
Switzerland	431,341	-
Thailand	-	25,000
Tunisia	98,275	-
United Republic of Tanzania	3,685	-
Venezuela	100,000	-
Yugoslavia	200,000	-
Zambia	54,845	57,000
Total	16,239,979	2,011,784

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>34/218, sect. VI.D, para. 8 (d), 19 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 647); <sup>(2)</sup>36/183, sect. II, paras. 2 & 3, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 741). <sup>(3)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37): 3(III), sect. II, 5 June.

## Activities of the UN system

The assistance provided by the United Nations system in connection with the eight major programme areas of the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development (p. 734) was described by the Secretary-General in his first annual report on the topic, submitted in May 1981 to the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development.<sup>(4)</sup> A similar report presented in April 1982 covered 1981 activities.<sup>(5)</sup> The Secretary-General also presented to the General Assembly in May 1981 a study of the efficiency of the United Nations system in this field (p. 750).<sup>(3)</sup>

In addition, the report to the Committee by the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, proposing the operational plan,<sup>(2)</sup> contained specific suggestions for new or expanded activities in each of the eight areas, including financing (p. 737) and technology transfer (p. 753). Comments on each area were made in February by the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology for Development.<sup>(1)</sup> After reviewing these reports, the Intergovernmental Committee, on 5 June, identified areas of concentration in each programme area except financing.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19; <sup>(2)</sup>DIEC Director-General, A/CN.11/12; S-G, <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/240, <sup>(4)</sup>A/CN.11/18, <sup>(5)</sup>A/CN.11/24.

## Science and technology policy

Activities of the United Nations system in regard to scientific and technological policies and plans for development (programme area I of the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action), described in the Secretary-General's reports to the Intergovernmental Committee,<sup>(4)</sup> included studies on aspects of scientific and technological development, containing information on policy-making bodies and normative discussions on how to formulate policy; assistance in establishing such bodies; early identification and assessment of technological trends and breakthroughs; training of personnel for policy-making and -implementation; identification of methods for establishing policy priorities; and regional meetings of science and technology ministers and other officials.

In his study of the efficiency of the United Nations system in the field of science and

technology,<sup>(3)</sup> submitted to the General Assembly in May 1981, the Secretary-General analysed the Programme in Science and Technology Policy conducted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The Programme encompassed expert missions, fellowships, studies, the compilation and publication of statistics, and the organization of regional meetings, especially a series of ministerial-level conferences on the application of science and technology to development. The study found that the Programme had met with only limited success in building the scientific and technological capacities of developing countries, that the results of technical co-operation had been disappointing, and that the ministerial conferences had been of doubtful benefit when compared with the cost and effort of preparing them. It favoured closer integration of UNESCO activities with projects of the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme.

The operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme<sup>(2)</sup> contained suggestions for improving policy-making and planning, and institutional arrangements for policy formulation and policy implementation; the establishment of an "advance monitoring system" on scientific and technological developments; country studies on the relationship between science and technology and development; training of specialists for policy, planning and management; international co-operation in policy formulation and implementation; and support in methods and analytical techniques, including indicators and statistics of scientific and technological development, an information exchange and reference system on publications and documents, and the development and diffusion of methods and techniques for planning and programming.

The Advisory Committee, in its comments on the operational plan,<sup>(1)</sup> said that emphasis should be given to training of policy and planning officials through "learning-by-doing" programmes. Special attention should be paid to developing scientific capabilities which could provide the proper knowledge base on which to construct technology policies. Case studies were needed to analyse successful and unsuccessful attempts to develop and apply science and technology policies in developing countries.

The Intergovernmental Committee, on 5 June, specified three areas of concentration for activities of the United Nations system in connection with scientific and technological policies and plans for development: provision of advisory services to national science and technology agencies and institutions; early identification and assessment of new scientific and technological developments which might adversely affect de-

velopment as well as those of specific and potential importance for development and for strengthening the scientific and technological capacity of developing countries; and support in methods and analytical techniques, by providing indicators and statistics to facilitate the definition of national targets.<sup>(5)</sup>

Reports <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19; <sup>(2)</sup>DIEC Director-General, A/CN.11/12; S-G, <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/240, <sup>(4)</sup>A/CN.11/18 & 24.

Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 2(III), para. 2 (d), programme area I, 5 June.

#### Assessment of levels of scientific and technological attainment

A report on levels of attainment of scientific and technological development among different countries, prepared by the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation with the assistance of the Executive Director of the United Nations Centre for Science and Technology for Development,<sup>(2)</sup> was transmitted by the Secretary-General in April 1981 to the Intergovernmental Committee. The report, prepared in accordance with a June 1980 request by the Committee,<sup>(4)</sup> concluded that, in view of the difficulties in precisely assessing levels of attainment in science and technology in relation to development, current efforts were limited mostly to compilation of statistics not sufficiently refined to provide a comparative basis for analysis. It recommended that measurement of levels of attainment, including development of criteria and indicators, should be undertaken by the Centre.

Commenting on this recommendation, the Advisory Committee stated that a study on the topic would be useful. However, as many developing countries were not in a position to provide reliable data, it recommended that, initially, information be collected which was readily available, easy to assemble and reliable. As a first step, the Secretariat might concentrate on methodological studies to facilitate assessment of the levels of attainment on a continuous basis, and the attention of Governments might be drawn to the usefulness of undertaking national and regional studies.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Intergovernmental Committee, on 5 June,<sup>(3)</sup> decided to consider the report further at its 1982 session. It requested the Director-General, assisted by the Centre's Executive Director, to submit a separate report on the activities of other United Nations bodies, in particular UNESCO and the regional commissions.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19; <sup>(2)</sup>DIEC Director-General, transmitted by S-G note, A/CN.11/13.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 3(III), sect. V, 5 June.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 676.

## Future studies

The Intergovernmental Committee, on 5 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> referred to the Advisory Committee the question of science and technology and the future, including a 1979 report of the Working Group on Science and Technology and the Future presented to the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development.<sup>(2)</sup>

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 3(III), sect. IV, para. 7, 5 June.  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1979, p. 640.

## Scientific and technological infrastructure

Various United Nations agencies were helping developing countries to establish national and regional centres for technology and had supported activities of existing centres, the Secretary-General noted in his reports to the Intergovernmental Committee on activities of the United Nations system in science and technology.<sup>(4)</sup> Describing activities in connection with the creation and strengthening of scientific and technological infrastructure (programme area II of the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action), the reports also mentioned programmes to set up self-help organizations in rural areas; assistance to small and medium-scale industries, with emphasis on strengthening planning and managerial skills; and support to research and training centres, scientific and engineering organizations and professional associations.

In his study of the efficiency of the United Nations system in the field of science and technology,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General cited the initiation by the World Health Organization of research and development programmes in tropical diseases and human reproduction as an indication of effectiveness in responding to changing needs. With regard to nuclear science, he suggested an inter-agency review that would enable the International Atomic Energy Agency to focus its technical assistance on institution-building.

The operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme<sup>(2)</sup> proposed a set of activities to assist policy and planning machinery, educational and training institutions, research, design and development organizations, and scientific and technological services. These proposals included: assessment of complementary scientific and technological functions of educational and training institutions; support to centres for the development of educational and training materials; compilation of a directory of common training facilities and feasibility studies on sharing facilities; identification of subject areas for advanced regional and international re-

search and development centres, and feasibility studies for networks of such centres; support for professional and popular societies; and assistance to standardization and quality control services and maintenance facilities.

The Advisory Committee recommended <sup>(1)</sup> that special attention be paid to the least developed countries, which lacked resources to develop even a minimum range of science and technology institutions. It also emphasized the role of extension services, and felt that the establishment of advanced research and development centres should be encouraged. In addition, incentives should be applied to encourage innovation and provide motivation to scientists and technologists of developing countries.

The Intergovernmental Committee, on 5 June 1981, identified seven areas of concentration in relation to infrastructure: pure research and basic scientific knowledge; upgrading of traditional technologies and promotion of their dissemination among developing countries; popularization; assessment of assistance received and needed by national agencies and institutions; identification of needs for advanced research and development facilities; support and guidelines for maintenance facilities; and interactive participation of national centres and scientific and technical units.<sup>(5)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19; <sup>(2)</sup>DIEC Director-General, A/CN.11/12; S-G, <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/240, <sup>(4)</sup>A/CN.11/8 & 24.

Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 2(III), para. 2 (d), programme area II, 5 June.

## Human resources development

Education and training of personnel in science and technology were carried out by several United Nations organizations, the Secretary-General pointed out in his reports to the Intergovernmental Committee on activities of the United Nations system.<sup>(4)</sup> In relation to the development of human resources for science and technology (programme area IV of the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action), various programmes dealt with manpower policy and planning, educational planning, vocational training and guidance, and continuing education and training. Specific activities included seminars and workshops, fellowship programmes, publication of training manuals, and studies on the brain drain (p. 757).

The Secretary-General's study of the efficiency of the United Nations system in science and technology<sup>(3)</sup> stated that the International Centre for Theoretical Physics, at Trieste, Italy, had had a valuable impact on the post-doctoral training and support of physicists in developing countries; 1,431 scientists had participated in

1980, of whom 792 had been from developing countries. The International Centre for Advanced Technical and Vocational Training, at Turin, Italy, had had 3,357 participants from 117 developing countries between 1 January 1978 and 31 July 1980. Some 175 meetings of interest to scientists from developing countries were held by the United Nations system each year, but the study found that greater efforts were needed to inform such scientists about those activities.

The operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme,<sup>(2)</sup> in its proposals on human resources development, included various activities to promote in-school and out-of-school education and training, including professional updating, post-graduate work and curricula development. It also suggested the expansion of education and training abroad. Other proposed activities covered manpower planning and policy-making, enhancing the role of women in scientific and technological development, reversing the brain drain, helping countries obtain foreign personnel through recruitment services, and building an awareness in developed countries of the role of developing countries in international scientific and technological development.

The Advisory Committee, in its comments on this programme area,<sup>(1)</sup> saw an urgent need for short- and medium-term activities, including programmes for learning-by-doing, in-service and pre-service training, and training of research and development managers. It suggested a study of the problems involved in planning a balanced distribution of persons educated in science and technology. It also urged special activities for first-generation learners whose parents had not had formal education, early recognition and continuous cultivation of special talents, the creation and strengthening of professional institutions, and measures to reverse the rural-urban migration of trained personnel.

The Intergovernmental Committee, on 5 June 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> identified two areas of concentration related to human resources development: scientific, technical and vocational education and training; and elimination of causes of the brain drain, utilization of the expertise of expatriate nationals, and provision of incentives for the return of scientists and skilled personnel.

During the debate on science and technology for development in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, Kenya stated that real technology transfer was unattainable unless training was carried out in developing rather than developed countries.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19; <sup>(2)</sup>DIEC Director-General, A/CN.11/12; S-G, <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/240, <sup>(4)</sup>A/CN.11/18 & 24.

Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 2(III), para.2 (d), programme area IV, 5 June.

#### Scientific and technological information

Most United Nations agencies had established specialized information services or systems, some of international importance, the Secretary-General pointed out in his reports to the Intergovernmental Committee on activities of the United Nations system in science and technology.<sup>(4)</sup> Describing activities related to scientific and technological information (programme area VI of the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action), the reports noted that United Nations organizations had also helped in the establishment and management of national information capabilities by issuing guidelines, organizing meetings, promoting the design and development of information systems and services, introducing new information technologies and developing training programmes for information specialists. Other activities included the publication of guidelines, manuals and directories to information sources, and the issuance of reports on information transfer.

The Secretary-General's study of the efficiency of the United Nations system in science and technology<sup>(3)</sup> assessed some of these activities, with emphasis on the General Information Programme of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, designed to provide a conceptual framework for the establishment of national and international scientific and technological information systems and services. The report noted that this and other systems, established on the understanding that most potential users were in industrialized countries, had shifted their priorities and budgets so as to concentrate on well-funded projects aimed at meeting the needs of developing countries.

The operational plan<sup>(2)</sup> suggested three areas in which Governments might act, with assistance from the United Nations system. First, to improve access to and availability of information sources, it proposed action to promote access to bibliographical sources, increase the availability and supply of documents, and provide access to know-how information. Second, it urged the establishment and management of national information capabilities, including national information systems and networks, extension services with links to the productive sector, and the creation and strengthening of problem-oriented information and advisory services. Third, to promote the use of information for national development, it suggested programmes to educate and train information users and to promote scientific and technological information among policy-makers, the scientific and engineering community and the public. Beyond the national level, it proposed support for regional systems and the

establishment of a global and international network for information exchange.

In the Advisory Committee's opinion,<sup>(1)</sup> national science and technology information systems should be established as an integral part of national development plans, permitting feedback from users to scientists and technologists and encouraging systematic subregional, regional and international co-operation. Caution must be taken to avoid information pollution caused by the flow of unnecessary or unusable information, thereby reducing the effectiveness of the system and diminishing a country's absorptive capacity.

The Intergovernmental Committee, on 5 June 1981, identified five areas of concentration related to scientific and technological information: problem-oriented information and advisory services; establishment of a global network of information systems based on the establishment and strengthening of national systems and the improvement of existing international systems and data banks; strengthening of subregional and regional information systems; access to and availability of information sources; and inclusion of information from developing countries in the global information system.<sup>(5)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, E/CN.11/19; <sup>(2)</sup>DIEC Director-General, A/CN.11/12; S-G, <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/240, <sup>(4)</sup>A/CN.11/18 & 24.

Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 2(III), para. 2 (d), programme area VI, 5 June.

#### Research and development

Activities by the United Nations system to strengthen research and development in and for developing countries and their linkage to the production system (programme area VII of the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action) were described by the Secretary-General in reports to the Intergovernmental Committee on the activities of the system in science and technology.<sup>(4)</sup> The reports mentioned research in such areas as water, energy, food and agriculture, health services and disease control, and industrial development. Extension services, pilot plants and information dissemination were components of many United Nations programmes. Assistance was given in strengthening linkages between higher educational institutions, professional organizations and the production system. Programmes to develop managerial and technical capabilities included some designed to provide the expertise to transfer, adapt and develop technologies and products. Links between research institutes in developing and developed countries were being promoted.

The Secretary-General's study of the efficiency of the United Nations system in science and

technology<sup>(3)</sup> cited estimates that the system committed about \$45 million a year to the support of research institutes in developing countries, compared to the \$3 billion which they were estimated to have spent on research and development in 1976. It found that, while the system had evolved extensive programmes in the agricultural sciences, results in industrial research had been disappointing. The limited funds and modest planning efforts had proved no match for the scale and complexity of the industrial technologies. The study also suggested that higher priority be accorded to strengthening consulting engineering design organizations in developing countries.

The operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme<sup>(2)</sup> proposed a number of activities in this area, under four headings.

First, to promote research and development and strengthen the ability to carry out research, it suggested the formulation and execution of national programmes and projects, the development of regional programmes in critical areas for development and the conduct of training programmes on advanced research techniques. Second, it suggested that closer links between research and development and production be promoted by improving the service orientation of research and development institutions, strengthening engineering and consulting services linked to applied research and development centres, establishing extension services, promoting linkages with the informal sector, setting up pilot plants and pioneer projects, strengthening linkages between universities and the production system, establishing mechanisms to commercialize technologies and technological services offered by developing countries, and promoting an exchange of experience among developing countries in linking research and development to the production system.

Third, the operational plan proposed that research and development activities and greater capability in the production system be promoted through fiscal and other incentives and through management training programmes. Fourth, to enable developed countries to contribute to the strengthening of research and development in developing countries, it suggested that twinning and other co-operative arrangements be established between institutions and programmes, that consortia of institutions on topics of concern to developing countries be established, and that developed countries increase their support for research and development on such topics.

The Advisory Committee, commenting on this area of the plan,<sup>(1)</sup> suggested that developing countries analyse their untapped industrial and agricultural potential and assess what could be

done at current levels of science and technology capability. To strengthen the bridge between research and the production system, a system of incentives should be offered to researchers, and the roles of universities, industrial research associations and small groups of specialized entrepreneurs should be explored. Regional networks of research institutions should be encouraged and United Nations training activities should be linked with those of non-governmental scientific organizations. The creation and strengthening of engineering and consultancy services as well as extension services should be stressed. The Committee suggested that consortia of institutions from developed and developing countries be created to help establish research centres for specific programme areas in the least developed countries.

The Intergovernmental Committee, in establishing on 5 June 1981 the areas of concentration for the operational plan, selected two areas with regard to research and development: promotion of closer links between research and development and production, and promotion of research and development activities and greater technological capability in the productive system.<sup>(5)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup> Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19; <sup>(2)</sup> DIEC Director-General, A/CN.11/12; S-G, <sup>(3)</sup> A/36/240, <sup>(4)</sup> A/CN.11/18 & 24.

Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup> Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 2(III), para. 2 (d), programme area VII, 5 June.

#### International co-operation

United Nations organizations were directing considerable efforts to strengthening co-operation in science and technology among developing countries and between developing and developed countries (programme area VIII of the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme), according to reports by the Secretary-General to the Intergovernmental Committee on the science and technology activities of the United Nations system.<sup>(4)</sup> Such activities at the regional level included the establishment of technology centres, the promotion of visits and meetings for exchanging and reviewing experience in technical fields, the organization of symposia and seminars, and the provision of scholarships and fellowships. Interregional links among technology centres were promoted. Several programmes encouraged co-operation between individual enterprises in developed and developing countries. Co-operative global activities included smallpox eradication, air navigation and safety programmes and the World Weather Watch, as well as international conferences.

In his study of the efficiency of the United Nations system in science and technology,<sup>(3)</sup> the

Secretary-General concluded that many international scientific programmes and meetings were still oriented towards developed countries' science. Greater efforts were needed to assist the many developing countries having scientists but without effective organizations to participate in international scientific activity.

The operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action<sup>(2)</sup> proposed a number of measures to strengthen co-operation among developing countries and between them and developed countries. The first area encompassed: communication and information exchange, through strengthening policy and institutional support for intercountry co-operation, diversifying channels of communication, enhancing the scope and depth of information exchange, and holding seminars and other meetings; strengthening the capacity of institutions and enterprises to perform internationally, through co-operation between them, developing models of co-operative arrangements, legal and financial arrangements for co-operation in research and development, joint acquisition of technology, promotion of joint ventures, strengthening the multinational scope of national institutions, and co-operation between commodity groups; and co-operation in development projects with significant scientific and technological content.

With regard to co-operation between developing and developed countries, the plan proposed measures to increase the flow of information, to develop forms and institutional arrangements for co-operation (intergovernmental agreements, promotional measures to support co-operation among enterprises and institutions), and to orient and intensify co-operation through preferential treatment of the least developed countries and broadening the range of co-operating partners.

The Advisory Committee, commenting on this part of the operational plan,<sup>(1)</sup> suggested that, whenever possible, new co-operative activities be generated and maintained through existing regional and subregional mechanisms, both intergovernmental and non-governmental; and that mechanisms be devised capable of sustaining co-operation even during intervals of conflict among the partners.

In its resolution of 5 June 1981 on the operational plan, the Intergovernmental Committee established six areas of concentration in regard to international co-operation in science and technology: communication and exchange of information; strengthening the capacity of institutions and enterprises of developing countries to perform internationally; intergovernmental agreements for co-operation; strengthening co-



operation between developed and developing countries in the application of science and technology to development; assessment and support of programmes of technical co-operation among developing countries (see below); and technology transfer among developing countries.<sup>(5)</sup>

Speaking in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee during the debate on development and international economic co-operation, Egypt said co-operation among developing countries should not be enhanced at the expense of co-operation between them and developed countries. Mongolia thought it important to develop mutually profitable co-operation among countries with differing socio-economic systems. In Tunisia's view, while the establishment of technical and scientific capacity was primarily the duty of the countries concerned, international co-operation acted as a catalyst and had a multiplying effect on research and the transfer of technology. Romania noted that an international symposium on scientists and peace, held at Bucharest in September, had stressed the responsibility of scientists for the future of mankind and had set up an International Action Committee to prepare for a world congress of scientists in the service of peace (p. 141).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19; <sup>(2)</sup>DIEC Director-General, A/CN.11/12; S-G, <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/240, <sup>(4)</sup>A/CN.11/18 & 24.

Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 2(III), para. 2 (d), programme area VIII, 5 June.

#### Technical co-operation among developing countries

The High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries (p. 463), on 7 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended joint action and collaboration between developing countries to make maximum use of existing scientific and technological facilities, establish and strengthen regional training and research institutes and centres of excellence in important developmental areas, establish and promote councils of directors of research institutes, and encourage leaders of public and private industry to co-operate and exchange experience. The Committee invited developed countries and governing bodies in the United Nations development system to develop and strengthen training and research institutes, research and development infrastructure, and training in the management of co-operative research and development programmes. It reiterated its June 1980 decision urging support for national research and training centres of multinational scope,<sup>(3)</sup> and asked for a study on the co-operative exchange of skills.

The Committee for Development Planning, in its report to the Economic and Social Council on its March/April 1981 session,<sup>(2)</sup> suggested that developing countries give special attention to pooling their technical capabilities in order to accelerate the building of a stronger technological base for upgrading traditional domestic technologies, for developing more appropriate technologies to make fuller use of local resources, and for screening and adapting imported technologies. It also favoured greater use by developing countries of each other's professionals, consultancy firms, construction contractors and skilled workers.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on TCDC (report, A/36/39), 2/4, 7 June.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>CDP, E/1981/27.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 589.

#### Co-ordination in the UN system

WORK OF THE ACC TASK FORCE. The Task Force on Science and Technology for Development, set up in 1980 by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) as the mechanism of inter-agency co-operation in the implementation of tasks assigned to the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development,<sup>(4)</sup> held two sessions at Geneva in 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> At its first session, from 10 to 13 March, it reviewed draft proposals for the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action (p. 734). At its second session, from 1 to 3 April, it discussed the draft study of the efficiency of the United Nations system in the field of science and technology (p. 750).

The Centre for Science and Technology for Development served as the secretariat of the Task Force for both sessions, and the Centre's Executive Director was appointed by ACC to be Chairman of the Task Force for one year.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In accordance with a June 1980 request of the Intergovernmental Committee, the Secretary-General submitted in May 1981 the first annual report on activities of the United Nations system in the field of science and technology for development, in the eight main programme areas outlined in the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action.<sup>(1)</sup> The Intergovernmental Committee, on 5 June, noted this report with appreciation.<sup>(3)</sup>

Proposals for improved inter-agency co-ordination were included in the Secretary-General's report on efficiency of the United Nations system (p. 750).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/CN.11/18; <sup>(2)</sup>Task Force, ACC/1981/11 (Parts I & II).

Resolution: ("Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 3(III), sect. VI, 5 June.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup> 1980, p. 677.

### Efficiency of the system

A study of the efficiency of the United Nations system in the field of science and technology for development was submitted by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly in May 1981, in accordance with a June 1980 decision of the Intergovernmental Committee, endorsed by the General Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(2)</sup>

The report<sup>(1)</sup> evaluated various programmes of the United Nations system in the eight programme areas of the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action (p. 734) in terms of whether they contributed to the establishment of endogenous capacity for science and technology in developing countries and to the restructuring of international relations in science and technology. It concluded that, due in large part to the absence of a coherent strategy for the use of science and technology for development, United Nations organizations had developed activities in science and technology independently from each other, which resulted in a fragmented approach at the system level.

With the Vienna Programme providing a general strategy, the report saw a need for: a continuing commitment at the highest levels for launching the Programme as an integrated, system-wide effort; a frank acknowledgement of the inherently pragmatic nature of technical co-operation, including the need for progressive adjustment in focus and periodic redirection of efforts; and a continuing, well-supported, system-wide programme for review and assessment as a means of identifying successful approaches to the development of endogenous capacity and of reorienting those that encountered difficulties.

Based on these conclusions, the Secretary-General submitted six proposals. (I) Better methodologies were needed to ensure improved inter-agency co-ordination. (II) Efforts should be made to ascertain why the benefit drawn by Member States from the various United Nations programmes fell far short of what was desirable, to suggest steps for overcoming the difficulties and to find ways to encourage the participation of a much greater proportion of developing countries in international science and technology programmes, (III) Ways should be sought to expand and diversify the methods employed by the United Nations system, such as by making the scientific community in developing countries more active in planning and executing programmes, and examining the possibility of setting up an international institute for science policy, training and study. (IV) Evaluation and assessment of programmes must be continuous so that adjustments could be made taking account of experience and changing needs. (V) An

integrated data base describing all approved programme activities in the United Nations system should be established. (VI) Despite the lack of comparable procedures for programme planning and budgeting, there was scope for undertaking interorganizational joint planning and formulation of global, intersectoral and sectoral programmes, with the ACC Task Force on Science and Technology for Development playing a useful role in promoting such activities.

Taking note with appreciation of the Secretary-General's report, the Intergovernmental Committee, on 5 June<sup>(3)</sup> welcomed his proposals and recommended that the General Assembly request the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, with the assistance of the Executive Director of the Centre for Science and Technology for Development and the ACC Task Force, to study them and submit action-oriented recommendations with cost estimates to the Committee in 1982, taking into account the areas of concentration established by the Committee. The Assembly took the requested action on 17 December.<sup>(4)</sup>

Report: (1)S-G, A/36/240.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 35/67 A, para. 2, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 683); (3)Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 3(III), sect. I, 5 June 1981. Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/442, para. (b), 17 Dec. (p. 751).

## UN machinery

### Intergovernmental Committee

The Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development, established by the General Assembly in 1979 to identify priorities in the Vienna Programme of Action and to monitor science and technology activities and programmes in the United Nations system,<sup>(2)</sup> held its third session in 1981 in New York, the first part from 26 May to 5 June and the second part from 25 to 31 August.<sup>(1)</sup> This followed a resumed second session on 29 January, also in New York, solely to appoint the 28 members of the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology for Development (p. 752).

At the May/June meetings, the Committee approved the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action (p. 735). The August meetings were mainly devoted to the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development (p. 738). At both parts of the session, the Committee considered issues left unresolved by the 1979 United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development (p. 735).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee, A/36/37.  
 Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 34/218, sect. II, 19 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 645).

#### Relations with international organizations

The Intergovernmental Committee, on 26 May 1981, invited to participate as observers at its future sessions the intergovernmental, non-governmental and other organizations which had been invited to participate in the 1979 Conference on Science and Technology for Development and its Preparatory Committee.<sup>(3)</sup>

Recognizing that arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were an important means to further United Nations purposes and principles, the Intergovernmental Committee, on 5 June, <sup>(2)</sup> adopted a procedure for their participation, specifying that approved organizations could designate representatives, submit written statements and, subject to the Committee's approval, make oral statements. The Secretary-General was requested to submit in 1982 a paper on criteria and arrangements for the participation of NGOs.

The important role of international, regional and national NGOs in applying science and technology to development was stressed by the Advisory Committee, which suggested that their commitment to development be harnessed in the implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19.  
 Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 1(III), 5 June. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee, 1 (III), 26 May.

#### Report of the Committee

The report of the Intergovernmental Committee on its 1981 meetings <sup>(3)</sup> was considered by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

The Council, on 21 October, authorized the Secretary-General to transmit the report directly to the Assembly.<sup>(1)</sup> The Assembly, on 17 December, <sup>(2)</sup> took note of the report, endorsed the Committee's recommendations, requested follow-up work to the Secretary-General's study of the efficiency of the United Nations system in science and technology for development (p. 750), authorized the establishment of ad hoc panels by the Advisory Committee (p. 752) and requested updated proposals on the work programme of the Centre for Science and Technology for Development (p. 753).

The Assembly decision was taken, without vote, on the recommendation of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, which approved the text in like manner on 10 December, on a draft by a Vice-Chairman.

In the Second Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, several speakers expressed support for the work and recommendations of the Intergovernmental Committee, while the USSR, recalling that it had not supported the creation of the Committee, said it had achieved practically nothing and had simply referred issues to the Second Committee. Senegal suggested that the Intergovernmental Committee's annual sessions be divided into a one-week phase in which experts would participate, followed by three days in which countries would be represented at a high level.

Decisions: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/193, para. (a), 21 Oct. (p. 1091); <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/442, 17 Dec., text following.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee, A/36/37.  
 Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 47 (24 Sep.-10 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly decision 36/442

##### Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.5) without vote, 10 December (meeting 47); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.155); agenda item 69 (e).

##### Science and technology for development

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, decided:

(a) To take note of the report of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development on its resumed second session, its third session and its resumed third session and to endorse the recommendations contained therein;

(b) To take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the basic study of the efficiency of the United Nations system in the field of science and technology for development and to request the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, with the assistance of the Executive Director of the Centre for Science and Technology for Development and the Task Force on Science and Technology for Development of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, to study the proposals contained in paragraphs 218 to 225 of the report and to submit action-oriented recommendations, with estimates of costs, to the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development at its fourth session, taking into consideration the areas of concentration established by resolution 2(III) of 5 June 1981 of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development;

(c) To authorize the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology for Development, as recommended by the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development in its resolution 3(III) of 5 June 1981, to constitute a maximum of four ad hoc panels during the next two years, in accordance with the terms of reference of the Advisory Committee, on the understanding that no more than two ad hoc panel meetings should be held each year and that those meetings should be not more than one week in duration, and to request the Advisory Committee to provide the Intergovernmental Committee, at its fourth session, with specific information on the constitution and work of the ad hoc panels;

(d) To request that the updated proposed programme of work for 1982-1983 for the Centre for Science and Technology for Development, taking into account in particular the areas of concentration described in resolution 2(III) of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development, be presented to the Intergovernmental Committee at its fourth session.

## Advisory Committee

### Appointment of members

On 29 January 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Intergovernmental Committee appointed 28 members nominated by the Secretary-General to its advisory body on science and technology for development, established pursuant to a June 1980 resolution of the Committee,<sup>(2)</sup> and decided to call that body the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology for Development. It expressed its understanding that the Secretary-General, when submitting future nominations, would give priority to experts from countries whose candidates had not been appointed. (For list of members, see APPENDIX III.)

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 4(II), 29 Jan.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 677.

### Activities of the Committee

The Advisory Committee held its first session in New York from 23 to 27 February 1981. <sup>(1)</sup> It concentrated on the draft operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development (p. 734), and also made suggestions for future work on assessment of levels of scientific and technological attainment (p. 744), on the role of non-governmental organizations (p. 751) and on its own work programme (see below).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19.

### Work programme

In February 1981, the Advisory Committee recommended that it hold three sessions during 1981-1982, each no longer than two weeks; that a meeting of its Bureau (officers) be convened between each session; that its meetings normally be held at United Nations Headquarters or the headquarters of one of the regional commissions; and that it constitute ad hoc panels (see below).<sup>(1)</sup>

The Intergovernmental Committee, on 5 June,<sup>(2)</sup> decided that the Advisory Committee should meet once early in 1982 before the Intergovernmental Committee, immediately preceded by a meeting of the Bureau, and that it should normally meet at United Nations Headquarters. The Advisory Committee was requested to submit recommendations in 1982 on ways of providing advice on specific scientific and technological problems confronting the various regions. The Intergovernmental Committee also decided to refer to the Advisory Committee the question of science and technology and the future (p. 745), invited it to consider women and science and technology (p. 993), and recommended that it be authorized to constitute panels.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 3(III), sect. IV, 5 June.

**Ad hoc panels.** On the recommendation of the Advisory Committee in February 1981<sup>(1)</sup> and the Intergovernmental Committee on 5 June,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly, on 17 December,<sup>(3)</sup> authorized the Advisory Committee to constitute up to four ad hoc panels during 1982-1983, with not more than two one-week panel meetings to be held each year. The Assembly requested the Advisory Committee to inform the Intergovernmental Committee in 1982 on the constitution and work of the panels.

In proposing this course, the Advisory Committee stated that the panels would enable up to seven specialists, including some Committee members, to give in-depth consideration to special activities and projects. They would normally be chaired by a Committee member.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 3(III), sect. IV, para. 4, 5 June. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/442, para. (c), 17 Dec. (p. 751).

### UN Centre for Science and Technology for Development

During 1981, its second year of operation, the United Nations Centre for Science and Technology for Development, established by the General Assembly in 1979,<sup>(3)</sup> carried out analysis and research, engaged in co-ordination and monitoring of activities by the United Nations system, reviewed financial arrangements for science and technology, promoted national and regional activities, and provided services to the Intergovernmental Committee and the Advisory Committee.

After submitting proposals for the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action, the Centre began work, at the Intergovernmental Committee's request, on specific proposals for activities in the areas of concentration selected by the Committee (p. 734). Other topics of study included levels of attainment of scientific and technological development among countries (p. 744), science and technology and the future (p. 745), the proposed establishment of an international labour compensatory facility in connection with the brain drain (p. 757), women and science and technology (p. 992), an early-warning system on the effects of technological developments, and advice on specific scientific and technological problems confronting the regions.

The Centre served as the secretariat for the inter-agency Task Force on Science and Technology for Development (p. 749), worked on follow-up to the study on the efficiency of the United Nations system in science and

technology (p. 750), and provided comments to the United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development (p. 742) on projects under its appraisal.

The national and regional activities of the Centre included reactivation and institutionalization of the network of national focal points on science and technology originally formed for the 1979 United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development, information exchange with the focal points, publication of a newsletter entitled UPDATE and other information dissemination activities, and liaison with the international community of scientists and technologists. The Centre also initiated steps to identify non-governmental organizations (NGOs) which could assist in implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action (p. 751).

Information on these activities was contained in reports of the Secretary-General to the Intergovernmental Committee covering the period from the establishment of the Centre through March 1981<sup>(1)</sup> and for the year beginning April 1981.<sup>(2)</sup>

On 5 June,<sup>(4)</sup> the Intergovernmental Committee noted with satisfaction that the Centre planned to establish a network for information exchange between the focal points and the Centre, and asked for an updated work programme for 1982- 1983 (see below).

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>A/CN.11/17, <sup>(2)</sup>A/CN.11/29.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 34/218, sect. III, 19 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 645); <sup>(4)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 3(III), sect. III, 5 June 1981.

#### Work programme for 1982-1983

The programme of work of the Centre for 1982-1983 included the substantive servicing of the first four ad hoc panels of specialists of the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology for Development, to be convened in 1982 and 1983 (p. 752). It also included first steps towards a global information network for science and technology for development, and envisaged regional meetings of national focal points and the publication of a survey of NGOs.

The Intergovernmental Committee, on 5 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> took note of the proposed programme, saying it should be updated in the light of the Committee's decisions and should take into account the areas of concentration of the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action (p. 734). The Committee recommended that the updated work programme be presented to the General Assembly for endorsement and that the necessary resources be given to the Centre.

The Assembly, on 17 December, requested that the updated proposed programme be presented to the Committee in 1982.<sup>(2)</sup>

Speaking in the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, Senegal expressed hope that the Centre's organization would be gradually improved so that it could take charge of implementation of the various aspects of the Vienna Programme of Action.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37), 3(III), sect. III, para. 4, 5 June. Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/442, para. (d), 17 Dec. (p. 751).

## Technology transfer

The work of United Nations organizations on development and transfer of technology, in specific sectors and in global aspects, was described in reports by the Secretary-General to the Intergovernmental Committee on the activities of the United Nations system in science and technology (p. 743).<sup>(7)</sup>

The reports noted that several organizations were concerned with the regulation and streamlining of the flow of technology from industrialized to developing countries, with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) playing a central role in the restructuring of the legal environment for technology transfer through negotiations on a code of conduct (p. 755). UNCTAD also rendered advice to Governments through its Advisory Service on Transfer of Technology (p. 755). Developing countries were being assisted in the formulation of national policies and plans, and the establishment of national, subregional and regional centres for the development and transfer of technology. The transfer of industrial technology was the particular concern of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) (p. 755).

The Secretary-General's study of the efficiency of the United Nations system in science and technology for development,<sup>(6)</sup> submitted to the General Assembly in May 1981 (p. 750), found that the enormous capacities of the United Nations system for technology transfer were being underutilized. It concluded that all United Nations activities in this area could readily be integrated with the objectives of the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development.

The operational plan for implementation of that Programme,<sup>(4)</sup> approved by the Intergovernmental Committee in June (p. 735), suggested a number of activities in regard to the choice, acquisition and transfer of technology (programme area III of the plan). With regard to choice of technology, it proposed national action, sup-

ported by assistance from the United Nations system, to relate such choices to development objectives and policies, to establish information bases and support decision-making, and to develop the technological capability of user institutions and producers. Concerning the acquisition of technology, it suggested action to strengthen national legislation and regulatory institutions, study the impact of corporate and contractual arrangements, strengthen technological project appraisal by financial institutions, make use of the purchasing power of the State for domestic technological development, develop skills, establish national centres, and carry out a variety of subregional and regional activities. With respect to patterns of international relations, the plan envisaged continuing negotiations on codes and conventions, action to apply international agreements, and the development of international forums to improve relations.

The Advisory Committee on Science and Technology for Development, commenting on this aspect of the operational plan,<sup>(3)</sup> stated that emphasis should be placed not only on choice, acquisition and transfer but also on the development of indigenous skills and capabilities for innovation and mastery of technologies, as well as on the development of the technologies themselves. The Committee held it necessary to analyse the technology options available to developing countries, internally and externally, with a view to making the most appropriate choices. It suggested that an analysis be undertaken to categorize countries according to their stages of development, so as to differentiate their technological needs. Regional technology centres should focus on programmes which permitted the participation of all countries in the region. Codes and conventions on technology transfer should anticipate the changing patterns of trade and transfer not only between countries but also between corporations.

The Intergovernmental Committee, in selecting on 5 June the areas of concentration for the operational plan, defined six areas in relation to the choice, acquisition and transfer of technology: strengthening the information base in order to help developing countries before choosing a particular technology; strengthening planning capacity in science and technology; support to national enterprises of developing countries in the choice, acquisition and transfer of technology; promotion and support of subregional, regional, interregional and international co-ordination among national centres; training in negotiation and management of science and technology agreements; and strengthening links between users and producers of technology.<sup>(12)</sup>

Speaking during the debate on development and international economic co-operation in the

General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, the Congo stressed the need for the developing countries to strengthen their technological and scientific capabilities through the transfer of technologies selected by them. In Egypt's view, two main objectives could be achieved if developing countries were able to use advanced technology: solutions to development problems could be brought within reach more quickly, and developing countries could make use of time that would otherwise have been spent on developing the technology.

Albania said that, in the face of efforts by developing countries to develop their scientific and technological capabilities, the imperialist Powers were doing their utmost to preserve their monopoly in that sphere, using it as a political weapon to achieve their expansionist aims. In the opinion of the United Arab Emirates, talk of technology transfer for development had not met with a positive response, since the industrialized countries had been unwilling to fulfil their obligations and upheld monopolistic activities and restrictive practices; redeployment of industry from developed to developing countries could facilitate technology transfer.

Speaking for the Nordic States, Norway considered that the Intergovernmental Committee should not deal with technology transfer, to avoid duplication and allow it to concentrate on other important questions.

UNCTAD ACTIVITIES. The Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD, on 20 March,<sup>(13)</sup> requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General, in co-operation with UNIDO and other United Nations bodies, to convene up to two meetings of governmental experts on food processing and on capital goods and industrial machinery, in order to identify and examine in depth the problems and issues concerning the transfer, application and development of technology in those sectors, taking into account the interrelationships between the technological needs and development objectives of the developing countries. The meetings, open to all UNCTAD members, were to make recommendations in 1982 to the Board's Committee on Transfer of Technology. The Board further requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to continue to prepare studies on main issues relating to the transfer, application and development of technology in other sectors and areas of critical importance to developing countries.

On 9 October, the Board added a third meeting to this series, on energy technology

The Board's actions were welcomed by the General Assembly in its resolution of 16 December on UNCTAD.<sup>(11)</sup> The Assembly urged Govern-

ments and international organizations to participate in the meetings.

On 20 March 1981,<sup>(8)</sup> the Board took note of the report of the Committee on Transfer of Technology on its 1980 session and endorsed several of its resolutions and decisions.<sup>(15)</sup>

The UNCTAD Advisory Service on Transfer of Technology continued to assist regional and subregional technology centres in formulating and implementing technology policies and training technology policy-makers, with increasing emphasis on promoting interregional linkages. Technical assistance and advisory services were extended to over 30 developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Sectoral activities were a major feature of the Service's work, particularly in the pharmaceutical, food processing, capital goods and energy sectors. The Service co-operated with regional technology centres and networks in developing regions, as well as with other regional bodies. Three regional workshops on various aspects of technology transfer and development and three in-house training courses were held in 1981. Two on-the-job training courses were organized in Latin America and India.<sup>(9)</sup>

The UNCTAD training programmes were made possible by a combination of sources, including the Swedish International Development Authority, various country programmes of the United Nations Development Programme, direct financing from requesting Governments or specific institutions in developing countries, and fellowships sponsored by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research.

The UNCTAD secretariat issued a study on planning the technological transformation of developing countries, based on case studies of a number of countries, to serve as a guide for developing countries in formulating their own strategies.<sup>(2)</sup>

**UNIDO ACTIVITIES.** Among its activities in the development and transfer of industrial technology (p. 593), UNIDO surveyed and disseminated information on indigenous technologies and supported the development of appropriate technologies via reports, training and technical co-operation. It assisted developing countries in the establishment of national registries for technology transfer, and provided information, expertise and training on the negotiation of licensing agreements. Its Technology Advisory Services provided short-term advisory services to developing countries in the negotiation of contracts for the transfer of industrial technology, while its Industrial and Technological Information Bank provided information on selection of technology.

A UNIDO-sponsored National Seminar on Technology Transfer Management and Industri-

al Development (Georgetown, Guyana, 16-21 February) sought to create awareness of technology transfer problems and opportunities among decision-makers and the general public, to pave the way for setting up institutions which would facilitate technology policy formulation and implementation, and to serve as a model for wider use in other Caribbean countries.<sup>(1)</sup>

After receiving a progress report from the secretariat on UNIDO activities relating to the development and transfer of technology,<sup>(10)</sup> the Industrial Development Board, on 30 May,<sup>(5)</sup> commended the UNIDO Executive Director on progress in the development and transfer of technology and drew attention to the need to strengthen secretariat arrangements in order to increase the technological capabilities of developing countries. The Board urged the secretariat to co-operate closely with the United Nations agencies and other bodies dealing with the subject. It requested the General Assembly, in allocating resources to activities in this sphere, to take into account the consensus reached by the Board. In that consensus, the Board, on 20 May, included industrial technology as one of the priority areas of UNIDO (p. 576).

Proceedings: <sup>(1)</sup>Seminar on technology transfer management. UNIDO/IS.302.

Publication: <sup>(2)</sup>Planning the Technological Transformation of Developing Countries (TD/B/C.6/50), Sales No. E/F/S.81. H.D.10.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/CN.11/19; <sup>(4)</sup>DIEC Director-General, A/CN.11/12; <sup>(5)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; S-G, <sup>(6)</sup>A/36/240, <sup>(7)</sup>A/CN.11/18 & 24; <sup>(8)</sup>TDB, A/36/15; <sup>(9)</sup>UNCTAD secretariat, TD/B/WP/16; <sup>(10)</sup>UNIDO secretariat, ID/B/252 & Add.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(11)</sup>GA: 36/145, para. 14, 16 Dec. (p. 534).

<sup>(12)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report. A/36/37): 2(III), para. 2 (d), programme area III, 5 June. TDB:

<sup>(13)</sup>230(XXII), 20 Mar.; <sup>(14)</sup>241(XXIII), 9 Oct.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(15)</sup>1980, p. 633.

#### Draft code of conduct

The United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology, initially convened in 1978 under the auspices of UNCTAD,<sup>(5)</sup> was unable in 1981 to reach agreement on the remaining issues involved in a code to govern technology transfer transactions across national borders. The General Assembly, in December, established an Interim Committee of the Conference to seek agreement on those issues.

**CONFERENCE ACTIVITIES.** The fourth session of the Conference on a code of conduct was held at Geneva from 23 March to 10 April.

The Conference decided that outstanding issues should be examined by the President's Contact Group as the central body for negotiation. Discussions and negotiations were held by the Group on two chapters of the draft code.

Chapter 9, on applicable law and settlement of disputes, concerned the choice of the national law to govern contractual relations between parties to a technology transfer transaction and the nature of dispute settlement mechanisms, including arbitration and conciliation. Chapter 4, on restrictive practices, would prohibit a number of business practices defined as adversely affecting the international flow of technology. The President submitted informal proposals covering all the outstanding issues in the draft code. No agreement could be achieved on any of these issues, however.

At the close of the session, the Conference requested that the draft code of conduct<sup>(1)</sup> be transmitted to the General Assembly and requested the Assembly to take measures for further action on a code, including reconvening the Conference.<sup>(2)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. Recognizing the importance of the unresolved issues and the need to reach agreement on them, the General Assembly, by a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(4)</sup> decided to establish, as a special measure to accelerate the finalization of the code, an Interim Committee of the Conference to consider and seek solutions to the outstanding issues and make proposals to the Conference. The Committee was to be open to all UNCTAD members and would follow the rules of procedure of the Conference. The Interim Committee was allocated four weeks of meetings and was to be convened by the UNCTAD Secretary-General in the first quarter of 1982. He was invited to follow the Committee's work, with a view to convening the Conference as soon as practicable, preferably not later than the last quarter of 1982 or the first quarter of 1983.

The Assembly adopted the resolution without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 20 November of a text submitted by a Vice-Chairman, based on informal consultations on a draft by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77.<sup>(3)</sup>

The adopted text differed in several respects from the Group's draft. A reference in paragraph 1 to agreement reached on specific chapters of the code was deleted in favour of a general reference to progress achieved. In paragraph 2, the Assembly recognized the need to reach agreement on the unresolved issues without specifying, as the initial draft stated, that agreement should be reached before the next Conference session. In paragraph 3 of the original, the Assembly would have decided to establish an Interim Committee to make proposals with a view to ensuring the final adoption of the code at the fifth Conference session; by the revised version, the Committee was established as a special mea-

sure to accelerate finalization of the code and to make proposals to the fifth session. In paragraph 6, the Assembly would have invited the UNCTAD Secretary-General to convene the fifth session in the last quarter of 1982, while the adopted text said it should be convened as soon as practicable and preferably not later than the last quarter of 1982 or the first quarter of 1983.

Stating its position in the Committee, Poland, also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said the socialist States supported the resolution because it was aimed at expediting the elaboration of an international code which had been delayed by the Western States; they hoped the Interim Committee would discharge its mandate within the prescribed time and would not entail an increase in expenditures.

Introducing the original draft in the Committee, Algeria said it had been formulated because of the concern of the developing countries at the inability of the Conference to conclude its work and the fact that several issues remained outstanding.

Regret or concern that the code of conduct had not been finalized was expressed by several others, such as Ecuador, India, Mongolia and Norway, the last speaking for the five Nordic States. Ecuador added that the developing countries regarded the code as essential if they were to secure freer and fairer access to the technology they needed. China said there should be no delay in the establishment of the code.

Conference documents: <sup>(1)</sup>Draft code, TD/CODE TOT/33;

<sup>(2)</sup>Selected documents, TD/CODE TOT/34.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(3)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.15.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/140, 16 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1978, p. 503.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/733; S-G statements, A/C.2/36/L.43, A/C.2/36/L.109, A/C.5/36/61.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee. A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-24, 25, 26, 28-32, 42, (24 Sep.-20 Nov.); plenary; A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/140

Adopted without vote Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.3) without vote. 20 November (meeting 42); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.108). based on informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.15); agenda item 69 (c).

United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology

The General Assembly,  
Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362 (S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation.



Recalling also its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recalling further its resolutions 32/158 of 19 December 1977, 34/195 of 19 December 1979 and 35/60 of 5 December 1980 on an International code of conduct on the transfer of technology,

Noting with concern that the fourth session of the United Nations Conference on an international Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology did not conclude the work on the adoption of a code of conduct on the transfer of technology, and noting particularly the lack of progress in reaching agreement on several issues outstanding in the draft code of conduct,

1. Takes note of the progress achieved in the negotiations on the draft international code of conduct on the transfer of technology;

2. Recognises the importance of the unresolved issues and the need to reach agreement on them;

3. Decides, as a special measure to accelerate the finalization of the code, to establish an Interim Committee of the United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology to consider and seek solutions to the outstanding issues and make proposals thereon to the Conference at its fifth session;

4. Decides also that the Interim Committee of the United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology shall be open for the participation of all States members of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and shall meet as necessary within the four weeks allocated to it, and that its rules of procedure shall be those of the Conference itself;

5. Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to convene the Interim Committee in the first quarter of 1982 and to submit to the Committee all appropriate documentation to assist it in its work;

6. Invites the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to follow closely the progress of work in the Interim Committee, with a view to convening the United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology as soon as practicable and preferably not later than the last quarter of 1982 or the first quarter of 1983.

#### Laws and regulations

Recognizing the importance of national regulations and policies dealing with the transfer and development of technology as a means of strengthening scientific and technological capability, particularly of the developing countries, the UNCTAD Trade and Development Board, on 9 October 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to submit at the 1982 session of the Committee on Transfer of Technology a report with proposals on common approaches to legislation and regulations dealing with the transfer, application and development of technology in developing countries. The proposals were to take into account the special needs of developing countries, particularly the least developed.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15), 240(XXII), 9 Oct.

#### Brain drain

Measures to deal with the negative effects of the reverse transfer of technology- the so-

called brain drain of skilled personnel from developing to developed countries- were considered in 1981 by the UNCTAD Trade and Development Board and the General Assembly (see below).

In addition, in his proposals for the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development, the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation recommended that action be taken to reduce and eliminate the migratory trends of scientists, engineers, managers and technicians. The Secretary-General, in a report to the General Assembly, provided guidelines for the establishment of an international labour compensatory facility, to help reduce the adverse effects of large-scale migrations of economically active persons (p. 759).

#### Group of Experts

The Trade and Development Board, on 20 March 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> authorized the UNCTAD Secretary-General to convene, no earlier than three months after a comprehensive study had been submitted to States for comments, an intergovernmental group of experts to examine the feasibility of measuring human resource flows. The Board decided that the group's report should be submitted in 1982 to the Committee on Transfer of Technology.

Noting the Board's resolution with satisfaction, the General Assembly, on 16 December,<sup>(2)</sup> urged Governments and intergovernmental organizations, particularly those of developing countries, to participate in the meeting of the group of experts, and asked that a progress report on the group's work be included in the Board's 1982 report. The UNCTAD Secretary-General and the Director-General of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) were requested to continue to keep the problem of the reverse transfer of technology under review.

The Assembly adopted the resolution without vote, following similar approval on 20 November, by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, of a text submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on a draft by Algeria for the Group of 77.<sup>(1)</sup>

According to the original text by the Group of 77, which was later withdrawn, the Assembly would have requested only the UNCTAD Secretary-General to keep under review the problem of reverse transfer of technology and would have requested him instead of inviting the Board to report on the group's work. This draft also included a request to the United Nations Secretary-General to assist the UNCTAD Secretary-General in implementing the Board's resolution.

Introducing the original text in the Committee, Algeria said it reflected the concern of the developing countries about a situation that was hampering their development by depriving them of badly needed skilled manpower; the Group of 77 believed that the damage suffered needed to be assessed before any arrangement for compensation was considered.

Poland, also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, made the following points: they supported the claims of the developing countries concerning the flow of skilled manpower; United Nations measures should aim principally at obliging countries which attracted skilled manpower from the developing countries to compensate them; stopping the brain drain would help the developing countries to introduce progressive reforms and escape from the influence of transnational corporations; implementation of the resolution should be financed from within the existing budget, and the group of experts should be geographically balanced.

Speaking during the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, the German Democratic Republic said that, between 1961 and 1972, the losses accruing to the developing countries from the brain drain had totalled \$60 billion, whereas the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom had gained \$46 billion, or more than they had given in official development assistance in the same period; the UNCTAD Secretary-General's study should cover possible international, regional and national action to regulate and contain the brain drain and the developing countries' right to compensation from those capitalist industrialized countries which profited from it. The Syrian Arab Republic called for effective action to offset the harmful effects of the brain drain on the economies of developing countries.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.63.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/141, 16 Dec., text following; <sup>(3)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15), 227(XXII), 20 Mar.

Meeting Records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10.26, 28.32, 40, 42, (24 Sep.-20 Nov.); plenary. A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/141

Adopted without vote Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.3) without vote. 20 November (meeting 42): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.94), based on informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.63); agenda item 69 (c).

#### Reverse transfer of technology

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of

Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling also its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recalling further its resolutions 32/192 of 19 December 1977 and 33/151 of 20 December 1978, entitled "Reverse transfer of technology", as well as its resolutions 34/200 of 19 December 1979 and 35/82 of 5 December 1980 on development aspects of the reverse transfer of technology,

Recalling the Economic Declaration adopted by the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana from 3 to 9 September 1979,

Bearing in mind the report of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development on its fifth session, particularly resolution 102(V) of 30 May 1979, the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development and the resolutions and decisions of the Trade and Development Board on the reverse transfer of technology, in particular decision 193(XIX) of 20 October 1979 and resolutions 219(XXI) of 27 September 1980 and 227(XXII) of 20 March 1981,

Bearing in mind also the proposals contained in the Arusha Programme for Collective Self-Reliance and Framework for Negotiations, adopted by the Fourth Ministerial Meeting of the Group of Seventy-seven,

Expressing its concern regarding the adverse effects of the reverse transfer of technology on the capacity and potential of scientific and technological development in the developing countries and, thus, on their economic and social development,

Considering that the flow of skilled manpower from developing countries constitutes a reverse transfer of technology,

Aware that the search for solutions to the reverse transfer of technology, which has serious economic, political and social implications for developing countries, is an important concern of the international community in its efforts towards the establishment of the new international economic order,

Convinced that the United Nations system could play a role in the alleviation of the adverse effects of the reverse transfer of technology,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the establishment of an international labour compensatory facility, prepared in accordance with paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 34/200;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to keep under continued review the co-ordination of work on the question of reverse transfer of technology in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the International Labour Organisation and other relevant United Nations organizations;

3. Notes with satisfaction Trade and Development Board resolution 227(XXII), by which the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development is authorized to convene, no earlier than three months after a comprehensive study of the feasibility of measuring human resource flows has been submitted to member States for comments, an intergovernmental group of experts to examine the feasibility of measuring human resource flows;

4. Urges all Governments and appropriate intergovernmental organizations, particularly those of developing countries, to participate actively in the meeting of the group of experts referred to in paragraph 3 above;

5. Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the Director-General of the International Labour Organisation to continue to keep under review, as necessary, the problem of the reverse transfer of technology;

6. Invites the Trade and Development Board to include in the report on its twenty-fifth session a progress report on the work of the intergovernmental group of experts.

### Other activities

In his proposals for the operational plan for implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action (p. 734),<sup>(1)</sup> the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation recommended that action be taken to foster measures to reduce and eliminate the migratory trends of scientists, engineers, managers and technicians, and provide incentives for the return of those who had already emigrated. The proposals also envisaged studies by Governments and others to identify the factors affecting such migration and the possibilities of controlling them, action by the United Nations system to promote the return of highly qualified persons to the developing country of origin, and assistance by the United Nations and other international sources to help developing countries secure the utilization of skilled personnel living abroad and to promote the establishment of an international labour compensatory facility.

In its resolution of 5 June 1981 on the operational plan,<sup>(5)</sup> the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development identified the elimination of causes for reverse transfer of technology, the utilization of the expertise of expatriate nationals and the provision of incentives for the return of scientists and skilled personnel as one area of concentration in connection with the development of human resources for science and technology (p. 746).

By a report submitted to the General Assembly in September 1981<sup>(2)</sup> in accordance with a December 1980 Assembly resolution,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General suggested guidelines for the establishment of an international labour compensatory facility, proposed by Crown Prince Hassan bin Talal of Jordan in a 1977 address to the International Labour Conference. The aim of the scheme would be to help reduce the adverse economic and social effects of large-scale migration of economically active persons to developed and developing countries, and to ensure an orderly process of regulating migratory labour. National policies, the report stated, appeared insufficient to deal with the complexities of the problem unless reinforced by collective international efforts.

Under this plan, countries receiving economically active emigrants-excluding developing countries whose gross national product or average per capita income was below certain levels-would contribute to the facility an amount determined by taking into account such factors as the proportion of immigrants in the total labour force as well as specific categories thereof, and their gross value to the economy. Portions of the contributions would be made available to the emigration country for its devel-

opment programmes, in the form of grants, fellowships, equipment and reimbursable loans. The assistance would be related to the adverse impact on the emigration country caused by the emigration as well as the cost of rearing, educating and training the emigrant.

The General Assembly, by its resolution of 16 December on the reverse transfer of technology, took note of the Secretary-General's report and requested him to keep under continued review the co-ordination of work on the question in UNCTAD, ILO and other United Nations organizations.<sup>(4)</sup>

Explaining its position on the resolution in the Assembly's Second Committee, the United States said that, by joining in the consensus, it was not signifying its support of the Secretary-General's report, which dealt with the desirability, rather than the feasibility, of establishing an international labour compensatory facility.

Speaking during the Committee debate on development and international economic co-operation, the German Democratic Republic stated that the Secretary-General should present proposals to intensify co-ordination of activities by the United Nations system in regard to the brain drain. Sri Lanka stressed the need for international action and thought the guidelines in the Secretary-General's report appeared to provide a sound basis for formulating detailed proposals and arrangements.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>DIEC Director-General, A/CN.11/12; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/483.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/62, para. 2, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 685); <sup>(4)</sup>36/141, paras. 1 & 2, 16 Dec. 1981 (p. 758). <sup>(5)</sup>Intergovernmental Committee (report, A/36/37): 2(III), para. 2 (d), programme area IV, para. (b), 5 June.

## Information science

### Preparations for the Conference on informatics

In relation to the application of information science to development, the Economic and Social Council, by a resolution of 22 July 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended that Member States collaborate in the preparatory activities and achievement of the objectives of the Second Intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for Informatics, scheduled for 1983. The Council invited the United Nations and its specialized agencies to collaborate actively with the Intergovernmental Bureau for Informatics in the preparations, and invited the Secretary-General to submit a progress report to the Council at a future session.

The Council adopted the eight-nation draft resolution without vote. The text was introduced by Ethiopia, also on behalf of Algeria, Burundi, Cuba, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nicaragua and the United Republic of Tanzania.

Voicing reservations on the resolution, the Federal Republic of Germany said it lacked information on the activities of the Intergovernmental Bureau for Informatics and did not see how the Secretary-General could properly be invited to submit a progress report on preparations for a conference that was not a United Nations conference. Canada also had difficulties with the request for a report, which it assumed to be permissive rather than prescriptive.

Stating its approval of the draft, Mexico emphasized the major role played by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in the First Intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for Informatics, held in 1978, and expressed the hope that UNESCO would participate in and help organize the Second Conference and would continue its support for the Intergovernmental Bureau. A UNESCO representative told the Council that UNESCO considered the proposed Second Conference premature since it was still implementing the decisions of the First Conference.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/52.22 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.21-34, 38, 39 (2-22 July).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/52

Adopted without vote Meeting 39 22 July 1981

8-nation draft (E/1981/L.53); agenda item 3.

Sponsors: Algeria, Burundi, Cuba, Ethiopia, Libyan Arab Jamahirliya, Mexico, Nicaragua, United Republic of Tanzania.

#### Second intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for Informatics

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolution 1978/43 of 1 August 1978 relating to the application of the techniques of informatics to development, which called for a report on the results of the First intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for informatics, held at Torremolinos, Spain, from 28 August to 6 September 1978,

Recalling further the recommendations of the First Conference,

Taking note of the decision of the General Assembly of the intergovernmental Bureau for Informatics to convene a second conference on the same theme at Havana in June 1983.

Having been informed of the Declaration on Informatics Development and Peace, adopted in Mexico during the preparatory meeting organized by the intergovernmental Bureau for Informatics in June 1981,

1. Recommends that Member States should collaborate in the preparatory activities and the achievement of the objectives of the Second intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for informatics;

2. Invites the United Nations and its specialized agencies, particularly the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, the International Labour Organisation, the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and also the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, to collaborate actively with the Intergovernmental Bureau for Informatics in the preparations for the Conference;

3. Invites the Secretary-General to submit to the Economic and Social Council at a future session a progress report on the preparations for the Second intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for Informatics.

## Marine science and technology

CONFERENCE ON THE LAW OF THE SEA. On 28 August 1981, Pakistan submitted to the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (p. 127) a revised draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77, by which the Conference would: call on Member States to determine priorities in their development plans for the strengthening of their marine science, technology and ocean services; call on the developing countries to establish programmes for the promotion of technical co-operation among themselves in those fields; urge the industrialized countries to assist; recommend that multilateral funding agencies augment and co-ordinate their operations in those areas; and recommend that the United Nations system expand assistance to developing countries and co-ordinate their efforts in implementing marine science and technology programmes.<sup>(1)</sup>

On the same day, the Conference decided, on the suggestion of the President, to postpone action on the proposal until 1982.

EXPERT GROUP MEETING. An Expert Group Meeting on Links between Producers and Users of Marine Technologies, convened by the United Nations Department of International Economic and Social Affairs in New York from 14 to 17 December 1981, proposed measures to promote marine resources development by improving technology transfer.<sup>(2)</sup> Among them were: resource surveys; co-ordination and support by the United Nations through meetings, information dissemination and the compilation of directories of consultants and companies; promotional efforts by the United Nations, including the refining of aids for contracting and commissioning marine technology, visits to installations in other countries, and promoting training of personnel and public awareness of the potential of marine technology; creation of national or regional marine resources institutes in developing countries; and action by technology producers to train users' personnel, collaborate with marine resources institutes, and provide them with information on updated marine technologies and trends in marine development.

Draft resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>Pakistan, for Group of 77, A/CONF.62/L.68.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Links between producers & Users of Marine Technologies: Report of the Expert Group Meeting on Links between Producers and Users of Marine Technologies (ST/ESA/122), Sales No. E.82.II.A.20.

Meeting record: Conference on Law of Sea, A/CONF.62/SR.155 (28 Aug.).

## Chapter XIII

## Social and cultural development

Efforts to extend to all people the benefits of development and a role in the development process occupied the attention in 1981 of United Nations bodies concerned with social development.

Social development and welfare topics included the social aspects of United Nations development activities, national experience with social change and with co-operative movements, social surveys, strengthening social welfare activities and the work of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD). Crime prevention and criminal justice were examined in relation to development.

Most of these topics were dealt with by the Commission for Social Development, which held its twenty-seventh session at Vienna, Austria, from 9 to 19 February.<sup>(1)</sup> The Economic and Social Council acted on the Commission's recommendations in May.

The Council gave initial consideration to recommendations for strengthening the capacity of the United Nations to deal with social development issues, made in 1980 by its Ad Hoc Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations. It endorsed the Group's view on the need for the United Nations system to devise a better conceptual framework for an integrated approach to development problems, and decided to continue consideration of specific measures suggested by the Group.<sup>(6)</sup> The General Assembly, in December, invited the Council to consider implementation of the recommendations in 1982.<sup>(11)</sup>

In November, the Assembly called for further United Nations work on national experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for social progress.<sup>(8)</sup> Regional commissions and specialized agencies were invited to promote the co-operative movement in order to improve popular well-being.<sup>(7)</sup>

The Economic and Social Council asked the Secretary-General to report on emerging social issues of international concern connected with changes in the world economic situation.<sup>(4)</sup> It also urged Governments to exploit social welfare structures fully so as to make the best use of available resources for serving the needs of all people.<sup>(5)</sup>

The United Nations continued its technical co-operation activities in various social fields during 1981 (p. 769). The Council invited Governments to contribute to UNRISD,<sup>(2)</sup> which con-

ducted research on food systems and society, improving development data, popular participation in development, and refugee settlement (p. 770).

The Assembly addressed the question of crime in November by urging the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development and the United Nations Development Programme to increase support to technical assistance programmes on crime prevention and criminal justice.<sup>(9)</sup>

With regard to cultural development, the Assembly called in November for several steps to promote the restitution of cultural property to the country of origin and prevent illicit trafficking in cultural property.<sup>(1b)</sup> The Council urged Governments and institutions to intensify efforts to expand people's access to culture and cultural amenities for promoting balanced social development.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Commission, the Council and the Assembly took action on a number of other social topics, including the social aspects of rural development (p. 399), disabled persons (p. 795), studies on migrant workers (p. 886), women in development (p. 985), a draft declaration on adoption and foster placement of children (p. 1012), youth (p. 1014) and aging persons (p. 1022).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission for Social Development, E/1981/26. Resolution ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1981/14 (p. 770), <sup>(3)</sup>1981/17 (p. 775), <sup>(4)</sup>19&X1/19 (p. 768), <sup>(5)</sup>1981/20 (p. 769), <sup>(6)</sup>1981/24 (p. 763), 6 May. GA: <sup>(7)</sup>36/18 (p. 767), <sup>(8)</sup>36/19 (p. 765), <sup>(9)</sup>36/21 (p. 773), 9 Nov.; <sup>(10)</sup>36/64, 27 Nov. (p. 777); <sup>(11)</sup>36/159, 16 Dec. (p. 763).

## Social development and welfare

## General aspects

## Social aspects of UN development activities

The Commission for Social Development and the Economic and Social Council began considering in 1981 the recommendations made in 1980 by the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations,<sup>(9)</sup> proposing ways of improving the Organization's capacity to deal with social development issues. In May 1981, the Council approved some of the general views expressed by the Group and in July it postponed further consideration to 1982. In December 1981, the General Assembly invited the Council

to give due consideration to implementation of the Group's recommendations.

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** On 6 May<sup>(5)</sup> the Economic and Social Council endorsed the Working Group's view that the United Nations system needed a better conceptual framework for an integrated approach to development problems, that economic and social development were different facets of a unified approach, and that the United Nations Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs should pay special attention to popular participation in development, local-level action and social welfare policies. The Council requested that the Centre and other Secretariat bodies be enabled to play an appropriate role in technical co-operation (p. 770), and asked the Secretary-General to take administrative measures to implement the approach described in the resolution so that the Centre could implement its mandates within existing resources. It decided to continue considering at its second regular session of 1981 the Group's suggestions to improve the Council's work in this area, together with a report it requested from the Secretary-General on implementation of the resolution.

The resolution originated in the Commission for Social Development, which approved it on 17 February.<sup>(3)</sup> The Council adopted it without vote with an oral amendment by France, approved by the Council's Second (Social) Committee, which recommended the text on 29 April, also without vote. The amendment affected paragraph 4, by which the Council recommended that the General Assembly consider taking co-ordinated measures to ensure an integrated approach to development in its work. The amendment specified that such measures should be both interregional and intersectoral.

This amendment replaced an earlier amendment by France<sup>(2)</sup> which would have added a paragraph expressing hope that the United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development could mobilize research and analysis resources to ensure intersectoral and interregional co-ordination and a permanent liaison with governmental and non-governmental organizations concerned with development. In addition, Australia proposed but later withdrew an amendment<sup>(1)</sup> asking the Secretary-General to bring the resolution and the Working Group's report to the attention of the Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development, established by the Commission on Human Rights (p. 922).

In July, the Secretary-General submitted a report<sup>(4)</sup> on implementation of the Council's May resolution. The report described action to

strengthen inter-agency co-operation on social aspects of development, to evolve a better conceptual framework for an integrated approach to development, to promote activities relating to popular participation in development, to involve the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs in technical co-operation activities, and to enable it to implement its mandates within existing resources.

The Council took note of the report on 23 July<sup>(7)</sup>. Also on that date,<sup>(8)</sup> it decided to postpone until its first regular session of 1982 further consideration of the Working Group's suggestions to improve the Council's work, and to consider at the same time the Secretary-General's comments on the feasibility and resource implications of the Group's main recommendations.

Both decisions were adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee, which approved the first one without vote on 3 July on an oral proposal by the Chairman and the second without objection on 10 July as proposed and orally revised by Italy. The revision specified that consideration of the Working Group's proposals and the Secretary-General's comments would take place at the first session of 1982.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 16 December 1981, the General Assembly adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(6)</sup> noting that the Working Group's report would be discussed by the Economic and Social Council in 1982 and inviting the Council to consider the implementation of the recommendations in the report. The Assembly also requested a report by the Secretary-General in 1982 on implementation of the Council's decisions.

The resolution, introduced by Yugoslavia and also sponsored by Algeria, Bangladesh, India, Italy, the Netherlands, the Philippines and Romania, was approved without vote by the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee on 30 November, as revised by the sponsors.

In related action during 1981, the Council and the Assembly decided to continue regular consideration of a unified approach to analysis and planning for socio-economic development (p. 395).

Amendments withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Australia, E/1981/C.2/L.7;

<sup>(2)</sup>France, E/1981/C.2/L.8.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission for Social Development, E/1981/26; <sup>(4)</sup>S-G, E/1981/87.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/24, 6 May, text following;

<sup>(6)</sup>GA: 36/159, 16 Dec., text following.

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(7)</sup>1981/175, 23 July, text following;

<sup>(8)</sup>1981/176, 23 July, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(9)</sup>1980, p. 772.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/G.2/SR.3-8, 9-12 (16.29 Apr.); 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.1, 2,

3, 5, 6, 7, 8 (2-10 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.14, 40 (6 May & 23 July). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-63, 64, 65, 66 (19-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/24

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57 end Corr.1) without vote. 29 April (meeting 12); draft by Commission for Social Development (E/1981/26), orally amended by France: agenda item 10.

#### Social aspects of the development activities of the United Nations

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolution 1979/45 of 11 May 1979 on the establishment of an Ad Hoc Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations and its resolution 1980/27 of 2 May 1980 concerning the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group,

Recalling also General Assembly resolution 32/197 of 20 December 1977 and Assembly decision 35/439 of 16 December 1980 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system.

Convinced that all efforts should be made to ensure that the objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, contained in the annex to General Assembly resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, shall be attained, in particular those set forth in paragraphs 39 and 42 and paragraphs 162 to 168 thereof, as part of the overall strategy.

Reaffirming the Declaration on Social Progress and Development, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 2542(XXIV) of 11 December 1969,

Reaffirming that development is an integral process embodying both economic and social objectives.

1. Takes note of the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations and expresses its appreciation to the members of the Group and all those who contributed to the report;

2. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General, the replies received from Governments and the discussion on the question at the twenty-seventh session of the Commission for Social Development;

3. Endorses, in particular, the view of the Ad Hoc Working Group that economic and social development are different facets of a unified approach to development, that social aspects of development are related to the problem of ensuring that development will become an increasingly people-oriented process which will fit into a comprehensive integrated approach that takes full account of the indivisible nature of the development process;

4. Takes note of the recommendations contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group regarding relevant legislative mandates of the United Nations system and recommends that the General Assembly should consider taking appropriate co-ordinated measures at both the interregional and intersectoral levels to ensure an integrated approach to development in its work;

5. Decides to continue consideration, at its second regular session of 1981, of measures suggested in the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group to improve the work of the Council, particularly through communication between and co-ordination of its functional commissions and committees;

6. Expresses its appreciation of the inputs made to the work of the Commission for Social Development by the specialized agencies and stresses the importance of continuing and strengthening co-operation between those agencies and those parts of the United Nations engaged in the social aspects of development;

7. Endorses the view of the Ad Hoc Working Group that the United Nations system must continue efforts to evolve a better conceptual framework for an integrated approach to developmental problems, and on the need for such a con-

ceptual framework for its activities related to social development;

6. Calls upon the Commission for Social Development at its twenty-eighth session to make its contribution to the review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

9. further endorses the view of the Ad Hoc Working Group that the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs, in order to make its appropriate contribution to the work of the United Nations system in the area of social effects of development for the fulfilment of overall development objectives should, at the same time as it pursues its group-specific mandates, intensify its efforts, in co-operation with other elements of the United Nations system concerned, to pay special attention, inter alia, to popular participation, local-level action and social welfare policies;

10. Requests the Secretary-General to enable the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs and other relevant bodies of the Secretariat to play their appropriate role in providing substantive support in their areas of competence for technical co-operation activities undertaken on behalf of the United Nations at the request of the Member States by the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development;

11. Further requests the Secretary-General to take the administrative measures necessary to implement the approach described in the present resolution, thus also enabling the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs to implement its mandates within its existing resources, and to report to the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1981 on the implementation of the present resolution.

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/175

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/96 (Part I)) without vote, 3 July (meeting 3); oral proposal by Chairman: agenda items 18 and 19.

#### Implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/24 on the social aspects of the development activities of the United Nations system

At its 40th plenary meeting, on 23 July 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/24 of 6 May 1981 on the social aspects of the development activities of the United Nations.

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/176

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/96 (Part I)) without objection. 10 July (meeting 8); draft by Italy (E/1981/C.3/L.4), orally revised: agenda items 18 and 19.

#### Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations

At its 40th plenary meeting, on 23 July 1981, the Council decided:

(a) To postpone to its first regular session of 1982 the further consideration of the measures to improve the work of the Council suggested in the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations;

(b) To consider, at that session, those measures, together with comments of the Secretary-General on the feasibility, programme and co-ordination implications, as well as the resource implications, of the main recommendations submitted by the Ad Hoc Working Group.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/159

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, 30 November (meeting 64); 8-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.67/Rev.1); agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bangladesh, India, Italy, Netherlands, Philippines, Romania, Yugoslavia.

Social aspects of the development activities  
of the United Nations

The General Assembly.

Taking note of Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/24 of 6 May 1981 on the social aspects of the development activities of the United Nations,

Mindful of the fact that the recommendations contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations will be further discussed at the first regular session of the Economic and Social Council in 1982, in accordance with Council decisions 1981/175 and 1981/176 of 23 July 1981, in which the Secretary-General was requested to prepare and submit comments on the feasibility, programme and co-ordination implications, as well as the resource implications, of the main recommendations submitted by the Ad Hoc Working Group,

1. Invites the Economic and Social Council, in the light of its above-mentioned decisions, to give at its first regular session in 1982 due consideration to the Implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, under the agenda item entitled "Report of the Economic and Social Council", a report on the implementation of the relevant decisions of the Economic and Social Council pertaining to the recommendations contained in the above-mentioned report.

Medium-term plan for 1984-1989. The Commission for Social Development considered in February 1981 the sections of the proposed United Nations medium-term plan for 1984-1989 concerned with social development, including crime. The plan, prepared by the Secretary-General, emphasized the further elaboration of an integrated approach to development, as well as examination of the social impact of economic policies and of the economic impact of social policies, national and international. Methods for reconciling increased popular participation with demands for efficient economic management would be studied. Global synthesis and analysis of socio-economic trends and the development and application of tools for socio-economic policy formulation and analysis would continue. The programme would be designed to enhance the capacity of all members of society to participate effectively in development. Subprogrammes would focus on popular participation and on promoting the interests of youth, the aging and the disabled. Crime prevention and criminal justice would also be a concern.

On 17 February 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission requested the Secretary-General to recast portions of the draft in the light of comments by Commission members and to submit them to members and observers for further comments.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission for Social Development (report, E/1981/26), II, 17 Feb.

Activities in 1979-1980. On 17 February 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission for Social Development took note of the Secretary-General's progress report on 1979-1980 activities of two units of the

United Nations Secretariat- the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs and the Office for Development Research and Policy Analysis.(2)

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission for Social Development (report, E/1981/26), III, 17 Feb.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, E/CN.5/593.

National experience with social change

On 9 November 1981, the General Assembly adopted, by a recorded vote of 126 to 1, with 1 abstention, a resolution<sup>(1)</sup> calling for further United Nations work on the national experience of developed and developing countries in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for social progress. Reaffirming the right of every State to choose its economic and social system without outside interference, the Assembly invited Member States to give special attention to the social aspects of development so as to increase the well-being of the population based on its full participation in development and a fair distribution of benefits. The Secretary-General was asked to arrange regular interregional and regional seminars to study national experience and to prepare a report on that subject, to be submitted to the Assembly in 1983 through the Commission for Social Development and the Economic and Social Council.

The resolution was adopted on the recommendation of the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, which approved the 10-nation draft on 26 October, as orally revised, by a vote of 133 to 1, with 2 abstentions. Paragraph 4 of the resolution, which called for the holding of seminars on national experience, was adopted by 93 votes to 1, with 30 abstentions; the vote was requested by Australia, which expressed concern at the financial implications of holding seminars that were not certain to yield practical results.

The resolution incorporated oral amendments made in Committee by several countries. On a proposal by Pakistan, supported by Oman, the word "all" was added to a preambular paragraph which expressed the Assembly's desire to secure a speedy removal of obstacles to economic and social progress. In the list of obstacles which followed, the phrase "military, political and economic intervention and pressures, foreign aggression and occupation or alien domination" replaced "aggression, foreign occupation or domination". This rewording resulted from several separate proposals. First, Pakistan, supported by Oman, proposed the words "military intervention, foreign aggression and occupation or alien domination"; the words "political and economic" were added by Mongolia to qualify "intervention". Second, "pressures" was added by Mon-



golia, following suggestions by Morocco to add a reference to economic blockade or to political and economic pressures.

In the following preambular paragraph, the Assembly expressed conviction that peaceful co-existence and co-operation among States, as well as disarmament measures, created favourable international conditions for the socio-economic development of all countries, in particular developing ones. The mention of developing countries was added in an oral revision by the sponsors, and the word "all" was inserted before "countries" at the suggestion of Oman.

In paragraph 1, the reference to outside interference was supplemented by the phrase "in whatever form it takes", on a revision by Mongolia sub-amended by Morocco. This superseded a suggestion by Pakistan to add the words "in any form, including military intervention".

In paragraph 3, in an oral revision by the sponsors, Member States were invited rather than called upon to give attention to social aspects of development in their national development plans.

Australia proposed amending paragraph 5 so that the report requested of the Secretary-General would take into account "the consequences of military intervention". The sponsors saw the proposal as inconsistent with the intent of the paragraph; however, they added a reference to "safeguarding national independence".

Mongolia, which introduced the resolution, said it was especially important to choose the right form of development. Therefore, the United Nations could and should promote an exchange of experience in the implementation of profound social and economic change.

Explaining its vote against the resolution, the United States said it was opposed to proposals which meant additional expenditure. The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community (EC) members, said they had voted in favour but with reservations about asking for additional reports and believed that discussing the issue of national experience as a separate item would further overload the Third Committee's agenda without leading to productive debate or resolutions.

Among those which voted in favour, the USSR believed that the resolution would facilitate United Nations work for social development and that its subject-matter was important to economic and social progress and to guaranteeing the economic independence of States.

In the Committee's debate on social items, Bulgaria said social progress was not feasible unless economic growth was combined with changes in the social structure and standards of living. For the Byelorussian SSR, the task of choosing the correct strategy for social develop-

ment could be lightened by studying and adapting to local conditions the historical experience of other countries which had made or were making far-reaching social and economic changes ensuring rapid development and a steady rise in living standards. A country's national experience could serve as an inspiration for other countries, particularly those whose development had been hampered by imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist policies, said Czechoslovakia.

The Ukrainian SSR regarded the State as the principal instrument in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes. The USSR supported the work of the United Nations in encouraging an exchange but said the methodology employed by the Secretariat in compiling documents on economic and social development was tendentious and inaccurate, resulting in overlooking the experience of real socialism.

Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR and the USSR were disappointed that Assembly and Economic and Social Council decisions to hold regional seminars on national experience with social change had not been implemented.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/19, 9 Nov., text following.

Financial implications: S-G statements, A/C.3/36/L.29, A/C.5/36/32.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.15-17, 19, 21, 23-26, 27-29 (12-26 Oct.); plenary: A/36/PV.49 (9 Nov.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/19

126-1-1 (recorded vote) Meeting 49 9 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/644) by vote (133-1-2), 26 October (meeting 29); 10-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.27), orally revised to incorporate oral amendments by Morocco, by Oman and by Pakistan, and to take account of further oral amendments by Australia, by Morocco and by Pakistan: agenda item 78.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Grenada, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Viet Nam.

National experience In achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress  
The General Assembly,

Guided by the desire to promote a higher standard of life, full employment and conditions for economic and social progress and development.

Bearing in mind the Declaration on Social Progress and Development,

Mindful of the provisions of the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order as well as the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States,

Noting Economic and Social Council resolutions 1581 A (L) of 21 May 1971, 1667 (LII) of 1 June 1972 and 1746 (LIV) of 16 May 1973 concerning the importance of fundamental structural socio-economic changes for the strengthening of national independence and the achievement of the ultimate goals of social progress.

Recalling its resolutions 3273 (XXIX) of 10 December 1974 and 31/38 of 30 November 1976, in which it reaffirmed the importance for every State to exercise its inalienable right to carry out fundamental social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress and the necessity of studying national experience in this field,

Desirous of securing a speedy and complete removal of all obstacles to the economic and social progress of peoples, especially colonialism, racism, racial discrimination, apartheid, military, political and economic intervention and pressures, foreign aggression and occupation or alien domination as well as all forms of inequality and exploitation of peoples,

Convinced that peaceful coexistence and co-operation among States as well as measures in the field of disarmament create favourable international conditions for the socio-economic development of all countries, in particular developing ones,

Desirous of contributing to the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

1. Reaffirms the sovereign and inalienable right of every State to choose its economic and social system in accordance with the will of its people, without outside interference in whatever form it takes;

2. Considers that the exchange of national experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress would contribute to the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

3. Invites Member States to give special attention in their national development plans and programmes to the social aspects of development with a view to increasing the well-being of the population on the basis of its full participation in the process of development and a fair distribution of the benefits therefrom;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to make arrangements for holding, within the programme of advisory services, regular interregional and regional seminars to study the national experience of developing and developed countries in carrying out far-reaching social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultation with Member States, a report on national experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress and for safeguarding national independence within the context of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, taking into account social aspects of development and the role of existing concepts and practices in the development process, and to submit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, through the Commission for Social Development and the Economic and Social Council;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-eighth session the item entitled "National experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress" and to consider under this item the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States.

Abstaining: Australia.

National experience with co-operative movements

A report by the Secretary-General on national experience in promoting the co-operative movement<sup>(1)</sup> was the focus of General Assembly discussion on that topic in 1981. The report, circulated in March, showed that the establishment and growth of co-operatives was important for promoting development, and described the role co-operatives played in such areas as agriculture, rural savings and credit, small-scale enterprises, housing, consumer protection and social services. It contained suggestions for national and international policies to encourage economic, financial, technical and legislative aid for co-operatives. It suggested a strengthening of the Joint Committee for the Promotion of Aid to Co-operatives (COPAC), composed of several United Nations and non-governmental organizations. The report concluded that co-operatives provided a framework for people to articulate their needs and assume responsibility for management of society, and were especially appropriate for less-advantaged population groups.

On 6 May,<sup>(3)</sup> the Economic and Social Council noted the Secretary-General's report and transmitted it to the Assembly. This decision, adopted without vote, was recommended by the Council's Second (Social) Committee, which approved it in like manner on 1 May on an oral proposal of the Chairman.

On 9 November, the Assembly, reaffirming that co-operatives played an important role in the socio-economic development of developing countries, adopted a resolution<sup>(2)</sup> by a recorded vote of 123 to 1, with 4 abstentions, in which regional commissions and specialized agencies were invited to promote the co-operative movement in order to improve popular well-being. The Assembly asked the Secretary-General to prepare a comprehensive report on national experience in promoting the co-operative movement. This was to pay special attention to: the role of co-operatives in social and economic development, particularly in rural areas; participation of peasants, women and youth; the ability of co-operatives to increase their members' material welfare; the interrelationship between agrarian reform and agricultural co-operatives; and difficulties of countries in establishing and developing co-operatives.

The resolution was recommended by the Assembly's Third Committee, which approved it on 26 October by a vote of 129 to 1, with 6 abstentions. The 16-nation draft was introduced by Mongolia.

The text was orally revised by the sponsors to change a reference to one of the aspects to be considered by the Secretary-General's report from "participation of landless peasants" to

“participation of peasants, including landless peasants”.

Explaining its vote against the resolution, the United States said it objected to promoting political objectives that went far beyond the exchange of national experience in the co-operative movement and it opposed proposals that meant the expenditure of additional funds. Canada did not think another report was needed so soon. The United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of the EC members, said that, though voting for the resolution, they felt the Committee should exercise restraint in asking for reports.

In the Committee's debate on social questions, Argentina and the Niger stressed the importance of co-operatives in achieving development of the least-favoured sectors. The German Democratic Republic said the co-operative system there had safeguarded fundamental rights, aligned the incomes of co-operative farmers with those in other parts of the economy and brought far-reaching changes in the position of women in villages. To contribute to co-operative development, said Guyana, the population had to understand the movement's ideology; education in co-operativism helped children to grasp opportunities for useful citizenship. India trusted that the co-operative movement would continue to receive support.

Uganda said it had formulated policies to re-activate the co-operative movement, which had disintegrated between 1971 and 1979 because State corporations had failed to provide due remuneration for the primary produce of co-operative societies. According to Yemen, one of the ambitions of its co-operative movement was to realize an international system based on joint co-operation among peoples.

The Congo believed that the Secretary-General's report did not devote enough attention to the poorer countries. Mongolia thought the report did not show the importance of co-operatives in carrying out internal changes to increase popular well-being and overcome colonial vestiges in agriculture. The Ukrainian SSR stated that United Nations documents should present separately the experiences of capitalist and socialist countries.

Finland thought that international and bilateral development co-operation agencies should increase technical, managerial and material assistance for co-operative development, particularly to less-advantaged groups, and that the role of COPAC should be strengthened. The work of COPAC was praised by Pakistan. France said it would be wrong to presume that the experience of one country could be transplanted to another and cautioned against hastily systematizing the lessons drawn in the Secretary-General's report.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/115.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/18, 9 Nov., text following. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/124, 6 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-12, 75 (16 Apr.-1 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.15-17, 19, 21, 23-26, 27-29 (12-26 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.49 (9 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/124

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote. 1 May (meeting 15); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 10.

Report of the Secretary-General on national experience in promoting the co-operative movement

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Secretary-General on national experience in promoting the co-operative movement and decided to transmit it to the General Assembly.

General Assembly resolution 36/18

123-1-4 (recorded vote) Meeting 49 9 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/644) by vote (129-1-6), 26 October (meeting 29); 16-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.26), orally revised; agenda item 78.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Viet Nam, Yemen.

National experience in promoting the co-operative movement

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 33/47 of 14 December 1978 on national experience in promoting the co-operative movement and other relevant resolutions referred to in that resolution,

Desiring to promote the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Reaffirming that co-operatives play an important role in the socio-economic development of developing countries,

Convinced that the exchange among countries of national experience relating to the co-operative movement plays an essential role in strengthening the co-operatives for the benefit of their members and in overcoming difficulties in the development of various co-operatives,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on national experience in promoting the co-operative movement;

2. Invites the regional commissions and specialized agencies concerned to make further efforts with a view to promoting the co-operative movement as an effective instrument for the improvement of the well-being of the population;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultation with Member States and relevant organizations of the United Nations system, a comprehensive report on national experience in promoting the co-operative movement, paying special attention, *inter alia*, to the following aspects:

(a) Role of co-operatives in overall social and economic development, particularly in rural areas;

(b) Participation of peasants, including landless peasants, as well as of women and youth in co-operatives;

(c) Ability of co-operatives to increase the material welfare of their members;

(d) Interrelationship between agrarian reform and agricultural co-operatives;

(e) Difficulties faced by countries in the establishment and development of co-operatives and their experience in overcoming them;

4. Further requests the Secretary-General to submit, through the Commission for Social Development and the Economic and Social Council, the above-mentioned report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session for

discussion under the item entitled "National experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress".

Recorded vote in Aesembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yaman, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lasotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niouaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States.

Abstaining: Bahrain, Canada, Malaysia, Singapore.

#### Social surveys

A note by the Secretary-General on aspects of social development in the 1980s,<sup>(1)</sup> submitted in January 1981 to the Commission for Social Development, identified recent trends and issues emerging as future concerns. The period was described as one of international economic and political uncertainty, characterized by a loss of confidence in the ability of societies to direct socio-economic change and the functioning of the world economy. There seemed to be a hiatus between the capacity of the State to penetrate all aspects of life through modern techniques of information and control, and its capacity to solve economic, social and political problems. One challenge of the decade was to gain a better understanding of the evolution of development problems and of how they became resistant to familiar policies.

In a resolution adopted without vote on 6 May,<sup>(3)</sup> based on the Commission's consideration of the Secretary-General's note,<sup>(2)</sup> the Economic and Social Council, concerned at the growing disparity in living conditions and income levels between people in developing and developed countries, asked him to report in 1983 on emerging social issues of international concern connected with changes in the world economic situation. The Council also requested him, in his periodic reports on the world social situation, to address emerging social issues of international concern in connection with changes in the world situation, giving special attention to the relationship between disarmament and development and bearing in mind that resources released by implementing disarmament measures should be channelled into the development of all countries and should con-

tribute to bridging the economic gap between developed and developing countries.

The resolution was based on a draft approved by the Commission on 17 February. The Council adopted it with an amendment by the Byelorussian SSR as orally sub-amended by Canada. The Council's Second Committee approved the amendments and recommended the text without vote on 29 April.

The changes affected paragraph 2, by which the Council asked the Secretary-General to pay attention in his reports to emerging social issues of international concern in connection with changes in the world situation. The amendment by the Byelorussian SSR asked that special attention be given to the disarmament-development relationship, bearing in mind that the resources released through disarmament "help to narrow the economic gap" between developed and developing countries. The Byelorussian SSR accepted a Canadian sub-amendment stating that such release of resources "should contribute to the bridging of" the economic gap. Canada withdrew a sub-amendment which would have added the words "and the full enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms" between "disarmament" and "development".

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/CN.5/585.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission for Social Development, E/1981/26.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/19, 6 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-5, 6, 7-10, 11, 12 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/19

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote, 29 April (meeting 12): draft by Commission for Social Development (E/1981/26), amended by Byelorussian SSR (E/1981/C.2/L.2, orally sub-amended by Canada); agenda item 10.

#### Emerging social issues of International concern The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling the Declaration on Social Progress and Development contained in General Assembly resolution 2542(XXIV) of 11 December 1969, the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order contained in General Assembly resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States contained in General Assembly resolution 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974,

Recalling also the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade contained in the annex to General Assembly resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980.

Concerned at the growing disparity in conditions of living and income levels between people in the developed and developing countries,

Concerned also at the adverse effects that unfavourable world economic trends may have on levels of living and social conditions of people, particularly in developing countries,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare a report on emerging social issues of international concern in connection with the changes in the world economic situation, and to submit that report for consideration by the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1983 through the Commission for Social Development at its twenty-eighth session;

2. Also requests the Secretary-General to pay full attention in his reports on the world social situation to emerging social issues of international concern in connection with the changes in the world situation, giving special attention to the relationship between disarmament and development and bearing in mind also that the resources released as a result of the implementation of disarmament measures should be channelled into the economic and social development of all countries and should contribute to the bridging of the economic gap between developed and developing countries.

#### Strengthening social welfare activities

On 6 May 1981, the Economic and Social Council adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(3)</sup> urging Governments to exploit existing social welfare structures to make the best use of available resources for serving the needs of all segments of the population. Concerned at the slow progress in strengthening developmental social welfare policies and programmes, the Council urged the Secretary-General to reinforce, within existing resources, related Secretariat research and operational activities. He was also asked to submit every two years to the Commission for Social Development comparative interregional analyses of the deliberations and recommendations of regional conferences on social welfare, and to report to the Commission in 1983 on progress achieved.

The resolution was based on a draft recommended by the Commission on 17 February<sup>(1)</sup> and approved without vote by the Council's Second Committee on 29 April.

The Commission also examined a progress report by the Secretary-General on steps taken to strengthen United Nations developmental social welfare policies and programmes.<sup>(2)</sup> The report analysed activities undertaken in 1979-1980 by the United Nations Secretariat and the regional commissions, by three United Nations social welfare research and training institutes, and by the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. The report concluded that there was a lack of agreement on what constituted social welfare and social development, making comparative analysis and the sharing of accomplishments difficult. The Secretary-General suggested synthesizing the recommendations of intergovernmental bodies as a common basis for global mandates for research, training and operational activities in developmental social welfare. The Commission took note of the report on 18 February.<sup>(4)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission for Social Development, E/1981/26; <sup>(2)</sup>S.G., E/CN.5/589.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/20, 6 May, text following. Dec.; <sup>(4)</sup>Commission for Social Development, VI, 18 Feb.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-10, 11 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/20

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote, 29 April (meeting 11); draft by Commission for Social Development (E/1981/26); agenda item 10.

#### Strengthening developmental social welfare policies and programmes

The Economic and Social Council,

Concerned at the slow rate of progress of implementation of its resolution 1979/18 of 9 May 1979 on strengthening developmental social welfare policies and programmes,

Convinced of the value of developmental social welfare as an investment in the process of development

Mindful of the importance of the nine regional conferences of ministers responsible for social welfare held since the 1968 International Conference of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare and their Contribution to the elaboration of strategies for social welfare in the context of overall development,

Convinced that the conclusions and recommendations of those conferences should constitute a valuable resource for Governments in all regions as well as for the deliberations of the Commission for Social Development,

1. Reaffirms its resolution 1979/18, in which it requested the Secretary-General to strengthen the Secretariat's activities relating to policy, planning, training and operational aspects of social welfare, including those of relevance to integrated rural development, having in mind the guidelines established by the General Assembly with regard to development;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the Commission for Social Development at its biennial sessions comparative interregional analyses of the deliberations and recommendations of regional conferences on social welfare and related areas;

3. Urges Governments to exploit to the full extent existing social welfare structures so as to make best use of available resources for serving the needs of all segments of the population;

4. Urges the Secretary-General to reinforce Secretariat research and operational activities related to developmental social welfare policies and programmes within existing resources;

5. Requests the regional commissions to report to the Commission for Social Development at its biennial sessions on social welfare and social development activities;

6. Further requests the Secretary-General to report on the progress achieved to the Commission for Social Development at its twenty-eighth session.

#### Technical co-operation

Requests by Governments for funding by the United Nations Development Programme for projects dealing with social issues decreased in 1981. In connection with the International Year of Disabled Persons (1981) (p. 795), advisory missions were undertaken at the request of 30 developing countries and regional meetings were organized. Activities regarding youth (p. 1014) emphasized interregional advisory services to provide Governments with policy alternatives and institution-building techniques. In crime prevention and criminal justice, technical co-operation continued through regional institutes, seminars and training courses. The United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development (DTCO) continued support for the Centre for Research and Training for

Community Development in Saudi Arabia, which provided advisory services and training in neighbouring Gulf States.

The Economic and Social Council addressed technical co-operation in its resolution of 6 May on social aspects of United Nations development activities.<sup>(1)</sup> It requested the Secretary-General to enable the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs and other Secretariat units to provide substantive support to technical co-operation activities undertaken by DTCD.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/24, para. 10,6 May (p. 763).

#### UN Research institute for Social Development

The United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) continued research in 1981 on food systems and society, improving development data, popular participation in development, and refugee settlement.

The food systems project, concerning policies to ensure food security, encompassed research in China, Nicaragua and Senegal. Work on improving development data continued with projects on measuring and analysing socio-economic development and on setting up a methodology for monitoring change in socio-economic conditions and for examining interrelationships in the development process at a local level.

Regarding popular participation, expert meetings were held at Bangkok, Thailand; Bogotá, Colombia; Bombay, India; and Managua, Nicaragua. The aim was to translate general questions on participation into precise, researchable issues relevant to development. Field work was conducted in Latin America and the Caribbean and in Asia.

Research on refugee settlement consisted of sociological field studies of refugee integration in East Africa. A joint project with the United Nations Environment Programme on perceptions and attitudes in relation to environmental and development measures was suspended in 1981.

Expenditures of UNRISD in 1981 totalled \$1,353,125, while income for the period came to \$706,643.

Contributions to UNRISD. During 1981, UNRISD received from 11 countries contributions totalling \$423,731 (see table below).

On 6 May, the Economic and Social Council, acting without vote, invited Governments to contribute or consider increasing their contributions.<sup>(3)</sup> The resolution was approved without vote by the Council's Second (Social) Committee on 29 April. It was based on a draft recommended on 16 February by the Commission for Social Development,<sup>(1)</sup> which considered a report of the UNRISD Board on its activities from 1 November 1978 to 31 October 1980.<sup>(2)</sup>

#### 1981 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

(as at 31 December 1981: in US dollar equivalent)

country	Payment
Denmark	55,427
Finland	47,441
France	43,860
Germany, Federal Republic of	69,540
Jamaica	1,000
Mexico	4,746
Netherlands	56,604
Nicaragua	22,269
Norway	92,593
Switzerland	27,411
Yugoslavia	2,840
<b>Total</b>	<b>423,731</b>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission for Social Development, E/1981/26; <sup>(2)</sup>UNRISD Board, E/CN.5/595.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/14, 6 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-10, 11 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/14

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote. 29 April (meeting 11); draft by Commission for Social Development (E/1981/26); agenda item 10.

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development  
The Economic and Social Council,

Having considered the report of the Board of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development on its activities during the period from 1 November 1978 to 31 October 1980.

Recognizing the importance of research on social issues for the formulation and implementation of integrated development plans and policies, promoting participation of all segments of society in the development process and an equitable distribution of the benefits therefrom,

Considering the functions of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development and the important contribution made by the Institute in this area,

Recognizing that the Institute has complied with the recommendations of the Commission for Social Development in its resolution 10(XXV) of 3 February 1977, particularly with regard to its catalytic role and its support for research by national research bodies.

Stressing the need to provide the Institute with the necessary financial means to ensure the continuation of its work.

Considering the appeal made by the Secretary-General to the Commission for Social Development at its twenty-seventh session in the same respect,

1. Expresses its appreciation to Governments providing financial support to the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development;

2. Invites those Governments that have not yet done so to make financial contributions to the Institute according to their possibilities and, in the case of those Governments that actually support the Institute, to examine the possibility of increasing their contributions, in both cases preferably on a regular basis or a project basis.

#### Commission for Social Development

Report on the 1981 session. In a decision adopted without vote on 6 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Economic and Social Council took note of the report of the Commission for Social Development on its twenty-seventh session (9-19 Febru-

ary).<sup>(2)</sup> The draft, orally proposed by the Chairman of the Second Committee, was approved by the Committee on 1 May, also without vote.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/123, 6 May, text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission for Social Development, E/1981/26.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-12, 15 (16 Apr.-1 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/123

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote. 1 May (meeting 15); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 10.

Report of the Commission for Social Development

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Commission for Social Development on its twenty-seventh session.

Agenda for the 1983 session. A provisional agenda for the 1983 session of the Commission for Social Development, together with a list of documents to be prepared, was approved without vote by the Economic and Social Council on 6 May 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> Substantive topics included a survey of recent and prospective trends and changes in socio-economic development, socio-economic policies related to equitable distribution of national income and institutional development, and social integration.

The draft was recommended by the Commission on 19 February and approved by the Second Committee without vote on 29 April.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/121, 6 May, text following.

Meeting records; ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-11, 12 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1961/121

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote, 29 April (meeting 12); draft by Commission for Social Development (E/1981/26); agenda item 10.

Provisional agenda and documentation for the twenty-eighth session of the Commission for Social Development

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council approved the provisional agenda and requested documentation for the twenty-eighth session of the Commission for Social Development set out below:

Provisional agenda and documentation for the twenty-eighth session of the Commission for Social Development

1. Election of officers
2. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters
3. Survey of recent and prospective trends and fundamental changes in the field of socio-economic development
 

Documentation

1981 report on the world social situation and report on the implementation of the Declaration on Social Progress and Development

Report by the Secretary-General on the review and appraisal of the international Development Strategy

Report of the Secretary-General on emerging social issues of international concern
4. Socio-economic policies related to issues concerning the equitable distribution of national income and the process of institutional development

#### Documentation

Note by the Secretary-General on the main conclusions of the research project on income distribution

Report of the Secretary-General on the social aspects of rural development

#### 5. Social integration

##### Documentation

Report on trends in strategies and policies for social integration

Report on popular participation and local-level action

Report on developmental social welfare policies and programmes

Report on trends in family and child welfare

Report on pertinent regulations regarding the protection of migrant workers and their families

Report on the progress in the preparations for International Youth Year

Report on the situation of youth

Report on the World Assembly on Aging and the international programme of action for aging

Report on the international Year of Disabled Persons and the world plan of action for disabled persons

Annex to the report on the world social situation on the implementation of the Declaration on the Rights of Disabled Persons

Report on the prevention of disability

Report of the Committee for Crime Prevention and Control on its seventh session

#### 6. Other matters

- (a) Progress report for 1981-1982, including, inter alia, follow-up action to the resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council on the recommendation of the Commission at its twenty-seventh session, and the medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989
- (b) Progress report on the implementation of the social welfare and social development activities of the regional commissions for the biennium 1981-1982
- (c) Report of the Board of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development
- (d) Consideration of the draft provisional agenda for the twenty-ninth session

#### 7. Adoption of the report of the Commission to the Economic and Social Council

#### Crime

As requested by the General Assembly, the Secretary-General submitted a report in August 1981<sup>(1)</sup> on implementation of the Assembly's December 1980 resolution<sup>(2)</sup> calling for measures to strengthen international co-operation in crime prevention and criminal justice. The report covered new perspectives for international co-operation, described steps to strengthen regional and subregional activities, discussed the United Nations Trust Fund for Social Defence (p. 774), summarized new administrative arrangements and mentioned activities by non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

The report said the Secretariat was doing research on crime prevention and criminal justice in relation to development, and especially on the emergence of new types of criminal activity in the context of changing socio-economic structures. Countries with the lowest and highest crime rates were being studied in a search for factors relating to crime and delinquency and

strategies for prevention in the development context. United Nations institutes on crime in Asia and the Far East and in Latin America were engaged in related research, including a Latin American study of criminal victimization for a project to promote community participation in crime prevention. The Secretary-General was to convene an expert group meeting in October to examine ways to improve the data base on crime trends and crime prevention strategies.

Meetings during the year included an international seminar in crime prevention and sound national development (23 February-20 March), organized by the United Nations Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, and a meeting on establishing an institute in Africa (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, December). Information on United Nations activities had been disseminated by NGOs.

Human rights aspects of criminal justice were the subject of several actions during 1981. The General Assembly, on 9 November, condemned summary or arbitrary executions (p. 898). On 25 November, it invited comments on a proposal aimed at the ultimate abolition of capital punishment through the drafting of a second optional protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (p. 899), and requested further consideration of the protection of persons detained on grounds of mental ill-health (p. 906). The Assembly continued work on a body of principles for the treatment of prisoners and detainees (p. 900) and requested further comments on a draft Code of Medical Ethics for health personnel in prisons (p. 902). Work proceeded on a draft convention against torture and other cruel treatment (p. 901) and a study on discrimination in the administration of criminal justice (p. 889).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 9 November, the General Assembly adopted, by a recorded vote of 135 to none, with 1 abstention, a resolution<sup>(4)</sup> urging the United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development (DTCD) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to increase support to technical assistance programmes in crime prevention and criminal justice. The Assembly asked the Secretary-General to implement the Caracas Declaration adopted in 1980 by the Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders<sup>(3)</sup> and to prepare for the Seventh Congress (in 1985). The Committee on Crime Prevention and Control, in preparing the agenda for the Seventh Congress, was called on to give attention to current and emerging trends with a view to defining

new guiding principles for crime prevention and criminal justice in the context of development needs. Members States were invited to make their criminal justice systems more responsive to changing socio-economic conditions.

The resolution was recommended by the Assembly's Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, which approved the 29-nation draft on 26 October, as orally amended and revised, by a vote of 136 to none, with 1 abstention.

The draft was introduced by Venezuela, which made some oral revisions. The fifth preambular paragraph was revised to describe the new international economic order as "one of the principal guarantees for the creation of better conditions so that all peoples may attain a decent life" rather than as "designed to achieve development and guarantee a decent life for all". In paragraph 2, concerning the context for considering crime prevention, the article "a" was replaced by "the" before "new international economic order".

The sponsors accepted an oral amendment by Somalia changing "the" to "their" in paragraph 3, by which Member States were invited to make their criminal justice systems responsive to socio-economic change. The sponsors also accepted Somalia's proposal to change paragraph 4, on technical assistance, so as to urge DTCD and UNDP to "encourage" technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC) rather than simply support TCDC programmes. A drafting change by Cyprus and Oman was also incorporated.

Explaining its abstention in the vote, the United States said the resolution limited consideration of crime prevention and criminal justice to an economic development context and suggested that eliminating crime depended on restructuring the world economic system. Making a similar point, the United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community members, did not consider development needs to be the only criteria for defining guiding principles in this area. Turkey voted for the resolution with reservations regarding paragraph 2, stating that, though it believed in a relationship between crime and socio-economic development, the issue was too complex to be related in all cases to economic factors.

In the Committee's debate on various social questions, Austria said crime prevention and control were related to socio-economic issues and should be placed in the perspective of overall development planning. Zaire said fighting crime must be a part of each country's development strategy, requiring increased international co-operation.

Bulgaria stated that crimes relating to the abuse of economic and political power were



alarming and typical of capitalist societies. Czechoslovakia said its criminal policy was oriented towards education and rehabilitation, and the involvement of all State and other organizations, as well as individuals, in preventing crime. To fight criminality, the educational role of the family, the school and society must be strengthened, Romania stated. The Ukrainian SSR said rising crime was not the inevitable consequence of development; in societies where there was no room for the exploitation of man by man or for the alienation of the individual from society, there was no reason for the emergence of crime.

Several countries commented on topics in connection with the United Nations work programme on crime. India said that the problem of crime victims should be studied, along with the impact of economic development on crime prevention and criminal justice. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya suggested that United Nations congresses on crime consider improving United Nations information services on the question, making technical expertise available to Member States, intensifying co-ordination and emphasizing the role of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control. Nepal welcomed Secretariat studies on the 10 countries with the highest and the 10 with the lowest crime rates.

The United Kingdom urged a more realistic work programme for the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control, with agreed priorities. The United States said the United Nations should give attention to narcotic drug abuse, drug trafficking and crime, and to the relationship between youth unemployment and vulnerable aged victims as factors in crime growth. Venezuela was pleased that the United Nations would elaborate measures to assist States in developing crime prevention policies and programmes in the context of national planning, and stressed the need to improve information machinery on crime prevention and criminal justice.

Papua New Guinea remarked that social imbalance and economic disparity contributed to the increasing crime rate and that the root causes had to be detected to prevent it. Uganda voiced its commitment to restoring the rule of law and ensuring the security and property of all residents there; it expressed appreciation for plans to authorize United Nations assistance to Uganda in that connection (p. 939).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/442.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/171, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 787); <sup>(3)</sup>ibid., annex (p. 788); <sup>(4)</sup>36/21, 9 Nov. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR. 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23-26, 27-29 (12-26 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.49 (9 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/21

135-0-1 (recorded vote) Meeting 49 9 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/645) by vote (136-0-1), 26 October (meeting 29): 29-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.22), orally amended by Cyprus and Oman and by Somalia and orally revised: agenda item 90.

Sponsors: Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Romania, Sudan, Sweden, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

Crime prevention and criminal justice and development

The General Assembly,

Concerned at the escalation of crime and violence in many parts of the world,

Conscious of the forms and dimensions crime has assumed in the context of socio-economic development, and the increasing difficulties encountered,

Stressing the vital contribution that the United Nations Congresses on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders make to improving the quality of life,

Recalling its resolution 35/171 of 15 December 1980, in which it endorsed the Caracas Declaration, annexed to that resolution, and recommendations relating to the new perspectives for international co-operation in crime prevention in the context of development, adopted by the Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders,

Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, which is one of the principal guarantees for the creation of better conditions so that all peoples may attain a decent life,

Mindful that in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, contained in the annex to General Assembly resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the Assembly declared that the ultimate aim of development was the constant improvement of the well-being of the entire population on the basis of its full participation in the process of development and the fair distribution of the benefits therefrom,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on crime prevention and criminal justice and development;

2. Reaffirms that crime prevention and criminal justice should be considered in the context of economic development, political, social and cultural systems and social values and changes, as well as in the context of the new international economic order;

3. Invites Member States to intensify efforts to make their criminal justice systems more responsive to changing socio-economic conditions, also through the appropriate development of national forms of social control;

4. Urges the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development of the Secretariat and the United Nations Development Programme to increase their level of support to programmes of technical assistance in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice, and to encourage technical co-operation among developing countries;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to take the necessary measures for the fullest implementation of the Caracas Declaration and for the appropriate preparation of the Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, in close co-operation with all the relevant United Nations bodies, in particular with the regional commissions and the United Nations training and research Institutes in crime prevention;

6. Calls upon the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control, entrusted with the preparation of the United Nations Congresses on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, to give particular attention, in the formulation of the agenda of the Seventh Congress, to current and emerging trends in crime prevention and criminal justice, with a view to defining new guiding principles for the future course of crime

prevention and criminal justice. In the context of development needs and the goals of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade and a new international economic order, taking into account the political, economic, social and cultural circumstances and traditions of each country and the need for crime prevention and criminal justice systems to be consonant with the principles of social justice;

7. Requests the Secretary-General, in reporting to the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982 on the preparatory work for the Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, also to take into account the relevant recommendations made by the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control at its seventh session, without prejudice to the existing reporting procedures.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour :Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States.

#### Committee on Crime Prevention and Control

On 18 February 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the Commission for Social Development noted the report of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control on its sixth session (September 1980).<sup>(7)</sup> Regarding the Committee's recommendation that it hold its seventh session in 1981 instead of 1982, the Commission drew attention to an Economic and Social Council resolution of 1973<sup>(2)</sup> to the effect that its subsidiary bodies should meet biennially, and a 1979 decision<sup>(4)</sup> that there could be no departures from the biennial cycle following adoption of the meeting calendar.

On 6 May 1981, the Economic and Social Council noted the Committee's report and approved the provisional agenda for its seventh (1982) session, as recommended by the Committee.<sup>(5)</sup> By the same decision, adopted without vote, the Council requested the Secretary-General to submit to it in 1982 a statement on preparatory work for the Seventh Congress on crime. The decision was recommended without vote by the Council's Second (Social) Committee on 1 May, as orally proposed by the Chairman.

The Secretary-General, in a note to the Second Committee,<sup>(1)</sup> had proposed that the Council not take any decisions relating to preparatory work for the Seventh Congress until he submitted a statement on that work, including programme budget implications.

On 21 October 1981, the Council added an item on arbitrary or summary executions to the provisional agenda for the Committee's 1982 session.<sup>(6)</sup>

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/C.Z/L.3.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1768(LIV), para. 16 (b), 18 May 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 597).

Decisions: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission for Social Development (report, E/1981/26): V, 18 Feb. ESC: <sup>(4)</sup>1979/81, para. (d) 3 Aug. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1214); <sup>(5)</sup>1981/122, 6 May 1981, text following; <sup>(6)</sup>1981/194, 21 Oct. (p. 899). Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1980, p. 785.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.Z/SR.3-12, 15(16 Apr.-1 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May):

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/122

##### Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote, 1 May (meeting 15); draft orally proposed by Chairman, based on informal consultations; agenda item 10.

Report of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control. At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council:

(a) Took note of the report of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control on its sixth session:

(b) Approved the provisional agenda for the seventh session of the Committee, to be held in 1982, contained therein;

(c) Took note of the note by the Secretary-General concerning the report of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control and requested the Secretary-General, without prejudice to the established reporting procedures of the Committee, to submit a comprehensive statement on the preparatory work for the Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders to the Council at its first regular session of 1982.

#### UN Trust Fund for Social Defence

In 1981, the United Nations Trust Fund for Social Defence supplied \$378,217 to the United Nations Social Defence Research Institute (UNSDRI). The Trust Fund was established pursuant to a 1965 resolution of the Economic and Social Council<sup>(1)</sup> to strengthen United Nations work in social defence.

UNSDRI focused mainly on developing countries, including research on juvenile criminality and social maladjustment in selected countries, and preparation of reports and publications on specific themes. Its 1981 expenditures, financed from intergovernmental and government grants, totalled \$532,000.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1086 B (XXXIX), para. 4, 30 July 1965 (YUN 1965, p. 409).

Contributions. Eleven countries paid a total of \$557,851 during 1981 in voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund for Social Defence (see table on p. 775).

In his report to the General Assembly on United Nations activities concerning crime prevention and criminal justice (p. 771),<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General said he would be in a better position to strengthen regional and subregional crime prevention activities if the level of contributions to the Trust Fund were to increase.

The Assembly, on 17 December,<sup>(1)</sup> took note of a note by the Secretariat stating its intention of adding the Trust Fund to the list of programmes and funds included within the scope of future United Nations pledging conferences for development activities.<sup>(2)</sup>

1981 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS  
TRUST FUND FOR SOCIAL DEFENCE  
(as at 31 December 1981; In US dollar equivalent)

Country	Payment
Cyprus	200
France	18,750
Greece	6,491
Iraq	2,221
Italy	445,761
Japan	57,610
Norway	8,741
Philippines	1,000
Switzerland	12,077
Thailand	1,000
Yugoslavia	4,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>557,851</b>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/446, 17 Dec. (p. 427).

Note: <sup>(2)</sup>Secretariat, A/C.2/36/3.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/442.

## Cultural development

### Cultural participation

On 6 May 1981, the Economic and Social Council adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(2)</sup> by which it urged Governments and private and public institutions to intensify efforts to expand people's access to culture and cultural amenities for promoting balanced social development. It called on States to protect and develop cultural values as social and spiritual energy for authentic national development and as mankind's common heritage. It appealed to nations to create cultural values which enhanced mutual friendship and to establish better social relations in the world, particularly in mass culture.

The resolution was recommended by the Commission for Social Development on 16 February<sup>(1)</sup> and was approved without vote by the Council's Second (Social) Committee on 29 April.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission for Social Development, E/1981/26.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/17, 6 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-10, 11 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/17

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote, 29 April (meeting 11); draft by Commission for Social Development (E/1981/26); agenda item 10.

#### Social aspects of the access to culture

The Economic and Social Council,

Mindful of mankind's lofty ideals enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Recalling the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 16 December 1966.

Recalling also the Declaration on Social Progress and Development,

Convinced of the importance of the role culture has to play in meeting the common needs of all peoples, and in raising the quality of their lives,

Recognizing the relationship between the cultural progress of peoples, their co-operation, understanding and friendship, and world peace,

Recognizing also that cultural values represent a basic component of the identity of nations, which promotes understanding of their respective cultures and their values, and that full utilization of the cultural heritage is an indispensable condition of each nation's self-affirmation,

Convinced that every person, without distinction as to race, colour, sex, language, religion, nationality, ethnic origin, family or social status and political conviction, has the right of access to cultural values,

Aware that unless special Institutional forms of national assistance are established, it will soon not prove possible to overcome the legacy of long-standing backwardness and negligence,

1. Reaffirms that cultural development is one of the most important factors of social progress;

2. Calls upon States to pursue continuous efforts to protect and further develop cultural values as social and spiritual energy for authentic national development and as mankind's common heritage;

3. Appeals to all nations to create cultural values which enhance friendship among them and to establish better social relations in the world, in particular in mass culture;

4. Commends the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization for its record of achievement thus far in the field of access to culture, including, in particular, the reduction of illiteracy, raising the level of general education and the protection and further development of cultural values;

5. Urges all Governments and other public and private institutions, both national and international, to intensify their organizational, intellectual and financial efforts with a view to expanding as effectively as possible wide access of all people to culture and cultural amenities for promoting a balanced social development.

#### Restitution of cultural

property to the country of origin

The Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) reported in November 1981 on the work of that organization's Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation, which held its first session in May 1980. At its second session (Paris, 13-18 September 1981), covered in an appendix to the report, the Committee accorded importance to the struggle against illicit traffic in cultural property and to

the development of museums. It adopted recommendations to promote bilateral negotiations for return or restitution, international technical co-operation, national and international steps to curb illicit traffic, and public information for wider awareness of the issue. Its technical co-operation proposals covered preparation of inventories, training of specialized personnel, preparation and application of standards of protection, and development of infrastructure for the protection of movable cultural property.

The report also described other UNESCO activities, including the preparation of inventories by the International Council of Museums and the intensification of public information efforts. It noted that, as at 15 June, 50 States had ratified or accepted the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property.

The Director-General's report annexed to a report by the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> was made in response to a 1979 request by the General Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup>

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 27 November 1981, the General Assembly, by a vote of 109 to none, with 13 abstentions, adopted a resolution<sup>(3)</sup> inviting Member States to take measures to prevent the illicit import, export and transfer of ownership of cultural property, and to end illicit trafficking in priceless objets d'art and museum pieces. By this text, sponsored by 36 nations, UNESCO was requested to intensify efforts to help countries solve problems relating to the return or restitution of cultural property. Member States were invited to draw up, in co-operation with UNESCO, systematic inventories of cultural property in their territories and abroad. Emphasizing that the cultural heritage of a people conditioned the present and future of its artistic values and overall development, the Assembly called on the United Nations Development Programme to help develop national capacity in respect of museum infrastructures. The Assembly appealed to Member States to encourage information media and institutions to arouse greater awareness of the problem.

A separate vote was taken on paragraph 7, by which the Assembly appealed to museums and public and private collectors to return or make available to the countries of origin items kept in museum storehouses and to help those countries, with the co-operation of UNESCO, to inventory such collections. This paragraph was adopted by 105 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.

Introducing the resolution, Zaire said the cultural heritage of a people conditioned the flourishing of its artistic values and integral development and, in turn, increased peoples' aptitude

for understanding the culture and civilization of others, with a fortunate effect on international co-operation. Massive transfers of art works carried out under foreign or colonial occupation, expropriation of art works, trade and illicit transfer of cultural property mutilated a people's capacity to understand and be inspired by its culture.

Voting against paragraph 7, the United States opposed any governmental obligation on restitution that went beyond the 1970 UNESCO Convention on cultural property, which did not require restitution of art works that had entered a country before the Convention's entry into force; though abstaining on the resolution as a whole, it supported the principle of restitution but rejected State direction of information media for a specific purpose. Japan voted for the resolution but explained that it understood "inventories of cultural property" in paragraph 6 to mean protective inventories of natural cultural property.

The United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of the European Community members, said they believed UNESCO should remain the forum for discussion on the topic and they supported the work of the Intergovernmental Committee it had set up in 1978 to facilitate bilateral negotiations for the return of cultural property.

The importance of cultural awareness as a catalyst to national and international development and solidarity was mentioned in the debate by Algeria, Egypt and Senegal. Algeria stressed the need to put an end to an abnormal situation which forced third world peoples to seek outside their countries the symbols of their cultures and the traces of their history.

Albania made the point that the return of works of art with historical value had to be carried out within the framework of efforts to end the injustices committed against countries and peoples subjected to colonial domination, war and occupation, plunder during archaeological excavations, illicit trade and other illegal means. Colonial plundering, the greed of collectors and the cultural black market had deprived many countries of the right to preserve their art, culture and religion, said Argentina. Senegal detected a general consensus on the need for owners to claim the return of their cultural property, for the protection of the cultural heritage of all peoples and on the importance of the restitution of that property.

Colombia urged UNESCO to consider establishing a group of experts to advise countries in identifying, codifying, protecting and exhibiting national treasures, with the eventual aim of building a world register. Ecuador said the establishment in developing countries of museums with modern techniques and the training of experts in research and restoration had changed the

former belief that cultural works were safer in the museums of the world's large industrial centres. Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt and Iraq called on Governments to ratify the UNESCO Convention on cultural property.

Democratic Kampuchea linked restitution and return of cultural property to peace, international security and defence of the Charter of the United Nations. Iraq thought the time had come to agree at least on cultural matters even if there was no agreement on political and economic issues.

Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia and India said they had voted for the resolution despite their objections to its co-sponsorship by Democratic Kampuchea. Poland and Viet Nam, the former also speaking on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said they could not participate in the discussion or decision for the same reason.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/651.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>34/64, para. 8, 29 Nov. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 979); <sup>(3)</sup>36/64, 27 Nov. 1981, text following.

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.74 (27 Nov.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/64

109-0-13 Meeting 74 27 November 1981  
36-nation draft (A/36/L.22/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1); agenda item 21.

Sponsors: Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Suriname, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

#### Return or restitution of cultural property to the countries of origin

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3026 A (XXVII) of 18 December 1972, 3148 (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973, 3187 (XXVIII) of 18 December 1973, 3391 (XXX) of 19 November 1975, 31/40 of 30 November 1976, 32/18 of 11 November 1977, 33/50 of 14 December 1978, 34/64 of 29 November 1979 and 35/127 and 35/128 of 11 December 1980,

Recalling also the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, adopted on 14 November 1970 by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,

Emphasizing that the cultural heritage of a people conditions the present and future flowering of its artistic values and its overall development,

Taking note with satisfaction of the report submitted by the Secretary-General in co-operation with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,

Aware of the importance attached by the countries of origin to the return of cultural property which is of fundamental spiritual and cultural value to them, so that they may constitute collections representative of their cultural heritage,

Noting with satisfaction that the countries of origin have already reinforced the steps they have taken for the organization and maintenance of their museums, in order to accommodate their cultural treasures, and for the classification, restoration and conservation of their objets d'art with national experts of international repute,

Noting also with satisfaction that some countries have taken positive steps for the return or restitution of museum pieces, archives and objets d'art to their countries of origin,

Deeply concerned at the persistence of the illicit traffic in cultural property, which continues to impoverish the cultural heritage of all peoples.

1. Renews its support for the solemn appeal launched on 7 June 1978 by the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization for the return to those who created it of an irreplaceable cultural heritage;

2. Reaffirms that the restitution to a country of its objets d'art, monuments, museum pieces, archives, manuscripts, documents and any other cultural or artistic treasures contributes to the strengthening of international co-operation and to the preservation and flowering of universal cultural values through fruitful co-operation between developed and developing countries;

3. Commends the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation on the work they have accomplished, particularly through the promotion of bilateral negotiations, for the return or restitution of cultural property, the preparation of inventories of movable cultural property, the development of infrastructures for the protection of movable cultural property, the reduction of illicit traffic in cultural property and the dissemination of information to the public;

4. Requests the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to intensify its efforts to help the countries concerned to find suitable solutions to the problem relating to the return or restitution of cultural property and urges Member States to co-operate with that organization in this area;

5. Invites Member States to take adequate measures to prohibit and prevent the illicit import, export and transfer of ownership of cultural property, and to put an end to the illicit trafficking in priceless objets d'art and museum pieces by all necessary measures within each country's jurisdiction with the full co-operation of the courts and customs authorities;

6. Also invites Member States to draw up, in co-operation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, systematic inventories of cultural property existing in their territories and of their cultural property abroad;

7. Appeals to museums and public and private collectors to return totally or partially, or make available to the countries of origin, particularly the items kept in the storehouses of such museums, and to help the countries of origin, with the co-operation of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in their endeavours to prepare an inventory of those collections;

8. Reminds Member States of the need to strengthen museum infrastructures, in particular conservation techniques, museographic facilities and procedures adapted to local conditions and the training of qualified personnel;

9. Calls upon the United Nations Development Programme to continue to assist the development of national capacity in respect of museum infrastructures and invites Member States as well as national agencies and regional organizations to strengthen their technical co-operation in this area;

10. Appeals to Member States to co-operate closely with the Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation and to conclude bilateral agreements for this purpose;

11. Also appeals to Member States to encourage the mass information media and educational and cultural institutions to strive to arouse a greater and more general awareness with regard to the return or restitution of cultural property to the countries of origin;

12. Urges all Governments to reproduce the reports and studies made by archaeologists and explorers from the devel-

oped countries, especially if those studies are out of print, and to make them available to the countries of origin;

13. Invites once again Member States to sign and ratify the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property;

14. Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, to take the necessary measures to alert and mobilize International public opinion in favour of the return or restitution of cultural property to the countries of origin, in particular by mobilizing the United Nations Information media for this purpose;

15. Further requests the Secretary-General, In co-operation with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session a report on the implementation of the present resolution;

16. Reiterates its desire that the second World Conference on Cultural Policies, to be held In 1982, should devote considerable attention to the question of return or restitution of cultural property with a view to improving international cultural co-operation;

17. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of Its thirty-eighth session the item entitled "Return or restitution of cultural property to the countries of origin".

## Chapter XIV

# Population

United Nations activities in the population field in 1981 were highlighted by the decision to convene a population conference in 1981, creation of the United Nations Population Award, the start-up of the Population Information Network (POPIN) and the beginning of a review of the activities of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA).

In November, the Economic and Social Council decided to convene an International Conference on Population in 1984, making maximum use of extrabudgetary resources for its financing.<sup>(6)</sup> The Council acted after two postponements during the year, including a request in July for further information on extrabudgetary resources.<sup>(5)</sup>

In May 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the Council urged continued support for the World Fertility Survey (p. 788) and other activities to implement the World Population Plan of Action; the product of the World Population Conference held in 1974.<sup>(8)</sup> It also laid down guidelines for future United Nations activities on population, including a call to facilitate the establishment of POPIN (p. 788).<sup>(4)</sup>

The Secretary-General reported that total world population had reached an estimated 4,437 million in 1980, and that there were likely to be almost 50 per cent more people in the developing countries by the year 2000.<sup>(2)</sup> Projections to the year 2025 anticipated a tripling of the population of Africa, a doubling of the population of South Asia, a 150 per cent increase in Latin America and a rise of a little below 50 per cent in China (see below).

Against this background, a decline in 1981 resources obliged UNFPA to undertake extensive reprogramming and rephasing (p. 781). The Fund spent \$136.4 million in 1981, 7 per cent less than the previous year (p. 784). The Govern-

ing Council of the United Nations Development Programme, which oversees UNFPA, asked in June for a report on the possibilities of substantially increasing family planning, education and communication activities at the expense of work on data collection and population dynamics.

The decision to institute a United Nations Population Award was taken in December by the General Assembly.<sup>(7)</sup> It was to be given annually, starting in 1983, to an individual, individuals or an institution for an outstanding contribution to awareness of population questions or their solutions.

The Assembly called in December for implementation of a new United Nations work programme to study the interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development (p. 390).

The Population Commission, which meets biennially, held its 1981 session at United Nations Headquarters from 26 January to 4 February.<sup>(1)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Population Commission, E/1981/13 & Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/117.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(3)</sup>1981/28 (p. 780), <sup>(4)</sup>1981/29 (p. 786), 6 May; <sup>(5)</sup>1981/74, 24 July (p. 790); <sup>(6)</sup>1981/87, 25 Nov. (p. 790). <sup>(7)</sup>GA: 36/201, 17 Dec. (p. 792).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(8)</sup>1974, p. 552.

Publications: World Population Prospects as Assessed in 1980 (ST/ESA/SER.A/78), Sales No. E.81.XIII.8. Evaluation of the Impact of Family Planning Programmes on Fertility: Sources of Variance (ST/ESA/SER.A/76), Sales No. E.81.XIII.9. Demographic Yearbook 1981 (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.R/11), Sales No. E/F.82.XIII.1. Population Newsletter, No. 30/31 (Apr.); No. 32 (Dec.).

## Population policy and trends

The report of the Secretary-General on the world population situation in 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> based on United Nations demographic estimates and pro-

jections as assessed in 1980, stated that substantial population increase, mainly in many of the developing countries, would continue to be a major factor influencing the present and future of humanity. Towards the end of the century, the annual addition to the population of the developing countries might well increase to 84 million, or 93 per cent of the projected total annual increase in world population. If that trend continued, the population of the developing regions would increase by almost 50 per cent between 1980 and the year 2000, despite the anticipated decline in the overall birth rate for those countries.

The report also indicated that mortality had regained world attention as a serious demographic problem: mortality in Africa south of the Sahara remained the highest in the world, infant mortality continued to be most critical in Africa and South Asia, and child mortality also remained high in many developing regions.

Urban population was increasingly becoming a concern to policy-makers, particularly in the developing countries, where that sector of the population had increased fourfold since the middle of the century to reach 1 billion. The high level of urbanization in developed countries, along with the rapid urban population growth in developing countries, would lead to a significant milestone in human demographic history by the year 2000, in that the world population, which had always been largely rural, would have become predominantly urban.

In addition to the continued movement of workers from poorer to richer countries, a new trend which had gained momentum in the last decade was the flow of migrants to the oil-exporting countries of Western Asia and elsewhere in the developing countries: 2 million migrant workers were estimated to be employed in the oil-exporting Arab countries in 1975. Outbreaks of repatriation flows and refugee movements had continued, and the report found Africa to be the continent with the largest number of refugees and displaced persons.

In the early 1980s, most Governments considered population-related problems as critical factors for the success of their national development plans, and recognized that those problems comprised not only the growth rate but also uneven population distribution and excessive mortality levels. Further, national recognition of the importance of population and its relationship to economic and social development (p. 390) had been accompanied by growing awareness of the possible international consequences of national population policies. The report indicated that, world-wide, 35 countries out of a total of 165 perceived an increased rate of growth as desirable

and 75 other countries had expressed satisfaction with their rate of natural increase; however, 55 developing countries, which together comprised 59 per cent of the world's population and 79 per cent of the population of the developing countries, had indicated a desire to reduce their rate of population growth.

The Economic and Social Council, on 6 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> took note of the Secretary-General's report, and the General Assembly did likewise on 17 December.<sup>(2)</sup> Both actions were taken, without vote, on oral proposals by the Chairman of the Committee concerned: on the recommendation of the Council's First (Economic) Committee, a proved on 23 April, and the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, approved on 7 December.

Commenting on population matters in the Second Committee, Bangladesh said that, in view of the alarming trends projected in the Secretary-General's report, Governments must make increased efforts to curb population growth. India stated that international assistance was of capital importance if the population situation was to improve. Nepal remarked that, although its population programmes had been limited to the provision of family planning services, emphasis was beginning to be placed on the systematic involvement of government ministries in population activities. The USSR said it was helping developing countries to train their personnel in the population field and was prepared to continue such co-operation.

Decisions: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/128, 6 May, text following; <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/440, 17 Dec., text following.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/117.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.1-3, 4 (21-23 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.4, 7-10, 46 (25 Sep.-10 Oct. & 7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

Publications: Population and Development Modelling: Proceedings of the United Nations/UNFPA Expert Group Meeting Geneva, 24-28 September 1979 (ST/ESA/SER.A/73), Sales No. E.81.XIII.2. World Population Trends and Policies, 1981 Monitoring Report, vol. I: Population Trends (ST/ESA/SER.A/79), Sales No. E.82.XIII.2; vol. II: Population Policies (ST/ESA/SER.A/79/Add.1 & Add.1/Corr.1), Sales No. E.82.XIII.3 & corr.

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/128

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/62) without vote, 23 April (meeting 4); oral proposal by Chairman: agenda item 14.

Report of the Secretary-General on the world population situation in 1981

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Secretary-General on the world population situation in 1981 and decided to transmit it to the General Assembly.

General Assembly decision 36/440

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/691/Add.2) without vote, 7 December (meeting 46); oral proposal by Chairman: agenda item 12.

#### World population situation

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, took note of the report of the Secretary-General on the world population situation in 1981.

#### Implementation of the World Plan of Action

In a resolution of 6 May 1981, the Economic and Social Council<sup>(2)</sup> urged Member States and regional and international bodies to develop and strengthen activities to implement the World Population Plan of Action, adopted in 1974 by the United Nations World Population Conference.<sup>(3)</sup> It also urged government representatives to give full consideration to the interrelationships of population factors and social, economic, cultural and political development. Further, the Council called on United Nations organizations to include population matters in the deliberations of their conferences and to integrate population questions more fully into their work programmes; urged Governments and international organizations to give high priority to research on human reproduction and fertility regulation; and requested the Population Commission to continue the monitoring, review and appraisal of the Plan. It urged support for the World Fertility Survey (p. 788) and greater United Nations efforts to meet requests for assistance from developing countries.

The text was adopted without vote, having been approved in similar manner by the First Committee on 23 April on a draft recommended by the Population Commission on 4 February.<sup>(1)</sup> It incorporated an oral amendment by Norway, also on behalf of Denmark, Finland and Sweden, adding the provision on the World Fertility Survey.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Population Commission, E/1981/13 & Corr.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/28.6 May, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1974, p. 552.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.1-3, 4 (21-23 Apr.); plenary: E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/28

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/62) without vote, 23 April (meeting 4): draft by Population Commission (E/1981/13), orally amended by Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden; agenda item 14.

#### Strengthening of actions concerned with the fulfilment of the World Population Plan of Action

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolution 1979/32 of 9 May 1979, in which it called upon the governmental representatives of States Members responsible for drafting and adopting the international development strategy for the third United Nations development decade, the action programme to be produced by the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development, and other international instruments for economic, social and technological progress to include in such documents full recognition of the interrelationships of population factors and social, economic, cultural and political development, and the need for full and urgent action to deal with population problems; these interrelationships should

also be borne in mind in all instruments developed for the implementation of a new International economic order,

Noting with satisfaction the role given to population factors in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, which declares that population policies will be considered as an integral part of overall development policies and that all countries will continue to integrate their population measures and programmes into their social and economic goals and strategies,

Also noting with satisfaction resolution 1 of the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace, in which the Conference called upon Governments to take all appropriate measures to provide information, education and means to enable women and men to exercise freely the right to determine their family size and to set aside an appropriate proportion of their resources for population programmes,

Recalling that its resolution 1979/32 included fourteen priority areas for action identified in the first review and appraisal of the progress made towards the implementation of the World Population Plan of Action,

Emphasizing the important role of technical co-operation in implementing the World Population Plan of Action,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on monitoring of population trends, which shows that, although there has been some decline in the rate of growth of the world's population, there are indications that some developing countries are not succeeding in reducing infant and general mortality to the levels set out in the World Population Plan of Action and that, although there have been significant declines in fertility in some countries, there have been relatively slight or no such declines in some less developed countries and that others have increased their rate of population growth,

Conscious of the magnitude and urgency of the tasks remaining,

1. Urges all Member States and regional and International bodies, both governmental and non-governmental, to develop and strengthen further activities designed to implement the World Population Plan of Action, in particular to recognize that, together with social and economic factors, population is a central element in any strategy designed to improve the quality of life;

2. Urges governmental representatives of States Members responsible for formulating new development strategies, for the organization and conduct of relevant international conferences or for the drafting of international instruments for economic, social and technological progress to give full consideration to the interrelationships of population factors and social, economic, cultural and political development in dealing with population problems;

3. Calls upon the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, the International Labour Organisation, the World Bank, the United Nations Children's Fund, the regional commissions and other organizations of the United Nations system which have not yet given due attention to population to take steps to include population matters in the deliberations of their periodic and special conferences and to integrate population questions more fully into their regular work programmes;

4. Urges international organizations, including the United Nations Fund for Population Activities and the World Health Organization, and Governments to give high priority to research on human reproduction and the development of more acceptable, safer, and more effective means of fertility regulation, to promote the establishment of projects in which research workers in developed and less developed countries would co-operate fully in such research and to emphasize to public and private donors the great importance of such research;

5. Requests the Population Commission to continue with the process of monitoring, review and appraisal of progress made towards the implementation of the World Population



Plan of Action and requests the regional commissions and specialized agencies to continue to contribute to that process;

6. Urges the Secretary-General, the United Nations Fund for Population Activities and other International bodies concerned to continue supporting the World Fertility Survey to ensure that fertility and family planning data are collected and analysed as required, *Inter alia*, for the monitoring of the implementation of the World Population Plan of Action;

7. Requests the Secretary-General, taking account of experience gained through technical co-operation projects in the field of population in implementing the World Population Plan of Action, to strengthen efforts to meet requests for assistance in the implementation of the Plan of Action from the developing countries.

## UN Fund for Population Activities

### Activities of UNFPA

The 1981 programme of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) suffered from a general decline in resources caused, in part, by a lower rate of increase in contributions and by wide fluctuations in currency exchange rates (p. 784). The reduced resource level made extensive reprogramming and rephasing necessary, and the work plan for 1981-1984 had to be revised downward from a projected income of \$159 million in 1981 to a more realistic income projection of \$131 million, according to a report by the UNFPA Executive Director to the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).<sup>(2)</sup>

Much of this rephasing and reprogramming affected family planning activities, as it was possible to rephrase a portion of such projects into a future year without disastrous results for the entire project. By the end of the year, some \$60 million had been rephased to the 1982-1985 work plan period or beyond, and the belt-tightening was expected to continue into 1982.

In 1981, as in 1980, support for family planning accounted for over half of all UNFPA assistance to individual countries, and family planning projects also accounted for 80 per cent of its multi/bilateral programmes, carried out in co-operation with individual donor countries. As a proportion of the Fund's overall programme allocations, family planning activities received \$41.8 million or 31.8 per cent. These activities continued to focus on expanding the accessibility of services and improving their quality.

The International Conference on Family Planning in the 1980s (Jakarta, Indonesia, 26-30 April), jointly sponsored by the International Planned Parenthood Federation, the Population Council and UNFPA, brought together 133 participants from 76 countries and from major interna-

tional agencies. Conducting the first such global review of family planning trends since 1965, the Conference urged developing countries to increase substantially the proportion of public expenditures allocated to family planning to a level of approximately 5 per cent of domestic government spending.

The impact of financial constraints during the year was least felt in UNFPA assistance for basic data collection, primarily because it was impossible to halt and rephase census and other projects already under way. The Fund's assistance in this area totalled \$30.7 million, or 23.4 per cent of total programme allocations for 1981, part of which was spent on the purchase of computer equipment for the China census programme.

Providing a vital link between data collection and programme implementation, policy formulation and development planning activities amounted to some 19 per cent of the total programme: \$15.3 million or 11.7 per cent of total programme allocations went to population dynamics, \$8 million or 6.1 per cent to policy and programme formulation and evaluation, and \$1.4 million or 1.1 per cent to policy implementation.

A major problem concerning the implementation of population policies was the shortage of adequately trained personnel. UNFPA assistance in education and communication amounted to \$16.4 million, or 12.5 per cent of total programme allocations. Activities included preparation and field testing of a handbook for teacher trainers.

Special programmes for women, youth and aging persons received \$2.4 million, or 1.8 per cent of total programme allocations. UNFPA assistance to preparations for the 1982 World Assembly on Aging (p. 1024) totalled some \$128,000 at the end of 1981. In addition, \$15.2 million or 11.6 per cent of total programme allocations went to multisector activities, which included interdisciplinary and programme development work, support of UNFPA field staff, and overhead payments to the United Nations agencies and organizations executing UNFPA-funded projects.

Several regional meetings of parliamentarians were supported by UNFPA in 1981, including the African Conference of Parliamentarians on Population and Development (Nairobi, Kenya, 6-9 July); the Asian Conference of Parliamentarians on Population and Development (Beijing, China, 27-30 October); and the Colloquy on Trends and Prospects of Population Changes in Europe and Less Developed Countries (Strasbourg, France, 7-9 December), organized by the Council of Europe.

On 23 June,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNDP Governing Council, serving as the governing body of UNFPA, con-

firmed that the Fund should Concentrate on the following areas, listed in order of priority: family planning, including training of personnel and research into contraceptive methods; population education and family planning information dissemination; basic data collection; population dynamics; and population policy formulation, implementation and evaluation. The UNFPA Executive Director was asked to report on the possibilities of substantially increasing family planning, education and communication activities at the expense of work on data collection and population dynamics, and on the UNFPA experience with its system of priority countries. He was asked to take several factors into account in making project allocations, such as magnitude of population problems in relation to per capita gross national product, and to undertake a comprehensive review of contraceptive research and development needs and opportunities.

The Council approved large-scale programmes and projects in 15 countries (see below), as well as assistance to intercountry programmes (p. 783) and to the World Fertility Survey (p. 788). The Executive Director was requested to report in 1982 on the UNFPA programme for 1982-1985 (p. 784). The Council expressed the view that UNFPA should not help finance the International Conference on Population (p. 791). On other financial matters, it approved administrative budgets for 1981 and 1982 (p. 784), gave the Executive Director approval authority for projects in 1982-1984 (p. 784) and decided on the level of the Operational Reserve (p. 785).

At the end of 1981, UNFPA was assisting 1,786 projects—1,303 country, 202 regional, 90 inter-regional and 191 global; 209 new projects were approved in 1981, amounting to \$11.3 million, compared to 393 new projects in 1980 amounting to \$39.1 million.

The tables on this page and opposite show UNFPA allocations by major function, by executing agency, and by country and region.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/7, 23 June.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNFPA Executive Director. DP/1982/23 & Add.2,3.

UNFPA publications: Inventory of Population Projects in Developing Countries around the World, 1980/81 (yearly); 1981 Report by the Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities; Population, UNFPA Newsletter, vol. 7, Nos. 1-12 (monthly in Arabic, English, French and Spanish; every 2 months in Chinese); Populi, Journal of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, vol. 8, Nos. 1-4 (quarterly).

#### Country and regional projects

Of the total project allocations of \$131.2 million for 1981 (see table on following page), those for regional and country activities amounted to more than \$105 million.

An allocation of \$19.7 million was made for Africa south of the Sahara, where some 36 countries received UNFPA assistance in data collection. In Asia and the Pacific, the greatest part of the \$52.1 million in assistance went for family planning and maternal and child health, in 23 countries. The largest share of the \$18.6-million allocation for Latin American and the Caribbean, and of the \$15.1 million for the Middle East, the Mediterranean and Europe, also went to improvement of maternal and child health services and family planning.

In its 23 June decision on UNFPA (p. 781),<sup>(1)</sup> the UNDP Governing Council reaffirmed that efforts would be made to devote up to two thirds of country programme resources to priority countries, and approved large-scale programmes and projects in the following 15 countries:

Benin, \$1,460,390; Bhutan, \$2,070,000; Ecuador, \$2,850,000; Egypt, \$15,000,000; Ethiopia, \$16,000,000; Gambia, \$2,550,000; Guinea, \$5,400,000; Haiti, \$3,121,400; Morocco, \$10,000,000; Nigeria, \$17,300,000; Pakistan, \$30,000,000; Sri Lanka, \$5,400,000; Syrian Arab Republic, \$9,000,000; Tunisia, \$5,000,000; Yemen, \$8,000,000.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/7, sects. I & II, 23 June.

#### UNFPA ALLOCATIONS BY MAJOR FUNCTION, 1981

	Amount (In millions of US dollars)	Percent of total programme
Family planning	41.8	31.8
Basic data collection	30.7	23.4
Communication and education	16.4	12.5
Population dynamics	15.3	11.7
Multisector activities	15.2	11.6
Formulation and evaluation of population policies	8.0	6.1
Special programmes	2.4	1.8
Implementation of policies	1.4	1.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>131.2</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*Total includes allocations for Deputy Representatives and Senior Advisors on Population, overhead for government-executed projects and infrastructure.

#### UNFPA ALLOCATIONS BY EXECUTING AGENCY, 1981

	Amount (In millions of US dollars)	Percent of total programme
UNFPA*	39.1	29.8
United Nations	32.1	24.5
WHO	20.3	15.4
Non-governmental organizations	12.9	9.8
ILO	7.1	5.4
UNESCO	6.6	5.0
Regional commissions	6.2	4.8
UNICEF	4.4	3.3
FAO	2.5	2.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>131.2</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*Includes \$27.6 million in directly executed projects (21 Per cent of total).

## UNFPA PROJECT ALLOCATIONS FOR 1981

(in US dollars)

COUNTRY/REGION/OTHER	ALLOCATION	COUNTRY/REGION/OTHER	ALLOCATION	COUNTRY/REGION/OTHER	ALLOCATION
COUNTRY AND REGIONAL PROJECTS		COUNTRY AND REGIONAL PROJECTS (cont.)		COUNTRY AND REGIONAL PROJECTS (cont.)	
Africa south of the Sahara		Asia and the Pacific (cont.)		Latin America and the Caribbean (cont.)	
Angola	246,519	Indonesia	5,191,954	Peru	1,155,030
Benin	311,903	Klribati	82,839	St. Kitts-Nevis	67,279
Botswana	743,433	Lao People's Democratic Republic*	198,494	Saint Lucia	88,509
Burundi*	422,355	Malaysia	1,195,666	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	88,450
Cape Verde	185,863	Maldives*	13,500	Suriname	86,251
Central African Republic	360,844	Mongolia	150,209	Turks and Caicos Islands	3,859
Comoros	390,107	Nepal*	2,749,305	Uruguay	122,000
Congo	346,312	Pakistan*	996,659	Regional	5,884,422
Equatorial Guinea	106,780	Papua New Guinea	1,032,174	Subtotal	18,572,554
Ethiopia*	682,186	Philippines*	828,072	Middle East and the Mediterranean	
Gabon	193,329	Republic of Korea	464,332	Algeria	115,624
Gambia*	219,079	Samoa*	102,689	Bahrain	393,960
Ghana*	24,976	Singapore	55,265	Cyprus	141,724
Guinea*	438,169	Solomon Islands*	18,855	Democratic Yemen*	1,130,859
Guinea-Bissau	143,832	Sri Lanka	1,489,813	Djibouti	184,368
Ivory coast	106,617	Thailand*	3,142,270	Egypt	1,368,329
Kenya*	602,184	Tonga*	98,615	Iraq	372,712
Lesotho	131,825	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	24,250	Jordan*	1,222,825
Liberia*	348,299	Tuvalu	34,012	Kuwait	75,600
Madagascar*	300,923	Vanuatu	84,025	Malta	2,730
Malawi	208,319	Viet Nam*	2,750,806	Morocco*	897,134
Mali*	260,321	Regional	5,978,761	Somalia*	826,235
Mauritania*	819,039	Subtotal	52,136,535	Sudan*	1,112,457
Mauritius	263,687	Latin America and the Caribbean		Syrian Arab Republic	705,566
Mozambique	972,183	Anguilla	24,949	Tunisia	921,313
Niger*	70,496	Antigua	49,438	Turkey	1,130,810
Nigeria	784,739	Argentina	1,900	United Arab Emirates	63,392
Rwanda*	445,106	Barbados	291,658	Yemen*	541,614
Sao Tome and Principe	41,891	Belize	(7,961)	Regional	2,280,255
Senegal*	601,816	Bolivia	492,590	Subtotal	13,487,507
Seychelles	42,534	Brazil	635,528	Europe	
Sierra Leone	749,004	British Virgin Islands	19,000	Bulgaria	161,813
Swaziland	394,985	Cayman Islands	19,854	Czechoslovakia	19,000
Togo	600,915	Chile	82,349	Hungary	76,313
Uganda*	56,583	Colombia	362,378	Portugal	612,333
United Republic of Cameroon	222,039	Costa Rica	72,800	Yugoslavia	210,271
United Republic of Tanzania*	633,751	Cuba	711,753	Regional	531,850
Upper Volta*	612,421	Dominica	67,272	Subtotal	1,611,580
Zaire	660,692	Dominican Republic	680,208	INTERREGIONAL AND GLOBAL PROJECTS	
Zambia	722,720	Ecuador*	659,874	Interregional	12,878,346
Regional	4,260,460	El Salvador*	655,016	Global	12,778,314
Subtotal	19,731,236	Grenada	30,360	Subtotal	25,656,660
Asia and the Pacific		Guatemala	632,099	Total	131,196,072
Afghanistan*	640,070	Haiti	949,990		
Bangladesh*	4,941,615	Honduras*	600,820		
Bhutan	419,500	Jamaica	270,559		
Burma	90,763	Mexico	1,952,688		
China	15,722,629	Montserrat	6,500		
Cook Islands	20,400	Nicaragua	294,186		
Fiji	298,923	Panama	628,265		
Hong Kong	36,680	Paraguay*	892,681		
India*	3,283,390				

\*Classified as a priority country for UNFPA assistance.

## Intercountry projects

Allocations for interregional and global activities by UNFPA amounted to \$25.7 million in 1981.

The Fund continued to work closely with the United Nations and the specialized agencies to consolidate and reduce the number of intercountry activities within the level of approximately 25 per cent of total programme resources. Its support for a number of interregional and global projects, including United Nations monitoring

of the World Fertility Survey (p. 788), was being phased out. Intercountry projects provided advisory services by the specialized agencies, when necessary to supplement regional or country services, and the agencies received funding for a few interregional training courses and seminars.

The UNDP Governing Council reaffirmed, in its 23 June decision on UNFPA (p. 781), that the Fund's support of intercountry activities should be within the level of approximately 25 per cent of total programme resources by 1982.<sup>(1)</sup> It

requested, for its consideration in 1982, a report by the UNFPA Executive Director on intercountry activities that would identify types of programmes that were clearly technical assistance and backstopping for country activities, indicate the effects of other intercountry programmes at the country level, recommend activities to be phased out or to receive priority, and provide precise guidelines for all new projects. He was asked to exercise extreme caution in approving any new projects or programmes in order to ensure respect for the 25 per cent ceiling.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/7, sect. I, para. 5, 23 June.

#### Work programme for 1982-1985

The UNFPA work plan for 1982-1985, prepared by the Executive Director,<sup>(3)</sup> was based on the assumption that income would increase by 12 per cent over 1981 and by 15 per cent annually thereafter. It was considered obvious that, at current inflation rates, a 15 per cent increase would not permit real growth in the programme.

As described in a report of the Executive Director on UNFPA in the 1980s,<sup>(2)</sup> the Fund expected to reduce the share of resources given to basic population data collection, while most other activities were anticipated to increase slightly over the current share, with family planning programmes continuing to receive the largest percentage of resources.

The UNDP Governing Council, in its 23 June 1981 decision on UNFPA (p. 781), requested the Executive Director to review and reassess the UNFPA programme for 1982-1985 in view of the resource situation, assuming a 10 per cent annual increase.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/7, sect. I, para. 2, 23 June.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNFPA Executive Director, DP/530.

Work plan: <sup>(3)</sup>UNFPA Executive Director, DP/529.

#### Approval authority for projects in 1982-1984

The UNDP Governing Council, in its decision of 23 June 1981 on UNFPA (p. 781), gave the Executive Director additional authority to approve projects in each of the years 1982, 1983 and 1984, up to set limits.<sup>(1)</sup> Those limits were: \$144 million for 1982 (a \$33.75-million increase instead of the \$36.75 million he had requested<sup>(2)</sup>); \$108 million for 1983 (\$34.5 million additional, as against \$36.75 million requested); and \$72 million for 1984 (\$73.5 million requested). He was also authorized to make programme adjustments in the event of financial shortfalls.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/7, sect. II, paras. 2 & 3, 23 June.

Work plan: <sup>(2)</sup>UNFPA Executive Director, DP/529.

#### Finances of UNFPA

Expenditures of UNFPA totalled \$136,366,575 in 1981, a 7 per cent decrease from 1980. Of this total, \$122,376,587 constituted programme expenditure, \$9,514,584 was spent on UNFPA administrative and support costs, and \$4,475,404 was reimbursed to executing agencies for their support costs. Of total project expenditure, 58 per cent was spent by the participating and executing agencies, 30 per cent by UNFPA itself in directly executed projects, and 12 per cent was expenditure on non-governmental organization projects and special grants.

Government contributions totalled \$126.9 million in 1981 (p. 785).

#### Administrative budget for 1981

A supplementary appropriation of \$1,249,500 for the UNFPA administrative and programme support budget for 1981 was approved on 23 June<sup>(2)</sup> by the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (p. 782). This sum had been requested by the Executive Director to finance the transfer of UNFPA headquarters to the Daily News Building in New York City.<sup>(1)</sup> It raised the 1981 administrative budget by 15.1 per cent over the appropriation of \$8,275,667 approved by the Council in June 1980, to a total of \$9,525,167.

At 31 December 1981, total headquarters staff numbered 166, an increase of 9 over 1980. Field staff decreased by 6, to 34.

Budget estimates: <sup>(1)</sup>UNFPA Executive Director, DP/531 & Corr.1-3.

Decision: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/7, sect. III, para. 1, 23 June.

#### Administrative budget for 1982

As proposed by the Executive Director<sup>(1)</sup> and as recommended by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ),<sup>(3)</sup> the UNDP Governing Council, on 23 June 1981 (p. 782), approved appropriations of \$9,345,579 for the 1982 administrative and programme support services budget of UNFPA.<sup>(2)</sup> Of this total, \$5,540,478 was for programme planning, appraisal and monitoring; \$2,593,736 for administrative and public information support services; and \$1,211,365 for executive direction and management. The total amounted to 6.3 per cent of the Fund's resources, the same percentage as for 1981 prior to the one-time supplementary appropriation for moving (see above). The Executive Director attributed most of the rise over the initial 1981 level to inflation.

Budget estimates: <sup>(1)</sup>UNFPA Executive Director, DP/531 & Corr.1-3.

Decision: <sup>(2)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/7, sect. III, para. 2, 23 June.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>ACABQ, DP/532 & Corr.1.

#### Accounts for 1980

The General Assembly, in a resolution of 30 November 1981 on the accounts of several United Nations funds and programmes for the year ended 31 December 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> accepted the financial reports and accounts of UNFPA, along with the audit opinions of the Board of Auditors.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Board called for intensified efforts to collect unpaid pledges by Governments, including some \$8 million pledged and outstanding for 1980. It also recommended: that overhead costs to administer projects be charged at a uniform rate; that control over non-expendable property be strengthened; that measures be taken to ensure prompt submission by field offices of project delivery reports and audited accounts on completed projects; and that the Fund's administrative policies and procedures on travel be complied with.

ACABQ suggested<sup>(1)</sup> that the UNDP Governing Council consider extending the uniform support cost reimbursement arrangements to trust funds for projects executed directly by UNFPA. Further, immediate action should be taken by the Fund's administration to ensure compliance with its administrative policies and procedures covering travel advances.

In the discussion on these reports in the General Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, Bangladesh expressed the hope that weaknesses in project management would be corrected. India hoped that steps would be taken to reduce unspent balances in UNFPA accounts. Yugoslavia supported the Board's recommendation on uniform charging of support costs.

A UNFPA representative told the Committee that it was intended to strengthen project management at headquarters so as to ensure timely reviews; that UNFPA had taken steps to establish its own internal audit capacity; that new procedures would make possible closer monitoring of expenditures on government-executed projects; and that a senior adviser had been appointed to review arrangements for financial reporting on projects executed by specialized agencies.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ A/36/480; <sup>(2)</sup>Board of Auditors and financial statements, A/36/5/Add.7.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/65, 30 Nov. (p. 1302).

#### Operational Reserve

In order to cover and compensate for downward fluctuations or shortfalls in resources, uneven cash flows, increases in actual costs as compared to planning estimates or fluctuations in delivery, and other contingencies resulting in a loss of resources for which commitments had

been made, the UNDP Governing Council approved on 23 June 1981, in its decision on UNFPA (p. 781),<sup>(1)</sup> an Operational Reserve at a level of 25 per cent of the estimated contributions for a given year. The target level was to be achieved as soon as possible and preferably before the end of 1989.

Proposing this action in a report to the Governing Council,<sup>(2)</sup> the UNFPA Executive Director asserted that the Reserve should serve as a guaranty for the financial viability and integrity of the Fund, and requested donor Governments to increase their annual pledges so that the increase in the Reserve would be without detriment to the programme level.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/7, sect. III, paras. 4-6, 23 June.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNFPA Executive Director, DP/534.

#### Contributions

During 1981, 75 countries paid a total of \$126,884,659 in voluntary contributions to UNFPA (see table on following page). Pledges for 1982, from 72 countries, totalled \$54,185,543 as at 31 December 1981.

#### Other UN population activities

Guidelines for the United Nations work programme in the population field were set out by the Economic and Social Council in a resolution adopted without vote on 6 May 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> on the recommendation of the Population Commission.<sup>(2)</sup> The Council specified 16 areas of activity, including trends and policies, structure, estimates and projections, interrelations with development (p. 391), indicators, publication of studies and projections, fertility levels and trends, analysis of World Fertility Survey data (p. 788), policy analysis, policy impact, the Population Information Network (p. 788), technical co-operation (p. 787), training of personnel, institutions, and a population inquiry among Governments. Member States were urged to ensure that methods of evaluation and analysis of data formed an integral part of national census programmes by establishing and strengthening national population organizations. The Council emphasized the need for co-ordination among United Nations organizations and with bodies outside the system.

The resolution incorporated an oral amendment by Brazil, accepted without vote by the First (Economic) Committee. It affected a provision in the Population Commission's text which would have had the Council request that a population inquiry be carried out among Governments at a time that would permit a report on

the results to be submitted to the forthcoming Conference on Population (p. 788). As amended, the provision called for continuation of the inquiry without linking it to the Conference. The Committee approved the amended resolution without vote on 23 April.

A United Nations/World Health Organization Working Group on Data Bases for Measurement of Levels, Trends and Differentials in Mortality (Bangkok, Thailand, 20-23 October) recommended national and international action on civil registration, censuses and surveys, other data needs, research strategies and data management.<sup>(1)</sup> Addressing the role of international organizations and funding agencies, it expressed the view that donor agencies should expand sharply their support for programmes of mortality

data collection and analysis and for implementation of the results of those programmes.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup> Data Bases for Mortality Measurement (ST/ESA/SER.A/84), Sales No. E.83.XIII.3.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup> Population Commission, E/1981/13.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup> ESC, 1981/29, 6 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.1-3, 4 (21-23 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/29

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/62) without vote, 23 April (meeting 4); draft by Population Commission (E/1981/13), orally amended by Chairman following informal consultation and by Brazil; agenda item 14.

Work programme in the field of population

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 3344(XXIX) of 17 December 1974, in which the Assembly affirmed that the

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR POPULATION ACTIVITIES, 1981 AND 1982

(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country or territory	1981 payment	1982 pledge	Country or territory	1981 payment	1982 pledge
Afghanistan	2,000	2,000	Malta	513	500
Australia	996,310	1,666,667	Mauritius	3,955	—
Austria	48,700	50,000	Mexico	11,141	11,472
Bangladesh	10,000	13,200	Mongolia	500	500
Barbados	3,000	3,000	Morocco	4,000	4,000
Benin	—	2,000	Nepal	3,000	—
Bhutan	1,100	1,265	Netherlands	11,182,047	12,562,500
Botswana	1,371	1,600	New Zealand	639,800	—
British Virgin Islands	1,000	500	Nigeria	36,232	—
Burma	6,973	6,784	Norway	12,077,512	13,333,333
Burundi	5,584	—	Oman	—	10,000
Canada	6,443,627	7,203,390	Pakistan	525,000	300,000
Chile	10,000	3,000	Panama	2,000	1,000
China	275,000	300,000	Philippines	339,622	169,811
Colombia	38,860	44,000	Portugal	—	15,000
Cyprus	881	—	Qatar	10,000	30,000
Democratic Yemen	1,575	1,733	Republic of Korea	41,000	41,000
Denmark	5,068,740	5,352,113	Romania	10,000	5,455
Djibouti	—	2,000	St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla	736	—
Egypt	214,286	208,110	Senegal	—	20,000
Ethiopia	—	10,000	Seychelles	1,000	1,000
Fiji	2,000	2,000	Sierra Leone	—	5,000
Finland	548,246	965,116	Singapore	7,500	7,500
France	75,893	176,991	Solomon Islands	—	1,000
Germany, Federal Republic of	12,685,318	—	Somalia	1,605	—
Ghana	30,000	—	Sri Lanka	—	7,500
Guatemala	5,000	5,000	Sudan	—	25,000
Guyana	333	337	Suriname	—	2,500
Haiti	—	2,500	Sweden	8,411,435	8,839,779
Honduras	10,000	10,000	Switzerland	1,408,451	1,875,000
Hungary	10,012	11,429	Syrian Arab Republic	208,096	—
Iceland	—	3,700	Thailand	44,000	44,000
India	294,118	361,582	Togo	9,306	—
Indonesia	150,000	150,000	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	1,000	—
Iraq	—	14,237	Tunisia	6,750	24,000
Italy	932,502	168,067	Turkey	4,950	5,000
Japan	27,397,642	—	Uganda	1,923	—
Jordan	20,000	20,000	United Kingdom	4,518,419	—
Kenya	4,286	—	United Republic of Cameroon	2,011	—
Kuwait	25,000	30,000	United States	32,000,000	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	—	500	Upper Volta	—	3,534
Lesotho	2,000	1,000	Viet Nam	1,000	1,000
Liberia	—	3,000	Yemen	2,000	11,500
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	20,000	—	Yugoslavia	6,000	—
Luxembourg	8,413	7,067	Zambia	—	11,500
Malawi	1,514	1,400			
Malaysia	10,000	10,000			
Maldives	871	871	Total	126,884,659	54,185,543

World Population Plan of Action was an instrument of the International community for the promotion of economic development, quality of life, human rights and fundamental freedoms within the broader context of the Internationally adopted strategies for national and International progress.

Taking due cognizance of the population policies and programmes adopted by international agencies, non-governmental organizations and many countries pursuant to the provisions of the World Population Plan of Action,

Taking note of the discussions of the Population Commission at its twenty-first session on the progress of work and the work programme in the field of population,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the progress of work, the work programme for the biennium 1982-1983 and the medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989;

2. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To continue vigorously the work on monitoring of population trends and policies and the work necessary for the review and appraisal of the World Population Plan of Action;

(b) To continue the work on population trends and structure, paying particular attention to studies of fertility, mortality and internal and international migration;

(c) To strengthen the work on demographic estimates and projections;

(d) To continue work on interrelations of population and development, paying due attention both to the implications of population trends for development and to the impact of social and economic change on demographic trends, with a view to promoting the integration of demographic factors in national and international development strategies and plans, and to expedite the preparation of manuals for the use of national planners on methods of incorporating demographic factors in development planning;

(e) To arrange for the timely publication and wide dissemination, in all working languages, of the manual for estimating basic demographic indicators from incomplete data;

(f) To effect the more timely publication of all population studies and projections;

(g) To continue work on the assessment of levels and trends of fertility, and studies designed to explain causes of fertility change, including those dealing with the impact of family planning programmes, and the condition of women, making full use of data from the World Fertility Survey, other relevant sample surveys, population censuses and data from vital registration systems;

(h) To continue to promote co-operation within the United Nations system in the international comparative analysis of World Fertility Survey data through the United Nations Working Group on Comparative Analysis of World Fertility Survey Data;

(i) To continue the analyses of population policies and their implications for national and international development planning;

(j) To pursue research on the impact of population policies, other than family planning programmes, on population policy with that in other subprogrammes;

(k) To continue work on the interrelations of population, resources, environment and development;

(l) To facilitate, in collaboration with the regional commissions and specialized agencies, the establishment of a Population Information Network (POPIN), in collaboration with national and international information programmes;

(m) To continue the United Nations programme of technical co-operation in the field of population for countries requesting such assistance, in co-operation particularly with the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, and, in the event of a forthcoming world population conference, to take full account of experience gained through technical co-operation projects in the field of population;

(n) To strengthen the United Nations programme of training in population, through the work of the regional and inter-regional demographic training and research centres sponsored by the United Nations, support for national training institutions and the continuation of the programme of fel-

lowships for training in the population disciplines, particularly in relation to development planning;

(o) To assist Governments, on their request, in establishing or strengthening national institutions whose purpose is to co-ordinate population activities, particularly those relating to development planning, to study techniques of incorporating population factors in national development and to advise Governments in the formulation, implementation, follow-up and evaluation of population policies and programmes;

(p) To continue to carry out a population inquiry among Governments;

3. Urges Member States to ensure that methods of evaluation and analysis of population census and survey data and their use form an integral part of national census programmes by establishing and strengthening national population organizations and institutions;

4. Emphasizes the need for the organizations of the United Nations system to strengthen their collaboration and co-ordination in the planning and execution of their population programmes, as well as the need for those organizations to strengthen collaboration and co-ordination with national research organizations and other organizations outside the United Nations system in the planning and execution of their population programmes.

### Technical co-operation

In 1981, the United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development (DTCD) assisted 120 country projects financed by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). Placing particular emphasis on institution-building and training, many projects provided assistance in demographic analysis as a follow-up to the 1980 round of censuses. Three international demographic training centres and programmes in Egypt, Romania and the USSR, backstopped by DTCD, trained fellows from developing countries. A total of 156 fellowships were awarded for study at these and other institutions.

Activities in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Western Asia dealt mainly with demographic analysis, whereas the emphasis in Latin America and the Caribbean was on population policies and development. The Department continued to provide technical support to Governments in conducting population censuses and processing results, within the limitation of funds provided by UNFPA, and 15 censuses were completed in 1981. During the year, 37 experts worked in Africa, 5 in Asia, 8 in Latin America, 7 in Western Asia and 7 in Europe, the last on inter-regional and global projects.

Of DTCD programme delivery totalling \$137 million in the entire range of technical co-operation, \$26 million was provided by UNFPA. The reduction in the level of UNFPA funding in 1981 (p. 784), together with direct execution of projects by that body, seriously affected the scope of DTCD activities at the country and inter-country levels.

On 6 May, the Economic and Social Council, in its resolution on the population work

programme,<sup>(1)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to continue the United Nations technical co-operation programme, strengthen the training programme, assist Governments in establishing or strengthening national institutions for co-ordination of population activities, and advise Governments in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of population policies and programmes.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/29, para. 2 (m)-(o). 6 May (p. 787).

#### Population Information Network

The Population Information Network (POPIN), envisaged in 1979 by the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(2)</sup> came into being in January 1981 under the aegis of the United Nations as a decentralized network for co-ordination of regional, national and non-governmental population information activities. Acting as the Network's secretariat was a Co-ordinating Unit, also established in January, in the Population Division of the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, with financial support from UNFPA.

A Consultative Meeting,<sup>(1)</sup> held at Geneva from 27 to 30 April, set out the objectives and guidelines for the operation of POPIN, including its work programme for 1981-1982. The Meeting called for efforts to develop an infrastructure of governmental and non-governmental population information services, suggested that POPIN be guided by a 14-member Advisory Committee, and defined the functions of the Co-ordinating Unit, including publication of the POPIN Bulletin to keep members informed. As recommended by the Meeting, working groups consisting of population information experts from POPIN member institutions were formed during the year to deal with management of the Population Multilingual Thesaurus, development of a guide for the establishment and strengthening of population information services, and preparation of an inventory and evaluation of training materials.

On 6 May, the Economic and Social Council, in its resolution on the population work programme,<sup>(3)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to facilitate the establishment of POPIN, in collaboration with the regional commissions, specialized agencies, and national and international information programmes.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Consultative Meeting, ST/ESA/SER.R/42.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1979/33, para. 2 (h), 9 May 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 792); <sup>(3)</sup>1981/29, para. 2 (l), 6 May 1981 (p. 787).

#### World Fertility Survey

In 1981, the first stage of a comparative analysis of World Fertility Survey (WFS) data was completed by the United Nations Population

Division, and work was carried out on seven additional studies to be presented to a 1982 meeting of the United Nations Working Group on Comparative Analysis of World Fertility Survey Data. With funds from UNFPA, a technical adviser at United Nations Headquarters, assisted by regional advisers in Latin America and in Asia and the Pacific, helped countries analyse WFS data.

The Population Commission,<sup>(1)</sup> in January/February 1981, noted the wide use being made of WFS data, including their use by the Secretariat in preparing studies for the Commission on relationships between fertility and other demographic, social and economic phenomena. The Commission recommended that continued strong support be given to all phases of the Secretariat's work on comparative analysis of WFS data, and reiterated its call on all Governments involved in the Survey to release their data tapes to the United Nations for the purpose of international comparative analysis.

In its 6 May resolution on fulfilment of the 1974 World Population Plan of Action,<sup>(2)</sup> the Economic and Social Council urged the Secretary-General, UNFPA and others to continue supporting WFS so as to ensure that fertility and family planning data were collected and analysed. This call was included in the resolution on an oral proposal made in the Council's First (Economic) Committee by Norway, also on behalf of Denmark, Finland and Sweden.

In another resolution of 6 May, on the population work programme,<sup>(3)</sup> the Council requested the Secretary-General to continue promoting co-operation within the United Nations system in the international comparative analysis of WFS data through the United Nations Working Group.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Population Commission, E/1981/13.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1981/28, para. 6, 6 May (p. 781); <sup>(3)</sup>1981/29, para. 2 (h), 6 May (p. 787).

#### Convening of an International Conference on Population

On 25 November 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the Economic and Social Council decided without vote to convene in 1984, under United Nations auspices, an International Conference on Population. The Conference was to be conducted with the utmost economy in size, duration and other cost factors, and extrabudgetary resources were to be utilized to the maximum. It was to discuss selected issues of the highest priority, giving full recognition to the relationships between population and social and economic development with the aim of contributing to review and appraisal of the 1974 World Population Plan of Action.<sup>(6)</sup> The Population Commission, at sessions open to all States, would act as preparatory body. The



UNFPA Executive Director would serve as the Conference Secretary-General and would seek financial support for the Conference from external sources. The Director of the United Nations Population Division would be Deputy Secretary-General. Up to four expert groups could be convened or up to 45 experts employed in preparations for the Conference.

In view of the concern expressed by many members on the escalating cost estimates for the Conference, the Council agreed to consider the financial implications at its first regular session of 1982 in the light of a report on the availability of extrabudgetary resources, to be submitted by the UNFPA Executive Director (p. 791).

The proposal for a conference was made on 4 February by the Population Commission.<sup>(2)</sup> The draft resolution it recommended would have had the Council recommend to the General Assembly the convening of a conference and request the UNFPA Executive Director to assume a significant role in organizing it. Participating States would have been urged to ensure representation by high-level policy-makers and experts in population and related fields. Taking the Commission's draft as a basis, the Council added provisions to the effect that any State could participate in preparatory sessions of the Commission, without receiving the reimbursement of travel expenses accorded to Commission members; that Secretariat officials to be utilized for preparations should be drawn mainly from the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs; and that the number of experts and expert groups should be limited while ensuring a full range of scientific disciplines and equitable geographical distribution.

In an appendix to its report to the Council, the Commission said there was broad consensus but no unanimity on recommending the convening of a conference. A few members saw no need for a conference and considered that the money could better be used for strengthening population action programmes, while a large majority, including all developing countries represented, believed that such an undertaking would help revitalize work which might have slackened since the commitments made at the 1974 World Population Conference.

The Council considered this matter on three occasions in 1981 before reaching a decision. When it took up the question at its first regular session of 1981, it decided without vote on 6 May<sup>(5)</sup> to postpone until its second regular session consideration of the text by the Population Commission as well as an amendment by the USSR proposing that the Conference be financed from extrabudgetary resources. It took this action on a proposal by the Chairman of the

First Committee, made after informal consultations and approved by the Committee without vote on 24 April. The Chairman orally revised his proposal before its approval by deleting a suggestion that the matter of financing be raised with the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

At its second regular session, the Council decided without vote on 24 July to postpone consideration until its resumed second regular session of 1981.<sup>(3)</sup> At the same time, it requested the Secretary-General to provide further information on financing from extrabudgetary resources as well as on preparatory and organizational arrangements, and to explore alternatives to a conference. The Council acted by adopting a resolution approved on 21 July by its First Committee on the basis of an oral proposal by a Vice-Chairman, made following consultations.

Responding to this request, the Secretary-General informed the Council in October<sup>(1)</sup> that he believed a conference could contribute more effectively to the implementation of the World Population Plan of Action, provide policy-makers and experts with an appropriate forum for thorough examination of priority issues, and prove less costly than most alternatives. The other possibilities considered were a special session of the General Assembly or of the Council devoted exclusively to population issues, a special session of the Population Commission and a purely scientific meeting.

The resolution adopted by the Council in November, when it decided to convene the Conference, was submitted by a Vice-President on the basis of informal consultations. It incorporated oral amendments by Brazil adding the words "in all" to the paragraph authorizing the use of up to 45 experts in preparatory work for the Conference and specifying that this number excluded experts from the United Nations regional commissions.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/114.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Population Commission, E/1981/13.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(3)</sup>1981/74, 24 July, text following;

<sup>(4)</sup>1981/87, 25 Nov., text following.

Decision: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/125, 6 May, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1974, p. 552.

Financial implications: S-G statements, E/1981/40 & Rev.1, E/1981/L.60.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.I/SR.1, 2, 3-5, 15, 17 (21-24 Apr. & 15, 21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May), E/1981/SR.41 (24 July), E/1981/SR.43, 45 (2, 25 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/125

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/62) without vote, 24 April (meeting 5); draft by Chairman (E/1981/C.I/L.3), orally revised; agenda item 14.

#### Convening of a world population conference in 1984

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council, having considered the draft resolution entitled "Convening of a World Population Conference in 1984" recommended by the Population Commission at its twenty-first session for adoption by the Council, and the proposed amendment thereto, decided:

(a) To postpone taking action on the draft resolution and the proposed amendment thereto until its second regular session of 1981;

(b) To request the Secretary-General to submit to the Council, at its second regular session of 1981, a revised statement of the programme budget implications of the draft resolution, in accordance with the discussion that took place at the first regular session of 1981 of the Council;

(c) To request the Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities to explore the possibility of finding resources from external sources for the proposed conference.

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/74

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/110) without vote, 21 July (meeting 17); draft orally proposed by Vice-Chairman; agenda item 13.

#### Convening of a World Population Conference in 1984

##### The Economic and Social Council,

Having considered the note by the Secretariat containing the text of the draft resolution entitled "Convening of a World Population Conference in 1984" and the amendment thereto and the revised statement of financial implications of the draft resolution,

1. Decides to postpone consideration of the draft resolution and the amendment thereto until its resumed second regular session of 1981;

2. Requests the Secretary-General, in view of the opinion of many delegations in favour of holding a conference, to provide at the resumed second regular session of the Council in 1981 further information on the outstanding issue related to financing from extrabudgetary resources;

3. Further requests the Secretary-General to examine the views expressed by a few delegations which, while not opposing a conference, suggested that alternative approaches also be explored;

4. Decides, at the same time, that the Secretary-General should furnish information on preparatory and organizational arrangements for a conference.

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/87

Adopted without vote Meeting 45 25 November 1981

Draft by Vice-President (E/1981/L.59), based on informal consultations on draft by Population Commission (E/1981/13) and on amendment thereto by USSR (E/1981/C.1/L.1), orally amended by Brazil; agenda item 13.

#### Convening of an International Conference on Population in 1984

##### The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 3344(XXIX) of 17 December 1974 on the World Population Conference,

Recalling also Council resolution 1979/32 of 9 May 1979 on the strengthening of actions concerned with the fulfilment of the World Population Plan of Action.

Taking note of the report of the Population Commission on its twenty-first session, in which it recommended the convening of a new population conference,

Urging States participating in the conference to involve high-level policy-makers and experts in population and related fields,

Noting with appreciation the policies and programmes adopted by many States, United Nations bodies and non-governmental organizations pursuant to the provisions of the World Population Plan of Action,

Concerned at the magnitude and urgency of the tasks still remaining for the more effective implementation of the World Population Plan of Action at the national, regional and global levels,

Recalling further General Assembly resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, in which the Assembly stated, *inter alia*, that the implementation of the World Population Plan of Action should be strengthened during the 1980s and that the international community should increase the level of population assistance in support thereof,

Having regard to General Assembly resolutions 35/5 of 20 October 1980 and 35/10 C of 3 November 1980,

1. Decides to convene in 1984, under the auspices of the United Nations, an International Conference on Population open to all States as full members and to the specialized agencies, bearing in mind that it should be conducted with the utmost economy in size, duration and other cost factors and the need to utilize extrabudgetary resources for its financing to the maximum extent possible;

2. Decides that the Conference shall be devoted to the discussion of selected issues of the highest priority, giving full recognition to the relationships between population and social and economic development with the aim of contributing to the process of review and appraisal of the World Population Plan of Action and to its further implementation;

3. Decides further that the Conference shall work within the framework of the existing World Population Plan of Action, the principles and objectives of which continue to be fully valid;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure the substantive contribution to the Conference of the regional commissions, specialized agencies and other bodies of the United Nations system and other international organizations, as appropriate;

5. Decides to designate the Population Commission, meeting in open-ended session, with the participation of any other State, as the intergovernmental preparatory committee for the Conference, and for this purpose decides that rule 11 of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council and rule 1 (d) of the rules governing payment of travel expenses and subsistence allowances in respect of members of organs or subsidiary organs of the United Nations shall be waived;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to appoint the Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities to serve as the Secretary-General of the Conference, and the Director of the Population Division of the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs to serve as the Deputy Secretary-General;

7. Recommends that the personnel to be utilized in the preparations for the Conference should be drawn mainly from the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, which will be responsible for the co-ordination of the substantive aspects of the preparations, including the review and appraisal of the World Population Plan of Action;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure a significant contribution by the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development to the Conference and to take full account of experience gained through technical co-operation activities in assisting in the implementation of the World Population Plan of Action;

9. Requests the Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities to seek financial support from external sources for the Conference and to report thereon on a regular basis to the Economic and Social Council;

10. Authorizes the Secretary-General to convene a maximum of four small expert groups, or to call upon individual experts in the preparatory work for the Conference, up to a maximum of forty-five experts in all, excluding experts from the secretariats of the regional commissions, taking fully into account the need to ensure a full range of scientific disciplines and the principle of equitable geographical distribution;

11. Requests the Conference to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session through the Economic and Social Council.

#### Financial aspects

In revised financial estimates on the convening of an International Conference on Population,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General informed the General Assembly in December 1981 that the Conference and its preparations might cost about \$2,319,700, of which \$1.5 million was anticipated from extrabudgetary resources. In the absence of definitive information on the availability of such resources, he was unable to present in 1981 a definitive request for additional appropriations but would do so in the context of his programme budget proposals for 1984-1985, in the expectation that extrabudgetary resources would be available to finance preparations in 1982-1983.

As recommended without vote on 15 December by the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, the Assembly, on 18 December,<sup>(5)</sup> also without vote, took note of the Secretary-General's report and of an oral report by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ), who noted the Secretary-General's intention to report to the Assembly through ACABQ once the Economic and Social Council reviewed the forthcoming report by the UNFPA Executive Director (p. 789). The Fifth Committee's recommendation was made on an oral proposal by its Chairman based on a suggestion by the ACABQ Chairman.

The issue of financing the Conference figured prominently in the Economic and Social Council's consideration of whether to convene it. In its 6 May decision,<sup>(6)</sup> the Council requested the UNFPA Executive Director to explore the possibility of finding resources from sources external to the United Nations budget. A phrase in the original draft decision proposed in April by the Chairman of the First Committee, authorizing the UNFPA Executive Director to bring the matter of financing to the attention of the UNDP Governing Council, was orally deleted by the Chairman before the decision was approved. The Governing Council, in its decision of 23 June on UNFPA (p. 781), stated its view that, given the scarcity of resources, UNFPA should not contribute from its regular budget to the financing of the Conference.<sup>(7)</sup>

In its 24 July resolution postponing a decision, the Economic and Social Council requested the Secretary-General to provide further information on extrabudgetary financing.<sup>(3)</sup> Responding in October, the Secretary-General said in a note to the Council that the UNFPA Executive Director

was confident, based on informal contacts with Governments, that \$1.5 million could be raised for the Conference from external sources, covering a major part of the cost of preparing and organizing it.<sup>(1)</sup>

In deciding on 25 November to convene the Conference, the Council mentioned the need to utilize extrabudgetary resources to the maximum and requested the UNFPA Executive Director to seek financial support for the Conference from external sources.<sup>(4)</sup>

At the Council's discussion in November, concern about escalating cost estimates was expressed by Australia, Belgium, Brazil, France, India, the United Kingdom and the United States. China, the Federal Republic of Germany, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States reiterated that the bulk of the cost should be covered by extrabudgetary resources-which the USSR said might be supplemented, if necessary, by savings in the regular budget to be achieved by eliminating obsolete or marginal activities. A number of States, including Belgium, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States, supported the USSR view that the matter should be reconsidered in 1982 in the light of the forthcoming report by the UNFPA Executive Director.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/114.

Report: (2)S-G, A/C.5/36/33/Add.1.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(3)</sup>1981/74, para. 2, 24 July (p. 790); <sup>(4)</sup>1981/87, paras. 1 & 9, 25 Nov. (p. 790).

<sup>(5)</sup>GA. 36/235 sect. XIV, 18 Dec., text following.

Decisions: <sup>(6)</sup>ESC: 1981/125, para. (c), 6 May (p. 789); <sup>(7)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1): 81/7. sect. II. para. 4, 23 June.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR. 76 (15 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section XIV

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without vote, 15 December (meeting 76); Oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 100.

Convening of an International conference  
on population in 1984

[The General Assembly...]

Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the convening of an International conference on population in 1984 and the related oral report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;

...

#### Participation in the Conference

On 25 November 1981, the Economic and Social Council decided without vote, on an oral proposal of its President, to request the Population Commission, as preparatory body for the International Conference on Population, to make detailed recommendations to the Council concerning participation in the Conference.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/205, 25 Nov., text following.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.43, 45(2,25 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/205

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 13.

Convening of an International Conference  
on Population in 1984

At its 45th plenary meeting, on 25 November 1981, the Council decided to request the Population Commission as the preparatory body for the International Conference on Population to make the necessary detailed recommendations to the Council concerning participation in the Conference, taking into account the relevant decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly and established United Nations practice regarding participation in conferences convened by the United Nations.

Establishment of the UN Population Award

Recognizing the economic and social implications of population trends and the projected growth in world population to 6.1 billion by the year 2000, the General Assembly, on 17 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> established the United Nations Population Award, to be presented annually to an individual, individuals or an institution for the most outstanding contribution made to the awareness of population questions or to their solutions. The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to arrange for commencement of the Award in 1983, in consultation with the Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities. A Trust Fund, which was to be established to receive voluntary contributions, would finance all costs related to the Award.

The Regulations annexed to the resolution dealt with the nomination and selection of Award recipients. They stipulated that the choice would be made each February by a Committee for the United Nations Population Award and that the Award, to be presented each June, would consist of a diploma, a gold medal and a monetary prize, in an amount to be determined each year by the Secretary-General.

The resolution, adopted by the Assembly without vote, was approved in similar fashion by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 7 December. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on a 14-nation draft.<sup>(1)</sup> The original text did not specify the contributions for the Award as voluntary, referred to a statute rather than to regulations, differed in regard to the composition of the Committee for the Award and would have entrusted that body, rather than the Economic and Social Council, with drawing up its rules of procedure.

Introducing the original draft resolution, Bangladesh stressed the importance of greater awareness and understanding of population problems.

Denmark, speaking also on behalf of the other Nordic States, announced that they would not contribute to the Trust Fund for the Award,

since operational activities rather than awards best promoted understanding of population issues, and the establishment of a population award might create a false impression of United Nations activities.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Bangladesh, Chad, China, India, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Suriname, Thailand, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, A/C.2/36/L.91.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/201, 17 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee. A/C.2/36/SR.3, 6, 33-39, 43-66 (24 Sep.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/201

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/812) without vote, 7 December (meeting 46); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.130), based on informal consultation on 14-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.91); agenda item 70 (e).

Establishment of the United Nations Population Award  
The General Assembly,

Recalling the World Population Plan of Action, adopted by the United Nations World Population Conference, held in 1974, and noting with satisfaction the significant contributions made by the United Nations to the implementation of that Plan,

Recognizing the economic and social implications of the population trends particularly related to development, as described in reports prepared by the United Nations and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, which indicate that world population is projected to grow from 4.4 billion in 1980 to approximately 6.1 billion by the year 2000,

Recognizing the need to promote better awareness and understanding of population issues, especially at the individual and community levels of each country and in accordance with national plans and priorities,

Further recognizing the special significance of establishing an award in order to promote that objective,

1. Decides to establish an annual award, to be named the United Nations Population Award, for the most outstanding contribution to the awareness of population questions or to their solutions, by an individual or individuals, or by an institution, to be presented through the United Nations;

2. Adopts the Regulations Governing the United Nations Population Award, annexed to the present resolution;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements, under the Regulations, for the commencement of the Award in 1983, in consultation with the Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to establish a Trust Fund for the United Nations Population Award to receive voluntary contributions for the Award;

5. Decides that all costs related to the Award should be borne out of the Trust Fund.

ANNEX

Regulations Governing the United Nations Population Award

Article 1

Aim

The aim of the United Nations Population Award (hereinafter referred to as "the Award") is to promote the solution of population questions through encouraging the efforts of people in population-related activities and increasing the awareness of population questions.

Article 2

Award

1. The Award shall be presented annually to an individual, to individuals or to an institution for the most outstanding contribution to increasing the awareness of population ques-

tions or to their solutions. No staff member, organ or organization of the United Nations system shall be eligible for the Award.

2. The Award shall consist of a diploma, a gold medal and a monetary prize, the amount of which shall be determined each year by the Secretary-General on the basis of the investment income of the Trust Fund for the Award.

3. The individual or individuals or the institution to receive the Award shall be announced by the beginning of March each year, and the Award shall be presented by the Secretary-General in the middle of June.

#### Article 3

##### Financial matters

1. All financial resources related to the Award shall be composed of the voluntary contributions made by Member States specifically for the Award.

2. Contributions for the Award shall be deposited in the Trust Fund for the United Nations Population Award, to be established by the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 36/201 of 17 December 1981.

3. The Trust Fund shall be administered by the Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities on behalf of the Secretary-General.

4. All costs relating to the Award shall be financed from the investment income of the Trust Fund. The administrative costs shall be kept as low as possible.

5. The Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities shall submit to the General Assembly an annual report concerning the Award and the Trust Fund.

#### Article 4

##### Selection of laureates

1. The individual or individuals or the institution to receive the Award shall be selected, from among those nominated under article 5 below, by a Committee for the United Nations Population Award, to be composed of:

(a) Ten representatives of States Members of the United Nations elected by the Economic and Social Council for a period of three years, with due regard to the principle of equitable geographical representation and the need to include those Member States that have made contributions for the Award;

(b) The Secretary-General and the Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, to serve as ex officio members;

(c) Five eminent individuals who have made significant contributions to population-related activities, to be selected by the aforementioned members of the Committee, to serve as honorary members in an advisory capacity for a renewable term of three years.

2. The Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities shall act as Secretary of the Committee.

3. The rules of procedure of the Committee shall be established by the Economic and Social Council.

#### Article 5

##### Nomination of candidates

1. Written nominations for the Award may be received from the following:

(a) Governments of Member States;

(b) Intergovernmental organizations engaged in population-related activities;

(c) Population-related non-governmental organizations having consultative status with the United Nations;

(d) University professors of population or population-related studies and heads of population-related institutions;

(e) Laureates of the Award.

2. Nominations shall reach the Secretary-General not later than 31 December of the year prior to the year for which nominations are to be considered.

3. The Committee for the United Nations Population Award shall be convened during the month of February to select the laureate or laureates of the year.

## Population Commission

### Report on the 1981 session

On 6 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Economic and Social Council, acting without vote, took note of the report of the Population Commission on its twenty-first session, held at United Nations Headquarters from 26 January to 4 February.<sup>(2)</sup> His decision was recommended without vote by the First (Economic) Committee on 23 April, on an oral proposal by its Chairman.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/127, 6 May, text following.

Report <sup>(2)</sup>Population Commission, E/1981/13 & Corr.1.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.1-3, 4 (21-23 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/127

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/62) without vote, 23 April (meeting 4); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 14.

#### Report of the Population Commission

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Population Commission on its twenty-first session.

### Agenda of the 1983 session

The Economic and Social Council approved without vote on 6 May 1981 the provisional agenda and documentation for the twenty-second (1983) session of the Population Commission.<sup>(1)</sup> This included items dealing with United Nations action to implement the recommendations of the 1974 World Population Conference,<sup>(2)</sup> progress of work on population and future work programmes.

The agenda had been recommended by the Commission in February 1981. The Council's First Committee, before recommending its approval without vote on 23 April, accepted an oral proposal by Brazil to delete an item concerning preparation of the 1984 Conference on Population (p. 788) pending a decision by the Council on the matter.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/126, 6 May, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1974, p. 552.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.1-3, 4 (21-23 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/126

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/62) without vote, 23 April (meeting 4); draft by Population Commission (E/1981/13), orally amended by Brazil; agenda item 14.

#### Provisional agenda and documentation for the twenty-second session of the Population Commission

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council approved the provisional agenda and documentation for the twenty-second session of the Population Commission, as set out below:

#### Provisional agenda and documentation for the twenty-second session of the Population Commission

1. Election of officers

2. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters

3. Action by the United Nations to implement the recommendations of the World Population Conference, 1974: monitoring of population trends and policies  
Documentation  
Concise report on monitoring of trends  
Concise report on monitoring of policies  
Working paper on monitoring of trends (English only)  
Working paper on monitoring of policies (English only)
4. Progress of work in the field of population  
Documentation  
Progress of work, 1981-1982, of the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs  
Recommendations of expert groups (approximately four reports)
- Progress of work, 1981-1982, of the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development
5. Programme of work in the field of population for the biennium 1984-1985 and medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989  
Documentation  
Programme of work, 1984-1985, and medium-term plan, 1984-1989  
Medium-term plan (Department of Technical Co-operation for Development), 1984-1989
6. Draft provisional agenda for the twenty-third session of the Commission
7. Adoption of the report of the Commission on its twenty-second session

## Chapter XV

# Health and human resources

The International Year of Disabled Persons (IYDP), with the theme of full participation and equality for the disabled, was observed by the United Nations and its Member States in 1981. Programmes focused on rehabilitation and other assistance to disabled persons and disability prevention, with the aim of ensuring the integration of the disabled in society. The Secretary-General reported to the General Assembly on activities during the Year.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Economic and Social Council endorsed the objectives of IYDP in May,<sup>(4)</sup> calling on Governments and organizations to work for its success. In December, the Assembly called for follow-up action in future years,<sup>(9)</sup> including contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for IYDP (p. 796). The Advisory Committee for IYDP prepared a draft World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons, to be refined in 1982 prior to its submission to the Assembly for adoption.

On the Council's recommendation,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly endorsed in November 1981<sup>(6)</sup> the Global Strategy for Health for All by the Year 2000, adopted in May 1981 by the World Health Assembly of the World Health Organization (WHO). The main thrust of the Strategy was to encourage development of each country's health system infrastructure, including measures for health promotion, disease prevention, diagnosis, therapy and rehabilitation.

In May, the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) approved a strengthening, of support for primary health care of mothers and children (p. 803). As an aspect of this approach, the outline of a Joint Programme on Provision of Essential Drugs for Primary Health Care in Developing Countries was approved in February by the UNICEF/WHO Joint Committee on Health Policy (p. 804).

In other United Nations action on health issues, the General Assembly called for international action to deal with problems related to banned substances and unsafe pharmaceutical products (p. 824). UNICEF allocated its largest expenditures to child health (p. 1004) and one tenth of its expenditures to nutrition (p. 1005).

Human resources development was pursued through training and research programmes undertaken by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and the United Nations University (UNU). The United Nations Development Programme allocated funds for disseminating information on national experience in training qualified personnel and enhancing their role in social and economic development (p. 804).

While continuing its training and research programmes within total expenditures of \$2.2 million in 1981, UNITAR concentrated on economy measures and efforts to make its programmes more effective (p. 804), according to its annual report to the General Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup> The Assembly, in December, welcomed those steps and called on UNITAR to adjust its programme and administrative costs to ensure that, from 1982, estimated expenditure did not exceed estimated revenue.<sup>(8)</sup> It also approved a \$352,600 grant from the United Nations regular budget to cover the 1981 UNITAR deficit (p. 807).

UNU reported to the Assembly<sup>(3)</sup> that it had experienced a transition year in 1981 with the adoption by its Council of a medium-term perspective for 1982-1987 that took the University from its formative years to a period of planning for future growth (p. 809). In November, the Assembly noted with satisfaction the decision to move towards the medium-term perspective and called for contributions to the UNU Endowment

Fund<sup>(7)</sup> A permanent site for UNU headquarters, in central Tokyo, was dedicated in November.

Training programmes were also carried out by the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa (p. 1117) and the United Nations Institute for Namibia (p. 1176).

Aspects of human resources development were also addressed by the General Assembly in two December resolutions. By one, the Assembly invited States to consider adopting measures to ensure full implementation of the right to universal education (p. 924). By the second, the Assembly noted with satisfaction a decision by the Trade and Development Board of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to authorize the convening of a group of experts on the feasibility of measuring human resource flows—an aspect of the brain drain of skilled personnel from developing to developed countries (p. 757).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/471; <sup>(2)</sup>UNITAR, A/36/14; <sup>(3)</sup>UNU Council, A/36/31.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(4)</sup>1981/22, 6 May (p. 796); <sup>(5)</sup>1981/61, 23 July (p. 803). GA: <sup>(6)</sup>36/43 (p. 803), <sup>(7)</sup>36/45 (p. 811), 19 Nov.; <sup>(8)</sup>36/75, 4 Dec. (p. 806); <sup>(9)</sup>36/77, 8 Dec. (p. 800).

## Health

### Disabled persons

#### International Year of Disabled Persons

##### Programme and activities

The observance during 1981 of the International Year of Disabled Persons (IYDP) spurred a wide range of national, regional and international activities on behalf of physically handicapped and other disabled persons.

The Year had been proclaimed by the General Assembly in 1976 to help disabled persons in their physical and psychological adjustment to society, promote national and international assistance, encourage research to facilitate adjustment to daily life, inform the public of the rights of the disabled, and promote prevention and rehabilitation.<sup>(14)</sup> The theme of the Year, set in 1978, was "full participation and equality".<sup>(15)</sup> To co-ordinate activities for the Year, the Secretary-General, in February 1981, appointed the Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for IYDP.

Activities by national committees aimed at improving the social and economic conditions of disabled persons were decisive for the achieve-

ments of the Year, the Secretary-General stated in an October 1981 report to the Assembly covering the period from January to the end of July.<sup>(10)</sup> The work of those committees, set up in 141 countries and territories, was described by the Secretary-General in that report and in a September 1982 report<sup>(12)</sup> covering subsequent activities during the Year.

The national committees focused on the development and implementation of national plans of action, social issues, participation by disabled persons in policy- and decision-making, statistics and research, legislation, decentralization of activities and responsibilities from national to local levels, assistance to developing countries, and promotion of national weeks and days.

National programmes and concerns were described in reports transmitted in notes verbales and letters to the Secretary-General submitted by China,<sup>(1)</sup> Democratic Kampuchea,<sup>(2)</sup> the United States<sup>(5)</sup> and Viet Nam.<sup>(6)</sup>

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 8 December on IYDP,<sup>(16)</sup> expressed satisfaction to all Member States that had elaborated national policies and programmes for implementing the Year's objectives. It also stressed the importance of strengthening support services for exchanging technical information and transferring technology, and noted with appreciation Yugoslavia's offer to contribute to that work. Yugoslavia presented its offer to establish a technical co-operation support service in a note verbale of 20 November to the Secretary-General.<sup>(7)</sup>

In regional action, the Economic Commission for Africa, in April, endorsed the report of a Regional Seminar on IYDP held at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in October 1980 (p. 629). A European regional seminar, organized by the United Nations in co-operation with the Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, was held at Siilinjärvi, Finland, from 27 May to 2 June. A plan of action for Western Asia was forwarded to the Assembly by the Economic Commission for Western Asia (p. 672). Meetings organized by the respective United Nations regional commissions had been held during 1980 in Asia and the Pacific and in Latin America.

At the international level, the World Symposium of Experts on Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries and Technical Assistance in Disability Prevention and Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons (Vienna, Austria, 12-23 October 1981) brought together 51 experts from all regions, 126 observers representing 41 States, and a number of international governmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).<sup>(11)</sup> The Symposium formulated a Vienna Affirmative Action Plan, setting out priority issues in technical co-operation concerning dis-

ability prevention, rehabilitation of disabled persons and the equalization of opportunities for them.

Tripoli, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, was the site of the International Symposium on Disabled Persons from 27 September to 4 October; its recommendations were transmitted to the General Assembly by a note verbale of 8 December from the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.<sup>(3)</sup> The World Conference on Actions and Strategies on Education, Disability Prevention and Integration of Disabled Persons, organized by Spain in co-operation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, was held at Torremolinos, Spain, from 2 to 7 November; its Declaration was transmitted by a letter of 3 December from Spain.<sup>(4)</sup>

Within the United Nations system, design alterations were introduced at United Nations Headquarters and at United Nations offices at Geneva and Vienna to make facilities more accessible to disabled people. United Nations public information units prepared background and feature material, photo displays, and film, television and radio productions. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization provided technical assistance for the use of traditional medicine in combination with advanced technology, giving priority to diseases leading to disability. UNICEF expanded immunization programmes to save 5 million children a year from preventable disabilities (p. 1005). The Commission on Human Settlements, in May, urged Governments and the United Nations system to assist in diminishing or eliminating barriers in human settlements that prevented the full participation of the disabled in social development (p. 856). Technical co-operation advisory missions on disability were undertaken in 30 developing countries and regional meetings were organized.

The activities of the United Nations system related to the Year were examined at two inter-agency meetings on IYDP, in Paris (24 and 25 February)<sup>(8)</sup> and at Vienna (27 and 28 October),<sup>(9)</sup> organized by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. The meetings concentrated on follow-up activities to IYDP (p. 798).

International NGOs participated in the Year by conducting research, presenting film exhibitions, organizing sports and music competitions, and organizing seminars and training courses for and about disabled persons. The First Founding Congress of Disabled People's International was held in Singapore from 30 November to 6 December.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. On 6 May,<sup>(13)</sup> the Economic and Social Council, acting without vote, called on Governments,

United Nations organizations, other intergovernmental organizations and NGOs to work for the success of IYDP. The Secretary-General was urged to ensure that the rehabilitation and well-being of the disabled and the prevention of disability were given due consideration in United Nations programmes.

The resolution was recommended by the Commission for Social Development on 17 February and approved without vote by the Council's Second (Social) Committee on 29 April. An oral amendment by Canada in the Second Committee added the words "especially organizations of disabled persons" in reference to organizations called upon to work for the success of the Year.

Letters (1) and notes verbales: <sup>(1)</sup>China, 2 June, A/36/363; <sup>(2)</sup>Democratic Kampuchea, 9 Sep., A/36/491 (1); <sup>(3)</sup>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 8 Dec., A/36/809; <sup>(4)</sup>Spain, 3 Dec., A/36/766 (1); <sup>(5)</sup>United States, 17 Nov., A/36/770; <sup>(6)</sup>Viet Nam, 25 Nov., A/36/726 (1); <sup>(7)</sup>Yugoslavia, 20 Nov., A/36/711.

Reports: Inter-agency meetings, <sup>(8)</sup>ACC/1981/19 (Feb.), <sup>(9)</sup>ACC/1981/38 (Oct.); S-G, <sup>(10)</sup>A/36/471, <sup>(11)</sup>A/36/471/Add.3, <sup>(12)</sup>A/37/351 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(13)</sup>ESC: 1981/22, 6 May, text following. GA: <sup>(14)</sup>31/123, 16 Dec. 1976 (YUN 1976, p. 558); <sup>(15)</sup>34/154, para. 1, 17 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 767); <sup>(16)</sup>36/77, paras. 1 & 17, 8 Dec. 1981 (p. 801).

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-10, 11 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/22

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote 29 April (meeting 11); draft by Commission for Social Development (E/1981/26), orally amended by Canada; agenda item 10.

international Year of Disabled Persons

The Economic and Social Council,

Taking note of the progress report of the Secretary-General on the prevention of disability.

Endorsing the conclusions and recommendations contained in that report,

Welcoming the nomination by the Secretary-General of his Special Representative for the International Year of Disabled Persons,

1. Calls upon Governments, the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, as well as other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, especially organizations of disabled persons, to work together to make the international Year of Disabled Persons a success;

2. Urges the Secretary-General to take all necessary steps to ensure that the rehabilitation and well-being of the disabled and the prevention of disability are, wherever appropriate, given due consideration within United Nations programmes.

Trust Fund for IYDP. Contributions from 14 countries collected during 1981 for the Trust Fund for IYDP totalled \$513,951 (see table below). The Fund was established under a 1977 resolution by which the General Assembly appealed for voluntary contributions for the Year.<sup>(1)</sup> According to the Secretary-General's October 1981 report on IYDP (p. 795), six requests for assistance had been financed from the



Trust Fund and more than 60 major requests, valued at over \$9 million, were pending due to the lack of resources. Priority was to be given to requests for international promotional activities and for advisory services to Governments relating to activities of IYDP national committees.

As suggested by the Advisory Committee for IYDP, the Assembly, in its 8 December resolution on the Year,<sup>(2)</sup> appealed for further voluntary contributions, to be used in part for activities in developing countries, including the strengthening of organizations of disabled persons.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TRUST FUND FOR THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF DISABLED PERSONS, 1981 AND 1982

(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment	1982 pledge
Austria	22,479	
Belgium	25,000	-
Canada	82,900	-
Chile	5,000	-
Japan	100,000	-
Kuwait	7,367	-
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	250,000	-
Malta	250	-
Pakistan	10,000	-
Philippines	5,000	-
Portugal	1,000	-
Qatar	4,000	-
Senegal		2,000
United Republic of Cameroon	851	-
Yugoslavia	104	-
Total	513,951	2,000

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>32/133, para. 7, 16 Dec. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 660); <sup>(2)</sup>36/77, paras. 12 & 13, 8 Dec. 1981 (p. 801).

#### Follow-up to the Year

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION. The Advisory Committee for IYDP, at its third session held at Vienna, Austria, from 3 to 12 August 1981, adopted on 10 August an initial draft for a World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons and made several recommendations for follow-up activities to the Year.<sup>(2)</sup> The Secretary-General submitted comments on the Committee's recommendations, for consideration by the General Assembly.<sup>(5)</sup>

The stated objectives of the draft Programme were to promote the full participation of disabled persons in society and their equality with other citizens in terms of living conditions. Noting that there were more than 500 million disabled persons, including 140 million children, the draft stressed the need for prevention (p. 802), described the services required for rehabilitation and suggested additional measures to equalize the opportunities of disabled persons by removing obstacles to their full participation in society. These measures touched on educational, economic, vocational and social questions.

The draft went on to propose national and international measures to implement the Programme through prevention, rehabilitation and equalization of opportunities. Equality was to be achieved through respect for human rights, education, employment, participation in decision-making, social security, access to the physical environment and community action. Also proposed were information and public education activities, technical and economic co-operation, research, monitoring and evaluation, and consultation with disabled persons and their organizations.

With a view to developing the draft Programme, the Committee requested that it be circulated for comments by Governments and organizations, after which the Secretary-General would prepare a revised text for the Committee's consideration at a proposed session in 1982.

On other aspects of follow-up to IYDP, the Committee recommended to the Assembly a draft resolution calling for participation by disabled persons in follow-up activities, higher priority for rehabilitation and training projects in developing countries, additional voluntary contributions for IYDP (see above), additional resources within existing budgets for follow-up activities by the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs, and improved employment opportunities for disabled persons in United Nations organizations as well as easier access to their buildings, facilities and information.

In his comments on these proposals, the Secretary-General reported that he had been making efforts to absorb the cost of follow-up measures through redeployment within the Centre. A study on access to United Nations buildings and facilities had been completed and a study on access to information was to be completed early in 1982. United Nations recruitment policy did not distinguish between the disabled and others.

In another action, the Committee recommended that, until the question of continuing the International Institute for the Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons in Developing Countries was settled, immediate action should be taken to secure support services for intensified technical co-operation, including the establishment of an inter-agency task force to support national and regional activities. The Institute was begun in 1976 as a project between Iran and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to assist developing countries in establishing services for disability prevention and rehabilitation; it ceased operations in 1979. The Secretary-General commented that, if the Assembly approved the recommendation on technical co-

operation, arrangements would be made, using the existing United Nations budget and the Trust Fund for IYDP, to support national committees, regional commissions and UNDP in their activities for the disabled.

Regarding Committee recommendations that the Secretary-General set up an interorganizational task force to support national and regional activities, and that he consider setting up machinery to promote co-operation between developed and developing countries on disability prevention and rehabilitation, the Secretary-General expressed the view that the existing inter-agency co-ordination mechanism should be utilized.

Follow-up activities were also addressed in a resolution by which the Committee recommended that the Assembly make available staff for such activities from within existing resources in the United Nations system. The Secretary-General reported that the United Nations Children's Fund and UNDP had provided staff to the secretariat for the Year and that he would explore continuing collaboration with those bodies.

The Committee recommended that the Assembly, in consultation with organizations of disabled persons, consider the possibility of proclaiming a world day of disabled persons. The Secretary-General suggested that the Assembly postpone a decision on this matter until 1982 when he would be able to present the views of those organizations as well as an analysis of the purpose of such a day.

To assist national and world organizations of disabled persons, the Committee suggested that part of the Trust Fund for IYDP be used to help strengthen such bodies, especially in developing countries.

At the first Inter-agency Meeting on IYDP, held in February 1981 (p. 796),<sup>(3)</sup> the method and timetable for preparing agency comments on the draft World Programme of Action were agreed upon. Discussion at the second Inter-agency Meeting<sup>(4)</sup> centred on the Advisory Committee's proposal for an inter-agency task force; it was felt that such a body should operate within the existing mechanism of inter-agency meetings. The Meeting recommended that United Nations organizations adopt firm policies and develop regulations on recruitment procedures, working conditions, travel and dependency questions affecting disabled persons.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 8 December 1981, the General Assembly adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(6)</sup> by which it urged Member States to build on the results of the Year and invited them to submit national reports and consider elaborating long-term programmes of action. Regional commissions, specialized

agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were requested to implement programmes for the disabled. The Assembly requested the Advisory Committee for IYDP to consider the advisability of proclaiming the period 1983-1992 as the United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons. The Committee was also requested to study the possibility of creating an optional international identity card for disabled persons to facilitate their international travel. The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to convene the Committee in 1982 to finalize the draft World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons and urged him to assure the successful follow-up of IYDP. The Assembly also appealed for further voluntary contributions for follow-up activities (p. 797).

The resolution was recommended by the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, based on a 43-nation draft approved without vote on 1 December. Introducing the text, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya orally revised two paragraphs. Paragraph 16, by which the Assembly called on the Secretary-General to strengthen and expand technical co-operation activities in developing countries relating to the disabled, was changed to address also the heads of specialized agencies. Paragraph 18, calling for the continuation of public information programmes, was changed to refer to information activities of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs rather than of the IYDP secretariat. Argentina, also a sponsor, orally added a paragraph inviting Member States to promote co-operation between developed and developing countries through transfer of technology and research results and exchanges of information on disability prevention and rehabilitation.

Although the agenda item on IYDP was considered directly in plenary meeting, the Assembly decided, on 13 November, to permit the Third Committee to deal with some matters relating to the item, such as the preparation of draft resolutions. Such a role for the Committee had been proposed in a 12 November letter to the Assembly President by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee.<sup>(1)</sup>

Explaining its position before the Third Committee approved the resolution, the United States expressed concern about the financial implications and said it accepted the provision on technical co-operation on the understanding that it did not entail expanding activities financed from the United Nations budget. Japan felt that the objectives of a decade of disabled persons would duplicate those of the draft Programme of Action. Canada also had reservations about the idea of a decade, remarking that its

proclamation might diffuse rather than enhance support for activities related to the disabled.

During two days of meetings devoted to the Year, the Assembly heard accounts of activities related to its observance by 56 States, the European Community (EC), the Palestine Liberation Organization, and United Nations and specialized agency officials.

States unanimously cautioned that efforts begun and attitudes fostered during IYDP should not end at its completion. The need for assistance from developed to developing States, technical co-operation and efforts by the United Nations system in technology transfer was emphasized by Australia, Belgium, Egypt, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Sudan, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

Support for the adoption of a long-term world programme of action was voiced by Australia, Canada, Guinea, Ireland, Kenya, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, New Zealand, the Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Somalia and the United Kingdom, the last speaking for EC. Indonesia suggested that the Programme of Action required a global strategy and should be more realistic if it was to be readily implemented. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Oman and Somalia also called on the Assembly to approve a decade for the disabled.

The persistence of wars as a major cause of disability was mentioned by the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Spain, the USSR and Viet Nam. An unbalanced international economic system created conditions resulting in disability, observed the Dominican Republic, Guinea and Yugoslavia.

Support for the work of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs was urged by a number of speakers, including Austria, Somalia and Yugoslavia, and continuation of the Trust Fund for IYDP was recommended by Liberia, the Philippines and Uganda. Canada expressed reservations about using the Trust Fund, believing that programmes for the disabled should be integrated into the regular United Nations programme and budget.

Integrating the disabled into society was stressed by many States, including Algeria, Austria, Canada, China and the EC members. Practical steps in a long-term programme to improve the situation of disabled persons should first be pursued at the national level, stated the Byelorussian SSR, Hungary and the USSR. Guinea, Malawi, Morocco and Somalia supported a proj-

ect by the International Labour Organisation, UNDP and the Organization of African Unity to establish an African vocational rehabilitation institute.

A number of developing countries stressed the need for international co-operation. Thus, Algeria said disabled persons were entitled to expect a larger contribution to their needs from United Nations specialized agencies. Argentina and Zaire argued that priority in the allocation of international resources had to be given to the needs of the developing countries because they had the largest percentage of disabled. China welcomed information exchanges with organizations in friendly countries and with international bodies. Jamaica said the developing countries possessed the political will to integrate the disabled into society but lacked the resources and know-how. Morocco appealed to United Nations organizations and to philanthropic individuals and associations to increase assistance for disabled persons, particularly in Africa. Nigeria supported the setting up of regional rehabilitation institutes and an international co-ordinating mechanism for sharing information and experience. The Sudan endorsed the proposed establishment of an international institute for the disabled. Uganda stressed the need for funds, stating that most developing countries might not be able to embark on meaningful programmes unless enough international assistance was forthcoming.

Brazil stressed the need for public awareness of the problem. The Dominican Republic urged Governments to see to it that educators received information to enable them to accept disabled persons in regular education. Ecuador included among the disabled those with physical, nutritional, psychological and educational limitations indicative of the level of development, and said such a situation affected more than 10 per cent of the population of Latin America. Egypt and India mentioned the need to obtain data from developing countries on the numbers and needs of the disabled. Guinea and others made the point that special attention should be given to disabled children and Egypt added that all possible measures must be taken to avoid the birth of a disabled child. Without remedial action, said Kuwait, the consequences of disability would be a constant obstacle to development, especially in poor developing nations. The Programme of Action for disabled persons should not be isolated from other development objectives, the Philippines said.

Singapore observed that, since resources would always be limited, each society had to look first to its own means to help the disabled. The stigma faced by the disabled was their most

serious handicap, said Somalia. Venezuela viewed the Year as the first time international attention had been drawn to a problem that was an everyday crisis, particularly in developing countries. Viet Nam stressed the need to prevent disabilities, noting that assistance for the disabled cost 5 to 10 times as much as that provided to others.

Among developed countries, Canada thought the United Nations could play an important role because, unlike national Governments, it was free from the need to obtain short-term results. Co-operation on disability and rehabilitation should take place not just between Governments but also between specialized NGOs, the United Kingdom said on behalf of EC. Japan announced its intention of initiating bilateral, regional and international technical assistance and leadership training programmes.

Austria observed that there had not been an organized effort to face the disability problem in a co-ordinated manner, taking into account the results of medical and technological research to offset the effects of disability. Belgium noted that expensive sophisticated technology could not be utilized everywhere; investment in simpler and less expensive items might benefit more people. France urged that, instead of specialized institutions for the disabled, there should be small living units which promoted meetings and exchanges. The Holy See opposed the suppression of fetuses having medical defects, stating that the time and means required to care for handicapped persons was the price a society should generously pay in order to remain truly human. To ignore disabled persons or consign them to the fringes of society would be to waste a vast reservoir of talent and skill, stated Malta. Norway, speaking for the Nordic States, listed five priority areas: altering public attitudes, making environmental changes, giving disabled persons the right to be heard, helping families with disabled children and aiding disabled persons in developing countries. The United Kingdom stressed the need to eliminate avoidable disabilities, in both industrialized and developing countries, caused by malnutrition, deprivation and environmental hazards.

Several States commented on the lasting consequences of IYDP. The disabled themselves had noted less indifference and more open-mindedness regarding their everyday problems as a result of the Year, said the Federal Republic of Germany. Ireland believed that a major effect of the Year would be to challenge ingrained attitudes which led people to underestimate the capacities of the disabled and the contribution they could make. The Netherlands said that during the Year a genuine awareness of what it was to be disabled had awakened the world's

conscience. The United States remarked that, by focusing world attention on a human concern, the United Nations had opened an important area of transnational communication across political boundaries on a common problem affecting all peoples.

Concern about improving the situation of disabled persons was not merely a necessary act of humaneness but was of great social and economic importance, said the Byelorussian SSR. It was hard to imagine improvements in the position of the disabled without comprehensive amelioration of the economic situation of the developing countries, Czechoslovakia observed. Romania suggested that the General Assembly should at future sessions evaluate the results of current activities and formulate conclusions on further action. The USSR believed that international organizations should focus on devising recommendations and standard-setting instruments as well as on sharing national experience and information on methods of attacking the problem.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee Chairman. 12 Nov., A/36/673.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Advisory Committee, A/36/471/Add.1; Inter-agency meetings, <sup>(3)</sup>ACC/1981/19, <sup>(4)</sup>ACC/1981/38; <sup>(5)</sup>S-G, A/36/471/Add.2.

Resolution <sup>(6)</sup>GA, 36/77, 8 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/771; S-G statements, A/C.3/36/L.90, A/C.5/36/68 & Corr. 1.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56, 60, 63, 66, 67, 68 (19 Nov.-1 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.63 (4 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.57, 86-89 (13 Nov.-8 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/77

Adopted without vote Meeting 89 8 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/764) without vote, 1 December (meeting 68); 43-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.79). orally revised; agenda item 30.

Sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Ireland, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

#### International Year of Disabled Persons

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 31/123 of 16 December 1976, by which it proclaimed the year 1981 International Year of Disabled Persons,

Recalling also its resolutions 32/133 of 16 December 1977, by which it established the Advisory Committee for the International Year of Disabled Persons, 33/170 of 20 December 1978, 34/154 of 17 December 1979, in which it, inter alia, decided to expand the theme of the International Year of Disabled Persons to "Full participation and equality", and 35/133 of 11 December 1980.

Deeply concerned that no less than five hundred million persons are estimated to suffer from disability of one form or another, of whom four hundred million are estimated to be in the developing countries,

Reiterating the continuing need to promote the realization of the right of disabled persons to participate fully in the

social life and development of their societies and to enjoy living conditions equal to those of other citizens, as well as an equal share in the improvements in living conditions resulting from social and economic development.

Recognizing that the observance of the International Year of Disabled Persons has contributed to the attainment of these objectives,

Recognizing also that a large number of disabled persons are victims of war and other forms of violence, and that the International Year of Disabled Persons has contributed towards the reaffirmation of the need for continued and reinforced co-operation among nations for world peace,

Believing that the activities undertaken by the international community in observing the International Year of Disabled Persons constitute a first essential step towards the achievement of the objectives of the Year,

Convinced that the timely and significant impetus generated by the activities of the International Year of Disabled Persons should be maintained and reinforced with appropriate follow-up action at all levels,

Taking note of the efforts of Member States during the International Year of Disabled Persons to improve the conditions and well-being of the disabled,

Expressing its satisfaction at the convening of the World Symposium of Experts on Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries and Technical Assistance in Disability Prevention and Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons at Vienna from 12 to 23 October 1981.

Also expressing its satisfaction at the convening of the World Conference on Actions and Strategies on Education, Disability Prevention and Integration of Disabled Persons at Torremolinos, Spain, from 2 to 7 November 1981, organized by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in observance of the Year,

Taking note with appreciation of the progress made in the elaboration of a World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/133.

Having also considered the report of the Advisory Committee for the International Year of Disabled Persons on its third session,

1. Expresses its satisfaction to all Member States that elaborated national policies and programmes for the implementation of the objectives of the International Year of Disabled Persons;

2. Takes note of the activities undertaken by organizations of the United Nations system and the relevant non-governmental organizations in the observance of the International Year of Disabled Persons;

3. Urges Member States to make every effort to consolidate and build further on the results of the International Year of Disabled Persons in order to secure prevention of disability, rehabilitation and full integration of the disabled in the society and, in this respect, to consider maintaining, where appropriate, the national committees or similar bodies established for the Year;

4. Again invites Member States to submit national reports to the Secretary-General on their implementation of the Plan of Action for the International Year of Disabled Persons and, in particular, to consider elaborating, on the basis of their experiences, national long-term programmes of action in the field of disability;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to convene in 1982 a meeting of the Advisory Committee for the International Year of Disabled Persons to finalize the draft World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons, in the light of comments by Member States, international organizations and relevant non-governmental organizations, with a view to its adoption by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

6. Requests the Advisory Committee to consider at its fourth session the advisability of proclaiming the period 1983-1992 as the United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons and to submit its views to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

7. Requests the Advisory Committee to study the possibility of creating an optional international identity card for disabled persons with the purpose of facilitating their international travel;

8. Urges the Secretary-General to take the necessary measures to assure the successful follow-up of the International Year of Disabled Persons, in particular the finalization of the World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons;

9. Also requests the Secretary-General and the heads of specialized agencies and other relevant organizations of the United Nations system to ensure the necessary co-operation and co-ordination of their activities relating to the disabled;

10. Further requests the regional commissions to give high priority to the formulation and implementation of regional programmes related to equalization of opportunities for disabled persons, as well as prevention and rehabilitation, and urges the specialized agencies and relevant organizations of the United Nations system to continue the implementation of such programmes;

11. Invites relevant non-governmental organizations to continue and expand their programmes related to the disabled in order to maintain the momentum given by the International Year of Disabled Persons;

12. Welcomes the contributions made by Governments and private sources to the United Nations Trust Fund for the International Year of Disabled Persons and appeals for further voluntary contributions which would facilitate the follow-up of the Year;

13. Calls upon the Secretary-General to use an appropriate portion of those voluntary contributions to support and strengthen activities in the developing countries related to the International Year of Disabled Persons, including the strengthening of organizations of disabled persons;

14. Urges the Secretary-General, the specialized agencies and other United Nations bodies and organizations to undertake or expedite the measures already under way to improve employment opportunities for disabled persons within these bodies at all levels and to improve access to their buildings and facilities and to their information sources;

15. Invites Member States to promote close and effective co-operation between developed and developing countries through a transfer of technology and of the results of research and exchanges of information on the prevention of disability and the rehabilitation of disabled persons;

16. Also calls upon the Secretary-General and the heads of the specialized agencies to take all necessary measures to strengthen and expand technical co-operation activities in developing countries relating to the disabled, especially in the areas of prevention of disability, rehabilitation and integration of disabled in their societies, with particular emphasis on the need to develop and strengthen indigenous capacities and capabilities;

17. Stresses the importance of strengthening support services for the exchange of technical information and transfer of technology and know-how, as well as other activities for the development of technical co-operation in the fields of prevention, rehabilitation and equalization of opportunities in developing countries, and notes with appreciation the offer of the Government of Yugoslavia to contribute in this direction;

18. Invites, as a matter of priority, Member States, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, as well as the governmental and non-governmental organizations concerned and the mass media, to continue to undertake public information programmes, including the continuation of the present information activities of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs of the Secretariat for the national committees, with a view to making all sections of the population increasingly aware of issues relating to the disabled;

19. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item entitled "World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons" and requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at that session on the implementation of the present resolution.

### Prevention of disability

In January 1981, the Secretary-General reported to the Commission for Social Development on progress achieved in the prevention of disability.<sup>(3)</sup> According to this report, work had been directed towards strengthening preventive measures at the national level. The situation in developing regions called for urgent measures. Initial responses to a questionnaire requesting information from States indicated that progress had been achieved but much remained to be done in preventing physical and mental disability and social discrimination or segregation affecting the disabled.

The Secretary-General also reported on recommendations for specific prevention measures discussed at a United Nations Expert Group Meeting on Different Policy Approaches to the Integration of Disabled Persons into Community Life (Vienna, 30 June-5 July 1980).<sup>(1)</sup> The Group emphasized detection through check-ups and registration for children, as well as more effective prevention of home and traffic accidents, drug addiction, alcoholism, and disability based on malnutrition and disease. Training of rehabilitation support teams in disability prevention was recognized as crucial.

Endorsing the conclusions and recommendations in this report, the Economic and Social Council, in its 6 May resolution on IYDP,<sup>(4)</sup> urged the Secretary-General to ensure that disability prevention was given due consideration in United Nations programmes.

Recommendations on disability prevention measures were included in the draft World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons,<sup>(2)</sup> approved in August by the Advisory Committee for IYDP (p. 797). The most important measures, the draft stated, were better nutritional practices, improved health services, early detection and diagnosis, pre-natal and post-natal care, proper health care instruction, family planning, adolescent health programmes, modification of life-styles, education regarding environmental hazards, avoidance of war, and the fostering of better informed and strengthened families and communities.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup> Integration of Disabled Persons into Community Life, Sales No. E.81.V.1 (ST/ESA/111).

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup> Advisory Committee, A/36/471/Add.1; <sup>(3)</sup> S-G, E/CN.5/591.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup> ESC, 1981/22, para. 2, 6 May (p. 796).

### General aspects of health

#### Global Strategy

The adoption by the World Health Assembly on 22 May 1981 of a Global Strategy for Health for All by the Year 2000 was described in a progress report by the Director-General of the World

Health Organization (WHO) submitted to the Economic and Social Council in June.<sup>(2)</sup> The Strategy arose from a 1977 decision by the World Health Assembly that the main health target of WHO and of Governments should be attainment by the year 2000 of a level of health that would permit all people to lead a socially and economically productive life.<sup>(6)</sup>

The Strategy was based on the concept of country-wide health systems, starting with primary health care. Its main thrust was development of the health system infrastructure, including measures for health promotion, disease prevention, diagnosis, therapy and rehabilitation. Crucial to the Strategy was ensuring social control of the health infrastructure and technology through close community involvement. In adopting the Strategy, the World Health Assembly requested the WHO Executive Board to prepare a plan of action for its immediate implementation, monitoring and evaluation, for submission to the Assembly in 1982.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. On 23 July 1981, the Economic and Social Council adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(3)</sup> commending the Global Strategy to the General Assembly. The Council also recommended to the Assembly a draft resolution endorsing the Strategy and urging its implementation (see below).

The 12-nation draft resolution, introduced by the United Kingdom, was approved by the Council's Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee without vote on 14 July. It incorporated two oral amendments by the USSR to the preamble of the draft resolution submitted to the Assembly: a new paragraph stating that peace and security were important for the preservation and improvement of the health of all people and that co-operation among nations on health issues could contribute substantially to peace; and revision of another paragraph to mention, as the basis of the Strategy, the Declaration of Alma-Ata on primary health care, adopted in 1978 by the WHO International Conference on Primary Health Care, held at Alma-Ata, USSR.<sup>(7)</sup> These amendments were accepted by the sponsors after they sub-amended the latter to state that the Alma-Ata Declaration implied an integrated (rather than a complex) approach to the solution of health care problems.

Brazil, although joining in the consensus on the resolution, objected to any partial or incomplete implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade<sup>(4)</sup> and thought the resolution's criteria for basic needs did not meet the developing countries' real requirements.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. Adopting without vote the draft recommended by the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly

endorsed the Global Strategy by a resolution of 19 November,<sup>(5)</sup> similarly approved by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 30 October. The Assembly urged Member States to ensure implementation of the Strategy as part of efforts to implement the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, and requested United Nations organizations to collaborate with WHO to that end.

A note to the Assembly submitted by the Secretary-General in September outlined the background and main points of the WHO report and the Council's action.

During discussion in the Second Committee, China said it was essential for developing countries to plan and gradually establish a health system based on primary health care in order to curb the spread of diseases and raise health levels. India urged the provision of adequate resources to make the Global Strategy a reality. Sierra Leone stressed the need for popular participation, especially involving the rural population, and the application of technology in harmony with the environment. The USSR said the Strategy could be implemented only if progressive socio-economic changes were carried out in developing countries, if national income was distributed equitably, if State social security systems were introduced and if effective measures were taken to achieve peace and disarmament.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/148.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>WHO Director-General, E/1981/88.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC: 1981/61, 23 July, text following. GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503); <sup>(5)</sup>36/43, 19 Nov. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(6)</sup>1977, p. 1096; <sup>(7)</sup>1978, p. 1107.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.1-3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12 (2-14 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.40 (23 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.4, 7-10, 28 (25 Sep.-30 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.64 (19 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/61

Adopted without vote Meeting 40 23 July 1981

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/96, Part I) without vote. 14 July (meeting 12); 12-nation draft (E/1981/C.3/L.5), orally amended by USSR and orally revised; agenda items 18 and 19.

Sponsors: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Senegal, United Kingdom.

Global Strategy for Health for All by the Year 2000

The Economic and Social Council.

Recalling General Assembly resolution 34/58 of 29 November 1979 entitled "Health as an integral part of development",

Having considered the Global Strategy for Health for All by the Year 2000 and the progress report thereon submitted by the Director-General of the World Health Organization.

1. Commends to the attention of the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session the full text of the Global Strategy for Health for All by the Year 2000;

2. Recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution:

[Text as in General Assembly resolution 36/43 below]

General Assembly resolution 36/43

Adopted without vote Meeting 64 19 November 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/691) without vote, 30 October (meeting 28); draft by Economic and Social Council (resolution 1981/61); agenda item 12.

Global Strategy for Health for All by the Year 2000

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 34/58 of 29 November 1979 concerning health as an integral part of development,

Noting with approval World Health Assembly resolution WHA 34.36 of 22 May 1981 by which the thirty-fourth Assembly unanimously adopted the Global Strategy for Health for All by the Year 2000.

Considering that the Global Strategy fully reflects the spirit of General Assembly resolution 34/58.

Considering that peace and security are important conditions for the preservation and improvement of the health of all people and that co-operation among nations on vital health issues can contribute substantially to peace,

Noting further that the Global Strategy is based upon the principles of the Declaration of Alma-Ata on primary health care, which implies an integrated approach to the solution of health care problems and requires the fullest support and involvement of all economic and social development sectors,

Recognizing that the implementation of the Global Strategy will constitute a valuable contribution to the improvement of overall socio-economic conditions, and thus to the fulfilment of the international Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

1. Endorses the Global Strategy for Health for All by the Year 2000 as a major contribution of Member States to the attainment of the world-wide social goal of health for all by the year 2000 and to the fulfilment of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

2. Urges all Member States to ensure the implementation of the Global Strategy as part of their multisectoral efforts to implement the provisions contained in the international Development Strategy;

3. Also urges all Member States to co-operate with one another and with the World Health Organization to ensure that the necessary international action is taken to implement the Global Strategy as part of the fulfilment of the international Development Strategy;

4. Requests all appropriate organizations and bodies of the United Nations system—including the United Nations Children's Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Labour Organisation, the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Fund for Population Activities and the World Bank—to collaborate fully with the World Health Organization in carrying out the Global Strategy;

5. Requests the Director-General of the World Health Organization to ensure that measures to implement the Global Strategy are taken into account in the review and appraisal of the implementation of the international Development Strategy.

### Primary health care

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) spent more than \$47 million on maternal and child health programmes in 107 countries during 1981. It continued to promote primary health care services as a means of extending basic health services to whole populations, using health workers chosen by the community for front-line curative, preventive and promotional tasks.

In May, the UNICEF Executive Board<sup>(1)</sup> welcomed efforts by UNICEF and WHO to co-

operate in comprehensive national approaches to primary health care. The Board also approved a strengthening of support for important components of this approach, such as immunization (p. 1005) control of diarrhoeal diseases (p. 1004) and the supply of essential drugs (see below), and endorsed recommendations on primary health care made by the UNICEF/WHO Joint Committee on Health Policy at its twenty-third session (Geneva, 2 and 3 February).<sup>(2)</sup>

The Committee recommended that UNICEF and WHO: reaffirm the principles of the primary health care approach; co-operate in mobilizing substantial assistance to countries committed to practising that approach; collaborate with countries to strengthen or establish a high-level political mechanism for decision-making on socio-economic development policies relevant to health promotion; support the mobilization of national institutions into a network to collaborate with the policy/planning mechanism responsible for health policies and programmes; strengthen their capacity to co-operate with countries in extending the primary health care approach to all people; help countries to increase their own capabilities in health economic analysis and health care legislation; support countries in developing innovative approaches to planning for health; and help countries to develop and disseminate material on primary health care for use in public campaigns and to develop training programmes for health workers.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Executive Board, E/1981/48; <sup>(2)</sup>UNICEF/WHO Joint Committee on Health Policy, E/ICEF/L.1429.

### Essential drugs

The outline of a UNICEF/WHO Joint Programme on Provision of Essential Drugs for Primary Health Care in Developing Countries was approved in February by the UNICEF/WHO Joint Committee on Health Policy.<sup>(1)</sup> Developed by the secretariats of the two organizations,<sup>(2)</sup> the Programme had as its long-term objective to ensure the regular supply of safe essential drugs to all people at reasonable cost. Immediate objectives called for UNICEF and WHO to assist in developing national lists of essential drugs, providing some drugs free of charge, establishing mechanisms for group bulk purchasing schemes for African countries, and developing and organizing programmes for drug management, local formulation, distribution and quality assurance.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF/WHO Joint Committee on Health study. <sup>(2)</sup>UNICEF and WHO secretariats, E/ICEF/L.1426.

## Human resources development

On 27 June 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) authorized the UNDP Administrator to spend \$80,000 to disseminate information on the national experience of countries in training qualified national personnel and enhancing their role in national social and economic development, as requested by the General Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(2)</sup>

Reporting to the Council in February 1981 on his plans for implementing the Assembly's request,<sup>(1)</sup> the Administrator said the first step would be to prepare an inventory of information being collected by the United Nations system on training of personnel. Based on that inventory, a determination should be made of how information systems could be improved to ensure periodic dissemination of information. A report would then be prepared for the Assembly in 1982.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNDP Administrator, DP/516.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 35/80, para. 7, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 595). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/19, paras. 4 & 5, 27 June 1981.

## UN Institute for Training and Research

### Activities of UNITAR

The United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), an autonomous organization within the United Nations system., added several new activities in 1981 despite economy measures adopted during the year. These programmes and other UNITAR activities, as well as information on its finances (p. 807), were described by the Executive Director in his annual reports to the General Assembly, detailing activities from 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981<sup>(2)</sup> and from 1 July 1981 to 30 June 1982.<sup>(3)</sup>

One of the the major events of 1981 was the establishment in May of the UNITAR/UNDP Information Centre on Heavy Crude and Tar Sands (p. 708).

Among the training programmes organized by UNITAR, seminars for members of permanent missions of Member States to the United Nations covered the drafting of treaties and other international instruments (New York, 20-24 April) and information for new delegates to the General Assembly (New York, 16-18 September). Seminars on special aspects of United Nations work covered: international economics for diplomats (Geneva, March); law of the sea (New York, 6 March; Geneva, July); economic development and its international setting, co-sponsored by the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank



(Washington, D. C., March); regionalism and world order, in collaboration with the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service (Washington, D. C., 17-19 June); storage, retrieval and use of United Nations documentation (New York, February); United Nations finances (New York, 19-21 May); and the working of the United Nations system, for new diplomats in permanent missions New York, 27-30 January). A workshop on international negotiations was also held (New York, 12-15 May).

Training programmes other than for diplomats included: the UNITAR-administered fellowship programme in international law and a regional training and refresher course in international law for African countries (Cairo, Egypt, 28 February-13 March), both part of the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law (p. 1267); a seminar on multilateral diplomacy and the new international economic order (Vienna, Austria, 1-12 June); and an orientation course on the international civil service (Geneva, 16-20 February).

Two training programmes for government officials from Portuguese-speaking Africa were given at the request of Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and Sao Tome and Principe. A training course on multilateral diplomacy and international co-operation for young diplomats from Yemen, begun in September 1980, ended on 3 July 1981. Briefing seminars on problems facing the United Nations were held in July for graduate students of the Universidad Central de Venezuela and in August for junior Saudi Arabian diplomats. UNITAR continued to advise the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Saudi Arabia on developing institutes of diplomatic studies. Improving the curriculum of the Diplomatic Institute in Pakistan was the purpose of an April visit to that country by two UNITAR experts.

Special training activities included a UNITAR/Libyan Institute of Diplomatic Studies symposium on the material remnants of the Second World War (Geneva, 28 April-1 May) and a seminar organized with Uppsala University on law and the new international economic order (Uppsala, Sweden, June).

Research activities begun in 1981 included preparation of an analytical guide to applying the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.<sup>(4)</sup> Another new project examined the organization and efficacy of the Economic and Social Council as the principal United Nations organ for formulating international economic policy and co-ordinating United Nations economic and social activities. Analyses of voting behaviour in the General Assembly

and of diplomats' views on the United Nations system were published. A programme on regional and interregional co-operation in the 1980s was placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Research. A set of uniform rules applicable to disaster relief operations was prepared and published.

The UNITAR Project on the Future, concentrating on long-term problems of socio-economic and technological transformation, continued work on two broad themes: policy choices related to implementing a new international economic order, and the meaning of physical limits and supply constraints to energy and natural resources. A UNITAR conference examined small-scale energy resources (Los Angeles, California, United States, 9-19 September). A symposium on new and renewable energy sources was held in Moscow (20-24 April), co-sponsored by UNITAR and the secretariat of the 1981 United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 689).

The Project on the Future remained a separate unit within UNITAR despite a 1980 recommendation by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) that the Project be merged into a reconstituted Department of Research.<sup>(6)</sup> In a November 1981 report to the General Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee on implementation of JIU recommendations,<sup>(7)</sup> the Secretary-General noted that the UNITAR Board of Trustees considered the Project on the Future too distinct in scope, purpose and character to be usefully merged into the Research Department.

In partial response to a JIU recommendation that the UNITAR Geneva office be phased out, the office was reduced to a small liaison unit. A JIU recommendation that UNITAR become an executing agency for projects financed by UNDP was accepted by UNITAR.

Fourteen publications and two periodicals were published by UNITAR in 1981 (see list on next page).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 4 December, the General Assembly adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(5)</sup> welcoming steps taken by UNITAR to enhance its effectiveness, reduce its costs and increase its resources, and calling on it to organize its work programme and ensure that estimated expenditure did not exceed estimated revenue. Also welcomed was its concentration on economic and social training and research, including projects in areas previously identified by the Assembly. The Executive Director was called upon to continue to rationalize UNITAR activities and to seek further co-ordination of its research programme with similar activities of other institutions. Countries were called on to increase their contributions (p. 809).

The 35-nation draft resolution was recommended without vote on 20 November by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, as revised by its sponsors in writing and orally. The oral changes related to provisions on finances (p. 807) and contributions.

Speaking after the Committee's action, the USSR said it had not opposed consensus approval of the resolution because it believed UNITAR activities were constructive, but it thought UNITAR could go even further than the laudable efforts it had made to reduce its deficit. Comments on UNITAR financing were also made by Brazil, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States.

During the Committee's discussion of research and training, Austria, Bangladesh, Egypt, Jamaica, Japan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Pakistan, Poland, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka and Uganda voiced appreciation for the emphasis UNITAR placed on research related to such topics as regional co-operation and the new international economic order, new and renewable energy sources, international economic co-operation and the Project on the Future. Ghana particularly welcomed the UNITAR publications programme.

Austria felt that UNITAR should set priorities among projects and avoid expansion in areas of lesser importance. Bangladesh suggested that the Institute study the situation of the least developed countries. India urged that UNITAR avoid too much theory in the matter of economic development, which might jeopardize practical goals. Similarly, Pakistan thought greater emphasis might be given to applied research, the results of which could directly benefit the development of developing countries. The view of the Philippines was that support should be given so that UNITAR could complete its project of consolidating the norms and principles of international law relating to a new international economic order (p. 1260).

The Byelorussian SSR remarked that some UNITAR seminars were unobjective and were used to spread ideas at variance with United Nations principles; to prevent such situations, UNITAR should arrange for participants from socialist and developing countries to attend its seminars. Poland welcomed UNITAR work related to the establishment of a new international economic order but felt that its studies should be of more practical use for delegations involved in negotiations on a new mechanism to govern international economic relations. The USSR stressed the usefulness of UNITAR work, including seminars in which Soviet organizations had participated, but expressed dissatisfaction that it did not have major research or training programmes on international security and thought

it should also concentrate on restructuring international economic relations and on developing non-discriminatory economic, scientific and technical co-operation among countries having different socio-economic systems and at different levels of development.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/41; UNITAR Executive Director. <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/14 & Corr.1, <sup>(3)</sup>A/37/14.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 419); <sup>(5)</sup>36/75, 4 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 999.

Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.2/36/L.36.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.4, 6, 7-12, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26, 42 (25 Sep.-20 Nov.), plenary, A/36/PV.84 (4 Dec.).

UNITAR publications:

Paths to Peace: The United Nations Security Council and Its Presidency (UNITAR/CR/14).

Asia and the New International Economic Order (UNITAR/FS/15). Regional Co-operation among Developing Countries: The New Imperative of Development in the 1980s (UNITAR/FS/16). Regionalism and the New International Economic Order (UNITAR/FS/L7). Political and Institutional Issues of the New International Economic Order (UNITAR/FS/18). Social and Cultural Issues of the New International Economic Order (UNITAR/FS/19). International Trade, Industrialization and the New International Economic Order (UNITAR/FS/20).

The International Law Commission: The Need for a New Direction, Sales No. E.81.XV.PE/1. Quantitative Analysis of Voting Behaviour in the General Assembly: Who Voted with Whom within the United Nations, Sales No. E.81.XV.PE/2. Crowded Agendas, Crowded Rooms: Institutional Arrangements at UNCLOS III—Some Lessons in Global Negotiations, Sales No. E.81.XV.PE/3. ECOSOC: Options for Reform, Sales No. E.81.XV.PE/4. The Eleventh Special Session and the Future of Global Negotiations, Sales No. E.81.XV.PE/5.

The New International Development Strategy: A Systems Analysis Approach, Sales No. E.81.XV.RR/26.

Racism and Its Elimination, Sales No. E.81.XV.ST/18. Important for the Future, vol. VI, Nos. 1-4 (quarterly).

UNITAR News, vol. XIII.

General Assembly resolution 36/75

Adopted without vote Meeting 84 4 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/693/Add.1) without vote, 20 November (meeting 42); 35-nation draft (A/C.2/35/L.11/Rev.1), orally revised; agenda item 71 (a).

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Barbados, Bolivia, China, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia.

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order,

Recalling its resolution 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States,

Recalling also its resolution 3362 (S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling further its resolutions 35/53 A and B of 5 December 1980 on the United Nations Institute for Training and Research,

Acknowledging the value of the research and the studies on the future undertaken by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research,

Recognizing the role of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research in assisting, through training and other services within its mandate, members of permanent missions to the United Nations and other national officials concerned with the work of the United Nations,

1. Takes note of the report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research and of his introductory statement on 2 October 1981;

2. Welcomes the emphasis on, and urges the continuation of, the concentration of the work of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research in the sphere of economic and social training and research and the inclusion of specific projects on the problems that exist in the areas identified by the General Assembly at its sixth and seventh special sessions and in the relevant decisions adopted by the Assembly at its twenty-ninth and subsequent sessions, taking into consideration the statements on the programme of work of the Institute made at the present session;

3. Calls upon the Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research to continue to rationalize the activities of the Institute and, in this context, to seek further co-ordination of its research programme with similar activities of other institutions, within and outside the United Nations system, and to continue to present research results, as far as possible, in a manner relevant to policy-making;

4. Welcomes also, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/53 B, the steps taken so far by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research to enhance its effectiveness, to reduce its costs and to increase its resources, and calls upon the Institute to organize its programme of work and activities and to adjust its administrative costs so as to ensure that, as from 1982, estimated expenditure does not exceed estimated revenue;

5. Urges all States that have not yet contributed to the United Nations Institute for Training and Research to do so, and calls upon all donor countries, especially those that are not contributing at a level commensurate with their capacity, to increase their voluntary contributions in order to meet the needs of the Institute.

#### Finances of UNITAR

Despite economy measures adopted by the UNITAR Executive Director, a grant-in-aid from the United Nations budget and new contributions from a few States, the UNITAR General Fund recorded a budget deficit of \$49,421 in 1981. This shortfall was ascribed by the Executive Director to reduced contributions from some States, exchange-rate fluctuations, United Nations salary increases, higher heating and communications costs, increased New York City taxes and pledges of contributions which failed to materialize.<sup>(6)</sup> Without the \$352,600 grant, expenditure would have exceeded income by \$281,427, compared to \$504,482 in 1980.

Income from special purpose grants amounted to \$3,153,909 against expenditures of \$2,192,631, leaving a surplus of \$961,278 and raising the available balance to \$3,452,159 as at 31 December, including \$2,455,396 in convertible currencies and \$996,763 in non-convertible currencies.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 9 December, the General Assembly's Fifth Committee ap-

proved an amount of \$352,600 as a grant-in-aid to UNITAR.<sup>(4)</sup> The sum was approved by a recorded vote—requested by Singapore—of 68 to 13, with 6 abstentions. The appropriation was subsequently included in the United Nations regular budget for 1980-1981, adopted on 18 December.<sup>(8)</sup> The grant was intended to cover the remaining UNITAR deficit for 1980-1981, after taking account of the \$305,700 appropriated by the Assembly for that purpose in 1980.<sup>(9)</sup> The appropriation was recommended by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions<sup>(3)</sup> after the matter was referred to the Fifth Committee by the Second Committee Chairman in a communication of 17 November.<sup>(1)</sup>

The forecast amount of the deficit was reported to the Assembly in the Executive Director's annual report for 1980/1981<sup>(5)</sup> and in a November 1981 note by the Secretary-General.<sup>(2)</sup> The Executive Director said that, as a result of some increases in appropriations and major reductions in expenditure, the deficit had been reduced from the initial estimate of \$646,060.

In its 4 December resolution on UNITAR, the Assembly welcomed steps taken to reduce its costs and called on it to organize its work programme and activities and to adjust its administrative costs so as to ensure that, from 1982, estimated expenditure did not exceed estimated revenue.<sup>(7)</sup> Singapore, introducing the revised draft resolution on behalf of its 35 sponsors, deleted a phrase in paragraph 1 noting the reference in the Executive Director's report to the Institute's financial situation in 1981 and 1982.

Among those opposing the grant approved by the Fifth Committee, the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy said they had voted against for budgetary reasons only; the former added that UNITAR was making a valuable contribution. Japan hoped that from 1982 UNITAR would reduce expenditures to ensure a balanced budget. The United Kingdom expressed the view that operational activities should not be financed through the United Nations budget and that grants should not be provided to United Nations organizations funded by voluntary contributions and thus free from external control over their spending. The United States opposed transferring items from voluntary financing to the regular budget.

Algeria, Barbados, Benin, Canada, Egypt, Ghana, Guinea, Jamaica, Kenya, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sweden and Yugoslavia supported the recommendation for a grant from the United Nations budget; several of them cited the efforts by UNITAR to reduce its budget deficit. Austria also voted in favour while hoping that UNITAR would set priorities and avoid expansion in

programmes of lesser importance. Barbados stressed the need for UNITAR to achieve a balanced budget in 1982.

In the Second Committee, support for the UNITAR request for financial assistance from the United Nations budget was expressed by China, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Norway, Sri Lanka, Sweden and the Syrian Arab Republic, Bangladesh, France and the Federal Republic of Germany supported the funding request in 1981 in the light of the budget deficit but said the budget should be balanced in 1982.

Brazil, Japan, the USSR, the United States and Uruguay opposed a grant of funds from the United Nations budget. Japan thought this incompatible with the independence of UNITAR, while the United States urged that it turn to non-governmental organizations for funds. Uruguay said that, if the manner in which UNITAR was financed was changed, its function should also be changed to respond more directly to the interests of Member States. India, on the other hand, felt that independence might be threatened by dependence on voluntary funding or special purpose grants. Norway stated that grant funding for UNITAR did not mean a new element was being introduced into the United Nations budget, since it was an ad hoc measure. Referring to such grants as a stop-gap, the Philippines said it was time to find innovative and long-term solutions. Contributions from States were called for by Austria, Egypt, France, Ghana, Jamaica, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sweden, the Syrian Arab Republic, and Trinidad and Tobago.

Some States, including Canada, Egypt, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Uganda, thought consideration should be given to the idea of providing UNITAR with a core budget financed from the United Nations regular budget, to guarantee financial stability. In Sweden's view, such a step would become necessary if voluntary contributions were not forthcoming.

Efforts by UNITAR to balance its budget were welcomed by Austria, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Jamaica. The Federal Republic of Germany recommended further cost reductions by redeploying resources from less important programmes and not starting new projects. France thought the future of UNITAR was far from assured and that it would be necessary to plan on reducing its activities and personnel costs. Spain suggested that UNITAR confine its activities within the limits determined by the level of voluntary contributions from States. On the other hand, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya saw a need to build up UNITAR economically rather than restrict its activities.

Communication: <sup>(1)</sup>2nd Committee Chairman, A/C.5/36/55/Add.1.

Note: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/55.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/738; <sup>(4)</sup>5th Committee, A/36/844. UNITAR Executive Director, <sup>(5)</sup>A/36/14 & Corr. 1, <sup>(6)</sup>A/37/14.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(7)</sup>36/75, para. 4, 4 Dec. (p. 807); <sup>(8)</sup>36/234 A, para. 1, sect. 33, 18 Dec. (p. 1285).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(9)</sup>1980, p. 1000.

#### Accounts for 1980

By a resolution of 30 November 1981<sup>(2)</sup> on the 1980 accounts of various United Nations programmes and funds, the General Assembly accepted the UNITAR accounts for the year ended 31 December 1980 and requested remedial action where required by the Board of Auditors in its comments on the accounts.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Board, in its examination of the UNITAR accounts, found internal controls and accounting procedures to be generally satisfactory, but recommended improvements in the area of budgetary and inventory control to ensure that no expenditure was incurred before allotments were issued and that annual inventory reports were prepared regularly.

Commenting on the UNITAR accounts in the Assembly's Fifth Committee, Japan agreed with the Board's comment that no expenditure should be incurred before allotments were issued and added that organizations should aim at attaining objectives within approved appropriations. Morocco observed that the UNITAR action in this regard was contrary to the United Nations Financial Regulations and Rules. The Philippines thought the Board might consider undertaking a comprehensive audit in view of the weaknesses in controls it had identified. The USSR reiterated its objections to a grant to UNITAR from the United Nations budget (p. 807), stating that it would withhold its share of the funds appropriated for that purpose. Also objecting, the United States said that good financial management could prevent deficits; increases in UNITAR expenditures on travel and hospitality at a time of financial difficulty defied understanding:

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Board of Auditors and financial statements, A/36/5/Add.4.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/65, 30 Nov. (p. 1302).

#### Contributions

Forty-two countries paid contributions to the UNITAR General Fund totalling \$2,134,619 for 1981 as at 31 December (see table opposite). In addition, contributions for future years were pledged by Sweden (\$127,446) and the United Republic of Tanzania (\$7,273).

The Executive Director, in his annual report for 1980/1981,<sup>(1)</sup> stated that the response of non-contributing States to the 1980 General Assembly appeal for funds<sup>(2)</sup> and to fund-raising efforts had not been encouraging. Only a few States

had announced new contributions. Some had increased their contributions but one major donor had significantly reduced its 1981 contribution because of budget constraints, supplying instead a Professional officer without cost to UNITAR. The Executive Director reported that he had had difficulty persuading major contributors with similar problems to maintain their level of support.

States that had not contributed were urged to do so in the resolution on UNITAR adopted by the Assembly on 4 December.<sup>(3)</sup> In addition, all donor countries, especially those not contributing at a level commensurate with their capacity, were called upon to increase their contributions.

Before this resolution was approved by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, the sponsors orally deleted the word "substantial" from the call for increased contributions.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE GENERAL FUND OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH, 1981  
(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country	Amount
Algeria	10,000
Argentina	13,628
Australia	39,535
Austria	30,000
Bahamas	500
Canada	139,407
Chile	5,000
China	23,545
Denmark	50,000
Finland	39,171
France	9,093
Germany, Federal Republic of	153,005
Ghana	1,818
Greece	4,000
Guyana	333
Hungary	3,385
India	20,000
Indonesia	4,000
Ireland	17,402
Israel	3,000
Italy	79,924
Ivory Coast	17,452
Japan	60,000
Kuwait	30,000
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	40,000
Mali	1,561
Malta	600
Netherlands	43,103
New Zealand	5,992
Norway	92,593
Qatar	10,000
Spain	50,000
Sweden	278,697
Switzerland	86,957
Trinidad and Tobago	103,000
Tunisia	2,875
Uganda	22,746
USSR	40,000
United Republic of Tanzania	13,297
United States	544,000
Venezuela	30,000
Yugoslavia	15,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,134,619</b>

<sup>a</sup>Includes loss on revaluation of unpaid pledges as at 31 December 1981.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNITAR Executive Director, A/36/14 & Corr. 1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>135/53 B, para. 3, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1001); <sup>(3)</sup>36/75, para. 5, 4 Dec. 1981 (p. 807).

## UN University

### Activities of UNU

The dedication of a site for the permanent headquarters of the United Nations University (UNU) and the adoption by its Council of a medium-term perspective for 1982-1987 (p. 811) highlighted UNU activities during 1981. This autonomous United Nations institution, operating since 1975 through world-wide networks of academic and research institutions and individual scholars, also continued its work of research, advanced training and dissemination of knowledge in its three broad programmes—on world hunger, human and social development, and the use and management of natural resources.

The 2 November dedication ceremony for the site of UNU headquarters in central Tokyo followed a decision by the Japanese Ministry of Education on the selection of an 18,600-square-metre plot of land in the Aoyama area of Shibuya Ward, made available by the city of Tokyo. The value of the land, offered free of charge, was estimated at \$150 million.

In mid-1981, there were 28 associated institutions and 112 research and training units carrying out UNU work in more than 60 countries. By 31 December, 233 UNU fellows had completed training. UNU published more than 100 titles, including issues of the quarterly Food and Nutrition Bulletin and the monthly ASSET (Abstracts of Selected Solar Energy Technology), and began co-publishing a new journal, Mountain Research and Development, in co-operation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the International Mountain Society.

Under the world hunger programme, research and training continued in regard to three subprogrammes—hunger and society, hunger and health, and hunger and technology. A total of 152 persons had completed advanced training by the end of December, while 72 were to continue training. Special supplements of the Food and Nutrition Bulletin were issued: Food Price Policies and Nutrition in Latin America; Nutritional Evaluation of Protein Foods; Protein-Energy Requirements of Developing Countries; Evaluation of New Data; and Interdisciplinary Dialogue on World Hunger. Meetings, workshops and symposia were held on such topics as iron deficiency and work output (United States, April/May); evaluation methodologies for nutritional effects of development programmes (United States, September); food as a human right (Norway, October); and agriculture, food science and nutrition (India, November).

The human and social development programme concentrated on two subprogrammes—problems of development and technology for

development. Work on development problems focused on three continuing projects: goals, processes and indicators of development; socio-cultural development alternatives in a changing world; and Arab alternative futures, the first of a planned series of regional projects. Three aspects of technology were being examined: sharing of traditional technology; research and development in rural settings; and the Japanese experience in technology transfer, transformation and development. Ninety-eight universities and research centres were associated with the programme. Among meetings, workshops and symposia was a joint meeting with UNESCO on the application of indicators of socio-economic change to social planning (Seoul, Republic of Korea, September).

Under the programme on the use and management of natural resources, a new subprogramme on coastal resources management was developed. Other activities concerned agro-forestry systems, highland-lowland interactive systems, water-level interactive systems, and energy systems, with special reference to rural energy systems. Seven institutions were associated with the programme, and 13 research and training units were in operation.

The Council's Ad Hoc Committee on Planning, appointed in December 1980,<sup>(6)</sup> held its first session in Tokyo from 27 April to 1 May 1981, to advise on the medium-term plan and other programme development matters. The first meeting of the Rector's newly formed advisory committee was held in Tokyo from 16 to 20 March, when the current state of the programmes and the future direction and development of UNU were discussed.

The work of UNU was described in the annual reports of its Council to the General Assembly, covering activities from 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981<sup>(2)</sup> and from 1 July 1981 to 30 June 1982.<sup>(3)</sup>

UNU COUNCIL ACTION. The progress of UNU and its Rector's views on new developments were discussed at the seventeenth session of the UNU Council, held at Geneva from 22 to 26 June. At that session, the Council considered a paper on the medium-term perspective for 1982-1987, submitted by the Rector, and expressed its general agreement with his proposals. It adopted the perspective at its eighteenth session, held at Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, from 21 to 25 November.

At the latter session, the Council also approved the UNU programme and budget for 1982, and appointed an ad hoc committee to review the rules of procedure, prepare guidelines for the conduct of Council business and consider ways of ensuring substantive discussions of the UNU programme at Council sessions. It agreed

that high priority should be given to collaboration with international educational and scientific organizations. The Council also approved the establishment in 1982 of a Planning and Evaluation Unit and of a mechanism for external evaluation of the University's development, to cover entire programmes as well as individual projects.

The Economic and Social Council decided without vote on 21 October 1981 to authorize the transmittal of the Council's 1980/1981 report directly to the General Assembly.<sup>(5)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 19 November, by a resolution<sup>(4)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly welcomed the development of UNU activities under the five themes of its medium-term perspective (p. 811). Also welcoming the opportunities for greater collaboration between UNU, the United Nations system and academic communities and institutions, the Assembly decided to encourage efforts to promote understanding of the University's enlarged scope of work, so as to help generate increased financial support from various sources, including non-governmental organizations. Member States were called upon to contribute generously (p. 812).

The resolution was recommended by the Second Committee without vote on 30 October after informal consultations resulted in the withdrawal of an initial draft<sup>(1)</sup> sponsored by 16 nations and introduced by Japan. The second draft, introduced by a Vice-Chairman, added to paragraph 4 the phrase by which the Assembly decided to encourage understanding of the University's enlarged scope of work so as to generate increased financial support.

Austria, Japan, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United Kingdom cautioned against duplication by UNU of the work of other United Nations agencies as it broadened its scope, and said studies and research should be co-ordinated with other institutions and United Nations agencies. Poland added that UNU should promote and co-ordinate research in selected programmes and develop and strengthen relations with universities and research centres world-wide. Egypt and others favoured closer co-operation between UNU and UNITAR. Japan and Sweden were among those which commended efforts to co-ordinate UNU activities with those of other United Nations agencies.

China, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia and Uruguay said UNU should continue to place emphasis on the problems of developing countries; China felt the topics of UNU studies should be more specific, while Malaysia believed it had a role to play in the search for solutions to economic problems so as to bring about more

balanced relations among nations. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya hoped UNU would pay more attention to the training of educators and to the issuance of publications in Arabic. Pakistan urged priority for UNU assistance in the establishment of scientific institutions in developing countries. The Syrian Arab Republic considered as constructive the work of UNU in preparing specialized studies on science and technology for development. Uruguay felt that UNU programmes should have broader geographical coverage and should deal with environmental problems. China, Ghana, India, Pakistan and Uruguay welcomed continued emphasis on implementing the three programmes originally formulated by UNU.

Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago welcomed the establishment by UNU of a wide network of associated institutes, including the University of the West Indies. Uganda called for greater efforts to promote awareness of the objectives of UNU among Governments, the international academic community and other national and international institutions. The United Kingdom believed that an evaluation of past work could help determine whether the proposed extension of UNU activities was justified and whether the global studies envisaged would contribute to decision-making in the United Nations system and by Governments.

Draft resolution with drawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Austria, Ecuador, Egypt, Ghana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, United Republic of Tanzania, A/C.2/36/L.10.

Reports: UNU Council, <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/31, <sup>(3)</sup>A/37/31.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/45, 19 Nov., text following. Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/193, para. (d), 21 Oct. (p. 1091).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 1002.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee. A/C.2/36/SR.4. 6-12: 18, 19, 23, 24, 27, 28 (25 Sep.-30 Oct.); plenary; A/36/PV.64 (19 Nov.).

UNU publication: UNU Newsletter, vol. 5, Nos. 1-3.

General Assembly resolution 36/45

Adopted without vote Meeting 64 19 November 1961

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/693) without vote. 30 October (meeting 28); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.18), based on informal consultations on 16-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.10): agenda item 71 (b).

#### United Nations University

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2951(XXVII) of 11 December 1972, 3061(XXVIII) of 6 December 1973, 3313(XXIX) of 14 December 1974, 3439(XXX) of 9 December 1975, 31/117 and 31/118 of 16 December 1976, 32/54 of 8 December 1977, 33/108 of 18 December 1978, 34/112 of 14 December 1979 and 35/54 of 5 December 1980,

Having considered the report of the Council of the United Nations University on the work of the University,

Noting decision 5.2.1 of 2 October 1981, adopted by the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at its one hundred and thirteenth session.

1. Welcomes the development of the activities of the United Nations University under five themes with which the Council of the University expressed its general agreement at its seventeenth session;

2. Notes with satisfaction the decision to move towards a six-year medium-term perspective;

3. Welcomes the opportunities under the medium-term perspective for greater collaboration at various levels between the United Nations University and the United Nations system and academic communities and Institutions;

4. Notes that the enlarged scope of the programmes and activities of the United Nations University in promoting advanced research and training on global problems affecting mankind and in ensuring a more effective global dissemination of knowledge calls for greater resources for their implementation, and decides to encourage efforts to promote understanding of this enlarged scope of the work of the University, thereby helping to generate increased financial support from various sources, including non-governmental organizations;

5. Earnestly appeals to all Member States to give special attention to those encouraging developments and to contribute generously and urgently to the Endowment Fund of the United Nations University and, additionally or alternatively, to make operating contributions to the University in order to enable it to fulfil effectively its global mandate.

#### Work programme for 1982-1987

The medium-term perspective, 1982-1987, adopted by the UNU Council in November 1981 stemmed from the Council's 1979 decision<sup>(2)</sup> that the University could not continue operating on a year-to-year basis as it had in its formative years since 1975. The six-year perspective, described in the Council's 1981/1982 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> had four aims: broadening the scope of the UNU programme and making it more coherent, responsive and multidimensional; strengthening the intellectual and administrative capacity of the UNU centre in Tokyo; making UNU a more decentralized and multi-centred global institution through development of institutional networks; and increasing financial resources.

Research, post-graduate training and knowledge dissemination were to be organized under five themes, two of them having multiple sub-programmes: peace, security, conflict resolution and global transformation; global economy; hunger, poverty, resources and the environment, with subprogrammes on resource policy and management, energy systems and policy, food, nutrition and poverty, and food-energy nexus; human and social development and coexistence of peoples, cultures and social systems, with subprogrammes on development problematique, cultures and world development, and socio-cultural implications of demographic change; and science and technology and their social and ethical implications. Each theme would also have a subprogramme on problems and methods of global learning.

The activities of UNU were to be developed and implemented through three modes of opera-

tion, organized in the divisions of development studies, regional and global studies, and global learning. The Development Studies Division would seek to improve understanding of global problems as manifested in particular locales by linking local problems to their national and international dimensions. The Regional and Global Studies Division would study problems in their broadest international dimensions to ensure that empirical and policy-oriented research results contributed to the broader debate among regional and international scientific and academic communities. The Global Learning Division would promote more equitable access to knowledge, encourage an understanding of local and national problems in their global dimensions and vice versa, study problems and opportunities created by the rapid growth of communications and information technology, and strengthen the outreach of UNU through co-operation with other bodies.

The perspective integrated and extended the work carried out under the three original programmes of world hunger, human and social development, and the use and management of natural resources, which ceased to exist as programmes at the end of 1981.

In the Second Committee's debate on training and research, Austria, Ghana, Japan, Poland, Sierra Leone and Sri Lanka expressed support for the new approach taken by the UNU Council in adopting a longer planning perspective and broadening its initial three programmes with the five themes. Austria said the proposed reorientation of activities could make them more relevant and responsive to the UNU mandate. Ghana welcomed the proposal to study science and technology with particular reference to social and ethical implications, thereby contributing to efforts by developing countries to cross new technological frontiers without disrupting their traditional values and cultural heritage. Sweden considered that, of the five themes, those concerned with the global economy and with hunger, poverty, resources and the environment were particularly important.

Japan considered the five themes to be basically philosophical and said that a detailed work

programme should be drawn up and priorities assigned. The United Kingdom sought clarification as to what the new perspective meant in practical terms and what proportion of work would focus on practical solutions rather than theoretical studies.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNU Council, A/37/31.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1979, p. 975.

#### UNU finances

By the end of 1981, a total of \$140 million had been pledged to the UNU Endowment Fund, of which \$110 million had been received. Contributions received during 1981 totalled \$4,257,528 from 13 States to the Endowment Fund and \$1,598,173 from 6 States to the General Operating Fund. As at 31 December 1981, 8 States had pledged a total of \$5,644,498 to the Endowment Fund for 1982. (See table below.)

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY, 1981 AND 1982

(as at 31 December 1981; In US dollar equivalent)

COUNTRY	1981 payment	1982 pledge
<b>Endowment Fund</b>		
Austria	88,396	119,522
Chile	5,000	-
Egypt	10,000	-
Germany. Federal Republic of	436,207	1,081,081
Ghana	250,000	-
India	168,750	-
Mexico	259,189	250,000
Netherlands	125,000	-
Nigeria	-	10,000
Philippines	10,000	10,000
Saudi Arabia	1,000,000	-
Thailand	-	200,000
Tunisia	6,250	-
United Kingdom	1,858,736	3,913,895
United Republic of Tanzania	40,000	60,000
Subtotal	4,257,528	5,644,498
<b>General Operating Fund</b>		
France	50,000	40,708
Greece	40,000	-
Japan	1,000,000	-
Norway	185,185	-
Sri Lanka	2,000	-
Sweden	320,988	-
Subtotal	1,598,173	40,708
Grand total	5,855,701	5,685,206

<sup>1</sup>Austria has pledged to pay 1.5 million Austrian schillings (\$119,522) annually.



## Chapter XVI

## Environment

Throughout 1981, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) continued its work of promoting international action to protect the environment, with the Governing Council, at its ninth session, held at Nairobi, Kenya, from 13 to 26 May, adopting 40 decisions on various aspects of the environment programme. Resolutions on topics dealt with in the Governing Council's report<sup>(1)</sup> were adopted by the Economic and Social Council in July and by the General Assembly in December.

Preparing for the 1982 Governing Council session of a special character to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment,<sup>(12)</sup> the Assembly adopted a resolution,<sup>(8)</sup> based largely on a Council draft, by which it decided to hold the session at Nairobi from 10 to 18 May 1982.

Several decisions were taken during the year to follow up the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, adopted by the 1977 United Nations Conference on Desertification.<sup>(13)</sup>

The United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office (UNSO) continued to assist the countries of that central and west African region to implement the Plan by combating deforestation, managing rangeland and water resources, and stabilizing sand dunes, as well as other planning and co-ordination efforts. The Economic and Social Council expressed satisfaction at progress made by UNSO and urged intensified aid for those countries.<sup>(2)</sup> The General Assembly invited UNEP and the United Nations Development Programme to continue their support for UNSO.<sup>(9)</sup>

In further action on the Plan, the Assembly adopted a resolution on its financing.<sup>(10)</sup> Noting with concern that insufficient funds and increasing demands on scarce resources of countries suffering from desertification were constraining the Plan's implementation, it sought Member States' views on financing measures, including the possibility of establishing and funding an independent corporation for financing desertification-control projects.

The Assembly moved closer to approving a World Charter for Nature when it requested revision of a UNEP draft in order that the Assembly might consider adopting it in 1982.<sup>(4)</sup> Also, noting that the arms race was adversely affecting the environment and damaging the vegetable and animal world, the Assembly requested completion of recommendations for the adoption by

States of specific obligations relating to the protection of nature from the effects of the arms race, for submission to the Assembly's 1982 special session on disarmament.<sup>(5)</sup> Both these actions were taken in October 1981.

Growing concern over toxic substances was reflected in an Assembly resolution on information exchange on banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceuticals.<sup>(6)</sup> Reiterating the need for intensified international co-operation on problems arising from the production and export of such substances, the Assembly urged more co-operation in providing data on them and requested that developing countries be given technical assistance to help them monitor imports.

The Assembly reiterated its support for compensation demands by States affected by landmines and other remnants of war, and appealed to all States, particularly those responsible for war remnants, to co-operate in order to solve the problem.<sup>(7)</sup>

The Economic and Social Council<sup>(3)</sup> and the General Assembly<sup>(11)</sup> adopted resolutions on international environmental co-operation covering a broad range of topics being dealt with by UNEP.

They endorsed proposals, originating in a UNEP expert group, for work on interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development (p. 390). They appealed for increased contributions to the UNEP Fund—the main source of extrabudgetary funding for projects related to the environment—which disbursed some \$30.6 million for such work in 1981 (p. 817). The Council agreed to consider in 1982 a report on proposals to provide additional resources for serious environmental problems in developing countries; the Assembly welcomed ongoing consultations on the means of providing such funds and recognized the desirability of voluntary resources (p. 819).

The Assembly stressed the importance of developing a policy document outlining the Environmental Perspective to the year 2000 and beyond (p. 822). Both bodies noted work to combat marine pollution (p. 832). They stressed the need for Governments to take environmental considerations into account when participating in conferences on other subjects (p. 838). The Assembly called for UNEP action on the environmental aspects of new and renewable energy sources (p. 839). Both the Council and the

Assembly expressed appreciation for efforts to develop a system-wide, medium-term environment programme, aimed at defining and co-ordinating the responsibilities of various United Nations organizations in regard to the environment during a six-year period, 1984-1989 (p. 841). The Assembly welcomed co-operation between UNEP and the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS) (p. 842).

On other topics dealt with at its May session, the UNEP Governing Council: moved to strengthen its regional programmes (p. 817); approved the establishment or continuation of several trust funds (p. 820); included Arabic as one of its official and working languages (p. 822); called for speedy implementation of the World Climate Impact Studies Programme (p. 823); initiated work on a global framework convention for protection of the stratospheric ozone layer (p. 823); endorsed plans for the phased expansion of the world-wide environmental-information exchange network of UNEP, known as the International Referral System (INFOTERRA) (p. 826); invited countries affected by soil erosion to formulate national soils policies (p. 831); requested continued preparation of a global plan of action for conservation, management and utilization of marine mammals (p. 834); called on Governments to oppose apartheid because of the serious environmental consequences for its victims (p. 838); requested a further report on natural resources shared by two or more States (p. 839); made arrangements and determined the mandate for an October/November meeting of environmental law experts (p. 839); transmitted to the General Assembly an updated list of international environmental instruments (p. 840); acted to strengthen environmental education and training (p. 840); and recommended improved co-operation with the Economic Commission for Africa (p. 842).

States in the Caribbean, west and central Africa, east Asia and the south-east Pacific adopted action plans to protect the marine environment in those regions, as part of the UNEP regional seas programme (p. 833).

Report <sup>(1)</sup> UNEP Council, A/36/25 & Corr. 1.  
Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1981/72 (p. 830), <sup>(3)</sup>1981/73 (p. 815),  
24 July. GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/6 (p. 835), <sup>(5)</sup>36/7 (p. 836), <sup>(6)</sup>27 Oct.;  
<sup>(7)</sup>36/166, 16 Dec. (p. 825); <sup>(8)</sup>36/188 (p. 837), <sup>(9)</sup>36/189  
(p. 821), <sup>(10)</sup>36/190 (p. 830), <sup>(11)</sup>36/191 (p. 828),  
<sup>(12)</sup>36/192 (p. 816), 17 Dec.

Yearbook references: <sup>(12)</sup>1972, p. 318; <sup>(13)</sup>1977, p. 509.

## Programme and finances of UNEP

### Programme policy decisions

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. On 24 July 1981, in a resolution on UNEP and international environmental co-operation,<sup>(3)</sup> the

Economic and Social Council noted the UNEP Governing Council's report on its ninth session (13-26 May),<sup>(2)</sup> as well as reports on marine pollution (p. 832) and the UNEP contribution to the August United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 839). It called on UNEP to play its role in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade (p., 838),<sup>(4)</sup> endorsed proposals for a work programme on resources, environment, people and development (p. 391), and expressed appreciation for efforts to develop the 1984-1989 system-wide medium-term environment programme (p. 841). It agreed to consider in 1982 a report on additional resources for serious environmental problems in developing countries (p. 819) and appealed for increased contributions to the UNEP Fund (p. 818). The General Assembly was invited to consider a proposal on arrangements for the Governing Council's 1982 special session (p. 821).

The resolution was adopted without vote. On 21 July, the draft, sponsored by Argentina, Denmark, India, Kenya, the Sudan and Sweden, had been similarly approved by the Council's First (Economic) Committee after oral amendments and revision in informal consultations.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 17 December, in a resolution on UNEP and international environmental co-operation,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly noted the Governing Council's report<sup>(2)</sup> and the report on marine pollution. It called for UNEP action on new and renewable energy sources and on implementation of the International Development Strategy,<sup>(4)</sup> and requested implementation of the work programme on resources, environment, people and development. The Assembly recognized the desirability of voluntary resources for meeting the most serious environmental problems of developing countries and appealed for substantially increased contributions to the UNEP Fund. It expressed appreciation for efforts to develop the medium-term environment programme, and welcomed co-operation between UNEP and UNCHS (p. 842). After stressing the importance of developing the Environmental Perspective to the year 2000 and beyond, the Assembly invited the Governing Council to make recommendations on the topic (p. 823).

The resolution was adopted without vote after the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee had approved the draft in like manner on 7 December. The orally revised text was proposed by a Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on a draft submitted by 13 nations, subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup> The revision concerned the provisions on contributions to the UNEP Fund, additional resources for developing

countries and the Environmental Perspective document.

The USSR said it had not opposed the resolution because it generally endorsed the activities of UNEP, which should continue to be oriented towards global, regional and interregional problems whose solution concerned all or nearly all States. Reservations were also expressed on the type of contributions to the UNEP Fund, additional resources for developing countries (USSR), and the work programme on resources, environment, people and development (Federal Republic of Germany).

Comments on the UNEP programme were made during the Second Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation. Belgium thought UNEP should continue to stimulate and co-ordinate environmental research and action, without itself undertaking operational activities. The Byelorussian SSR said UNEP should continue to finance posts and projects within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe, and Poland hoped UNEP would pay greater attention to environmental hazards in Europe. India suggested that UNEP make prominent use of technical co-operation among developing countries, since some of those countries possessed labour-intensive technologies particularly suited to the needs of others. New Zealand stated that UNEP activities should be principally directed towards activities of global benefit rather than to national projects. Other comments on the UNEP programme were made in the context of the system-wide medium-term environment programme (p. 842).

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Argentina, Iceland, India, Kenya, Nepal, Netherlands, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Yugoslavia, A/C.2/36/L.45.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNEP Council, A/36/25 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC: 1981/73, 24 July, text following. GA:

<sup>(4)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503);

<sup>(5)</sup>36/192, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.6-8, 12, 13, 17 (6-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 35, 46 (24 Sep.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/73

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/109) without vote, 21 July (meeting 17); 6-nation draft (E/1981/C.1/L.11), orally amended and revised In informal consultations: agenda item 11.

Sponsors: Argentina, Denmark, India, Kenya, Sudan, Sweden.

International co-operation on the environment

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980 on the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Reaffirming the need for further International co-operation in the field of the environment and reiterating that environmental considerations should be viewed in the context of the national plans and priorities and development objectives of all countries, in particular the developing countries,

Having regard to General Assembly resolution 35/74 of 5 December 1980. In which the Assembly decided, inter alia, to convene, in 1982, a session of a special character of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme,

Having considered the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the work of its ninth session, the note by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme on the work on the Interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development, prepared on the basis of the recommendations of a high-level group of experts, as well as the reports of the Governing Council concerning the contribution of the United Nations Environment Programme to the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy and on marine pollution,

1. Takes note of the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the work of its ninth session;

2. Also takes note of the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme concerning the contribution of the Programme to the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, submitted in pursuance of Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/49 of 23 July 1980; supports the appeal of the Governing Council to the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy that the Conference should give sufficient emphasis and attach high priority to uses of new and renewable energy sources which would make it possible to tackle the major problem of fuel wood; invites the Conference to give serious consideration to the environmental effects of the production and use of various renewable sources of energy; and considers that the Programme should have an active role in the follow-up to the Conference, as regards the relationship between new and renewable sources of energy and the environment;

3. Notes with appreciation the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on marine pollution and the report of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization on the same subject, submitted in pursuance of paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 34/183 of 18 December 1979, and transmits them to the General Assembly for consideration;

4. Calls upon the United Nations Environment Programme to play its role fully in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, and stresses the need for all Governments and United Nations agencies to take environmental considerations fully into account when participating in negotiations and conferences organized by the United Nations on subjects other than environmental ones, such as the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries;

5. Endorses in principle, as recommended by the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, the proposals made by the high-level group of experts with regard to the programme of work on the interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development and the important role that the Programme should assume in this regard consistent with its mandate, invites the General Assembly to request the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to provide for the implementation of those proposals within the context of the programme of work to be established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 35/74, taking into account Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/51, and takes note of the views expressed by the Governing Council on the report of the Secretary-General on the interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development;

6. Requests organs and organizations of the United Nations system to take fully into account the view of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination that the system-wide medium-term environment programme should be seen not only as a document of use to the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, but also, to the

extent relevant to their particular mandates, as a document of basic interest to the governing bodies of other United Nations organizations, and expresses its appreciation of the continued efforts made by the United Nations Environment Programme, in co-operation with the entire United Nations system, in the development of the system-wide medium-term environment programme;

7. Invites the General Assembly to give favourable consideration to the draft resolution on a session of a special character of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme in 1982, proposed in decision 9/2 of 26 May 1981 of the Governing Council;

8. Agrees to consider the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on additional resources for serious environmental problems in developing countries at its second regular session of 1982;

9. Expresses its appreciation to Governments that continue to contribute generously to the Fund of the United Nations Environment Programme;

10. Appeals to all Governments to increase substantially their contributions to the Fund and to make, before the end of 1981, firm pledges of contributions to the Fund for the period 1982-1983, taking into account decision 9/23 of 26 May 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, as adopted;

11. Reiterates its appeal to Governments that have not yet contributed to the Fund to do so before the end of 1981 and to those Governments still contributing amounts below their means to increase their contributions for the period 1982-1983.

By its decision 9/24, the Governing Council decided to postpone its response to paragraph 9 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/49 and to paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 35/74 relating to additional resources for environmental problems in developing countries.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/192

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.9) without vote. 7 December (meeting 46): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.132), orally revised, based on informal consultations on 13-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.45): agenda item 69 (j).

International co-operation in the field of the environment  
The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the work of its ninth session, in particular annex II thereto,

Taking note of Economic and Social Council resolutions 1981/51 of 22 July 1981 and 1981/73 of 24 July 1981 concerning, respectively, the interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development, and international co-operation in the field of the environment,

Taking into account the note by the Secretary-General on international conventions and protocols in the field of the environment,

Bearing in mind the importance which the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade attaches to an ecologically sustainable development process and the need for further international co-operation in the field of the environment, and taking into account the fact that environmental considerations should be viewed in the context of national plans and priorities and development objectives of all countries, in particular the developing countries,

Welcoming the convening of an Ad Hoc Meeting of Senior Government Officials Expert in Environmental Law at Montevideo from 28 October to 6 November 1981,

Stressing the need for additional resources to be made available to the Fund of the United Nations Environment Programme for the developing countries to deal with their most serious environmental problems, such as soil degradation

and deforestation, which are examples of very severe deterioration of natural resources calling for particular attention,

Recognizing that environmental deficiencies generated by the conditions of underdevelopment pose grave problems and can best be remedied by accelerated development through the transfer of substantial quantities of financial and technical assistance as a supplement to the domestic effort of the developing countries and such timely assistance as may be required,

1. Takes note of the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, as adopted, on the work of its ninth session and the decisions adopted by the Governing Council at that session;

2. Takes note also of the efforts of the United Nations Environment Programme with regard to the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, as reflected in its medium-term plan for 1982-1983 and in the objectives of the system-wide medium-term environment programme for 1984-1989, as endorsed by the Governing Council;

3. Requests organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to take into account the view of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination that the document on the system-wide medium-term environment programme should be seen not only as of use to the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme but also as of basic interest to their governing bodies, to the extent that they deem appropriate and to the extent relevant to their particular mandates, and expresses its appreciation for the continued efforts made by the United Nations Environment Programme, in co-operation with the entire United Nations system, in the development of the system-wide medium-term environment programme;

4. Calls upon the United Nations Environment Programme to continue to play its role fully in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade and stresses the need for all Governments and bodies of the United Nations system to take environmental considerations fully into account when participating in negotiations and conferences organized by the United Nations on subjects other than the environment;

5. Welcomes the recommendations of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, as contained in section II of its decision 9/1 of 26 May 1981, as well as those made by the Economic and Social Council, in its resolutions 1981/51 and 1981/73 concerning the system-wide programme of work on the interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development and the important role which the United Nations Environment Programme should assume in this regard consistent with its mandate, and requests the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to take the requisite steps for their implementation;

6. Stresses the importance it attaches to the development of the Environmental Perspective to the year 2000 and beyond and invites the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, at its session of a special character and at its tenth session, to make such recommendations as may be appropriate;

7. Reaffirms the catalytic mandate and role of the United Nations Environment Programme, recognizes the desirability of mobilizing voluntary resources for meeting the most serious environmental problems of developing countries, welcomes the consultations being undertaken by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme on possible means of providing additional resources for developing countries, and notes that the Economic and Social Council has agreed to consider at its second regular session of 1982 the report of the Governing Council on this subject, as requested in paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 35/74 of 5 December 1980;

8. Welcomes the stress placed by the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy on the environmental effects of the production and use of various

renewable sources of energy and calls upon the United Nations Environment Programme to play an active role in the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy, as regards the relationship between new and renewable sources of energy and the environment;

9. Also welcomes the growing co-operation between the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat);

10. Takes note of the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on marine pollution;

11. Takes note also of the report of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization on marine pollution;

12. Expresses its appreciation to the Governments that continue to contribute generously to the Fund of the United Nations Environment Programme;

13. Appeals to all Governments to increase substantially their contributions to the Fund of the United Nations Environment Programme and to make, before the end of 1981, firm pledges of contributions to the Fund for the period 1982-1983, taking into account decision 9/23 of 26 May 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, as adopted;

14. Reiterates its appeal to the Governments that have not yet contributed to the Fund of the United Nations Environment Programme to do so before the end of 1981 and to those Governments still contributing amounts below their means to increase their contributions for the period 1982-1983.

#### Regional activities

On 26 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council requested the UNEP Executive Director to support initiatives under subregional environment programmes to strengthen the capacity of the UNEP regional offices for programme formulation and implementation. It called on donors and multilateral funding institutions to support such programmes, and on developing countries to share responsibilities by contributing to their common programmes and activities.

The principal regional activities of UNEP related to the regional seas programme, which carried out a variety of tasks including co-operation with Governments in the preparation or implementation of action plans for the protection of marine and coastal environments in most regions of the world (p. 833).

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/21, 26 May.

#### Medium-term plan for 1982-1983

In a decision of 26 May 1981 on programme matters,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council approved activities proposed in a medium-term plan for 1982-1983 submitted by the Executive Director<sup>(2)</sup> and invited him to submit more precise budgetary indications for each element. Unlike the proposed system-wide medium-term environment programme (p. 841), the 1982-1983 plan was confined to UNEP activities.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/10 A, paras. 9 & 10, 26 May.

Medium-term plan: <sup>(2)</sup>UNEP/GC.9/6 & Corr.1,2 & Add.1.

## UNEP Fund and trust funds

### UNEP Fund

Of total UNEP income in 1980-1981, 69 per cent came from the voluntarily financed Fund of UNEP, which supported a variety of environmental activities. During 1981, the Fund disbursed \$21,377,190 for programme activities and \$9,199,383 for programme and programme support costs, or a total of \$30,576,573. Disbursements for programme activities-apart from \$186,244 under the programme reserve-were in the following fields: human settlements and human health, \$2,168,853; support, \$4,939,524; environment and development, \$1,483,512; oceans, \$2,576,447; energy, \$89,785; environmental management and environmental law, \$295,084; terrestrial ecosystems, \$2,617,541; natural disasters, \$26,947; Earthwatch, \$4,421,642; environmental data, \$602,278; and arid and semi-arid lands, including desertification, \$1,969,333. Staff costs accounted for over two thirds of programme and programme support costs.

On 26 May, the UNEP Governing Council adopted four decisions pertaining to the Fund.

With regard to the Fund's management,<sup>(1)</sup> the Council, after appealing for additional contributions (p. 818), accepted the desirability of a \$120-million target for 1982-1983, of which \$93 million would be for programme activities, but it considered that no more than \$77 million might be available. Accordingly, it apportioned appropriations for each of 11 programme areas in 1982-1983 in terms of the following percentages:

ACTIVITY	AMOUNT (In millions of US dollars)			Percent- age
	1982	1983	Total	
Human settlements and human health	4.5	5.5	10.0	11
support	7.9	9.2	17.1	18
Environment and development	2.7	3.3	6.0	6
Oceans	4.7	5.8	10.5	11
Energy	1.0	1.1	2.1	2
Environmental management and environmental law	1.1	1.4	2.5	3
Ecosystems	7.5	9.3	16.8	18
Natural disasters	0.3	0.3	0.6	1
Earthwatch	7.5	9.4	16.9	18
Data	0.8	0.7	1.5	2
Arid and semi-arid lands, including desertification	4.0	5.0	9.0	10
Total	42.0	51.0	93.0	100

Concerning programme and support costs, the Council approved for the 1980-1981 biennium a revised appropriation level of \$19,800,000 - including \$815,200 for 12 additional posts and an expert group meeting on desertification.<sup>(2)</sup> It further approved an appropriation of \$25,500,000 for 1982-1983, including the estab-

lishment of eight additional posts, and requested the Executive Director to aim at keeping this budget within 33 per cent of contributions received for the UNEP Fund during each year of the biennium.<sup>(3)</sup> The Council also requested the General Assembly to instruct the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to review in depth the Fund's programme and support costs and to report at the Council's 1982 regular session.<sup>(4)</sup>

Decisions: UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 26 May: <sup>(1)</sup>9/23, <sup>(2)</sup>9/27 A, <sup>(3)</sup>9/27 B, <sup>(4)</sup>9/27 C.

### Contributions

As at 31 December 1981, contributions for 1981 paid by 71 countries to the UNEP Fund totalled \$35,553,749, while pledges for 1982 from 42 countries reached \$18,521,949 (see table below).

Appeals for contributions were made during 1981 by the UNEP Governing Council, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

The Governing Council, in its 26 May decision on management of the Fund<sup>(4)</sup> (p. 817), ap-

pealed to all Governments to maintain the real value of contributions in terms of the 1978 United States dollar and to make firm pledges for 1982-1983. It further appealed to those not contributing to pledge for that period and to those contributing below their means to make increases. It renewed its appeal to those unable to contribute in fully convertible currencies to pay a part in convertible currency in 1981 and an increasing proportion each year thereafter. After taking note of the Executive Director's report on non-convertible currency balances,<sup>(1)</sup> it requested him to make the most effective use of such contributions, taking account of the need for balanced project selection.

In its July resolution on UNEP,<sup>(2)</sup> the Economic and Social Council appealed for substantial increases in contributions and for firm pledges for 1982-1983 before the end of 1981. It reiterated its appeal to those not contributing to do so before that date, and to those contributing below their means to make increases for 1982-1983.

As a result of informal consultations in the Council's First (Economic) Committee, the text

## CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNEP FUND, 1981 AND 1982

(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment	1982 pledge	Country	1981 payment	1982 pledge
Algeria	10,000	11,000	Luxembourg	10,000	-
Argentina	72,926	70,000	Malawi	2,404	-
Australia	502,560	-	Malaysia	20,000	10,000
Austria	300,000	300,000	Malta	1,842	-
Barbados	1,000	2,000	Mexico	198,036	-
Benin	-	2,000	Netherlands	390,011	445,833
Botswana	4,146	1,543	New Zealand	88,038	-
Brazil	20,000	20,000	Nigeria	119,612	32,000
Bulgaria	5,869	-	Norway	986,311	947,368
Burundi	5,589	-	Pakistan	5,000	-
Byelorussian SSR	18,336	36,466	Panama	8,000	-
Canada	805,000	-	Peru	4,000	-
Chile	5,000	-	Philippines	10,000	20,000
China	114,779	115,607	Poland	45,181	90,362
Colombia	21,336	35,000	Portugal	6,000	3,000
Congo	14,429	-	Republic of Korea	10,000	10,000
Cyprus	4,000	4,000	Saudi Arabia	250,000	-
Czechoslovakia	52,056	25,773	Seychelles	100	100
Democratic Yemen	2,779	1,456	Singapore	1,000	1,000
Denmark	335,032	-	Somalia	3,210	-
Egypt	10,000	15,000	Sudan	-	1,500
Finland	350,000	350,000	Sweden	1,875,000	5,000,000
France	1,071,429	973,451	Switzerland	513,507	536,932
German Democratic Republic	179,654	170,455	Syrian Arab Republic	1,000	-
Germany, Federal	-	-	Thailand	10,000	-
Republic of	1,956,522	-	Togo	1,807	707
Ghana	26,100	-	Tunisia	19,620	-
Greece	26,608	-	Turkey	6,000	-
Hungary	20,024	21,429	Ukrainian SSR	45,134	89,762
Iceland	12,600	-	USSR	3,698,166	7,354,839
India	50,000	-	United Kingdom	1,100,917	1,181,102
Indonesia	12,000	12,000	United Republic of Cameroon	-	7,813
Iraq	-	76,000	United Republic of Tanzania	16,173	-
Ireland	20,735	-	United States	14,981,000	-
Italy	400,000	400,000	Venezuela	100,000	100,000
Ivory coast	45,675	-	Yugoslavia	106,751	-
Jamaica	3,745	-	Zambia	-	11,500
Japan	4,000,000	-			
Kenya	40,000	34,951			
Kuwait	400,000	-			
			Total	35,553,749	18,521,949

of this part of the resolution was orally amended and revised. Whereas the original draft would have had the Council strongly appeal to all Governments to maintain the real value of their contributions in terms of the United States dollar, the final text had the Council appeal to them to increase their contributions substantially and to make firm pledges for 1982-1983, taking into account the Governing Council decision.

In its December resolution on UNEP,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly restated the provisions set out in the Economic and Social Council resolution. Introducing this text, India said the sponsors had wished to see a higher contributions target but had accepted the Governing Council's consensus and the wording of this paragraph in a spirit of accommodation.

Referring to this provision, the Federal Republic of Germany stated that its legislation did not permit multiyear pledges. The USSR said attempts to dictate the size or currency of a State's contribution violated the principle of voluntary contributions on which the Fund was based.

During debate in the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on development and international economic co-operation, Belgium thought it unrealistic to approve a \$120-million programme when it was clear that contributions would not exceed \$80 million. Canada expressed concern that the \$120-million target would not be met and said that, to respect the Governing Council's priorities, activities should be planned so that expenditures were in line with percentages set by the Council (p. 817). Finland, on behalf of the Nordic States, observed that the Fund's financial situation was unsatisfactory and urged all Governments to reconsider their position on contributions. Hungary pointed out that it had benefited from UNEP projects financed by contributions in non-convertible currencies.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Executive Director, UNEP/GC.9/10/Add.1.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/73, paras. 9-11. 24 July (p. 816); <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/192, paras. 12-14, 17 Dec. (p. 817). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/23, 26 May.

#### Additional resources for developing countries

In February 1981, the UNEP Executive Director submitted a report to the Governing Council<sup>(1)</sup> proposing ways of securing additional resources to deal with serious environmental problems in developing countries. The report suggested new funding by levying fees for the use of such international commons as oceans, airspace and telecommunication frequencies. It also envisaged additional money from established multilateral sources, including conces-

sional loans from financial institutions, as well as private contributions and taxes on commodities of little or no social value. The report further discussed a proposal by Sweden, made to the Council in 1980 and supported by Denmark and the Netherlands, for a "special window" in the UNEP Fund, to be financed from additional contributions which would not affect the Fund's regular target. The Executive Director said he had approached 10 major donor Governments to ascertain their willingness to support the proposal.

On 26 May,<sup>(7)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council decided to postpone its response to 1980 requests by the Economic and Social Council<sup>(2)</sup> and the General Assembly<sup>(4)</sup> for a report on additional resources for serious environmental problems in developing countries. The Governing Council also requested the Executive Director to continue consultations with Governments and to reintroduce the issue in 1982, particularly with regard to the "special window".

In another decision of the same date, on priorities for serious environmental problems in the developing countries,<sup>(6)</sup> the Council identified the priorities as: environment and development; terrestrial ecosystems; supporting measures, particularly environmental education and training and technical assistance; human settlements and human health; arid and semi-arid lands; natural disasters; energy; and oceans.

In its July 1981 resolution on UNEP,<sup>(3)</sup> the Economic and Social Council agreed to consider the Governing Council's report on additional resources at its second regular session of 1982.

This action was noted by the General Assembly in its December resolution on UNEP.<sup>(5)</sup> The Assembly also reaffirmed the catalytic mandate and role of UNEP, recognized the desirability of mobilizing voluntary resources for the most serious environmental problems of developing countries and welcomed the Executive Director's consultations.

During informal consultations in the Second Committee, a phrase in the original 13-nation draft resolution, which would have had the Assembly stress the need for additional resources in the UNEP Fund for developing countries to deal with their most serious environmental problems such as soil degradation and deforestation, was dropped in favour of the clause recognizing the desirability of mobilizing voluntary resources.

Explaining its position on this provision, the Federal Republic of Germany voiced its understanding that any additional resources would be made available through existing channels. The USSR said the serious environmental problems of developing countries should be dealt with without prejudice to other UNEP programmes and on the basis of voluntary contributions.

In the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, Kenya supported the Swedish proposal for a "special window" in the UNEP Fund. Belgium felt that establishing a new fund or "window" would not increase resources available for environmental purposes.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Executive Director, UNEP/GC.9/10/Add.2.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1980/49, para. 9, 23 July 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 723); <sup>(3)</sup>1981/73, para. 8, 24 July 1981 (p. 816). GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/74, para. 12, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 724); <sup>(5)</sup>36/192, para. 7, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 816).

Decisions: UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 26 May: <sup>(6)</sup>9/12 <sup>(7)</sup>9/24.

### Trust funds

During 1981, five main trust funds of UNEP were in operation. Two of them were part of the regional seas programme (p. 833): for protection of the Mediterranean Sea against pollution, and for protection and development of the marine environment and the coastal areas of Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. The others were for implementation of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora and of the 1977 Plan of Action to Combat Desertification (p. 827), and for regional training workshops on environmental management. The trust fund for training workshops, particularly for the pulp and paper industry, was established in 1981, with income entirely from the Swedish International Development Authority; an initial \$160,356 contribution was received in October.

The UNEP Governing Council, on 26 May 1981, <sup>(2)</sup> approved the continuation of these funds. It also agreed with the Executive Director's intention, subject to the Secretary-General's consent, to accept responsibility for administering them for as long as he was requested and urged States to pay their contributions promptly. The Council also approved the establishment of three trust funds for initial two-year periods, until 31 December 1983, for: protection and development of the marine environment and the coastal areas of the west and central African region; the Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme; and the Action Plan for the East Asian Seas (p. 833).

By another decision of 26 May, on financing plans of action, <sup>(1)</sup> the Council decided that the Executive Director, in respect of plans being drawn up, was to consult Governments on the approach to use in developing financing plans and then draw up detailed plans specifying Government and UNEP commitments. Once an action plan had been adopted, UNEP would

maintain support until the Council decided otherwise.

Income and expenditure of UNEP trust funds in 1981-1982 (24 months) were as follows:

TRUST FUND	AMOUNT (in US dollars)	
	Income	Expenditure
Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution	4,657,723	3,220,093
Protection and Development of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Areas of Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates	4,665,414	1,293,721
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora-	832,466	513,678
Regional Training Workshops on Environmental Management	162,109	80,528
Special account for financing the implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification	39,996	-
Total	10,357,708	5,108,020

Decisions: UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 26 May: <sup>(1)</sup>9/25, <sup>(2)</sup>9/26.

### Governing Council

#### Convening of a special session in 1982

Arrangements for a 1982 session of a special character of the UNEP Governing Council, including dates, place, agenda and rules of procedure, were approved by the General Assembly on 17 December 1981. The decision to convene the session, open to all States, had been taken by the Assembly in December 1980 <sup>(2)</sup> to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. <sup>(5)</sup> At the session, the Council was to review achievements of the previous decade and make programme recommendations for the following 10 years.

Plans for the session were approved by the Governing Council on 26 May 1981 in a draft resolution recommended for adoption by the Assembly. <sup>(4)</sup> This would have had the Assembly decide that the session be held at Nairobi, Kenya, from 10 to 18 May 1982, recommend a 15-minute limit on statements by delegation heads and decide that, with certain modifications, the Council's rules of procedure would apply. The Assembly would reiterate its invitation to Governments to participate at the highest political level and specifically invite ministers dealing with the environment, and also encourage participation by non-governmental organizations. It would agree to a special public information programme and would express hope that a new international prize and a number of UNEP medals would be announced in 1982 as an incentive to better environmental management and



protection. Annexed to the draft resolution were a draft provisional agenda and proposed amendments to the rules of procedure for the session.

The Economic and Social Council, in its July 1981 resolution on UNEP, invited the Assembly to consider the draft resolution favourably.<sup>(1)</sup> During informal consultations in the Council's First (Economic) Committee, this paragraph of the resolution had been orally revised to delete a phrase inviting the Assembly to consider favourably the budget implications of the session.

The Assembly accepted the principal provisions of the Governing Council's draft in adopting a resolution on the special session on 17 December.<sup>(3)</sup> It also reiterated an invitation to Governments to prepare thoroughly for the session and decided that the Council should report on it to the Assembly in 1982. The Assembly added that the public information programme should be financed largely from existing resources and that the resolution should be implemented with due regard to economy.

The resolution omitted the reference to an international prize and medals. Also, in addition to drafting changes to the provisional agenda, the Assembly expanded an item on major trends to be addressed by UNEP over the following 10 years by adding a phrase on future perspectives, action and international co-operation on the environment (p. 823). The Assembly accepted the amendments to the Council's rules of procedure substantially as proposed.

The resolution was adopted without vote after the revised 11-nation draft, introduced by Sweden, had been similarly approved by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 27 November.

The USSR and the United States felt that the session should have been organized within available financial resources. The USSR added that this also applied to the public information programme.

During the Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, a number of speakers expressed support for the holding of the session. Among them, Belgium hoped the session would thoroughly review past and future UNEP activities, while Canada hoped it would stimulate efforts to manage resources in an environmentally sound fashion. Finland, speaking for the Nordic States, said the session would give Governments an opportunity to address problems that had been inconceivable in 1972. Hungary saw it as a chance to review results, define targets and mobilize public opinion. The hope of India was that the session would lay greater emphasis on the problems of the develop-

ing countries and mobilize the resources to overcome them. Mongolia hoped the session would give new emphasis to international environmental co-operation.

#### Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC: 1981/73, para. 7, 24 July (p. 816). GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/74, paras. 13-15, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 724); <sup>(3)</sup>36/189, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(4)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25): 9/2, 26 May.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1972, p. 318.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/822; S-G statements, A/C.2/36/L.62/Rev.1, A/C.5/36/65.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28, 29-32, 44, 47 (24 Sep.-10 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/189

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.9) without vote. 27 November (meeting 44); 11-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.21/Rev.1); agenda item 69 (i).

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, India, Kenya, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Yugoslavia.

Session of a special character of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

The General Assembly,

Recalling paragraphs 13 to 15 of its resolution 35/74 of 5 December 1980 on international co-operation in the field of the environment,

Concerned that there is need to revive the sense of urgency and commitment by Governments for national and international co-operative action to protect and enhance the environment, which found expression at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held at Stockholm from 5 to 16 June 1972.

Recognizing that important changes in the perception of the environment and of environmental problems have occurred since that Conference and recognizing also the importance of the interrelationships between people, resources, environment and development,

Convinced that the session of a special character represents a unique opportunity for Governments to re-emphasize their continued commitment to and support of the cause of the environment and the United Nations Environment Programme,

1. Decides that the session of a special character of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme should be held at Nairobi from 10 to 18 May 1982 and that the Governing Council should report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

2. Approves the draft provisional agenda for the session as set forth in section I of the annex to the present resolution;

3. Further decides that the rules of procedure of the Governing Council will apply to the session of a special character, with modifications to rules 17, 18, 19, 31 and 67 as recommended by the Governing Council and set forth in section II of the annex to the present resolution;

4. Reiterates its invitation to Governments to prepare thoroughly for the session of a special character and to participate therein at the highest political level, and specifically invites ministers dealing with the environment to participate in the session;

5. Agrees that there should be a special public information programme, along the lines indicated by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, which should to a large extent be financed from existing resources;

6. Decides that the present resolution should be implemented with due regard for the need for economy in respect of the preparations and arrangements for the session of a special character;

7. Encourages the participation of non-governmental organizations in the session of a special character, in accordance with the practices normally followed by the Governing Council.

#### ANNEX

##### I. Draft provisional agenda for the session

1. Opening of the session.
2. Adoption of the rules of procedure.
3. Election of the President of the session.
4. Organizational and procedural matters:<sup>7</sup>
  - (a) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work;
  - (b) Election of officers other than the President.
5. Credentials of representatives.
6. Review of the major achievements in the implementation of the Action Plan for the Human Environment.
7. Future perspectives, action and international co-operation in the field of the environment, and major environmental trends to be addressed by the United Nations Environment Programme over the next ten years.
8. Adoption of the report of the session.
9. Closure of the session.

##### II. Amendments to the rules of procedure of the Governing Council for the session

Rule 17 (Representation and credentials). Paragraph 2 of this rule shall read as follows:

"A Credentials Committee of nine members shall be appointed at the beginning of the session of a special character. Its composition shall be based on that of the Credentials Committee of the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session. It shall examine the credentials of representatives and report to the session of a special character without delay."

##### Rule 18 (Elections):

(a) Paragraph 1 of this rule shall read as follows:

"At the commencement of the first meeting of the session of a special character, the Governing Council shall elect, for the duration of that session, a President, three Vice-Presidents and a Rapporteur from among its members. Those officers shall constitute the Bureau of the Governing Council. The Bureau shall assist the President in the general conduct of business of the Governing Council. The Chairman of such sessional committees or working parties as may be established under rule 60 below shall be invited to participate in meetings of the Bureau."

(b) Paragraph 2 of this rule shall remain unchanged:

(c) Paragraph 3 of this rule shall be suspended for the duration of the session of a special character.

Rule 19 (Terms of office). This rule shall be suspended for the duration of the session of a special character.

Rule 31 (Quorum). This rule shall read as follows:

"The President may declare a meeting open and permit the debate to start when at least one third of the members of the session of a special character of the Governing Council are present. The presence of a majority of the members shall be required for any decision to be taken."

Rule 67 (Participation of States not members of the Governing Council). This rule shall be suspended for the duration of the session of a special character.

Statements in plenary meeting are expected to be made in accordance with decision 9/2 of 26 May 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme.

#### Arabic language services

On 26 May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council amended its rules of procedure in order to include Arabic as one of its official and working languages. In taking this decision, the Coun-

cil recalled that, in December 1980,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly had decided to include Arabic among the working languages of its subsidiary organs no later than 1 January 1982.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 35/219 A, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1245). Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/1, sect. III, paras. 2 & 3, 26 May 1981.

## Environmental activities

### Environmental policy

On 26 May 1981, by a decision on long-term issues affecting the environment programme, the UNEP Governing Council emphasized the importance of redoubled efforts by the United Nations system in four areas: environmental and economic development planning, including environmental and economic cost/benefit assessment; environmental management for long-term solutions to the energy problem; sound integration of environmental dimensions in the programming of country-level technical assistance; and popular education and dissemination of information on environment-development relationships by the media and non-governmental organizations. The Council called on the international community to meet major potential crises of the 1980s in dealing with environmental problems in developing countries.

Eight priorities for serious environmental problems in the developing countries were identified by the Council in another decision of the same date (p. 819).

With a view to developing a document on global long-term environmental perspectives, the Council, in a 26 May decision on co-ordination questions,<sup>(2)</sup> authorized the Executive Director to consult with Governments and international organizations on the desirability, feasibility and financing of possible approaches to its preparation, including: an independent commission to report on global environment perspectives to the year 2000 and beyond; an intergovernmental process involving all States, the United Nations system and the world scientific community; and other possible options. In the same decision, the Council endorsed the view of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), formulated in 1980,<sup>(4)</sup> that the document should attempt to define shared perceptions of long-term environmental issues and of efforts needed to protect and enhance the environment, help define an agenda for action during the coming decades and set goals for the world community. The Council decided to consider these issues further in 1982.

In its October 1981 report to the Council (p. 842), ACC pledged to contribute fully to preparation of the perspective document.

The General Assembly, in December, stressed the importance of developing the Environmental Perspective to the year 2000 and beyond, and invited the Council to make recommendations in 1982. This action was incorporated in the Assembly's resolution on UNEP.<sup>(1)</sup> Also in December, in approving the draft provisional agenda for the 1982 special session of the Governing Council (p. 821), the Assembly revised the title of one of the items to add a reference to perspectives.

Consideration of the perspective document at the special session had been urged by Sweden, which expressed the view that the document should be drawn up by negotiation among Governments, organizations and the scientific community rather than by an independent commission.

Environmental policy issues, with special regard for the relationship between the environment and development, were discussed by the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee during its debate on development and international economic co-operation (p. 838).

#### Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA: 36/192, para. 6, 17 Dec. (p. 816).

Decisions: UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 26 May: <sup>(2)</sup>9/3, sect. III; <sup>(3)</sup>9/11.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 995.

#### Environmental monitoring

On 26 May 1981, in dealing with the 1980-1983 environment programme,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council approved revised objectives and strategies for assessment by UNEP of basic human needs in relation to the outer limits of stress placed on the environment by human activities.

The revised policies, proposed by the Executive Director, dealt with three main areas: environmental agents affecting man and other targets, climate-related activities in the physical environment, and renewable natural resources. The principal topics for monitoring were to be: long-range transport of pollutants and the effects of acid rain; assessment of toxic chemicals; ocean pollution; health-related pollution; impact of carbon dioxide-induced climate change; ozone depletion; assessment of climate-related monitoring; desertification; soil degradation; tropical rangelands; forest cover; shifting cultivation in the humid tropics; loss of cropland; and selected species and habitats.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/10 A, para. 4, 26 May.

#### Atmosphere and climate

##### World Climate Impact Studies Programme

Aimed at introducing climatic considerations into the formulation of rational policy alternatives, the major activities of the World Climate Impact Studies Programme (WCISP) included assessment of the impact of carbon dioxide-induced climate change; projects to improve climate assessment methodology; identification of climate-sensitive sectors of human activity; examination of the vulnerability of food systems in selected agro-climatic zones and nations; and assessment of depletion of the ozone layer. WCISP was a component of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) (p. 1465).

In 1981, WCISP activities included a joint project with the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development to reduce the vulnerability of food systems to climate in north-eastern India, and a project with the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment to improve the science of climate impact studies through the preparation of papers on methodology and the identification of all such studies throughout the world. An ad hoc meeting of climate modellers and agro-climatologists (Stockholm, Sweden, 13 and 14 August) recommended establishing a committee on crop-climate interactions for information exchange between climate modellers and agricultural research specialists, and to guide development of a research programme.

On 26 May,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council took note of recommendations by the first meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee for WCISP (Nairobi, Kenya, 23-27 February) concerning the Programme's implementation. These recommendations included a proposal for an international study conference on the socio-economic impact of man-induced climatic changes. The Council called for a close relationship between UNEP and the World Climate Programme Office established by WMO, and requested the UNEP Executive Director to implement WCISP as quickly as possible, in collaboration with participating international organizations.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/13 A, 26 May.

#### Research on the ozone layer

At the fifth session of the UNEP Co-ordinating Committee on the Ozone Layer (Copenhagen, Denmark, 12-16 October 1981), major advances were reported in understanding the chemistry of the ozone layer and of those chemicals, principally chlorofluorocarbons 11 and 12, released by human activity and suspected of depleting the stratospheric ozone layer. It was calculated that

an eventual ozone reduction of between 5 and 10 per cent would occur if releases of these chemicals continued at their current rate, thereby allowing more of certain damaging wave lengths of solar ultraviolet radiation to reach the earth. An environmental assessment of ozone layer depletion and its impacts, formulated at the Committee's November 1980 session, was published in April 1981 in the half-yearly *Ozone Layer Bulletin*.

On 26 May,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council decided to initiate work aimed at a global framework convention to protect the ozone layer, by establishing an ad hoc legal and technical working group which was to submit its first progress report in 1982. The Executive Director was requested to assist the group and to invite the Co-ordinating Committee to compile information for it.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/13 B, 26 May.

## Toxic substances

### Information exchange on chemicals and pharmaceuticals

Conforming to requests by the General Assembly in 1979<sup>(4)</sup> and 1980,<sup>(6)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted in May 1981 a report on the experience of Member States and international organizations in the exchange of information on banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products.<sup>(3)</sup> The report also contained a preliminary evaluation of the effectiveness of international facilities and the main issues deserving further consideration. It suggested that information systems be made more responsive to users and that, after two or three years, the need for more elaborate control systems might be assessed. It also called for co-ordination between the United Nations system and other bodies, such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and greater aid to help developing countries establish adequate import control of drugs of dubious therapeutic value and hazardous chemicals and to train scientific staff.

On 23 July,<sup>(8)</sup> acting without vote, the Economic and Social Council took note of the Secretary-General's report and decided to transmit it to the Assembly. This decision was recommended by the Council's Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee on 15 July, also without vote, on an oral proposal by its Chairman, with an oral amendment by the USSR to have the Council take into account the views expressed in the Committee.

ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON TNCs. Requested by the General Assembly in Decem-

ber 1980<sup>(5)</sup> to study ways of improving information exchange on this topic within the United Nations information system on transnational corporations (TNCs) (p. 602), the Commission on TNCs examined a July 1981 report by the Secretariat<sup>(2)</sup> highlighting the growing awareness of problems caused by banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceuticals and the need for information exchange. The report discussed the production and marketing of such products and described the activities of United Nations agencies and other international institutions. It concluded that the information system operated by the United Nations Centre on TNCs could only supplement the activities of specialized agencies in improving information exchange, initially by identifying TNCs involved in the production and marketing of products determined by those agencies to be toxic and hazardous.

Taking note of this report with appreciation, the Commission, in September, requested the Centre to co-operate with other United Nations bodies such as the International Labour Organisation, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Health Organization (WHO) and UNEP, in exchanging information on banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceuticals, and to inform the Commission of those activities in 1982.<sup>(1)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 16 December 1981, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(7)</sup> reiterating the need to intensify international co-operation on problems arising from the production and export of banned or severely restricted substances, and urging States and others, including TNCs, to co-operate more fully in providing data to United Nations bodies. Those bodies and others involved in disseminating information on the subject were called on to ensure that their documentation was adequate to the needs of and clearly understood by all those handling or using such products. The Assembly also requested those bodies and the Secretary-General to provide, within available resources, technical assistance to help developing countries monitor the import of unsafe pharmaceutical products of doubtful therapeutic value and banned hazardous chemicals, and to train scientific personnel. States were invited to employ appropriate means including legislation, and the Secretary-General was requested to consult them again on existing information systems and to report in 1983.

The resolution was adopted without vote. On 30 November, the draft, sponsored by 16 nations, had been approved in like manner by the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee after being orally revised by the sponsors. The main change affected paragraph 7, which would

originally have had the Assembly invite States to consider the need to deal with the subject through national legislation and at the international level; in the final text, States were invited to deal with the subject through appropriate means, including possible national legislation, where they did not exist.

The problem of preventing the introduction of low-quality or falsely labelled narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances into developing countries was addressed in February by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (p. 1062).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on TNCs, E/1981/49; <sup>(2)</sup>Secretariat, E/C.10/90; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/255.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>34/173, para. 2, 17 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 997); <sup>(5)</sup>35/186, para. 2, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1032); <sup>(6)</sup>*ibid.*, para. 3 (p. 1033); <sup>(7)</sup>36/166, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(8)</sup>ESC: 1981/177, 23 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR. 1, 2, 3, 5-8, 13 (2-15 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.40 (23 July). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-63, 64, 66 (19-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/177

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/96, Part I) without vote. 15 July (meeting 13); draft orally proposed by Chairman. orally amended by USSR; agenda items 18 and 19.

Exchange of information on banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products

At Its 40th plenary meeting, on 23 July 1981, the Council:

(a) Took note of the report of the Secretary-General on the exchange of Information on banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products;

(b) Decided to transmit that report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, taking into account the views expressed by delegations in the Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee at the second regular session of 1981 of the Council.

General Assembly resolution 36/166

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, 30 November (meeting 66): 16-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.74). orally revised; agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Jordan, Kenya, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Somalia, Tunisia, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Exchange of information on banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 34/173 of 17 December 1979, in which it recognized the urgent need to take concrete measures to prevent adverse effects on health on a world-wide basis.

Recalling also its resolution 35/186 of 15 December 1980, in which It Invited Member States to provide information on measures they had taken on the exchange of information on hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products that have been banned in their territories and requested the Secretary-General, In co-operation with the United Nations organs, organizations and bodies concerned, to submit a report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session on the experience of Member States and the United Nations organs, organizations and bodies concerned,

Conscious of the Importance of the Information system on transnational corporations for the analysis of the activities of

these corporations in certain sectors of special social and humanitarian interest to the countries in which operations take place, particularly developing countries.

Taking into account that in resolution 35/186 it requested the Commission on Transnational Corporations to study, during its seventh session, ways and means within the information system on transnational corporations to improve the exchange of information on those products with a view to formulating appropriate recommendations,

Bearing in mind the importance of objective information on banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products.

Aware that the production and export of banned or severely restricted hazardous substances-including pharmaceuticals, pesticides and industrial chemicals-endanger public health and the environment.

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the exchange of information on banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products;

2. Takes note also of the conclusions and recommendations in the report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations which was submitted to the Commission on Transnational Corporations at its seventh session;

3. Reiterates the need to intensify international co-operation in the search for the solution to problems arising from the production and export of banned or severely restricted substances;

4. Urges Member States and other interested parties, including transnational corporations, to co-operate more fully in providing data on banned or severely restricted substances to the appropriate organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system with responsibility for Information exchange in regard to such substances;

5. Calls upon the organs, organizations and other competent United Nations bodies involved in disseminating information on this subject to ensure that the documentation they prepare is adequately suited to the needs of and clearly understood by all those engaged in processing, handling, dispensing or using all banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products;

6. Requests the Secretary-General and the organs, organizations and other competent United Nations bodies to provide, within the available resources, the necessary technical assistance to the developing countries, at their request, to help them establish an adequate system for monitoring the import of unsafe pharmaceutical products of doubtful therapeutic value and banned hazardous chemicals, on the one hand, and to train scientific personnel to handle these problems, on the other;

7. Invites Member States to deal with this subject through appropriate means, including possible legislation at the national level, where they do not yet exist;

8. Once again requests the Secretary-General to consult Member States on the existing information systems on banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session through the Economic and Social Council.

#### Preparation of a list of toxic substances

On 25 May 1981, the UNEP Governing Council called for continued work on the preparation of a list of environmentally dangerous chemical substances.<sup>(1)</sup> After considering a preliminary report of the Executive Director on the topic,<sup>(3)</sup> the Council requested him to continue preparing a short list of such substances, harmful at the global level, to which environmental policies should pay special attention. The list requested by the Council was subsequently published.<sup>(2)</sup>

During 1981, the International Register of Potentially Toxic Chemicals (IRPTC) continued to publish the IRPTC Bulletin, a quarterly supplying information on such chemicals and providing base data for evaluating associated hazards. By the end of the year, 90 countries had appointed national correspondents for IRPTC, 250 data profiles for selected chemicals had been prepared, and information on the toxicity, use and regulation of chemicals was provided in response to 40 requests.

Among other activities, the Technical Committee of the International Programme on Chemical Safety (second meeting, Geneva, 2-4 February) reviewed its 1981-1982 work plan and progress reports from lead institutions; a working group on contingency planning for, and response to, emergencies and accidents involving potentially toxic chemicals (Bilthoven, Netherlands, 9-13 February) recommended the development of guidelines; the IRPTC Scientific Advisory Committee (fifth meeting, Geneva, 16-20 February) reviewed progress in data profile developments, the query-response service, contacts with national correspondents and assistance in establishing national registers; a UNEP/WHO expert working group (Federal Republic of Germany, 17-20 March) discussed guidelines for control of toxic and other hazardous chemical waste; and an expert meeting on toxicological and safety data for chemicals in international trade (Leningrad, USSR, 22-27 June) agreed on the type of data which should accompany a chemical entering an importing country.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/6, 25 May.

List: <sup>(2)</sup>UNEP/GC.10/5/Add.3.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>UNEP Executive Director, UNEP/GC.9/2/Add.6.

#### Strengthening the network of environmental information systems

Throughout 1981, the International Referral System (INFOTERRA), the world-wide environmental-information exchange network of UNEP, continued to operate as a decentralized system with a grid of national, regional and sectoral focal points in 116 countries, based on more than 9,200 sources of environmental information.

In addition to visits by INFOTERRA staff to co-operating countries and provision of consultancy services to national focal points, activities included: a workshop for Caribbean national focal points (Kingston, Jamaica, 31 August-4 September), which resulted in the launching of a pilot programme to improve national operations; a terminology task force meeting (Nairobi, Kenya, 16-20 November) which agreed on criteria for use in revising terminology; a regional co-operation meeting (Nairobi, 25-27 November), attended by

representatives of 36 African national focal points, to discuss expansion of INFOTERRA services beyond referral; an INFOTERRA seminar for government officials from 15 developing countries (Dresden, German Democratic Republic); and training courses for national focal point staff on INFOTERRA operations (Dakar, Senegal, 31 August-4 September; Nairobi, 14-18 September).

On 26 May,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council noted with satisfaction that UNEP and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in an evaluation report, had concluded that INFOTERRA had fulfilled its mandate. The Council endorsed the recommendations of that report calling on national focal points to provide services beyond referral, to speed up the query-response process and to continue to promote the system's use. After requesting Governments to make resources available so that the focal points could extend their activities, the Council requested the Executive Director to implement recommendations facilitating the phased expansion of INFOTERRA.

Also during the year, UNEP provided financial assistance and co-operation to the United Nations Statistical Office with regard to environmental statistics (p. 1071).

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/10 D, 26 May.

#### Ecosystems

Preservation of endangered ecosystems-- the interdependent complex of plant and animal populations within particular geographic contexts, terrestrial (see below) and marine (p. 831)-- continued to be a concern of UNEP and other United Nations bodies. Action was also taken to advance a draft charter for nature conservation (p. 834).

#### Terrestrial ecosystems

Terrestrial ecosystems, such as arid zones (see below), tropical rain forests and soils (p. 831), were identified by the UNEP Governing Council on 26 May 1981 as among the priority environmental problems in developing countries (p. 819).<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/12, paras. 1 (b) & (e), 26 May.

#### Arid zones

In 1981, UNEP continued to focus on control of desertification as one of the most acute examples of environmental degradation (p. 827). It also continued to support broader environmental management activities in arid and semi-arid lands, especially integrated projects on arid lands in Kenya and Tunisia under the Man and the Biosphere Programme of the United Nations

Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (p. 1412). On 26 May, the UNEP Governing Council requested the Executive Director, in consultation with United Nations agencies, notably UNESCO, to consider further development and support in 1982 and 1983 of integrated pilot projects on arid lands in the Sahelian and north African regions, including the continuation of current projects.<sup>(2)</sup>

In identifying priorities for serious environmental problems in developing countries (p. 819), the Council, also on 26 May, set as one of the priorities arid and semi-arid lands, particularly desertification and rangeland management.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decisions: UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 26 May: <sup>(1)</sup>9/12, para. 1 (e); <sup>(2)</sup>9/15 A.

**Desertification control.** UNEP continued to support, catalyse and co-ordinate bilateral and multilateral activities to further the purposes of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification,<sup>(4)</sup> adopted in 1977 by the United Nations Conference on Desertification.

During 1981, in addition to assistance to the Sudano-Sahelian region (p. 828), programming and project formulation missions were sent to Bangladesh, Burundi, Democratic Yemen, Nepal, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Yemen to assist Governments in preparing national plans to combat desertification and in formulating high-priority anti-desertification projects. An international symposium (Tashkent, USSR, 6-14 October) exchanged views and experience in combating desertification and approved guidelines for the establishment of regional integrated development schemes. Three training courses on desertification control were held, on rangeland ecology and pasture productivity, reclamation of saline irrigated soils, and sand-dune stabilization. A desert control training seminar was held in China.

In a February report to the UNEP Governing Council,<sup>(3)</sup> the Executive Director concluded that progress in implementing the Plan of Action had been slow and that Governments and regional and international organizations needed to intensify their efforts. On 26 May,<sup>(1)</sup> the Council urged Governments, United Nations bodies and other international organizations to augment their efforts to combat desertification. It requested the Executive Director to assist countries in humid zones affected by desertification problems and endorsed his intention to submit a comprehensive report in 1985.

An Inter-agency Meeting on Desertification and Protection of the Environment in Africa (Nairobi, Kenya, March) discussed proposals for assistance by the United Nations Development Programme and measures for increased aid to drought-stricken African countries. The Inter-

Working Group on Desertification (fourth and fifth sessions, 7 and 8 April and 15 September) discussed the progress of UNEP efforts to institute research and training programmes. Governments and organizations participating in the Consultative Group for Desertification Control (third session, Geneva, 26-28 August) expressed support for or interest in 10 project proposals submitted for their consideration; the Group recommended specific actions to ensure the better preparation and implementation of projects.

In its annual overview report for 1980/1981, published in May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination listed five priority areas for system-wide co-operation against desertification: information collection; application of science and technology; research, training and education; participation; and institution-building. It considered it highly important that additional external resources be made available and expressed satisfaction at the emphasis placed on desertification as a development problem as well as a major form of environmental degradation.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/22 A, 26 May

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ACC, E/1981/37; <sup>(3)</sup>UNEP Executive Director, UNEP/GC.9/8.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1977, p. 509.

**Financing the Plan of Action.** In response to a 1980 General Assembly request,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted in October 1981 a report<sup>(2)</sup> containing recommendations for additional means of financing the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification.<sup>(5)</sup> The report was based on an annexed study by a group of high-level specialists in international financing, convened by the UNEP Executive Director at Geneva from 20 to 24 July.

Among the financing sources identified by the consultants and deemed practicable by the Secretary-General were international taxation of trade flows, International Monetary Fund (IMF) gold sales and trust fund reflows, a link between IMF special drawing rights and development finance, taxes or "parking fees" from geostationary satellites, international revenues from sea-bed mining and the Common Fund for Commodities. The study concluded that the most practicable way of obtaining resources on a concessionary basis was to tap private capital markets on a commercial basis and then provide borrowers with interest subsidies. Under this scheme, these commercial borrowings would be backed by government guarantees and/or collateral sufficient to carry enough credibility in the market-place to enable loans to be raised. Also proposed was the setting up of an independent operational finan-

cial corporation for financing desertification projects.

The report concluded that there was a consensus on the importance of anti-desertification projects to development and that there was a need to increase substantially the level of financial aid to developing countries, many of them least developed, suffering from desertification.

Taking note of this report, the General Assembly, on 17 December, adopted a resolution<sup>(4)</sup> noting with concern that insufficient financing and increasing demands on scarce resources of countries suffering from desertification were constraining the Plan's implementation. It requested the Secretary-General to obtain Member States' views on the additional financing measures and on the modalities described in his report for obtaining financial resources. He was also requested, in co-operation with the UNEP Executive Director, to obtain Member States' views on establishing the independent corporation and on their financial participation, and to report to the Assembly in 1982.

The resolution was adopted without vote. On 27 November, the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee had likewise approved the draft, submitted by a Vice-Chairman after informal consultations had taken place on a text subsequently withdrawn-proposed by the Central African Republic, Ethiopia, Guinea, Jamaica, Pakistan and the Sudan.

In addition to drafting differences affecting the preamble, the final text omitted a provision in the original draft that would have had the Assembly request the Secretary-General and the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to consider how the recommendations on additional means of financing might be implemented in the context of efforts to strengthen international economic co-operation, and to determine the most appropriate ways by which the United Nations system, States, regional development banks and other financing sources could initiate measures to obtain concessionary funds.

Introducing the original draft, Jamaica spoke of the urgency of establishing an organization exclusively concerned with desertification on a scale that could not be financed by existing institutions. The Sudan also urged support for the organization's establishment.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community members, said they would submit comments on the proposals and continue to contribute voluntarily through existing channels to anti-desertification programmes. Poland, on behalf also of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR,

said that establishment of a fund financed from taxes on international trade and by other fiscal measures was unacceptable, as was automatic funding.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Central African Republic, Ethiopia, Guinea, Jamaica, Pakistan, Sudan, A/C.2/36/L.32.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/141.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/73, para. 9, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 730); <sup>(4)</sup>36/191, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: (5)1977, p. 509.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-30, 31, 32, 44 (24 Sep.-27 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/191

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.9) without vote, 27 November (meeting 44); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.110), based on Informal consultations on 6-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.32): agenda item 69 (j).

#### Study on financing the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 32/172 of 19 December 1977, in which it approved the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, and its resolutions 33/88 and 33/89 of 15 December 1978, 34/184, 34/185 and 34/187 of 18 December 1979 and 35/72 and 35/73 of 5 December 1980, dealing with various aspects of the implementation of the Plan of Action,

Taking note of the relevant sections of the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its ninth session and Governing Council decisions 9/22 A and B of 26 May 1981 on the implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification.

1. Notes with concern that the problem of insufficient financing and the increasing demands on the scarce resources of countries suffering from desertification are constraining the implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification;

2. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General and the annex thereto which contains feasibility studies on and detailed modalities for financing the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, prepared by a group of high-level specialists in international financing;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to obtain the views of Member States on the feasibility studies and concrete recommendations for the implementation of the additional measures of financing deemed practicable by the Secretary-General, and also on the modalities for obtaining financial resources, as described in paragraphs 13 to 17 of the report of the Secretary-General;

4. Also requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, to obtain the views of Member States on the establishment of an independent corporation for the financing of desertification-control projects on the basis of the plan presented in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General and also to ascertain the views of Governments as to their interest in participating financially therein;

5. Further requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

Assistance to the Sudano-Sahelian region. In 1981, several reports to various United Nations bodies described the ongoing efforts of the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office (UNSO) to implement in the Sudano-Sahelian region of central and west Africa the Plan of Action to



Combat Desertification.<sup>(12)</sup> The bodies concerned adopted several decisions in support of this joint venture of UNEP and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Meanwhile, drought-stricken countries in the Sahel continued to be helped by United Nations agencies through a medium- and long-term recovery programme (p. 485).

principal UNSO desertification control operations during 1981 were in combating deforestation, range and water resources management, sand-dune stabilization, and planning and co-ordination. Nineteen countries benefited from this work, including Benin, whose inclusion was authorized in May (see below). The number of anti-desertification projects jointly identified by UNSO and the assisted countries was 231. These required investments of \$693 million, of which \$350 million had been committed from bilateral and multilateral sources. Thirty-five new activities were funded during 1981 from the United Nations Trust Fund for Sudano-Sahelian Activities (p. 489), which earmarked \$7.6 million for desertification control.

UNSO supported projects involving the evaluation, testing and pilot production of different kinds of fuel-efficient cooking stoves; a post-graduate training programme in pastoral management; and restoration and integrated biological development of the Fouta-Djallon massif in Guinea, the watershed for all the main rivers of west Africa. Other projects under execution included: in the Sudan and the Upper Volta, replanting of *Acacia* Senegal, producing gum arabic for industrial, pharmaceutical and confectionery uses as well as arresting desertification; in the Gambia, preparation of an energy master plan to prevent the indiscriminate cutting of trees and shrubs for use as fuel wood; and in Mauritania, applied research on sand dunes and their stabilization, a project which was completed.

During 1981, planning and programming missions to Benin, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau and Uganda identified and formulated 43 priority projects requiring \$44.2 million in external aid. In development of project proposals, particular emphasis was placed on national involvement, popular participation and training.

Information on desertification control activities in the region was contained in reports by the UNDP Administrator to the UNDP Governing Council, submitted in March 1981<sup>(2)</sup> and April 1982,<sup>(3)</sup> and by the UNEP Governing Council to the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, transmitted to the Assembly by notes of the Secretary-General in September 1981<sup>(4)</sup> and September 1982;<sup>(5)</sup> the 1982 reports covered 1981 activities. The earlier UNEP report gave the costs of UNSO for desertification control

in 1978-1980 as \$1,369,059 obligated out of an operational budget of \$1.4 million.

On 26 May 1981,<sup>(11)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council included Benin among the countries receiving assistance through UNSO—an action suggested by the Assembly in December 1980. The Council also authorized continued contribution to UNSO of the UNEP share of administrative and operational costs of the joint venture for 1982 and 1983.

On 19 June,<sup>(10)</sup> the UNDP Governing Council endorsed the UNEP decision on Benin and urged Governments and United Nations and other organizations to intensify aid in response to the priority requirements of the Sudano-Sahelian countries, through UNSO or any other intermediary. It authorized continued UNDP payment towards support costs of the joint venture.

By a 24 July resolution,<sup>(6)</sup> the Economic and Social Council expressed satisfaction at the progress made by UNSO and welcomed the UNEP and UNDP decisions to continue the joint venture. In terms similar to those used by the UNDP Council, it urged intensified assistance to the region.

The resolution was adopted without vote. On 21 July, the draft, sponsored by 12 nations, had been approved in like manner by the Council's First (Economic) Committee, after the text had been orally revised by the sponsors and further orally amended in informal consultations. The latter change, affecting the clause urging intensified assistance, replaced a reference to "private" organizations by "other" organizations.

By a 17 December resolution,<sup>(9)</sup> the General Assembly largely restated the provisions of the Economic and Social Council resolution. It expressed satisfaction with progress in assisting Governments of the region; urged continued response, bilaterally or through UNSO or any other intermediary, to requests for anti-desertification aid from the Sudano-Sahelian countries; invited UNEP and UNDP to continue intensifying support for UNSO so that it could carry out increased responsibilities; and requested the UNEP Governing Council to continue annual reporting. In addition, the Assembly commended the UNEP Executive Director and the UNDP Administrator for the venture's effective development and noted with satisfaction Benin's addition to the list of those to be aided by UNSO.

The resolution was adopted without vote. On 11 November, the Second Committee had similarly approved the draft proposed by a Vice-Chairman after informal consultations had taken place on a 27-nation text which was subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup> The Vice-Chairman's draft was essentially the same as the original text, except that, in the paragraph urging a favourable response to aid requests, a reference to "private

organizations and individuals" was replaced by "other organizations". Introducing the original draft, the Gambia noted that it was based on the resolution which the Assembly had adopted in 1980.<sup>(7)</sup>

Poland, on behalf of the Eastern European States and Mongolia, reiterated a statement made on their behalf when the 1980 resolution was approved<sup>(13)</sup> (that further measures to implement the Plan should be voluntary and that the sovereign right of States to provide aid from their own resources should not be affected).

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Bangladesh, Benin, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Mali, Mauritania, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Qatar, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, A/C.2/36/L.22.

Reports: UNDP Administrator. <sup>(2)</sup>DP/543. <sup>(3)</sup>DP/1982/45; UNEP Council, transmitted by S-G note, <sup>(4)</sup>A/36/144, <sup>(5)</sup>A/37/397.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(6)</sup>ESC: 1981/72, 24 July, text following. GA: <sup>(7)</sup>35/72, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 731); <sup>(8)</sup> *ibid.*, para. 5 (p. 732); <sup>(9)</sup>36/190, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decisions: <sup>(10)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1): 81/4, 19 June. <sup>(11)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25): 9/22 B, 26 May.

Yearbook references: <sup>(12)</sup>1977, p. 509; <sup>(13)</sup>1980, p. 728.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.6-8, 12, 17 (6-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35 (24 Sep.-11 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/72

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1968/109) without vote, 21 July (meeting 17); 12-nation draft (E/1981/C.1/L.8), orally revised, and orally amended in informal consultations; agenda item 11.

Sponsors: Djibouti, Egypt, France, Ghana, Iraq, Morocco, Netherlands, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia,

Implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, particularly Assembly resolutions 32/172 of 19 December 1977, 34/187 of 18 December 1979 and 35/72 of 5 December 1980, and Council resolution 1980/52 of 23 July 1980.

Recalling also decision 9/22 of 26 May 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, and decision 81/4 of 19 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme,

Reiterating its concern over the seriousness of desertification in the Sudano-Sahelian region and the persistent critical situation resulting from it, which hampers the economic and social development of the countries of the region,

Having considered the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, and the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its ninth session,

1. Notes with appreciation the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 33/88 of 15 December 1978,

34/187 and 35/72, and transmits it to the General Assembly for consideration, noting with satisfaction the decision of the Governing Council to include Benin among the countries eligible to receive assistance through the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office;

2. Expresses its satisfaction at the progress made by the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office, on behalf of the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Development Programme, in assisting the countries of the Sudano-Sahelian region in the implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification;

3. Welcomes the decisions of the Governing Councils of the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Development Programme on the further continuation of the joint venture of the two Programmes aimed at (ensuring the timely and effective provision of assistance to the group of designated countries by the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office, on behalf of the United Nations Environment Programme, in combating desertification in the Sudano-Sahelian region;

4. Expresses its gratitude to the Governments, agencies of the United Nations system, intergovernmental organizations and other organizations that have contributed to the implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification;

5. Urges all Governments, organizations, organs and other bodies of the United Nations system, as well as other intergovernmental organizations and other organizations, to intensify their assistance either bilaterally or through the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office or any other intermediary, in response to the priority requirements of the countries of the Sudano-Sahelian region;

6. Requests the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme to continue to report annually on the implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification.

General Assembly resolution 36/190

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.9) without vote, 11 November; (meeting 35); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.51), based on informal consultations on 27-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.22); agenda item 69 (j).

Implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 32/170 and 32/172 of 19 December 1977, 33/88 and 33/89 of 15 December 1978, 34/184, 34/185 and 34/187 of 18 December 1979, and 35/2 and 35/73 of 5 December 1980.

Recalling also Economic and Social Council resolutions 1978/37 of 21 July 1978, 1979/51 of 2 August 1979, 198/52 of 23 July 1980 and 198 1/72 of 24 July 1981,

Noting decision 9/22 B of 26 May 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme and decision 81/4 of 19 June 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme,

Having considered the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification,

Reiterating its concern over the severe effects of desertification, a major form of environmental degradation and an obstacle to development in fragile ecosystems, on the socio-economic development and the way of life of the people of the Sudano-Sahelian region, and emphasizing again the need to hasten the implementation in the region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification.

1. Takes note of the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification;

2. Expresses its satisfaction with the progress made by the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office in assisting the Governments of the region, on behalf of the United Nations Environment Programme and under a joint venture of the Environment Programme and the United Nations Development Programme, in Implementing the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification;

3. Notes with satisfaction the addition of Benin to the list of countries to be assisted by the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office in the efforts to implement the Plan of Action to combat Desertification;

4. Commends the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme for the effective and co-ordinated manner in which they have continued to develop the joint venture through the instrumentality of the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office;

5. Takes note of the decisions of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme and of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme aimed at expanding and strengthening the joint venture and invites them to continue to intensify their support for the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office in order to enable it to carry out its increased responsibilities at a level commensurate with the pressing needs of the countries of the region;

6. Expresses its gratitude to the Governments, agencies of the United Nations system, intergovernmental organizations and other organizations that have contributed to the implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification;

7. Urges all Governments, organizations of the United Nations system, other intergovernmental bodies, non-governmental and other organizations to continue to respond favourably, bilaterally or through the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office or any other intermediary, to requests for assistance from the Governments of the Sudano-Sahelian countries in combating desertification;

8. Requests the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme to continue to report annually, through the Economic and Social Council, to the General Assembly on the implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification.

#### Tropical forests

In 1981, a world-wide assessment of tropical forest resources, covering 1,935 million hectares and indicating an annual deforestation rate of 0.58 per cent, was completed by UNEP and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) within the framework of the Global Environmental Monitoring System (GEMS). The assessment included information on growth of stock, logging, ownership, deforestation rates and tree plantation. Other activities during the year included projects on cover monitoring, ecological training and management as a basis for environmentally sound development, and preparation of an internationally co-ordinated programme for wide exploitation of tropical forests and woodlands.

Work towards an international arrangement on tropical timber went ahead in a preparatory meeting and two expert groups convened by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (p. 554).

#### Soil management

The second High-level Meeting of Experts on a World Soils Policy (Rome, Italy, 23-27 February 1981), convened by UNEP in co-operation with FAO and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), adopted a statement of guidelines to be followed in finalizing a world soils policy and a framework of a plan of action for its implementation.<sup>(1)</sup> The policy sought to increase knowledge, encourage productivity and management improvements, promote better agricultural systems, stimulate conservation, enlarge the supply of arable land, slow the loss of such land, and monitor quantitative and qualitative changes. On 26 May,<sup>(3)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council requested an appraisal of the experts' recommendations by several organizations and invited countries affected by soil erosion and degradation to formulate national soils policies, with technical assistance from UNEP and other United Nations organizations.

Other UNEP activities in 1981 included: preparation of draft guidelines to control soil degradation and land rehabilitation after mining; a meeting (Sofia, Bulgaria, 16-22 June), in co-operation with FAO, UNESCO and the International Society of Soil Sciences, to define measurements for use in an international referential base for soil classification and correlation; preparation of draft criteria for a global land and soil monitoring system as a part of GEMS; and the start of the second phase of the Save our Soils project, aimed at identifying socio-economic constraints to the adoption of sound soil conservation policies in arid, semi-arid and tropical zones.

The United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, in a resolution of 21 August on the relationship between energy policy and environmental policies (p. 839), invited Governments to consider co-operating with the world soils policy.<sup>(2)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Executive Director, UNEP/GC.9/5/Add.5, annexing statement of Meeting on world soils policy.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (report, A/CONF.100/11, Sales No. E.81.I.24), 1, para. 2, 21 Aug. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/15 B, 26 May.

#### Marine environment

In its list of priorities for serious environmental problems in the developing countries (p. 819), adopted on 26 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council identified, as one such priority, oceans, particularly conservation of marine living resources and their ecosystems, through support for regional seas programmes (p. 833).

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/12, para. 1 (h), 26 May.

### Marine pollution

Three studies were completed in 1981 under the auspices of the Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Pollution. One of them, an inter-agency review of the health of the oceans, was the first integrated global assessment of marine pollution. It stressed the need to control pollution in coastal waters, closed and semi-enclosed seas, but found that the open seas had not been significantly affected by the contaminants measured and appeared to be in good health. The other studies were an evaluation of hazards of harmful substances carried by ships and a report on the choice of sites for sea disposal of wastes.

Responding to a 1979 General Assembly request,<sup>(6)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council, on 26 May 1981,<sup>(8)</sup> authorized the submission to the Assembly, through the Economic and Social Council, of a UNEP report on marine pollution problems.<sup>(3)</sup>

The report examined sources of marine pollution and possible trends of changes in their occurrence; effects on living resources, ecosystems, human health and amenities; actions to alleviate problems; and the role of UNEP. It recommended: continued assessment by UNEP of the sources, amounts and effects of pollutants, as a component of Earthwatch (the UNEP-sponsored world-wide environmental assessment system); intensified work on regional action plans for the protection of enclosed and semi-enclosed seas, as well as of coastal waters of regions with defined common problems; constant review of pollution trends, through existing mechanisms and periodic reports on the state of the marine environment; and full support for marine environment protection activities defined by the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

The initial views of the UNEP secretariat on implementation of the Conference's work were communicated to the Conference in April.<sup>(1)</sup> UNEP pointed out that many of the environmental norms approved by the Conference would have to be elaborated and said it stood ready to assist Governments in that regard.

At its eighth session (Geneva, 2-13 February), the Working Group of Experts on Environmental Law completed a study on the legal aspects concerning the environment related to offshore mining and drilling within the limits of national jurisdiction. The Group adopted by consensus 42 conclusions on the study and agreed that they had the character of guidelines. They called for a government-operated authorization system to regulate the construction of installations, environmental assessment of the effects of operations, establishment of national environmental monitoring systems, consideration of transfrontier environmental impact when authorizing opera-

tions, establishment of information and consultation procedures between States, action by States to ensure compliance with safety measures, contingency planning and implementation measures to deal with accidents, and the adoption of measures to determine liability for damage and ensure payment of compensation.

On 26 May,<sup>(9)</sup> the Governing Council requested that these conclusions be circulated to Governments for comment and recommended that States consider the guidelines when formulating legislation or negotiating international agreements to prevent pollution caused by offshore mining and drilling within the limits of national jurisdiction.

Pursuant to a 1979 General Assembly request,<sup>(6)</sup> a report on marine pollution prepared by the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) was circulated to the Assembly in June.<sup>(2)</sup> The report described aspects of IMCO work, particularly measures for improving maritime safety through international standard-setting, training of seafarers and other personnel, promotion and organization of arrangements for combating marine pollution incidents, and establishment of schemes for determining liability and ensuring compensation for damage. The report also detailed the work of the Marine Environment Protection Committee since its inception in 1973 and gave an account of technical co-operation and technology transfer activities. (For 1981 IMCO activities concerning marine pollution, see p. 1470.)

Addressing the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 2 October, the IMCO Secretary-General said that, in order to promote wider implementation of its rules and standards, IMCO was organizing seminars, symposia and workshops and providing advisory services to developing countries, particularly for the world-wide training of maritime personnel since most accidents at sea were caused by human error.

The Economic and Social Council, in its July resolution on the environment,<sup>(5)</sup> noted with appreciation the UNEP and IMCO reports and transmitted them to the Assembly for consideration. By its December resolution on UNEP, the Assembly also took note of the reports.<sup>(7)</sup>

Communication: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP, A/CONF.62/112.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>IMCO, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/233;

<sup>(3)</sup>UNEP Council, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/452;

<sup>(4)</sup>UNEP Executive Director, UNEP/GC.9/5/Add.5, annexing conclusions of Working Group of Experts on Environmental Law.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/73, para. 3, 24 July (p. 815).

GA: <sup>(6)</sup>34/183, para. 5, 18 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 698);

<sup>(7)</sup>36/192, paras. 10 & 11, 17 Dec. 1981 (p.817).

Decisions: UNEP Council (report. A/36/25), 26 May:

<sup>(8)</sup>9/10 A, para. 6; <sup>(9)</sup>9/10 C.

### Regional seas programme

UNEP continued in 1981, under its regional seas programme, to co-ordinate activities by States to protect the marine environment in eight regions. Action plans were adopted during the year for the Caribbean, west and central Africa, east Asia and the south-east Pacific. Highlights of activities included:

—Caribbean. An Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme, recommended by an expert meeting (Managua, Nicaragua, 23-27 February), was adopted by an intergovernmental meeting (Montego Bay, Jamaica, 6-8 April), which also established a Caribbean trust fund with a target of \$1.5 million for 1982-1983. In collaboration with the region's Governments and organizations, UNEP prepared detailed descriptions of the fund's priority projects. The first meeting of the Plan's Monitoring Committee (New York, 14-16 December) adopted an \$806,133 implementation budget for 1982. A meeting of legal experts (New York, 7-11 December) revised 14 articles of a draft convention to protect and develop the marine and coastal environment of the Caribbean, and recommended a 1982 meeting to complete its work.

—West and central Africa. A Convention for Co-operation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region, and an action plan for the region, were adopted by a Conference of Plenipotentiaries (Abidjan, Ivory Coast, 16-23 March), which also approved a \$3.9-million budget for 1981-1983. Twelve countries ratified a regional Protocol concerning Co-operation in Combating Pollution in Cases of Emergency, finalized by a meeting of legal experts (Abidjan, 13 and 14 March). The Steering Committee for the Marine Environment of West and Central Africa (Abidjan, 20-22 July) defined a 1982-1983 work programme and adopted terms of reference for a trust fund, subsequently established in November 1981.

—East Africa. An inter-agency mission visited eight States in October and November; its findings were used to prepare sectoral and summary overview reports on regional environmental problems.

—East Asia. An intergovernmental meeting (Manila, Philippines, 27-29 April) adopted an Action Plan for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of East Asia and requested UNEP to complete the preparatory phase by year's end. The Second Intergovernmental Meeting on the East Asian Seas Action Plan (Bangkok, Thailand, 9-11 December) established a trust fund and identified five priority projects for 1982-1983.

—Kuwait Action Plan. The first review meeting of government experts on co-operative projects Kuwait, 11-15 April) reviewed implementation of the Action Plan and agreed on a budget. The first meeting of the Council of the Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment (Kuwait, 21-23 April) decided on the Plan's future development and adopted a budget for 1 July 1981-31 December 1982 based on an \$8.8-million trust fund. A Government Experts Meeting on En-

vironmental Public Awareness (Muscat, Oman, 15-17 December) approved the objectives, work plan and timetable for a 1982-1983 programme.

—Mediterranean. An expert meeting (Geneva, 12-16 January) evaluated the pilot phase of the Co-ordinated Mediterranean Pollution Monitoring and Research Programme and recommended a 10-year programme. Following review by an expert meeting (Geneva, 26-30 January), the Second Meeting of Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (Cannes, France, 2-7 March) adopted a 1981-1982 work programme and a \$7.3-million budget, and chose Athens, Greece, as the seat of the co-ordinating unit of the action plan. The first meeting of the Working Group for Scientific and Technical Co-operation (Athens, 28 September-2 October) approved criteria for implementing national monitoring programmes and developing research activities. The Bureau of the Contracting Parties (Athens, 23 September; Geneva, 17 and 18 December) noted that delays in government contributions were seriously affecting work under the action plan, but could not agree to a proposal for a \$1-million loan against future contributions. A drafting committee (Geneva, 15 and 16 December) finalized a draft protocol on specially protected areas, for adoption and signature in 1982.

—South-east Pacific. Following an expert meeting (Lima, Peru, 21 September) which revised a draft action plan, a conference of plenipotentiaries

(Lima, 9-12 November), convened by UNEP and the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific, adopted the Action Plan for the South-East Pacific Region, along with a convention to protect the marine environment, an agreement for regional Co-operation against oil pollution, and institutional and financial arrangements including a trust fund with a \$310,000 target for 1983-1984. Other activities included an international workshop on combating oil spills (Santiago, Chile, 6-15 April) and a seminar on international legal conventions related to the environment (Bogotá, Colombia, 4-8 May).

—South-west Pacific. The co-ordinating group for the South-West Pacific Regional Environment Programme agreed in March 1981 to convene in 1982 a regional conference on the environment.

On 26 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council decided that, in 1981-1983, UNEP should pay increased attention to the regional seas programmes and make funds available for approved activities. It requested the Executive Director to complete the draft action plans being prepared and urged Governments in the regions to co-operate with him.

In its 26 May decision on management of trust funds (p. 820),<sup>(2)</sup> the Council approved the establishment of three regional seas funds for initial two-year periods extending to 31 December 1983, for west and central Africa, the Caribbean and east Asian seas. It also approved continuation of the Kuwait Regional Trust Fund until 31 December 1981 and the Mediterranean Trust Fund until 31 December 1982.

Decisions: UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 26 May: <sup>(1)</sup>9/17 A & B; <sup>(2)</sup>9/26, para. I.

#### Marine mammals

In co-operation with UNEP, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations completed in 1981 a draft global plan of action for the conservation, management and utilization of marine mammals.<sup>(2)</sup> The plan proposed urgent action to alleviate the most serious threats to species or populations known to be in a critical state, information-gathering to determine the extent and nature of threats to marine mammals, and action to improve conservation conditions by increasing scientific capability, legal and administrative machinery, and public understanding. On 26 May, the UNEP Governing Council requested the Executive Director to continue preparing the plan with a view to submitting it

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/10 A, para. 8, 26 May.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNEP Executive Director. UNEP/GC.9/5/Add.5, annexing summary of action plan for marine mammals.

#### Draft charter for nature conservation

A revised text of a draft World Charter for Nature, aimed at protecting the earth's animals and plants and their environment, was prepared in August 1981 by an ad hoc meeting convened by UNEP in response to a 1980 General Assembly request.<sup>(4)</sup> Taking note of this text, the Assembly, in October 1981, requested further work to complete the draft.

The revision took account of comments by 50 states—also invited by the Assembly in 1980<sup>(3)</sup>—on a 1979 draft drawn up by experts from Zaire and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN). These views, transmitted to the Assembly in an October 1981 report of the Secretary-General,<sup>(2)</sup> also included Governments' accounts of their efforts to conserve and protect nature.

In its report, annexed to that of the Secretary-General, the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on the Draft World Charter for Nature (Nairobi, Kenya, 24-27 August) suggested that the replies could be interpreted as strong endorsement for proceeding with deliberations for the draft's timely adoption; that the United Nations system could administer and implement the Charter without need for a new organization; and that the information provided by some States regarding conservation activities should be used by UNEP and completed by data from the United Nations system and IUCN.

According to the Group, information from States and other sources indicated a wide array of conservation activities. Notable strides were being made in institutional development, legisla-

tion, policy and administration, treaties, national parks and other protected areas, and pollution control. Considerably less attention was being paid to desertification control and the conservation of marine resources and tropical rain forests.

The revised draft Charter, consisting of a preamble and sections on general principles, functions and implementation, incorporated the comments of the responding States to improve the original document's accuracy and clarity. It called for restraint in the use of natural resources, control of activities which might have an impact on nature and avoidance of discharges of pollutants into natural systems.

Zaire, on whose initiative the Assembly had taken up the topic in 1980, transmitted to the Assembly by letter of 8 September 1981<sup>(1)</sup> a resolution adopted at the thirty-seventh session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (Nairobi, 15-26 June) recommending the draft's adoption.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 27 October, the General Assembly adopted without vote a resolution on the draft World Charter for Nature,<sup>(5)</sup> taking note of the Secretary-General's report and requesting him, in co-operation with UNEP and IUCN, to complete revision of the draft if necessary and to submit a supplementary report in 1982. He was also invited to transmit to Member States the Ad Hoc Group's report and any further observations by States.

The resolution was sponsored by 32 nations. Introducing the draft, Zaire said it was not intended to halt progress or prohibit development, nor was it directed against any particular activity; it was intended to stress protection of the ecosystem in order to safeguard the quality of life. Pakistan, another sponsor, remarked that, although much time and energy was devoted to problems of war and peace and economic and social issues, Governments had the responsibility to keep essential life-support systems in view. The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community (EC) members, reiterated their support for preparation of the Charter and the continuing discussion which was needed to ensure its international support.

The USSR, while stressing that military activities had the most destructive effect on the environment (p. 836), mentioned the harm done by pollution, the destruction of tropical forests and desertification. Although it supported work on the draft Charter, Bulgaria felt that its purposes and principles, as well as fundamental principles for the protection of nature, should be defined more clearly. The Byelorussian SSR said it supported the elaboration of a charter because it felt the protection of nature should not be boiled down to measures to prevent the harmful effects of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruc-

tion. The Lao People's Democratic Republic remarked that only the socialist countries were able to pay the price for preserving nature, because they cared about the health of their populations.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Zaire, 8 Sep., A/36/487.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, annexing report of Group of Experts, A/36/539.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/7, para. 3, 30 Oct. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 726); <sup>(4)</sup>ibid., para. 4; <sup>(5)</sup>36/6, 27 Oct. 1981, text following.

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.41 (27 Oct.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/6

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 27 October 1981  
32-nation draft (A/36/L.6 and Add.1); agenda Item 23.

Sponsors: Angola, Belgium, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

#### Draft World Charter for Nature

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the draft World Charter for Nature.

Recalling its resolution 35/7 of 30 October 1980.

Aware of the crucial importance attached by the international community to the promotion and development of co-operation aimed at protecting and safeguarding the balance and quality of nature.

Also aware that life on earth is part of nature and depends on the uninterrupted functioning of natural systems,

Noting resolution CM/Res.852(XXXVII) adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-seventh ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 15 to 26 June 1981.

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General, which contains a revised version of the draft World Charter for Nature prepared on the basis of views and observations communicated by Member States in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/7;

2. Invites Member States which have not yet done so to communicate their views and observations to the Secretary-General;

3. Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the United Nations Environment Programme and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, to complete if necessary, on the basis of observations received from Member States, the revision of the draft World Charter for Nature and to submit a supplementary report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

4. Invites the Secretary-General to transmit to Member States the text of the report of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on the Draft World Charter for Nature, containing the revised version of the draft Charter, as well as any further observations by States, with a view to appropriate consideration at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly;

5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item entitled "Consideration and adoption of the revised draft World Charter for Nature: report of the Secretary-General".

### Environmental aspects of political, economic and other issues

#### Environment and the arms race

The need to protect nature from the pernicious effects of the arms race was the subject of action

in 1981 by the UNEP Governing Council and the General Assembly.

On 25 May,<sup>(4)</sup> the Council requested the Executive Director to include in the 1984-1989 system-wide medium-term environment programme (p. 841) regular analysis of the impact of the arms race on nature. It invited the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (p. 28) to include in the draft agenda for the 1982 session an item on the impact of the arms race on nature and also invited the Secretary-General to submit to that session the report he was preparing on that topic (see below).

By a decision on global armaments spending adopted on 26 May,<sup>(5)</sup> the Council called on Governments to stop the arms race and, until disarmament was achieved, to allocate at least 0.001 per cent of armaments spending for development projects and environmental protection.

In response to a 1980 Assembly resolution,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted in September 1981 an interim report to the Assembly<sup>(1)</sup> which focused on the impact of the arms race on nature. In view of the small number of substantive replies (22 of the 34 replies received), he considered it premature to put forward definitive proposals. Accordingly, he proposed to solicit additional government views and to convene an expert group meeting to advise on further implementation of the 1980 resolution.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 27 October, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on States' historical responsibility for the preservation of nature for present and future generations.<sup>(3)</sup> It requested the Secretary-General, with the co-operation of UNEP, to complete a report for the Assembly's special session on disarmament containing recommendations for the adoption by States of specific obligations and measures to protect nature from the effects of the arms race and to limit and prohibit the types of military activity presenting the greatest danger for nature.

The resolution, sponsored by 15 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 80 to none, with 55 abstentions.

A number of States explained their abstentions. Australia doubted the motives of some of the sponsors, since they were participating in the arms race being denounced. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, said the resolution was simplistic and potentially counter-productive; UNEP was not the forum for issues directly related to disarmament. The United States and Venezuela stated that, since environmental matters were being adequately dealt with by UNEP, duplication should be avoided. Venezuela added that the report requested would

distract attention from fundamental matters to be considered at the special session.

Among supporters of the resolution, the USSR stated that no other aspect of environmental preservation and protection was as urgent as eliminating the nuclear threat—a view shared by Mongolia. Unless that threat was eliminated, said the German Democratic Republic, there would be no progress towards solving environmental problems. Bulgaria observed that cessation of the arms race would release resources for economic development, including the solution of pressing ecological problems. The Byelorussian SSR said UNEP should devote attention to the link between the environment and the arms race, particularly through international scientific symposia and seminars. For Czechoslovakia, maintenance of peace and preservation of nature were indivisible. It was not only in time of war, Hungary observed, that military actions entailed harmful consequences for nature. The Ukrainian SSR said military production and activities contributed to pollution of the biosphere. The Lao People's Democratic Republic cited the use of defoliants in South-East Asia as an example of the environmental harm caused by military activities.

Zaire, also voting in favour, observed that the resolution had more to do with the arms race than with the preservation of nature.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/532 & Corr.1.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/8, para. 4, 30 Oct. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 726); <sup>(3)</sup>36/7, 27 Oct. 1981, text following.

Decisions: UNEP Council (report, A/36/25): <sup>(4)</sup>9/4, 25 May; <sup>(5)</sup>9/8, 26 May.

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.41 (27 Oct.).

General Assembly resolution 36/7

80-0-55 (recorded vote) Meeting 41 27 October 1981  
15-nation draft (A/36/L.7 and Add.1); agenda item 24.

Sponsors: Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

Historical responsibility of States for the preservation of nature for present and future generations

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/8 of 30 October 1980.

Noting that the continuation and intensification of the arms race are adversely affecting the human environment and damaging the vegetable and animal world.

Attaching great importance to the development of planned and constructive international co-operation in solving the problems of preserving nature.

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the historical responsibility of States for the preservation of nature for present and future generations,

1. Requests the Secretary-General, with the co-operation of the United Nations Environment Programme and on the basis of the studies now in progress and the views expressed by States on this subject, to complete the preparation of a report containing recommendations for the adoption by States of specific obligations and measures relating to the protection of nature from the pernicious effects of the arms

race, and to the limitation and prohibition of the types of military activity which present the greatest danger for nature;

2. Also requests the Secretary-General to submit the report referred to in paragraph 1 above to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela.

Material remnants of war

Both the UNEP Governing Council and the General Assembly took action in 1981 on the problem of material remnants of war, especially land-mines, which created hazardous conditions for civilian populations and activities long after hostilities had ended.

On 25 May,<sup>(4)</sup> the Council appealed to countries responsible for planting mines to supply the affected countries with information on locating minefields and to arrange for compensation. It requested the Executive Director to continue co-operating with the Secretary-General in consulting countries on the possibility of holding a United Nations conference to solve the issue.

In September, the Secretary-General submitted to the Assembly a progress report,<sup>(1)</sup> prepared by the UNEP secretariat pursuant to a 1980 Assembly resolution,<sup>(2)</sup> analysing States' views on the basis of 35 replies received by 9 September. Of the 28 which were more than acknowledgements, 9 either stated that they had no problems relating to material remnants of war or otherwise refrained from substantive comment. The remaining 19 expressed varying views, including 7 which supported and 4 which opposed the idea of a conference. Most of those replying assigned to the United Nations a responsibility for seeking a solution.

The report concluded that the main divergences of opinion among those that had replied seemed to relate to United Nations involvement and steps for a solution. In view of the apparent lack of interest and/or reticence on the part of



the majority, it was difficult to make concrete recommendations.

The report mentioned an International Symposium on Material Remnants of the Second World War on Libyan Soil, organized at Geneva from 28 April to 1 May by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research and the Libyan Institute of Diplomatic Studies.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 17 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on material remnants of war,<sup>(3)</sup> taking note of the report and regretting that no real action had been taken. It reiterated support of the demand of affected States for compensation and appealed to all States, particularly those responsible for war remnants, to co-operate with the Secretary-General so that he could make recommendations for a solution. He was requested to continue consulting Member States and to collate information in order to find ways of solving the problem, including the possibility of convening a United Nations conference, and to report again in 1982.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 115 to none, with 29 abstentions. On 11 November, the revised draft, sponsored by 16 nations and introduced by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, had been approved by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee by a vote of 97 to none, with 28 abstentions.

Explaining their abstentions, Italy and the United Kingdom said they could not accept any legal obligation to remove war remnants and felt that the problem should be dealt with bilaterally. This position was shared by the Federal Republic of Germany, which added that a United Nations conference was not the kind of action that could lead to a solution.

During the Second Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said thousands of its nationals had been killed or maimed since the Second World War by land-mines which had not been removed despite commitments by certain Governments. Sweden favoured a United Nations study on the subject, on the basis of which it might be possible to negotiate an understanding on ways to co-operate in removing war remnants.

Malta, advocating an international conference, said its economic development had been hindered by unexploded devices left behind by the former colonial administration, yet negotiations with the United Kingdom on their removal had led nowhere. The United Kingdom replied that, although it had no legal obligation to clear abandoned war matériel from Maltese territorial waters, it would consider what assistance it could render if such matériel constituted an obstacle to Malta's port development plans.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/531.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/71, paras. 4 & 5, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980. p. 725); <sup>(3)</sup>36/188, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(4)</sup>UNEP Council (report. A/36/25): 9/5, 25 May.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35 (24 Sep.-11 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/188

115-0-29 (recorded vote) Meeting 103 17 December 1981  
Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.9) by vote (97-0-28), 11 November (meeting 35); 16-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.12/Rev.1); agenda item 69 (i).

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malta, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Qatar, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates.

#### Problem of remnants of war

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2995(XXVII), 2996(XXVII) and 2997(XXVII) of 15 December 1972, pertaining to co-operation between States in the field of the environment, the international responsibility of States in protecting the environment and the establishment of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme,

Recalling also its resolutions 3435(XXX) of 9 December 1975 and 35/71 of 5 December 1980.

Recalling further decisions 80(IV) of 9 April 1976, 101(V) of 25 May 1977 and 9/5 of 25 May 1981 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme,

Convinced that the removal of remnants of war should be the responsibility of the countries that implanted them and should be carried out at their expense,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General:

2. Regrets that no real action has been taken to solve the problem of remnants of war despite the various resolutions and decisions thereon of the General Assembly and the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme;

3. Reiterates its support of the demand of the States affected by the implantation of mines and the presence of other remnants of war on their lands for compensation for the losses incurred from the States responsible for those remnants;

4. Appeals to all States, particularly those responsible for the presence of remnants of war in developing countries, to co-operate with the Secretary-General in order to enable him to make specific and effective recommendations for solving the problem of remnants of war;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to continue his contacts and consultations with Member States pursuant to General Assembly resolution 35/71 and to collate all relevant information received from States, in order to find ways and means, including the possibility of convening a conference under the auspices of the United Nations, of solving the problem of remnants of war, and to report to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Leo People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama,

Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia,<sup>2</sup> Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, Upper Volta.

<sup>2</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

#### Environmental impact of apartheid

On 26 May 1981, the UNEP Governing Council adopted a decision on solidarity with the victims of apartheid in southern Africa,<sup>(1)</sup> by which it reaffirmed support for cessation of all forms of co-operation between UNEP and South Africa and requested the Executive Director to use his good offices to sensitize the world community about the dangers of apartheid, particularly the bantustan policy, to the environment. The Council called on Governments to take resolute measures to oppose apartheid because it had serious environmental consequences for its victims.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/9, 26 May.

#### Environment and development

On 26 May 1981, the UNEP Governing Council took several decisions on environment and its relationship to development.

The Council requested the Executive Director to give more attention to the future environment and development budget line, called on him to initiate support for projects in that area in developing countries, urged him to consider assisting on a catalytic basis in implementing their findings and asked him to approach other international agencies for their support in such implementation.<sup>(7)</sup>

In a decision on programme policy and implementation,<sup>(4)</sup> the Council affirmed the importance of the UNEP role in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,<sup>(2)</sup> stressed the need for Governments and United Nations agencies participating in conferences or negotiations to take environmental considerations fully into account, and reiterated its call to the Executive Director to assist in preparations for global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development.

Environment and development, particularly development of methodologies for sound environmental management, was identified by the Council as one of the priorities for serious environmental problems in developing countries (p. 819).<sup>(6)</sup> Also, in its decision on long-term

issues of the environment programme (p. 822), the Council emphasized the importance of redoubled efforts by the United Nations system in environmental and economic development planning, including integrated environmental and cost/benefit assessment.<sup>(5)</sup>

In its July resolution on the environment,<sup>(1)</sup> the Economic and Social Council called on UNEP to play its role fully in implementing the International Development Strategy and stressed the need for Governments and United Nations agencies to take environmental considerations fully into account in United Nations negotiations and conferences, such as the September United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (p. 406). In its initial draft, this provision would have had the Council urge Governments and agencies to take environmental considerations into account (rather than stress the need for them to do so) at United Nations conferences and negotiations and in steps they took to give effect to the Strategy.

Brazil, explaining its position on this paragraph, said it did not favour partial implementation of the Strategy and did not regard the paragraph as limiting Governments' conduct or committing them to go beyond the strict meaning of taking environmental considerations into account.

The General Assembly, in its December resolution on the same subject,<sup>(3)</sup> took note of UNEP efforts to implement the Strategy and, in terms similar to those used by the Council, called on UNEP to continue playing its role fully in the Strategy's implementation and stressed the need to take account of environmental considerations.

When the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee discussed development and international economic co-operation, Australia remarked that the concept of "limits of growth" had misleadingly spread the idea that environmental protection demanded consolidation and conservation of the fruits of development rather than expanding growth. China held that environmental protection must be concurrent with and based on economic development.

Also in 1981, acting on proposals which originated in a UNEP expert group, the Assembly called for implementation of a new work programme to study interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development (p. 390).

#### Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(1)</sup>1981/73, para. 4, 24 July (p. 815). GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/56, annex, sect. III L, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 517); <sup>(3)</sup>36/192, paras. 2 & 4, 17 Dec. 1981 (p. 816).

Decisions: UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 26 May: <sup>(4)</sup>9/1, sect. I; <sup>(5)</sup>9/11, para. 1 (a); <sup>(6)</sup>9/12, para. 1 (a); <sup>(7)</sup>9/16.

## Environment and natural resources

## Shared natural resources

On 26 May 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the UNEP Governing Council determined that a report by the Executive Director on natural resources shared by two or more States<sup>(2)</sup> did not suffice as a basis for a Council report requested by the General Assembly in 1979.<sup>(3)</sup> Thus, it requested him, in consultation with Governments, to prepare for the Council in 1982 a report dealing exclusively with progress made in the application of the Assembly resolution, without recommendations on the identification or definition of shared natural resources.

In an October note to the Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General explained that, in view of the Council's decision, it was not in a position to report on the topic in 1981.

On a related topic, the Economic and Social Council, in July, requested the Secretary-General to undertake several tasks with regard to shared water resources (p. 685).

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/567.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNEP Executive Director. UNEP/GC.9/2/Add.5.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 34/186, para. 4, 18 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 698). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/19 B, 26 May 1981.

## Energy resources

Responding to a call by the Economic and Social Council in 1980<sup>(3)</sup> to elaborate proposals on energy and the environment for the August 1981 United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 689), the UNEP Governing Council, on 26 May 1981,<sup>(7)</sup> authorized the Executive Director to submit on its behalf a report to the Economic and Social Council on UNEP and the Conference.

The report, issued in July,<sup>(1)</sup> pointed out that the objectives of UNEP energy programmes were to promote understanding of the environmental impacts of energy production and use, and to promote development of alternative environmentally sound energy sources. The report described UNEP activities in this sphere.

On 25 May,<sup>(6)</sup> the Governing Council urgently appealed to the Conference Preparatory Committee to give high priority to the uses of new and renewable energy sources which would make it possible to tackle the major problem of fuel wood.

Taking note of the UNEP report and supporting this appeal, the Economic and Social Council, in its July resolution on the environment,<sup>(4)</sup> invited the Conference to consider the environmental effects of various renewable energy sources and said UNEP should have an active role in the environmental aspects of the Conference follow-up.

The Conference, in a resolution of 21 August,<sup>(2)</sup> invited Governments, in their development plans and with due respect for the sovereignty of each State, to consider energy policy in close relation with general environmental policies, particularly soil, water and forest policies, as well as to consider co-operation with the world soils policy (p. 831). The resolution was introduced by Colombia and co-sponsored by Australia and China.

In its December resolution on UNEP,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly welcomed the stress placed by the Conference on environmental aspects of energy production and use, and called on UNEP to play an active role in implementing the Nairobi Plan of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy adopted by the Conference (p. 689).

Three other Governing Council decisions of 26 May dealt with energy. Concerning the environment programme's long-term issues (p. 822), the Council emphasized the importance of redoubled efforts by the United Nations system in environmental management for long-term solutions to the energy problem.<sup>(8)</sup> With respect to priorities for serious environmental problems in the developing countries (p. 819), the Council identified energy, particularly national energy policies, as one such priority.<sup>(9)</sup> In regard to UNEP activities on energy,<sup>(10)</sup> the Council decided to continue allocating substantial funds to allow for the accelerated development of this aspect of the programme.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council, E/1981/85.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (report, A/CONF.100/11, Sales No. E.81.I.24); 1, 21 Aug. ESC: <sup>(3)</sup>1980/49, para. 3, 23 July 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 723); <sup>(4)</sup>1981/73, para. 2, 24 July 1981 (p. 815). <sup>(5)</sup>GA: 36/192, para. 8, 17 Dec. (p. 816).

Decisions: UNEP Council (report, A/36/25): <sup>(6)</sup>9/7, 25 May; <sup>(7)</sup>9/10 A, para. 7, 26 May; <sup>(8)</sup>9/11, para. 1 (b), 26 May; <sup>(9)</sup>9/12, para. 1 (g), 26 May; <sup>(10)</sup>9/18, 26 May.

## Environmental law

In May 1981, the UNEP Governing Council set out guidelines for an ad hoc meeting of environmental law experts, transmitted to the General Assembly an annual report on international conventions and protocols (p. 840), requested a further report on natural resources shared by two or more States (see above) and forwarded to States a set of guidelines on marine pollution caused by sea-bed activities (p. 832).

The Ad Hoc Meeting of Senior Government Officials Expert in Environmental Law was held at Montevideo, Uruguay, from 28 October to 6 November, preceded by a meeting of the UNEP Working Group of Experts on Environmental Law (Geneva, 9-18 September), which acted as a

preparatory committee. The Meeting was convened by the UNEP Executive Director in response to an April 1980 Governing Council request<sup>(3)</sup> to assist preparation of the environmental law section of the 1984-1989 system-wide medium-term environment programme (p. 841). All interested States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations were invited to attend.

The Meeting's report<sup>(2)</sup> outlined a draft programme for the development and periodic review of environmental law, and contained conclusions and recommendations for the development of guidelines in three major subject areas: marine pollution from land-based sources; protection of the stratospheric ozone layer; and transport, handling and disposal of toxic and dangerous wastes. It further identified eight other subject areas for action: international co-operation in environmental emergencies; coastal zone management; soil conservation; transboundary air pollution; international trade in potentially harmful chemicals; protection of rivers and other inland waters against pollution; legal and administrative mechanisms for prevention and redress of pollution damage; and environmental impact assessment. Also recommended was action to promote the general development of environmental law.

In addition, the Meeting, by a roll-call vote of 28 to none, with 2 abstentions, expressed the conviction that the work on the marine environment done by the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (p. 127) constituted an essential contribution to the development of environmental law.

The mandate and organizational arrangements of the Meeting had been established by the Council on 26 May,<sup>(1)</sup> when it also decided to consider the report at its 1982 regular session.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/19 A, 26 May.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Meeting of Government Officials, UNEP/GC.10/5/Add.2 & Add.2/Corr.1.2.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 717.

#### International instruments

In September 1981, in response to a 1975 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General transmitted to the Assembly the annual reports of the UNEP Executive Director on international conventions and protocols in the environment field and on the UNEP register of such instruments, including information on additional parties.<sup>(1)</sup> Transmission of these reports to the Assembly was authorized by the UNEP Governing Council on 26 May 1981.<sup>(3)</sup>

International instruments concluded during 1981 were the Convention for Co-operation in

the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region and the Protocol concerning Co-operation in Combating Pollution in Cases of Emergency. Both instruments were signed on 23 March at Abidjan, Ivory Coast (p. 833). As at 31 December, 98 international instruments were listed in the UNEP register.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Executive Director, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/142.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 3436(XXX), para. 5, 9 Dec. 1975 (YUN 1975, p. 444). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/10 A, para. 5, 26 May 1981.

#### Environmental education

On 26 May 1981, the UNEP Governing Council adopted four decisions on environmental education and training. Concerning the role of universities, the Council requested the Executive Director to promote professional training, research programmes, seminars, the preparation of methodologies and teaching materials, training for university teachers, the incorporation of environmental aspects in university courses and the use of existing education centres for training.<sup>(2)</sup>

With regard to Latin America and the Caribbean, the Council authorized UNEP support for an institutional network for environmental training in that region, proposed by the Ad Hoc Meeting of Representatives of the Latin American and Caribbean Countries and Spain (Montevideo, Uruguay, 19-21 November 1980).<sup>(3)</sup> Dealing with Asia and the Pacific, the Council requested the Executive Director to renew financial support for a further biennium to the Asian and Pacific Development Centre (p. 636), to take urgent measures to provide resources for a proposed regional network of universities and institutes for the conduct of post-graduate courses in environmental education and training, and to establish a programme activity centre for education and training in the region.<sup>(4)</sup> In respect of Africa, the Executive Director was requested to explore, with the Economic Commission for Africa, the possibilities of establishing a regional environmental education and training institution and to seek ways of supporting national institutions.<sup>(5)</sup>

Also on 26 May, in identifying long-term issues of the environment programme (p. 822), the Council emphasized the importance of redoubled efforts by the United Nations system in popular education and dissemination of information on environment-development relationships by the media and by non-governmental organizations.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decisions: UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 26 May:

<sup>(1)</sup>9/11, para. 1 (d); <sup>(2)</sup>9/20 A; <sup>(3)</sup>9/20 B; <sup>(4)</sup>9/20 C; <sup>(5)</sup>9/20 D.

## Technical co-operation and co-ordination in the UN system

### Technical co-operation

The technical co-operation programme for 1981 approved in May by the UNEP Governing Council amounted to \$2.73 million, as against \$2.38 million already committed for the year. No new projects were approved. Emphasis was placed on providing advisory services in collaboration with United Nations regional commissions and UNEP regional offices, and through small-scale projects stressing training and technical co-operation among developing countries.

UNEP continued to collaborate with Governments in implementing projects in such sectors as the Global Environmental Monitoring System, the International Register of Potentially Toxic Chemicals (p. 826), the International Referral System for sources of environmental information (p. 826) and the regional seas programme (p. 833), as well as in desertification control (p. 827).

### Co-ordination in the UN system

During 1981, work continued towards preparing the 1984-1989 system-wide medium-term environment programme, an interorganizational effort which was a major project of both UNEP and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), for submission to the UNEP Governing Council in 1982. The programme was to be the basic document for use by United Nations bodies in planning and programming for environment-related matters, encompassing UNEP-supported activities as well as those of an environmental nature in programmes of other United Nations organizations.

In a February 1981 report to the Council,<sup>(4)</sup> the Executive Director suggested that, after approving the programme's provisions, the Council might wish to provide general policy guidance for United Nations environmental programmes by inviting other organizations of the system to take full account in their own activities of provisions relevant to them. The report added that UNEP would endeavour to send high-level representatives to other organizations when future programmes were discussed to ensure that governing bodies would not lose sight of the broad environmental context of their programmes and that their activities would contribute to furthering environment programme objectives.

In its 1981 work on co-ordination in the United Nations system (p. 1075), ACC made several observations on the proposed programme. In a January report to the Governing Council,<sup>(3)</sup> ACC said the programme should be

seen not only as a document of use to the Council but also, to the extent relevant to their mandates, as one of basic interest to governing bodies of other United Nations organizations. This view was reiterated in the ACC annual overview report to the Economic and Social Council, issued in May.<sup>(2)</sup> Other aspects of environmental co-ordination covered in ACC reports included long-term environmental perspectives (p. 822) and desertification control (p. 827).

On 26 May, the Governing Council provisionally approved the programme's structure and objectives, and urged the Executive Director to proceed with its development for submission at the Council's 1982 regular session.<sup>(10)</sup> It commended the views of ACC, recognized that the programme had to take into account the concerns of the organizations in the system, urged continued close co-operation on the programme between them and UNEP, and appealed to Members States to continue supporting the programme's further development.<sup>(9)</sup>

With regard to the ACC report as a whole, the Council noted with appreciation the continuing readiness of ACC to co-operate with UNEP in formulating the system-wide programme and the long-term perspective, and requested the Executive Director to continue participating fully in ACC meetings and to report regularly to the Council on relevant ACC decisions.<sup>(8)</sup> The Council also dealt with co-ordination in respect of the perspective document, the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS) (p. 842) and United Nations regional commissions (p. 843).

The Economic and Social Council, in its July resolution on UNEP, requested the United Nations system to take fully into account the ACC view that the system-wide programme should be of basic interest to other organizations, and expressed appreciation for the continued efforts of UNEP and others to develop it.<sup>(5)</sup> This paragraph was orally amended and revised in informal consultations in the Council's First (Economic) Committee to have the Council request the United Nations system to take fully into account the view of ACC rather than having the Council simply endorse it.

The General Assembly, in its December resolution on the same subject,<sup>(6)</sup> restated the provisions of the Council resolution, with two differences: the Assembly did not use the word "fully" in requesting that the ACC view be taken into account and, with regard to the statement that the programme was of basic interest to governing bodies of the United Nations system, the Assembly qualified this by adding "to the extent that they deem appropriate". These changes were introduced in the draft submitted

by a Vice-Chairman of the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee as a result of informal consultations on the original 13-nation draft, which had used the Economic and Social Council's language in this paragraph.

During the Second Committee's debate on development and international economic co-operation, the Ukrainian SSR saw implementation of the system-wide programme as evidence of the capacity of UNEP to carry out its co-ordinating function in regard to the environment. Venezuela remarked that the general aims of medium-term environment programmes should be adopted by the Governing Council, while the strategy for implementing them should be formulated at the request of and in close consultation with Governments.

In more general comments on the environment programmes of UNEP and the United Nations system, the Federal Republic of Germany said UNEP must concentrate on urgent global questions and not embrace areas covered by other international organizations, particularly political ones. New Zealand hoped the programme would enable UNEP to identify activities it should undertake and those which should be undertaken by others.

The report on co-ordination prepared for the Governing Council's 1982 regular session<sup>(1)</sup> and approved by ACC on 30 October 1981<sup>(7)</sup> discussed inter-agency co-operation on the environment over the previous decade. With regard to the system-wide programme, ACC suggested that it should be further refined and elaborated, after which the Council could review it in 1983.

Reports: ACC, <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP/GC.10/4/Add.1, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1981/37, <sup>(3)</sup>UNEP/GC.9/4/Add.1; <sup>(4)</sup>UNEP Executive Director, UNEP/GC.9/4/Add.4.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/73, para. 6, 24 July (p. 815). <sup>(6)</sup>GA: 36/192, para. 3, 17 Dec. (p. 816).

Decisions: <sup>(7)</sup>ACC: 1981/23, 30 Oct. UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 26 May: <sup>(8)</sup>9/3, sect. I; <sup>(9)</sup>9/3, sect. II; <sup>(10)</sup>9/10 B.

#### Co-operation between UNEP and UNCHS

Collaboration on environmental aspects of human settlements continued in 1981 between UNEP and UNCHS (Habitat). Two projects under way concerned the preparation of guidelines for environmental aspects of human settlements planning, begun during the year, and of a methodology for environmental impact assessment of large urban areas, to be tested in the valley of Mexico City. The UNEP Task Force on Human Settlements participated in two expert group meetings convened by UNCHS, on development of the indigenous construction sector (p. 856) and infrastructure for slums and squatter settlements (p. 857).

The Commission on Human Settlements, by a 6 May resolution on co-operation between the two bodies,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the UNCHS Executive Director, in consultation with that of UNEP, to study ways of strengthening co-operation to make it more effective and to report on the staff and budgetary demands for preparing and servicing the joint meetings held regularly between the two Executive Directors and the bureaux (officers) of the Commission and the UNEP Governing Council. On 26 May, the Council requested the UNEP Executive Director to co-operate on this request and also expressed satisfaction at the continued co-operation.<sup>(4)</sup>

Also on 26 May, the Council invited States to consider adopting policies on local environmental planning and management of human settlements, and requested the Executive Director to collaborate with UNCHS and other United Nations bodies in incorporating the environmental aspect into local planning and management policies through devising methodologies for integrated planning, encouraging studies and information dissemination, encouraging the United Nations system to respond to requests for assistance in formulating local environmental planning policies, and supporting training programmes for officials.<sup>(5)</sup>

At their fourth joint meeting (New York, 9 and 10 December), the bureaux of the Council and the Commission and the Executive Directors of UNEP and UNCHS emphasized the need for practical alternatives to solve critical environmental problems.<sup>(1)</sup>

The growing co-operation between the two bodies was welcomed by the General Assembly in its December resolution on UNEP.<sup>(3)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP/UNCHS meeting, UNEP/GC.10/4/Add.2 (HS/C/5/INF.3).

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8): 4/11, 6 May; <sup>(3)</sup>GA: 36/192, para. 9, 17 Dec. (p. 817).

Decisions: UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 26 May: <sup>(4)</sup>9/3, sect. IV; <sup>(5)</sup>9/14.

#### Co-operation with regional commissions

The Secretary-General submitted to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) in April 1981 a note on the distribution of tasks and responsibilities between regional commissions and other United Nations bodies regarding water resources (p. 686) and the environment.<sup>(2)</sup> In regard to the latter, the note suggested that close co-operation existed between UNEP and the commissions and that efficient distribution of responsibilities might hinge mainly on future arrangements between them.

In June,<sup>(3)</sup> CPC agreed to review the matter further in 1982, based on a report that would con-

tain a detailed analysis of the various mandates and activities concerning the environment. It also agreed that the Secretariat should continue reviewing activities to determine whether tasks were being performed at appropriate levels.

The UNEP Governing Council, in its 26 May 1981 decision on co-ordination in the United Nations system (p. 841), expressed satisfaction at the fruitful co-operation between some of the regional commissions and UNEP, recommended that this be improved with the Economic Commission for Africa, and decided to take up in 1982 the subject of the regional presence of UNEP.<sup>(1)</sup>

During debate in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, Belgium said it would not oppose the transfer from UNEP to the regional commissions of certain responsibilities for project planning and implementation, provided that they were confined to clearly defined and purely regional and inter-regional activities; but it would oppose the duplication that would arise from having both regional UNEP offices and environmental units in the commissions' secretariats.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>UNEP Council (report, A/36/25), 9/3, sect. V, 26 May.

Note: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G E/AC.51/1981/3.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>CPC, A/36/38.

## Chapter XVII

### Human settlements

The United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS), also known as Habitat, continued during 1981 to implement its work programme based on the six major subject areas identified at Habitat: United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, in 1976 (p. 845). Its work was reviewed by the Commission on Human Settlements, and the General Assembly subsequently took action on some human settlements issues.

The Centre, under the Conference's guidelines, emphasized direct assistance to developing countries through technical co-operation projects (p. 850), research and development (including training) and the dissemination of information in the field of human settlements. It published, sponsored or co-sponsored the publication of several studies and reports, on such issues as energy utilization (p. 852), the construction industry (p. 856), infrastructure in slum areas (p. 857), problems of the disabled in housing (p. 856) and financing of human settlements (p. 856).

The Commission held its fourth session at Manila, Philippines, from 27 April to 6 May 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> Among the 15 resolutions and eight decisions it adopted were the Manila Communiqué on a Human Settlements Movement (p. 850) and a proposal to declare an international year of shelter for the homeless (p. 853). It approved the UNCHS work programme and budget for 1982-1983 (p. 845) and the medium-term plan for 1984-1989 (p. 846), but noted that the existing financial resources of UNCHS and the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foun-

dation were inadequate to ensure implementation of those plans (p. 847).

The General Assembly, in December, adopted three resolutions on human settlements. It welcomed the Manila Communiqué and urged the Commission to continue to provide support for technical co-operation among developing countries for human settlements programmes,<sup>(6)</sup> and requested the Centre's Executive Director to take steps to implement the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 689) which were within the mandate of the Centre.<sup>(7)</sup> By the third resolution, dealing with mobilization of financial resources for UNCHS, the Assembly appealed to Member States to contribute to the Human Settlements Foundation.<sup>(8)</sup>

By another resolution, the Assembly decided in principle to designate 1987 as the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless,<sup>(5)</sup> as recommended by the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(3)</sup> The Council, by another resolution of 24 July, welcomed the adoption of the Centre's work programme for 1982-1983 and the medium-term plan for 1984-1989 and noted the need for adequate financing.<sup>(2)</sup> By a third resolution, it welcomed the contributions by UNCHS to the preparations for the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, and requested follow-up activities in the field of energy related to human settlements.<sup>(4)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements, A/36/8.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1981/69 A (p. 844), <sup>(3)</sup>1981/69 B (p. 855), <sup>(4)</sup>1981/69 C (p. 853), 24 July. GA: <sup>(5)</sup>36/71 (p. 855), <sup>(6)</sup>36/72 A (p. 845), <sup>(7)</sup>36/72 B (p. 853), <sup>(8)</sup>36/72 C (p. 848), 4 Dec.

## Programme and finances of UNCHS

### Programme policy decisions

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** The Economic and Social Council, having considered the report of the Commission on Human Settlements on the work of its 1981 session,<sup>(2)</sup> transmitted the report to the General Assembly by a resolution of 24 July.<sup>(3)</sup> It recommended that the Assembly approve the recommendations of the Commission and welcomed the Commission's adoption of the Centre's work programme for 1982-1983 (p. 845) and the draft medium-term plan for 1984-1989 (p. 847). Noting the need for adequate financing for the proper implementation of the activities set out in the draft work programme and programme budget, it reiterated the appeal by UNCHS to Member States for contributions. It called on the Commission to provide adequate support to technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC) in the formulation and implementation of its programmes on human settlements (p. 850), and stressed the importance of UNCHS in providing project and advisory assistance to developing countries, particularly the least developed.

The Council adopted the resolution without vote, on the recommendation of its First (Economic) Committee, which approved the text on 21 July, also without vote. The resolution was based on a draft submitted by Venezuela, on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries, and orally revised. The main changes were made in paragraphs 4, 5 and 7. By the revised version of paragraph 4, the Council noted the need for adequate financing, rather than noting that the existing financial resources of UNCHS and the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation were insufficient, for the proper implementation of the projected activities. Revised paragraph 5 reiterated an urgent appeal to Member States to continue and, if possible, to increase their contributions, instead of reiterating an urgent appeal to those that had already made voluntary contributions to increase their contributions. Paragraph 7 stressed the importance of UNCHS in providing project and advisory assistance, instead of, as in the original version, underlining the need for it to increase its financial and advisory programme assistance.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** Acting on the recommendation of its Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, the General Assembly on 4 December adopted without vote a resolution on the Commission's report.<sup>(4)</sup> Welcoming the

Manila Communiqué on a Human Settlements Movement (p. 851), adopted by the Commission on 6 May, it also urged the Commission to continue to take account of and to provide adequate support to TCDC for implementation of its human settlements programmes.

The text was based on a 16-nation draft resolution introduced in the Committee by the Philippines.<sup>(1)</sup> The draft was withdrawn by the sponsors following informal consultations in favour of a text introducing some changes of wording, which was submitted by a Committee Vice-Chairman and adopted without vote on 13 November.

Stating its position in the Committee, the USSR said it did not oppose the adoption of the draft without vote since all were interested, especially the developing countries, in promoting co-operation in the field of human settlements; the main objective was to support UNCHS and the national activities of developing countries.

Speaking during the Committee debate, New Zealand said the Commission had a central role to play in improving the settlements problems in developing countries.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Argentina, Bangladesh, Canada, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, India, Kenya, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, A/C.2/36/L.25.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements, A/36/8.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/69 A, 24 July, text following; <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/72 A, 4 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.7-9, 13, 17 (7-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 39 (24 Sep.-13 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.84 (4 Dec.).

### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/69 A

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/107) without vote, 21 July (meeting 17); draft by Venezuela, for Group of 77 (E/1981/C.1/L.9, part A), orally revised; agenda item 9.

International co-operation in the field of human settlements  
The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New international Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling also General Assembly resolutions 32/162 of 19 December 1977 on institutional arrangements for international co-operation in the field of human settlements and 34/116 of 14 December 1979 on the strengthening of human settlements activities.

Further recalling its resolution 1980/47 of 23 July 1980 on international co-operation in the field of human settlements.

Affirming the importance of the role which human settlements activities can play in fostering national economic and social development.

Reaffirming that human settlements development should be viewed within the context of national plans and priorities and the development objectives of all countries, in particular the developing countries.



Noting that the promotion of human settlements development has been recognized as a distinct and important policy measure for the attainment of the goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980.

Having considered the report of the Commission on Human Settlements on the work of its fourth session,

1. Takes note of the report of the Commission on Human Settlements on the work of its fourth session and decides to transmit it to the General Assembly for consideration and decision at its thirty-sixth session;

2. Recommends to the General Assembly for consideration and decision those resolutions and decisions adopted by the Commission at its fourth session which require action by the Assembly;

3. Welcomes the adoption by the Commission of the work programme for the biennium 1982-1983 of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) and its approval of the draft medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989;

4. Notes the need for adequate financing for the proper implementation of the projected activities set out in the draft work programme and programme budget of the Centre for the biennium 1982-1983 and the draft medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989;

5. Reiterates the urgent appeal by the Centre to Member States to continue and, if possible, to increase their contributions, and to those that have not yet contributed, particularly developed countries and other countries in a position to do so, to make voluntary contributions to the activities of the Centre;

6. Calls upon the United Nations Commission on Human Settlements to take account of and to provide adequate support to technical co-operation among developing countries in the formulation and implementation of its programmes on human settlements;

7. Stresses the importance of the Centre in providing its project and advisory assistance to developing countries, particularly the least developed countries.

General Assembly resolution 36/72 A

Adopted without vote Meeting 84 4 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.10) without vote, 13 November (meeting 39); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.55, part A), based on Informal consultations on 16-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.25); agenda item 69 (k).

#### Report of the Commission on Human Settlements

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 32/162 of 19 December 1977 on institutional arrangements for international co-operation in the field of human settlements and 34/116 of 14 December 1979 on the strengthening of human settlements activities,

Recalling also its resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Further recalling the Vancouver Declaration on Human Settlements, 1976, and the other recommendations of Habitat: United Nations Conference on Human Settlements,

Affirming the importance of the promotion of human settlements development as a distinct and specific policy measure for the attainment of the goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980.

Reaffirming that human settlements development should be viewed and taken into account in the context of the national plans and priorities and the development of all countries, in particular the developing countries,

Recognizing that the Commission on Human Settlements has continued to address itself effectively to substantive issues in the field of human settlements of priority concern to Member States, particularly developing countries,

Taking note of Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/69A of 24 July 1981 on international co-operation in the field of human settlements,

Having considered the report of the Commission on Human Settlements on the work of its fourth session,

1. Takes note of the report of the Commission on Human Settlements on the work of its fourth session;

2. Welcomes resolution 4/1, entitled "Manila Communique on a Human Settlements Movement", adopted on 6 May 1981 by the Commission on Human Settlements at its fourth session;

3. Urges the Commission on Human Settlements to continue to take account of and to provide adequate support to technical co-operation among developing countries in the formulation and implementation of its programmes on human settlements.

#### Work programme and budget for 1982-1983

The six subprogrammes of the UNCHS work programme and programme budget for 1982-1983<sup>(8)</sup> corresponded to the six categories identified at the 1976 Habitat Conference: settlement policies and strategies; settlement planning; shelter, infrastructure and services; land; public participation; and institutions and management.<sup>(9)</sup>

Endorsing the work programme and approving the proposed use of extrabudgetary funds for projects, the Commission on Human Settlements, by a decision of 6 May 1981,<sup>(7)</sup> requested the Centre's Executive Director to prepare for the 1982 Commission session a report on the use of all extrabudgetary resources broken down by source. The Commission further decided, in order to implement the regional component of the work programme, to request the Executive Director to seek the conversion by the General Assembly of the 12 temporary assistance posts deployed to the United Nations regional commissions to established regular-budget posts, with the aim of ensuring that the resulting resources would be utilized for implementing the regional component of the Commission's work programme. The Centre would be accountable to the Commission for the use of those funds. The Commission noted with concern that the 1982-1983 budget proposals of the Secretary-General (p. 1272) indicated a negative growth rate of 8.6 per cent, in spite of the fact that the Commission had urged that human settlements programmes be given higher priority. In a resolution of the same day, the Commission requested the Secretary-General to propose to the Assembly the conversion of the posts.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Commission's approval of the work programme was welcomed by the Economic and Social Council in a resolution of 24 July.<sup>(5)</sup>

Reporting to the Assembly's Second Committee on 1 October, the Executive Director said

UNCHS would require extrabudgetary contributions of about \$10 million in order to be able to implement its 1982-1983 work programme. He urged all States to give the Centre the necessary support at the United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities in November (p. 426).

A report of 8 October on resources for the work programme at the regional level,<sup>(3)</sup> submitted by the Secretary-General to the Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, proposed that temporary posts at UNCHS be converted into established posts at the regional commissions on a permanent basis, in accordance with the Commission's action in May, and that those posts be included in the 1982-1983 programme budget. Financial implications for the two-year period would be \$1.03 million.

The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ), in a report of 22 October, declared that it did not object to the request for the creation of 12 established posts for deployment to the regional commissions, but recommended that the Commission and the governing bodies of the regional commissions monitor the human settlements programmes at the regional level to ensure that staff resources were used effectively and that there was no duplication of work.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Fifth Committee approved without vote on 29 October the ACABQ recommendation for an additional appropriation of \$1.03 million for the suggested transfer of posts. Following that decision, the United States said that, had there been a vote, it would have abstained because the redeployment of posts meant an increase of expenditure and was not in line with the concept of zero growth (p. 1275). The \$1.03 million was included in the total appropriations for UNCHS, amounting to \$8,312,200, approved by the Assembly in a resolution of 18 December.<sup>(6)</sup>

The Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC), at its May/June 1981 session,<sup>(2)</sup> recommended that two subprogrammes—settlement policies and strategies, and settlement planning—be merged and funds consequently released be used for strengthening the capacities of the regional commissions in the field of human settlements (p. 859).

Speaking during the debate in the Second Committee, the Byelorussian SSR said the Centre's activities should be carried out with existing financial resources. Approval of the work programme was expressed by Finland (on behalf of the Nordic countries), Kenya and Poland. The Federal Republic of Germany said the Centre's activities were oriented in the right direction, especially since they gave priority to practical measures rather than theoretical stud-

ies. Belgium agreed that practical measures should have priority, but added that the lack of clearly defined priorities among the subprogrammes and projects was unfortunate. Kenya said it did not agree with the CPC recommendation to merge the two subprogrammes.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ A/36/7/Add.4; <sup>(2)</sup>CPC, A/36/38; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/15.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8), 4/5, para. 5, 6 May; <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/69 A, para. 3, 24 July (p. 845); <sup>(6)</sup>GA, 36/240 A, para. 1, sect. 19, 18 Dec. (p. 1278). Dec.: <sup>(7)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements, 4/18, 6 May.

Work programme: <sup>(8)</sup>HS/C/4/6.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(9)</sup>1976, p. 444.

Meeting record: GA, 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.26 (29 Oct.).

#### Medium-term plan for 1984-1989

At its 1981 session, the Commission on Human Settlements considered the medium-term plan for 1984-1989, presented by the Executive Director of UNCHS.<sup>(1)</sup> By a decision of 6 May,<sup>(3)</sup> the Commission approved the submission of the plan to the Office for Programme Planning and Co-ordination of the United Nations Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, CPC, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

While the six priority areas selected at the 1976 Habitat Conference had provided the subprogrammes for the 1980-1983 medium-term plan, the Commission decided that for the 1984-1989 plan, subprogramme 3—shelter, infrastructure and services—should be divided, as suggested by the Executive Director, into four new subprogrammes: shelter and community services; development of the indigenous construction sector; low-cost infrastructure for human settlements; and mobilization of finance for human settlements development. The first three of these subprogrammes were to be given highest priority. Public participation, being a component of several other subprogrammes, was eliminated as a separate category. With four of the former subprogrammes—settlements policies and strategies; settlements planning; land; and human settlements institutions and management—included, the 1984-1989 plan consisted of eight subprogrammes.

The Executive Director was requested, in the preparation of future work programmes and programme budgets based on the plan, to continue to give high priority to the promotion of adequate living conditions for low-income groups, particularly those in the least developed, landlocked and island developing countries. The Commission also decided that no subprogramme activities proposed in the plan were obsolete, marginally useful or ineffective.

The Commission's approval of the plan was welcomed by the Economic and Social Council in a resolution of 24 July.<sup>(2)</sup>

During the debate on human settlements in the Assembly's Second Committee, Poland expressed support for the plan. Finland, speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said they appreciated the plan's quality.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements, A/36/8.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/69 A, para. 3, 24 July (p. 845). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements, 4/17, 6 May.

#### Management of the Centre

##### Information system

The Commission, following up a 1979 recommendation of the General Assembly for the establishment of a unified information service within UNCHS,<sup>(2)</sup> noted in a resolution of 6 May 1981 that this had been accomplished and requested the Executive Director to ensure that technical co-operation projects implemented by the Centre contained the appropriate project support communications components, emphasizing human settlements aspects.<sup>(1)</sup>

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8). 4/9, 6 May; <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 34/115, para. 1, 14 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 708).

##### Selection of consultants and experts

By a resolution of 6 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission requested the Executive Director to intensify his efforts to promote the use of consultants and experts from developing countries in all aspects of work concerning human settlements and to give preference to qualified indigenous personnel in project work. It also requested that due consideration be given to qualified personnel from developing countries in the compilation and updating of the UNCHS roster of consultants and experts.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8), 4/10, 6 May.

#### UN Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation

In 1981, a total of \$1.85 million of United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation funds was spent, as work continued on 48 projects in 31 countries, on 22 global projects and on 15 regional projects, as part of the 1980-1981 work programme (p. 848). In accordance with a 1979 resolution of the Commission on Human Settlements,<sup>(8)</sup> the activities of the Foundation were integrated into the work programme of UNCHS and its resources were utilized to provide extrabudgetary support for the

Centre's work programme as well as for technical assistance projects.

The Executive Director's report on the proposed programme budget,<sup>(3)</sup> submitted to the Commission in March 1981, showed that the projected resources of the Foundation for 1982-1983 would include \$4.43 million in available funds and \$4.02 million in expected contributions and pledges. Expenditures proposed were \$3.33 million; of this amount, \$2.38 million would be used for the Centre's work programme and the remainder for programme support costs. It was expected that approximately \$2 million would be committed for technical co-operation projects and that the reserve fund would be maintained at \$553,300.

In a report presented to the Commission in April, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions expressed the opinion that, with contributions and pledges for 1982-1983 not expected to exceed their level for 1980-1981, key programme and programme support costs of the Foundation should be kept below the estimate recommended by the Executive Director.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Commission, by a decision of 6 May,<sup>(7)</sup> approved the proposed allocation of funds for programme, programme support, project and reserve purposes for 1982-1983. Noting that the existing resources of UNCHS and the Foundation were inadequate to carry out the projected work programme for 1982-1983 and for 1984-1989, it appealed for contributions. By a resolution of the same date, it welcomed the participation of the Chairman of the Commission, in collaboration with the Executive Director, in the mobilization of financial resources.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Economic and Social Council, in a resolution of 24 July, reiterated the urgent appeal by UNCHS for contributions by Member States, particularly developed countries.<sup>(5)</sup>

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 4 December, also appealed for contributions and, if possible, for an increase in them, and appealed to those that had not contributed, particularly developed countries, to make voluntary contributions.<sup>(6)</sup>

The Assembly adopted the resolution without vote. Its Second (Economic and Financial) Committee had approved the text in like manner on 13 November, after an oral revision rewording the only operative paragraph urging States to contribute. The draft was submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Committee, following informal consultations on a 16-nation draft which was subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup>

After approval of the draft by the Committee, the USSR, expressing support for the Centre's objectives, said its work programmes should not

exceed the funds allocated from the United Nations regular budget and wider use should be made of contributions in national currencies.

Speaking during the Committee debate, India expressed regret that work of UNCHS had been adversely affected by the lack of resources, and Kenya said it was important to increase and strengthen the resources of the Centre and the Foundation.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS HABITAT  
AND HUMAN SETTLEMENTS FOUNDATION

(as at 31 December 1981; In US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment	Pledges for future years
Algeria	8,000	8,500
Bangladesh	10,000	10,000
Barbados	2,005	-
Belgium	4,317	-
Bhutan	1,001	500
Botswana	-	2,286
Canada	166,667	-
Chile	6,500	-
Colombia	10,233	12,000
Cyprus	281	-
Denmark	46,451	1,989,800*
Egypt	71,429	-
Finland	150,246	112,360
France	-	79,646
Germany, Federal Republic of	1	-
Greece	7,000	-
Haiti	500	500
India	197,232	100,000
Indonesia	10,000	10,000
Iraq	-	10,169
Italy	253,680	254,237
Kenya	62,585	32,143
Lesotho	-	3,000
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	25,000	-
Malawi	1,090	1,000
Netherlands	256,139	238,095**
Nigeria	50,471	-
Norway	9,239	117,647
Oman	-	10,000
Pakistan	5,000	5,000
Papua New Guinea	6,000	6,000
Philippines	375,000	-
Qatar	10,000	30,000
Republic of Korea	-	20,000
Somalia	1,605	-
Sri Lanka	-	24,000
Swaziland	-	1,069
Sweden	250,946	212,389
Trinidad and Tobago	1,000	1,005
Tunisia	-	24,000
United Arab Emirates	1,000,000	-
United Republic of Cameroon	-	3,534
United Republic of Tanzania	2,000	2,000
Venezuela	70,000	70,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,071,618</b>	<b>3,390,880</b>

\*The amount of \$1,989,800 for specific project costs of the Foundation represents pledges for future years of which \$46,451, from the Danish International Development Agency, was collected in 1981.

\*\*Includes additional pledged contributions of \$196,900 towards specific project costs of the Foundation.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Argentina, Bangladesh, Canada, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, India, Kenya, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, A/C.2/36/L.25.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ACABQ HS/C/4/9/Add.1; <sup>(3)</sup>Executive Director, HS/C/4/9.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report. A/36/8), 4/15, 6 May; <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/69 A, paras. 3-5, 24 July (p. 845); <sup>(6)</sup>GA, 36/72 C, 4 Dec., text following. Dec.: <sup>(7)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements, 4/22 6 May.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(8)</sup>1979, p. 704.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 39 (24 Sep.-13 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.84 (4 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/72 C

Adopted without vote Meeting 84 4 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.10) without vote, 13 November (meeting 39); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.55, Part C), based on informal consultations on 16-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.25), orally amended following informal consultations: agenda item 69 (k).

Mobilization of financial resources for the United Nations  
Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/77 D of 5 December 1980, in which it urgently appealed to all States and appropriate financial institutions to make or to increase their voluntary contributions to the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation in support of the activities of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat).

Noting the continued need for financial resources for the full implementation of the projected activities of the Centre under the work programme for the biennium 1982-1983 and the draft medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989 approved by the Commission on Human Settlements at its fourth session,

Taking note of Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/69 A of 24 July 1981, in particular paragraphs 4 and 5 thereof which refer to the need for adequate financing for the projected activities of the Centre,

Expressing its appreciation to those Governments that have so far made financial contributions to the activities of the Centre,

Reiterates its urgent appeal to Member States to contribute and, if possible, to increase their contributions to the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation in support of the activities of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) and appeals to those that have not yet contributed, particularly developed countries and other countries in a position to do so, also to make voluntary contributions.

## Human settlements activities

### Activities of the Habitat Centre

In 1981, UNCHS continued to carry out technical co-operation projects in the six areas, or sub-programmes, defined by the 1976 Habitat Conference<sup>(2)</sup> (p. 845). They were described in a February 1982 report of the Executive Director.<sup>(1)</sup>

Projects corresponding to subprogramme 1 (settlement policies and strategies) were aimed at assisting in the formulation of regional and national policies and strategies, and at strengthening the institutions responsible for implementing them. Such projects were implemented in 18 countries, including: a project in Burundi aimed at developing a regional planning policy, strat-

egies for the development of secondary centres, and a programme for the development of human settlements in urban and rural areas; a project in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the development of settlement policies and strategies; and two projects in Bangladesh, on national planning and on the development of an urban housing policy and programme. With regard to research and development activities, recommendations on policy guidelines for the Asia and Pacific region were prepared. Work continued on the preparation of the Quinquennial Global Report on Human Settlements, scheduled for publication in 1985.

Under subprogramme 2 (settlement planning), projects focused on establishing specific proposals on the use of resources in relation to needs, the location of activities and infrastructure investment, and the methodology for implementing priority programmes. Projects were carried out in 16 countries; they included master plans for Lagos, Nigeria, and Nicosia, Cyprus, and a reconstruction project to overcome the damage by hurricanes in Dominica (p. 858). UNCHS initiated research and development work to identify long-term global trends and prospects for human settlements. It carried out case studies on human settlements, population and the environment and, in co-operation with the United Nations Environment Programme, prepared recommendations for the formulation of environmental guidelines for human settlements planning. It organized an expert group meeting on planning for human settlements in disaster-prone areas (Nairobi, Kenya, 4-8 December) and was preparing a slide presentation on the topic. Several reports were prepared on rural settlements planning, as part of the Centre's work on a systems approach.

Subprogramme 3 (shelter, infrastructure and services) included such technical co-operation projects as implementation of sites-and-services schemes, development of local building materials, energy sources, urban and rural housing, and setting up financial mechanisms. Projects were carried out in 32 countries; among them were the integrated urban development of Musaga, Burundi, and a large-scale project to initiate and assist housing and building technology projects in several provinces of Argentina. An experimental training programme for high- and middle-level government officials responsible for housing programmes, undertaken with the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium, continued, with workshops in Asia and Africa. Steps were also taken to prepare a strategy and plan for an extensive programme of integrated multidisciplinary demonstration projects designed to show how basic human needs could be met and

living conditions improved in urban slums and squatter settlements.

An expert group meeting on development of the indigenous construction sector was held in November, and an ad hoc expert group meeting led to the preparation of a feasibility study on setting up an Asian human settlements bank (p. 856). An African housing development and finance institution known as "Shelter-Afrique", with headquarters at Nairobi, was established. Information activities included the production of two films on energy.

Technical co-operation projects under subprogramme 4 (land-use policy) were designed to assist Governments in formulating and implementing land policies and legislation. Most projects dealing with physical development at the national level or below related to this subprogramme. In 1981, there were such projects in five countries, including: a detailed land survey of all the islands belonging to Tuvalu; the setting up of institutional frameworks and methodologies for national land-use planning in Zimbabwe; and a Land Development Corporation in Cyprus, to advise on the institutional structure for the implementation of legislative measures governing land use. The Centre continued work on a theme paper on land for presentation to the Commission in 1983.

Programmes that most clearly involved active citizen participation in line with subprogramme 5 (public participation) were sites-and-services projects, projects dealing with the improvement of squatter settlements and pilot/demonstration projects. Projects were carried out in 14 countries. An example was a large-scale project to rehabilitate and develop the popular settlements in Nicaragua that had suffered extensive damage during recent years. A project on training for public participation in the design and construction of low-income housing and related infrastructure was approved by the Danish International Development Agency in May. Information activities included work on four films aimed at training and information dissemination at the community level.

Projects under subprogramme 6 (institutions and management) were concerned with establishing an appropriate institutional base for the formulation of human settlements development policies and for the execution of programmes in the fields of physical planning, building technology, housing, services and training. One of the 15 countries which benefited from activities under this subprogramme was Bahrain, where significant advances had been made in strengthening the Ministry of Public Works and in formulating plans for physical development, housing and infrastructure. Assistance was also

provided to the United Arab Emirates to build up operational capacity in the fields of physical planning, housing and infrastructure, and to Sri Lanka for the establishment of an Urban Development Authority dealing with urban renewal and squatter improvement. A course was held by the Economic Development Institute and UNCHS on training in human settlements management (Dakar, Senegal, 25 May-3 July) and an Urban Data Management Workshop was held in March at Bogotá, Colombia. Information activities included a survey to identify national documentation services in the field of human settlements and to assess the need for technical assistance, the microfiching of all documents in the first UNCHS bibliography of unpublished reports, and the distribution of three issues of Habitat News, with an Arabic insert widely distributed in Arabic-speaking countries.

Also in 1981, co-operation and collaboration with intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations were an important aspect of the Centre's activities, with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) remaining the main funding agency for field projects executed by the Centre (see below).

Speaking during the debate on human settlements in the General Assembly's Second Committee, Canada said the achievements of UNCHS in 1981 had been significant.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Executive Director, HS/C/5/2.  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1976, p. 444.

#### Technical co-operation

Technical co-operation projects were divided among the four geographical units of UNCHS. The unit concerned with sub-Sahara Africa was involved in 118 projects in 53 countries, 30 of which were completed in 1981 in 22 countries. Expenditures for 1981 in that area were \$5,840,994.

In the Latin America and Caribbean unit, there were 59 projects in progress in 33 countries; 21 of those projects in 18 countries were completed in 1981. In addition, there were five ongoing regional projects. Expenditures for 1981 were \$1,231,511.

The Asia and Pacific unit had 51 projects in 31 countries, completing 19 of them in 15 countries during 1981. Four regional projects were under way. Expenditures for 1981 in that region were \$3,197,815.

There were 24 projects in 18 countries in the Western Asia, Northern Africa and Europe unit, five of which were completed in five countries during 1981. Expenditures for 1981 totalled \$3,104,725.

During the year, UNCHS fielded 31 advisory missions to 21 countries, in particular the least developed.

Interregional and global technical co-operation projects were also undertaken. The Secretary-General reported<sup>(1)</sup> that about 90 per cent of the resources expended on technical co-operation by UNCHS during 1981 was provided by UNDP. Habitat was executing 86 UNDP-financed projects in 64 countries, of which 44 were initiated in 1981 (p. 848).

UNCHS also continued to co-ordinate its activities in the field with the World Bank. Such activities included: the training of technicians in policy formulation, project identification, analysis and preparation of detailed technical and financial mechanisms for low-income housing development projects; joint monitoring missions to ascertain the appropriate nature of large credit loans for pilot housing projects in the United Republic of Cameroon, the Upper Volta and Zimbabwe; and a joint monitoring and evaluation mission in Madagascar for the development of a human settlements programme.

The Economic and Social Council, in a resolution of 24 July,<sup>(2)</sup> called on the Commission on Human Settlements to take account of and to provide adequate support to technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC) in the formulation and implementation of its programmes. It stressed the importance of UNCHS in providing project and advisory assistance to developing countries, particularly the least developed. The General Assembly took similar action in a resolution adopted on 4 December,<sup>(3)</sup> urging the Commission to continue to take account of and to provide adequate support to TCDC (p. 844).

During the debate in the Assembly's Second Committee, India expressed the hope that economic and technical co-operation between developing countries would feature prominently in the planning of UNCHS programmes, since developing countries possessed labour-intensive technologies particularly suited to the needs of others.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, DP/1982/22.  
Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/69 A, paras. 6 & 7, 24 July (p. 845); <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/72 A, para. 3, 4 Dec. (p. 845).

#### 1981 Manila Communiqué

The Commission on Human Settlements, at its fourth session at Manila, Philippines, adopted on 6 May 1981 the Manila Communiqué on a Human Settlements Movement.<sup>(1)</sup> Expressing the view that human settlements development should encompass efforts to improve the quality of life by satisfying such basic human needs as water, energy, food, clothing, livelihood, medical

services, education, culture and technology, sports and recreation, ecological balance and mobility, it emphasized the need to co-ordinate sectoral activities in the human settlements field within a comprehensive and integrated framework.

The Communique noted achievements of the Commission and UNCHS which focused on the role of the construction industry in human settlements programmes and national development (p. 856) and the provision of infrastructure in slums and squatter areas in human settlements (p. 857). It expressed appreciation for contributions by Governments to the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation (p. 847), and called on Governments and international organizations to join in a comprehensive human settlements movement.

The adoption of the Communique was welcomed by the General Assembly in a resolution of 4 December.<sup>(2)</sup>

Speaking in the Assembly's Second Committee during the debate on human settlements, Kenya said the Manila Communique had proved to be one of the most important results of the 1981 Commission session and deserved close examination.

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8), 4/1, 6 May; <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/72 A, para. 2, 4 Dec. (p. 845).

#### Human settlements development

By a resolution of 6 May 1981 on the mobilization of resources for human settlements development,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission requested the UNCHS Executive Director to ensure the prompt utilization of resources allocated to the United Nations regional commissions and to intensify efforts to mobilize such resources. It called on all States and international organizations to increase contributions in this regard to developing countries. It also requested the Executive Director, in co-operation with the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa, to harmonize their work with regard to manpower, training, public participation at the grass-roots level, financing, energy requirements and conservation, services and assistance in research relating to human settlements.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8), 4/6, 6 May.

#### National action

In compliance with a 1979 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(2)</sup> the UNCHS Executive Director presented to the Commission in February 1981 an interim progress report<sup>(1)</sup> on implementation of the recommendations for national action, adopted at the 1976 Habitat Conference,<sup>(5)</sup> and on in-

ternational and national funding for human settlements development.

To obtain the necessary information, the Executive Director had sent a letter to all Member States in August 1980 requesting an accounting that focused on national priority action, on the programmes adopted, on the amount of funds allocated or received through bilateral and multi-lateral arrangements, and on the volume of national resources devoted to human settlements development. Thirty States responded initially, but the report indicated that few of them dealt comprehensively with the level and sources of funding for human settlements activities. The report summarized the information provided by those countries and included suggestions for future biennial reporting. Two supplements of March and April 1981 added information from 14 more States.

On 6 May, the Commission adopted a decision on future progress reports, requesting the Executive Director to ask for information from Member States on progress in national action and on the level and sources of funding for national activities; to prepare a format that Member States could follow in the presentation of that information (see below); and to submit in 1983 an overview paper with an analysis based on the countries' responses.<sup>(4)</sup>

During the debate in the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, Thailand said it believed that the development of human settlements should be viewed within the context of the national development plans and priorities, in particular in developing countries; activities related to human settlements played a key role in the economic and social development of a nation and were an integral part of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.<sup>(3)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Executive Director, HS/C/4/2/Add.1 & Add.1/Supplements 1,2.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>34/116, para. 3, 14 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 709); <sup>(3)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503).

Decision: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8): 4/21, 6 May 1981.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1976, p. 444.

#### Periodic reports

In January 1981, the UNCHS Executive Director, in accordance with a 1979 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(2)</sup> presented to the Commission an interim report on financial and other assistance for human settlements activities to and among developing countries and on human settlements activities within and outside the United Nations system, suggesting for the requested biennial reporting a tabular format for use in collecting

information on bilateral and multilateral assistance (p. 851), the tables to be annexed to a more analytical report.<sup>(1)</sup>

By a decision of 6 May,<sup>(3)</sup> the Commission approved the suggested format. It agreed with the Executive Director's proposal that reports on activities of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations should be presented to it as information documents.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Executive Director, HS/C/4/7.

Resolution and decision: Res: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 34/114, para. 2, 14 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 708). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8), 4/19, 6 May 1981.

#### Energy requirements

In accordance with a July 1980 resolution of the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(4)</sup> the UNCHS Executive Director submitted to the Commission on Human Settlements in 1981 a report<sup>(2)</sup> which provided an overview of the potential role of new and renewable sources of energy for the development of human settlements. Stressing that developing countries needed a two-pronged approach to the problem of meeting their energy needs, the report stated that the use of costly commercial energy resources would have to be optimized through technological innovation, effective management and the development of more efficient settlements systems, and that greater reliance would have to be placed on new and renewable energy sources in the development, rehabilitation and management of human settlements.

Recommendations for national, regional and global action were proposed in five areas: settlement and energy policies; energy-efficient spatial patterns in human settlements; energy for physical infrastructure and services in human settlements; energy and building; and pilot demonstration projects. The report also contained an annex on the application of renewable energy sources to human settlements, with particular emphasis on meeting the energy needs of the poor in urban and rural settlements.

The Commission, by a decision of 6 May,<sup>(7)</sup> endorsed the Executive Director's recommendations and requested him to forward his report to both the Council and the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 694). It further decided that follow-up activities involving research and development, technical co-operation and information dissemination should be initiated in the field of energy as it related to human settlements, particularly the possibility of saving energy through appropriate planning, construction, rehabilitation, and building management and operation.

Noting with satisfaction the revised report<sup>(3)</sup> and welcoming the contributions of UNCHS to the Conference, the Council, by a resolution of 24 July, requested the Executive Director to make relevant reports and documents available to the Conference and to initiate follow-up activities involving research and development, technical co-operation and the dissemination of information.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Council adopted the resolution, without vote, on the recommendation of its. First (Economic) Committee which approved, on 21 July in the same manner, the text submitted by Venezuela for the Group of 77, as orally revised.

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 4 December, also welcomed the Centre's contributions to the Conference and requested the Executive Director to take appropriate steps for the implementation of the Conference's recommendations which were within the mandate of the Centre.<sup>(6)</sup>

The resolution was adopted without vote, after the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee approved it likewise on 13 November. The text was submitted by a Vice-Chairman of the Committee, following informal consultations on a 16-nation draft, introduced by the Philippines, which was subsequently withdrawn.<sup>(1)</sup>

Reporting to the Committee on 1 October, the Executive Director said the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy had identified several issues which would have important implications for human settlements in the coming years, particularly in the field of solar energy, and he stressed the need to diversify the energy supply base. UNCHS planned to carry out research to help developing countries apply energy-efficient human settlements policies and would study measures and technology to conserve energy in rural areas at the village or household level. With urban population in developing countries expected to double in 20 years, economy in urban energy consumption would be an important factor in improving living standards.

Kenya, during the Committee discussions, commended UNCHS for its contribution to the preparatory stage of the Conference. Having supported the inclusion of energy supply to human settlements in the Centre's programme, the USSR noted with satisfaction that the programme for 1982-1983 included a project on criteria for using alternative sources of energy, more efficient use of energy and experimental construction projects using renewable sources 'of energy. Belgium said it was gratified that a programme element related to energy had been included in both the Centre's work programme (p. 845) and medium-term plan (p. 846).



Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Argentina, Bangladesh, Canada, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, India, Kenya, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, A/C.2/36/L.25.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Executive Director, HS/C/4/2/Add.3; UNCHS, E/1981/82.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(4)</sup>1980/47, para. 5, 23 July 1980 (YUN 1980 p. 738); <sup>(5)</sup>1981/69 C, 24 July 1981, text following. <sup>(6)</sup>GA: 36/72 B, 4 Dec., text following.

Decision: <sup>(7)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8): 4/23; 6 May.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.7-9, 13, 17 (7-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 39 (24 Sep.-13 Nov.); plenary. A/36/PV.84 (4 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/69 C

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/107) without vote. 21 July (meeting 17); draft by Venezuela. for Group of 77 (E/1981/C.1/L.9, part c), orally revised; agenda item 9.

Renewable sources of energy for human settlements

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling Its resolution 1980/47 of 23 July 1980, by which it called upon the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) to elaborate concrete and specific proposals aimed at making an effective and meaningful contribution to the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, to be held at Nairobi in August 1981, and to report thereon, through the Commission on Human Settlements, to the Economic and Social Council at Its second regular session of 1981.

Noting Commission on Human Settlements decision 4/23 of 6 May 1981, in which the Commission requested the Executive Director of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) to forward his report and any other documents or reports which he might prepare for the Conference to the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1981.

Noting with satisfaction the report on renewable sources of energy for human settlements, submitted by the Centre,

1. Welcomes the contributions made by the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) to the preparations for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy;

2. Requests the Executive Director of the Centre to make available the relevant reports and documents prepared by the Centre, including the report of the Commission on Human Settlements on the work of its fourth session and the report on renewable sources of energy for human settlements, to the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy;

3. Also requests the Executive Director, within the framework of the work programme of the Centre, to initiate follow-up activities involving research and development, technical co-operation and the dissemination of information in the field of energy as it relates to human settlements, based on the recommendations for action contained in the report on new and renewable sources of energy for human settlements.

General Assembly resolution 36/72 B

Adopted without vote Meeting 84 4 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.10) without vote. 13 November (meeting 39); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.55, part B), based on informal consultations on 16-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.25); agenda item 69 (k)

Renewable sources of energy for human settlements

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 33/148 of 20 December 1978, 34/190 of 18 December 1979 and 35/204 of 16 December

1980 on the convening of the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy,

Taking note of Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/69 C of 24 July 1981 on renewable sources of energy for human settlements,

Taking note, in this connection, of the Report of the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, held at Nairobi from 10 to 21 August 1981.

1. Welcomes the contributions made by the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) to the preparations for and success of the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy;

2. Requests the Executive Director of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements to take the appropriate steps for the implementation of those recommendations of the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy which are within the mandate of the Centre.

International Year of Shelter for the Homeless

In December 1981 the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the UNCHS Executive Director, the Commission on Human Settlements and the Economic and Social Council, decided in principle to designate 1987 the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless. The proposal for such a year had been made in 1980 by Sri Lanka.

The Executive Director, in compliance with a December 1980 Assembly resolution,<sup>(8)</sup> submitted in March 1981 a report<sup>(4)</sup> to the Commission on the implications of declaring an international year committed to shelter for the poor and the homeless and focusing world-wide attention on rehabilitation of slum dwellers. For the purpose of the report, "homeless" was taken to mean people without any shelter at all and people who lived in shelter "unfit for human habitation". The overall goal of the year would be to enable the homeless in urban and rural settlements to secure adequate shelter. Specific objectives would be to focus world attention on particular problems (including the plight of refugees and victims of natural disasters), to demonstrate approaches to their solution, to improve related policies, programmes and institutions, to disseminate information and to provide training. The proposed programme would be designed to contribute to the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade (p. 380) at the global level and to socio-economic development plans at the national level.

The Executive Director suggested that the Commission might act as the intergovernmental body responsible for guiding the work of the Secretariat and recommend to the Assembly that UNCHS be designated as lead agency reporting to the Secretary-General. He proposed that either 1984 or 1986 might be the most suitable for holding the international year, and made suggestions for possible activities at the national, regional and global levels. With regard to financing, he stated that additional resources and a

separate budget exclusively for the year would be required.

Introducing the report to the Commission,<sup>(3)</sup> the Executive Director said that currently the total number of homeless was perhaps well over 1 billion, out of a total world population of just over 4 billion, and the situation was deteriorating. He expressed the hope that an international year would set in motion a process whereby application of the resources and ingenuity of the homeless themselves, combined with national efforts and support from the United Nations system, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, would produce significant results in providing and improving shelter during the 1980s and 1990s.

The Commission, by a resolution adopted on 6 May,<sup>(5)</sup> endorsed the report and requested the Executive Director to transmit a revised version, taking into account the Commission's comments, to the Economic and Social Council. It recommended to the Assembly, through the Council, the adoption of a draft resolution, by which the Assembly would proclaim 1986 as the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless, designate the Commission as the body responsible for organizing the Year and give the Executive Director the responsibility of guiding the work of the Secretariat and of reporting to the Secretary-General. It would stress the importance of mobilizing the resources and skills of the homeless for activities at the local and national levels. Besides asking the Secretary-General to prepare a draft report outlining the Year's programme, objectives and financial implications, the Assembly would request the Commission to submit a specific programme of activities, and it would decide to include in its 1982 provisional agenda an item on the Year.

The Secretary-General, in a note dated 8 June 1981 to the Council,<sup>(2)</sup> described the work done so far on the proposal for an international year. The Council, by a resolution of 24 July,<sup>(2)</sup> recommended that the Assembly designate 1987 as the International Year, provided that the necessary financing could be arranged, which should in principle be based on voluntary contributions. It also recommended that the Assembly request the Secretary-General to report in 1982 on the financial and organizational implications of holding the Year.

The Council adopted the resolution without vote, following similar approval by the First Committee on 21 July. The draft, submitted by Venezuela for the Group of 77, was orally revised as a result of informal consultations. The original text endorsed in principle the proclamation of 1986 as the International Year to coincide with the tenth anniversary of the Habitat Confer-

ence, and recommended to the Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution proposed by the Commission. The revised text also included a new preambular paragraph recalling a 1980 Council resolution setting out guidelines for international years.<sup>(6)</sup>

On 4 December 1981, on the recommendation of its Second Committee, the Assembly adopted, without vote, a resolution<sup>(9)</sup> by which it decided in principle to designate 1987 as the International Year, on the understanding that the criteria for financing and organizing international years set out by the Council in 1980 were complied with. It requested the UNCHS Executive Director to prepare a proposal on specific activities to be undertaken before and during 1987, and requested the Secretary-General to prepare, on the basis of that proposal, a report on organizational matters, including the availability of voluntary funds. Finally, it appealed to States, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and the public at large to indicate appropriate support for the Year.

The Assembly acted on a draft approved by the Committee without vote on 16 November. It was submitted by a Vice-Chairman, on the basis of informal consultations held on a draft resolution introduced by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77, which was withdrawn by the sponsors.<sup>(1)</sup>

The draft approved by the Committee differed from Algeria's version in several aspects. A preambular paragraph was deleted that would have declared the Assembly's awareness that adequate preparation and support by Governments, specialized agencies, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and the public at large would be required for the Year to be successful. Under the operative paragraphs, it omitted a phrase by which the Assembly would have decided that financing should be based in principle on voluntary funds but stated instead that financing should comply with the Council's guidelines. Instead of asking the Commission to prepare a proposal on specific activities, it requested the Executive Director to do so. The final version appealed for indications of appropriate support for the Year rather than for support and generous contributions, and omitted a paragraph that would have designated the Commission as the body responsible for organizing the Year.

During the Committee debate, Canada, Jamaica, Kenya, Malaysia, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Thailand expressed support for holding an international year. The Byelorussian SSR said the Centre's participation should be carried out with its existing resources, and programme measures should be financed from voluntary sources.

Canada held it necessary to arrange financing before holding an international year. Finland, speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said they preferred the Council recommendation to designate 1987 the International Year, but Kenya considered the UNCHS recommendation for 1986 more appropriate since it would be the tenth anniversary of the Habitat Conference. Sri Lanka stated that the Assembly should take certain consequential steps, such as designating the Commission as the body responsible for organizing the Year.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.2/36/L.13.

Note: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, E/1981/83.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements, A/36/8; <sup>(4)</sup>Executive Director, HS/C/4/2/Add.2.

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements: 4/2, May. ESC: <sup>(6)</sup>1980/67, annex, 25 July 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1030); <sup>(7)</sup>1981/69 B, 24 July 1981, text following. GA: <sup>(8)</sup>35/76, para. 4, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 739); <sup>(9)</sup>36/71, 4 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting words: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.7-9, 13, 17 (7-21 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.41 (24 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-24, 25, 26, 28-32, 40 (24 Sep.-16 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.84 (4 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/69 B

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1961/107) without vote. 21 July (meeting 17): draft by Venezuela, for Group of 77 (E/1981/C.1/L.9, part B), orally revised; agenda item 9.

Proposal to declare an international year  
of shelter for the homeless

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/76 of 5 December 1980, in which the Assembly expressed the view that an international year devoted to the problems of homeless people in urban and rural areas in the developing countries could be an appropriate occasion to focus the attention of the international community on those problems, and requested the Executive Director of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) to submit a report to the Council, through the Commission on Human Settlements at its fourth session, on the implications of declaring such an international year,

Considering that human settlements activities constitute an important policy measure for the attainment of the goals and objectives of the international Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980,

Considering also that the improvement of human settlements is one of the essential elements for enhancing the quality of life.

Taking note of the report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) and of the note of the Secretary-General on the proposal to declare an international year devoted to the problems of the homeless,

Noting the recommendation set forth by the Commission on Human Settlements in its resolution 4/2 of 6 May 1981 that the General Assembly should proclaim 1986 as the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless,

Recalling in this context Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/67 of 25 July 1980, in the annex to which are set forth the guidelines for future international years,

1. Recommends to the General Assembly the year 1987 as an appropriate year for the holding of the International

Year of Shelter for the Homeless, provided that the arrangements necessary for its financing have been made, which should in principle be based on voluntary contributions;

2. Also recommends that the General Assembly should, at its thirty-sixth session, request the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the financial and organizational implications of holding the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless in 1987, to be submitted, through the Commission on Human Settlements at its fifth session, to the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982.

General Assembly resolution 36/71

Adopted without vote Meeting 84 4 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.10) without vote. 16 November (meeting 40): draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.69), based on Informal consultations on draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.2/36/L.13), orally revised; agenda item 69 (k).

International Year of Shelter for the Homeless

The General Assembly,

6 Recalling its resolution 35/76 of 5 December 1980, in which it expressed the view that an international year devoted to the problems of homeless people in urban and rural areas of the developing countries would be an appropriate occasion to focus the attention of the international community on those problems,

Recognizing the grave and generally worsening situation of the homeless in the developing countries,

Emphasizing that the building, improvement and maintenance of shelter, related physical infrastructure and social facilities can contribute significantly to national development,

Convinced of the imperative need to mobilize effectively the considerable skill and resources that the homeless themselves possess for building, improving and maintaining their own shelter and neighbourhoods.

Convinced also that, because of their complexity and magnitude, the problems of the homeless require co-ordinated and concerted action at all levels,

Confident that an international year of shelter for the homeless could serve as a means of increasing public awareness at the local, national, regional and global levels and set in motion a process which would lead to significant improvement in the situation of the homeless,

Considering that human settlements activities are among the important policy measures for the attainment of the goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Noting with satisfaction the follow-up action so far taken by Member States with regard to the Implementation of the recommendations of Habitat: United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, and the support being provided by the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) to developing countries to facilitate that action.

Recalling in that connection its decision 35/424 of 5 December 1980 and Economic and Social Council resolution 1960/67 of 25 July 1980 on guidelines for international years and anniversaries,

Taking note of Economic and Social Council resolution 1961/69 B of 24 July 1981 on the proposal to declare an international year of shelter for the homeless,

1. Decides, in principle, to designate 1987 as the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless, on the understanding that the criteria for financing and organizing international years set out in the annex to Economic and Social Council resolution 1960/67 are complied with;

2. Requests the Executive Director of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) to prepare a proposal containing a specific programme of measures and activities to be undertaken prior to and during the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless and to report to the Economic and Social Council through the Commission on Human Settlements;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, on the basis of that proposal, a report on the organizational matters

regarding the holding of the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless in 1987, including the availability of voluntary funds, to be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session through the Economic and Social Council during 1982;

4. Appeals to all States, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and the public at large to indicate appropriate support for the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless.

#### Housing for disabled persons

The Commission on Human Settlements, by a resolution of 6 May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> urged Governments to give special consideration to the needs of the disabled in their human settlements programmes and policies, and further urged Governments and the United Nations system to support and assist national and international endeavours to diminish or eliminate barriers in human settlements that prevented the full participation of the disabled in social development. The UNCHS Executive Director was requested to give due consideration in the Centre's work programme to the needs of disabled persons.

The Advisory Committee for the International Year of Disabled Persons (p. 795), in the report on its 1981 session,<sup>(1)</sup> also dealt with the problem of housing for the disabled. It encouraged Member States to adopt a policy ensuring access to all new public buildings, facilities, housing and transport systems, and to adopt measures to encourage access to existing facilities.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Advisory Committee for IYDP, A/36/471/Add.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8), 4/8, 6 May.

#### Financing of human settlements

Acting on a 1980 decision of the Commission,<sup>(4)</sup> the UNCHS Executive Director convened from 19 to 23 January 1981 at Nairobi, Kenya, an Ad Hoc Group of Experts on Ways and Means of Establishing or Strengthening Financial Institutions for Human Settlements Financing and Investment, focusing on the need for settlements infrastructure and services.

The 33 recommendations of the Group, presented to the Commission in January in a report of the Executive Director,<sup>(1)</sup> covered such questions as the need to re-examine and reform relations between different government levels, the problem of effective revenue administration at the local government level and the increased use by local authorities of benefit or user charges.

The Group recommended that consideration be given to the establishment of new specialized financial intermediaries or, preferably, to the extension of the activities and operations of existing development financing institutions. In order to encourage those institutions to extend their operations, it recommended that UNCHS CO-

operate with the World Federation of Development Financing Institutions, as well as with the regional associations of such institutions. Stating that there was a lack of information and knowledge about existing financial intermediaries specializing in the provision of human settlements infrastructure and services, the Group recommended that UNCHS assist in the review of experiences and in the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge.

Endorsing the recommendations, the Commission, on 6 May,<sup>(3)</sup> requested the Executive Director: to develop proposals, in conjunction with the World Bank, the regional development banks and the World Federation of Development Financing Institutions, to acquire and disseminate information about existing financial institutions in developing countries specializing in providing human settlements infrastructure and services; to co-operate with such institutions in order to encourage developing countries in financing human settlements projects, particularly for lower-income groups; to formulate proposals aimed at encouraging mobilization of additional financial resources in developing countries for urban services and more efficient management of services in urban areas; and to promote studies on solutions to problems in the area of financing posed by inflation.

By a resolution of the same date,<sup>(2)</sup> the Commission requested the Executive Director to conduct a feasibility study, in conjunction with the Asian Development Bank, on the creation of an Asian bank dealing with human settlements, as recommended by the 1979 Regional Conference on Human Settlements Finance and Management for Asia and the Pacific, held at Manila, Philippines. It called on regional and international funding agencies to assist in the study.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Executive Director, HS/C/4/8.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8), 4/14, 6 May. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements, 4/20, 6 May.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 736.

#### Construction industry

The UNCHS Executive Director, in a report to the Commission on Human Settlements on the role and contribution of the construction industry in human settlements programmes and national economic and social development,<sup>(1)</sup> examined the role played by the construction sector in the attainment of economic growth and a more equitable distribution of the benefits of such growth. The report analysed some major problems confronting the industry in developing countries and identified factors impeding the ability of Governments to manage the industry in such a way as to ensure that it contributed to national develop-

ment goals. Suggestions were made as to the kind of action Governments might take and the kind of support UNCHS might be able to give to Member States.

Effective action to ensure the development of a soundly based construction industry, the report concluded, could be taken by Governments through legislation and planning controls, as well as through their involvement as client, designer, supervisor and/or producer in the construction process itself.

With regard to international action, the report suggested that UNCHS engage in a series of demonstration and pilot projects designed to adopt, test and demonstrate improved design concepts, technologies and products; that it support the promotion, development and use of local building materials; that it expand and improve training opportunities in the construction sector; and that it assist Governments in the analysis of problems and in the identification of construction elements in national plans.

After reviewing the report, the Commission, by a resolution of 6 May 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> requested the Executive Director to pay special attention to specific issues affecting the indigenous construction sector in developing countries and to provide assistance in the form of training and pilot projects. It recommended that he convene a meeting of an ad hoc group of experts to examine ways of developing that sector.

The Commission urged Governments to give high priority to construction investment and recommended that they formulate policies to develop indigenous resources in terms of technology, labour and building materials. It recommended that priority be given at the national level to the co-ordination of information, research and training, mobilization of resources, the involvement of local professionals and the creation of agencies for the evaluation of research projects in building materials.

In accordance with the resolution, an Ad Hoc Expert Group Meeting on the Development of the Indigenous Construction Sector met at Nairobi from 23 to 30 November.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Group suggested that Governments reformulate policies for the integrated promotion and development of the indigenous construction sector, with emphasis on the informal (non-governmental) sector. It called for developing a sense of partnership between the private and public sectors in the use of domestic construction resources, through such measures as mobilizing finance, upgrading worker and management skills, and increasing production of building materials. Technical support could be expanded to include training for trades and management, financial aid for research and development.

formulation of procedures for evaluating cost effectiveness and efficiency, and standardization of building methods. The Group suggested ways of minimizing environmental degradation and conserving energy, as well as guidelines for administrative and institutional structures to improve construction efficiency. It made recommendations on generating employment opportunities by emphasizing labour-intensive construction methods.

Regarding the role of international organizations, the Group recommended that they assist finance, technology and manpower development. In particular, it suggested low interest financing, assisting Governments in formulating projects and policies, expanding information services, promoting training and mobilizing non-governmental organizations to work with local communities. The Group suggested projects for designing low-technology shelter and infrastructure for water supply and sanitation in slums and squatter areas, providing small production units for walling and roofing materials using indigenous resources, establishing small and accessible distribution centres for building materials, and introducing simply equipped prototype workshops.

During the debate on human settlements in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, Canada expressed agreement with the Commission on the importance of the construction industry's contribution to providing infrastructure in slums, squatter areas and rural settlements. The importance of the Commission action on construction in human settlements programmes was underlined by Finland, speaking for the Nordic countries, and by Jamaica and Kenya. The USSR emphasized the importance of helping developing countries expand their construction industries on the basis of their own material and financial resources, under comprehensive State housing programmes.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Executive Director, HS/C/4/3; <sup>(2)</sup>Expert Group Meeting, HS/C/5/INF.9.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8), 4/13, 6 May.

#### Improvement of slums and rural settlements

The UNCHS Executive Director submitted to the 1981 session of the Commission a medium-term work programme on the provision of infrastructure in slums and squatter areas and in rural settlements, with emphasis on water supply, sanitation, surface drainage and solid-waste disposal. The report<sup>(2)</sup> provided an overview of the extent of the infrastructure problem, stating that about 1.3 billion people, mainly in urban slums and squatter areas and rural settlements, were still without adequate water-supply

services, and almost 1.7 billion lacked adequate sanitation. The report also described current national and international policies, particularly with regard to water supply and sanitation, and outlined unresolved issues.

Recommendations were made for national action and for activities of UNCHS. On the national level, the report recommended that user charges be applied for public utilities in urban areas, with the resulting revenue made available for infrastructure development in low-income settlements, and that national policies on the upgrading of low-income communities be established and programmes for upgrading low-income settlements be expanded. With regard to the Centre's work programmes for 1982-1983 and for 1984-1989 (annexed to the report), it was recommended that the Centre assist national authorities in: provision and analysis of data; project evaluation; transfer of information; production of visual aids and training materials; organization of seminars and workshops; and involvement in demonstration projects.

Commending the Executive Director on his efforts to formulate a work programme, the Commission decided on 6 May 1981<sup>(1)</sup> to request him: to continue the Centre's work on research and development in this field; to co-operate with other United Nations agencies in contributing to the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade (1981-1990) (p. 684); to consider other aspects of infrastructure such as roads, transportation and energy supplies in the context of community development, with the participation of the informal sector; to promote the evaluation and development of appropriate materials, equipment, techniques and training manuals; and to communicate information to developing countries.

An Ad Hoc Expert Group Meeting on Appropriate Infrastructure Services, Standards and Technologies for Upgrading Slums and Squatter Areas and Rural Settlements (Nairobi, 2-9 November) emphasized the importance of training and information exchange and recommended that this should be reflected in the work programmes of both UNCHS and the United Nations Environment Programme. The report of the Meeting<sup>(3)</sup> identified and assessed available technologies, source levels and standards that had been found effective in promoting the provision of adequate infrastructure.

Speaking during the debate on human settlements in the Assembly's Second Committee, Kenya said the Commission's decision deserved special attention, and Nepal expressed support of the Centre's activities in improving infrastructure in such areas as water supply, sanitation, surface drainage and solid-waste disposal.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8), 4/16, 6 May.  
Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Executive Director, HS/C/4/4; <sup>(3)</sup>Expert Group Meeting, HS/C/5/INF.4.

#### Special assistance

The Commission adopted on 6 May 1981 three resolutions requesting special assistance for Dominica, the Palestinian people and African national liberation movements.

Noting that three hurricanes had caused extensive damage to Dominica in 1979 and 1980, the Commission requested the UNCHS Executive Director to explore the possibility of extending assistance to replace damaged human settlements there, to consult with other United Nations organizations on such assistance (p. 525) and to report on his efforts in 1982.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Commission requested the Executive Director to continue his efforts to implement General Assembly resolutions on assistance to the Palestinian people (p. 273), in particular the request that United Nations organizations consult with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) on implementing concrete projects to ensure improvement of the economic and social conditions of the Palestinians, and urged the Assembly to deplore the occupying authorities in Palestine for setting up obstacles that hindered assistance to the Palestinians.

The Executive Director reported on 6 January 1981 to the Commission on assistance to the Palestinians in the field of human settlements.<sup>(1)</sup> Pending a response from PLO as to how UNCHS could best provide such assistance, a number of possible activities had been explored in co-operation with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The occupying authorities had specifically required that UNDP execute projects itself rather than utilize any executing agencies; they had approved a project related to training in housing to be implemented by UNDP but, by the end of 1981, had not approved a second proposed project. Two more projects had not been submitted to the UNDP Governing Council because of the overall financial limitations of the UNDP programme of assistance to the Palestinian people.

By the third resolution,<sup>(4)</sup> the Commission called for assistance to victims of apartheid (p. 208) and colonialism (p. 1098). Commending the Executive Director for assistance provided to national liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, the Commission requested him to intensify human settlements training assistance to those movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in order to make apartheid victims self-reliant and to help them improve their living conditions, to

provide more assistance to those countries where human settlements had been disrupted by the Pretoria regime and to report in 1982. The Commission commended the OAU members and all other members of the international community for their support for the struggle against apartheid and colonialism, and strongly condemned the Pretoria régime for its repression in South Africa (p. 195) and its illegal occupation of Namibia (p. 1128), as well as its acts of aggression against the front-line States (p. 214).

During the debate on human settlements in the Assembly's Second Committee, Hungary stated that the Commission had greatly contributed towards resolving the problems of the Palestinians.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Executive Director, HS/C/4/2/Add.4.  
Resolutions: Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8), 6 May: <sup>(2)</sup>4/3, <sup>(4)</sup>4/7, <sup>(4)</sup>4/12.

#### Co-ordination in the UN system

##### Regional activities

The Commission on Human Settlements adopted several resolutions on 6 May 1981 on regional activities in the field of human settlements.

Following up a 1980 resolution,<sup>(5)</sup> the Commission urged UNCHS and the regional commissions to continue to strengthen their co-operation through the establishment of joint units. It urged the commissions to improve regional and subregional collaboration by promoting technical co-operation among developing countries and to make sufficient resources available for that purpose. It requested UNCHS to improve co-ordination with other United Nations agencies and to ensure more effective action at the regional level, and asked the Executive Director to report in 1982 on the implementation of the resolution.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Commission requested that the Executive Director ensure prompt utilization of the resources allocated to the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and the other regional commissions,<sup>(3)</sup> and urged UNCHS and ECA to continue to strengthen their relationship through periodic discussions on programme co-ordination and exchanges of information on all regional and sub-regional human settlements activities in Africa<sup>(1)</sup>

The Commission requested the UNCHS Executive Director and the ECA Executive Secretary to harmonize their work programmes and priorities with regard to manpower, training, public participation at the grass-roots level, financing, energy requirements and conservation in human settlements, services and assistance in research relating to human settlements (p. 630).<sup>(4)</sup>

During the debate in the Assembly's Second Committee, Hungary called for strengthened relations between the regional commissions and UNCHS; as an example, it said, the Economic Commission for Europe had launched several joint projects from which countries in other regions might also benefit.

Resolution: Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8), 6 May: <sup>(1)</sup>4/4; <sup>(2)</sup>4/5; <sup>(3)</sup>4/6, para. 2; 416, para. 6.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 736.

#### Co-operation with UNEP

By a resolution of 6 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission requested the UNCHS Executive Director, in consultation with the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), to study ways of strengthening their co-operation to make it more effective (p. 842). It requested them to review the demands placed on their staff and budgetary resources in the preparation and servicing of joint bureau meetings and to report to the Commission on the results in 1982.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Settlements (report, A/36/8), 4/11, 6 May.

## Chapter XVIII

### Human rights

United Nations bodies continued during 1981 to investigate situations involving violations of human rights in several parts of the world, to develop international standards, and to pursue other means of promoting and protection fundamental rights and freedoms.

A highlight of the year was the proclamation by the General Assembly in November of a Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of

Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief.<sup>(39)</sup> The Declaration, based on a text prepared by the Commission on Human Rights and recommended by the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(20)</sup> enumerated nine freedoms included in the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief.

The Commission adopted 41 resolutions and 12 decisions at its thirty-seventh session, held at

Geneva from 2 February to 13 March.<sup>(1)</sup> Its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities met for its thirty-fourth session from 17 August to 11 September, also at Geneva, where it adopted 22 resolutions and 5 decisions.<sup>(6)</sup> The work of the Commission was reviewed in May by the Economic and Social Council, which adopted 11 resolutions on the subject. The General Assembly adopted 32 resolutions on various human rights questions in October, November and December.

The Assembly and the Commission reviewed activities during the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (1973-1983). The Commission urged States to create social and other conditions which would exclude the emergence of all forms of racial discrimination. The Assembly, acting in October 1981<sup>(31)</sup> on a proposal of the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(18)</sup> recommended a number of steps to eliminate apartheid and other forms of racial discrimination, including action by States to outlaw organizations based on racial hatred and prejudice. The Council authorized the appointment of a Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, scheduled for 1983 (p. 868).

In 1981, three States became parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination,<sup>(27)</sup> which, as at 31 December, had been ratified or acceded to by 111 countries. The Assembly, in October,<sup>(34)</sup> requested additional States to adhere.

At two sessions in 1981, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) examined reports by 37 States parties on measures they had taken to give effect to the Convention.<sup>(2)</sup> In October, the Assembly again invited States parties to furnish CERD with information and requested it to explore the possibility of preparing a study of measures to ensure economic, social and cultural rights to certain racial groups.<sup>(35)</sup>

Both the Commission on Human Rights, in February, and the General Assembly, in December,<sup>(57)</sup> condemned and urged action against all totalitarian or other ideologies and practices, in particular Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist ones, based on racial or ethnic exclusiveness or intolerance, hatred, terror and systematic denial of human rights. Suggestions for action by the mass media in the fight against racial discrimination were examined by the Secretary-General in a report<sup>(5)</sup> to the Assembly (p. 878).

The Commission continued work on a draft declaration on the rights of persons belonging to national, ethnic, religious and linguistic minori-

ties (p. 883). The Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities considered the first part of a study on indigenous populations, to be completed in 1982, and requested authorization to establish an annual working group on this topic (p. 883). A Latin American seminar on protection of victims of racial discrimination, with particular reference to indigenous populations,<sup>(7)</sup> was held at Managua, Nicaragua, in December (p. 878).

A Working Group of the General Assembly met twice in 1981, in May and in October/November, to continue drafting a convention to protect the rights of migrant workers and their families. The Economic and Social Council decided to monitor in 1982 the status of work on this topic.<sup>(19)</sup> After considering the Working Group's report,<sup>(12)</sup> the Assembly decided in December that the Group should meet again in 1982 to complete its task.<sup>(56)</sup> The Assembly also reaffirmed the Council's request<sup>(16)</sup> that funds be provided for studies on questions concerning migrant workers.

Another Assembly working group continued work on a draft declaration on the human rights of non-citizens. In December, the Assembly decided to establish a further working group for this purpose in 1982.<sup>(60)</sup> Discrimination in the administration of criminal justice remained under study in the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities (p. 889).

In 1981, four States became parties to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights<sup>(29)</sup> and two States adhered to its Optional Protocol; as at 31 December, 69 States had ratified or acceded to the Covenant and 27 States had become parties to the Protocol (p. 839). The Human Rights Committee, established to oversee implementation of the Covenant, held three sessions during 1981 to consider reports from 11 States parties on measures they had taken to give effect to civil and political rights.<sup>(4)</sup> For the first time, the Committee adopted general comments on implementation of the Covenant (p. 889).

In the context of its continuing consideration of the right of peoples to self-determination, the Commission on Human Rights again reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle for independence, territorial integrity and liberation from colonial or alien domination and foreign occupation, and demanded the release of all people imprisoned as a result of their struggle for self-determination. The Assembly made a similar reaffirmation in October,<sup>(32)</sup> and also called for the immediate cessation of foreign military intervention, aggression and occupation.<sup>(33)</sup>

Dealing with specific cases, the Commission reaffirmed its profound concern that the people



of Afghanistan continued to be denied their right to self-determination (p. 896) and, in a resolution endorsed by the Economic and Social Council, affirmed that the persistence of foreign occupation in Kampuchea was a violation of human rights and prevented the people from exercising their right to self-determination (p. 897). The Commission deplored the continued occupation of Western Sahara by Morocco, stating that it prevented the exercise of self-determination in that Territory (p. 898).

Several measures to protect the rights of prisoners and detained persons were under consideration in 1981. Arbitrary or summary executions were condemned by the Assembly in November.<sup>(37)</sup> The idea of a second optional protocol to the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the ultimate abolition of capital punishment, was again discussed in the Assembly, which, in November, invited further comments from States.<sup>(44)</sup>

Work on a draft Body of Principles to protect persons under any form of detention or imprisonment continued in a working group of the Assembly's Sixth (Legal) Committee. In December, the Assembly decided to have a similar group conclude consideration of the draft in 1982 (p. 900).

Additional articles of a draft convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment were provisionally adopted in January and March by a working group of the Commission on Human Rights. The Economic and Social Council authorized meetings of a similar group in 1982,<sup>(21)</sup> and the General Assembly, in November, requested the Commission to complete the draft in 1982 as a matter of high priority.<sup>(45)</sup> In December 1981,<sup>(51)</sup> the Assembly redesignated the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile as the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture, as recommended by the Council.<sup>(23)</sup>

Draft Principles of Medical Ethics relevant to the role of health personnel in the protection of imprisoned and detained persons against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment were considered by the Assembly, which decided in November to consider the draft again in 1982 with a view to adopting it.<sup>(46)</sup> The Economic and Social Council had recommended in May that the Assembly take measures to finalize the text in 1981.<sup>(17)</sup>

The protection of those detained on grounds of mental ill-health was again taken up by the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities and by the Assembly. The Sub-Commission requested the submission of a draft body of guidelines in 1982, while the Assembly, in November, requested the Commission on

Human Rights to continue consideration of the question with a view to submitting a report in 1983.<sup>(41)</sup>

Both the Economic and Social Council, in May,<sup>(26)</sup> and the Assembly, in December,<sup>(62)</sup> appealed for the release of the Palestinian Ziad Abu Eain, who was extradited in December to Israel after having been held in a United States prison for more than two years.

Enforced or involuntary disappearances of persons were again considered by the Commission on Human Rights, its Working Group on this subject, the Sub-Commission, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. Having received information on upwards of 11,000 cases, the Working Group transmitted it to the Governments concerned with a request for further information. The Commission, with the Council's authorization, extended the Group's mandate for another year. The Sub-Commission proposed further action by the Commission, including steps to publicize the problem. The extension of the Working Group's mandate was welcomed in December by the Assembly,<sup>(58)</sup> which also urged continuation of the tracing of missing persons in Cyprus.<sup>(59)</sup>

At the Commission's request, the Sub-Commission designated two of its members to study the question of conscientious objection to military service (p. 913). Work continued on a Sub-Commission study on the independence of the judicial system (p. 913).

On the recommendation of its Working Group on Slavery, which held its seventh session in August at Geneva,<sup>(14)</sup> the Sub-Commission proposed measures to obtain more information about slavery-like practices and to increase public awareness of the problem (p. 913). The Economic and Social Council requested an inquiry on traffic in persons and exploitation of the prostitution of others.<sup>(24)</sup>

During the year, five States became parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,<sup>(28)</sup> which had a total of 71 parties as at 31 December 1981 (p. 915). The Economic and Social Council's Sessional Working Group on implementation of the Covenant, at its third session in April,<sup>(13)</sup> considered reports from 22 States parties on what they had done to implement specific provisions. On the Group's recommendation, the Council decided on several aspects of future arrangements for the Group, including the organization of its work, its 1982 agenda and its membership (p. 917).

The Commission on Human Rights established a Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development, to submit proposals in 1982 for implementation of this right and for a draft international instrument

(p. 921). Following two sessions of the Group, in July and November/December, the Assembly, in December, declared that the right to development was an inalienable human right and requested the Commission to take measures to promote it. Also in December, the Assembly again invited States to consider adopting measures to ensure full implementation of the right to universal education.<sup>(52)</sup>

Another working group of the Commission continued an analysis of further action the United Nations system might take to promote and encourage human rights, including alternative approaches for improving their effective enjoyment. The Assembly, in December, requested the Commission to continue its analysis.<sup>(47)</sup>

Establishment of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, originally proposed in 1965, was discussed by several United Nations bodies. The Commission informed the Assembly that it had not reached a decision, while the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities expressed its conviction that the establishment of such a post would be highly valuable. The Assembly, in December, requested the Commission to consider the question with the attention it deserved and to report in 1982, so that the Assembly could decide what steps might be taken.<sup>(49)</sup>

With regard to the activities and status of the Sub-Commission, the Commission decided to allocate high priority to the annual consideration of the Sub-Commission's report (p. 932).

The Assembly, in November, again invited States to become parties to the International Covenants on Human Rights.<sup>(43)</sup> For the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in 1983, the Assembly, in December, suggested several national and international activities.<sup>(61)</sup>

Under the United Nations programme of advisory services in the field of human rights, an international seminar on human rights, peace and development was held and a training course for Asian and Pacific countries focused on human rights guarantees in the administration of criminal justice (p. 937). The Economic and Social Council approved the provision of advisory services and other assistance to help guarantee the enjoyment of human rights in the Central African Republic (p. 937), Equatorial Guinea<sup>(22)</sup> and Uganda (p. 939).

On the recommendation of the Commission on Human Rights, the Council decided to terminate the periodic reporting system on human rights established in 1965 (p. 940). The Commission requested the Secretary-General to continue to implement public information programmes in human rights (p. 940). In December, the Assem-

bly invited States to take steps to establish or strengthen national human rights institutions and to consider including human rights materials in their educational curriculum.<sup>(48)</sup> In connection with regional arrangements for human rights, the Assembly commended the Organization of African Unity on the adoption of an African Charter of Human and People's Rights, and authorized a United Nations seminar for the promotion and protection of human rights in the Asian region in 1982 at Colombo, Sri Lanka.<sup>(53)</sup>

Reports of violations of human rights in a number of countries and territories were considered by United Nations bodies during 1981.

South Africa's apartheid policies were the subject of several resolutions and reports. The Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on Southern Africa reported<sup>(15)</sup> on policies and practices violating human rights in South Africa and Namibia (p. 943). The mandate of the Working Group was renewed by the Economic and Social Council, on the recommendation of the Commission on Human Rights. The Commission requested Security Council consideration of mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa and suggested that the General Assembly refer to the International Court of Justice the question of whether a State pursuing apartheid might lawfully continue to hold a place in the international community. It also called for an end to all forms of assistance to South Africa (p. 945). The Economic and Social Council demanded recognition of the right of the black trade union movements to freedom of association and unimpeded collective bargaining.<sup>(25)</sup>

As at 31 December, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid<sup>(30)</sup> had been ratified or acceded to by 65 States, seven of which became parties during the year (p. 946). The Group of Three, set up to oversee implementation of the Convention, met in January to examine reports from 14 States parties.<sup>(3)</sup> In October, the General Assembly called for measures to prosecute and punish persons responsible for the crime of apartheid.<sup>(36)</sup>

The Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Chile, whose mandate was extended for another year by the Economic and Social Council, reported to the Assembly in November that it was not possible to report any improvement in the human rights situation in that country.<sup>(8)</sup> The Assembly, in December,<sup>(55)</sup> urged the Chilean authorities to put an end to a number of practices violating human rights.

The Commission and the Assembly condemned a series of Israeli policies and practices in the territories occupied since 1967 as a result of hostilities in the Middle East (p. 955). The Commission reaffirmed that Israel's settlement

policy violated the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and affirmed the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. The Assembly, in December, adopted seven resolutions on the situation in the occupied territories (p. 390), most of them dealing with human rights issues.

By decision of the Commission on Human Rights, approved by the Economic and Social Council, a Special Representative was appointed to investigate the human rights situation in El Salvador. After receiving in October an interim report of the Special Representative,<sup>(11)</sup> the Assembly, in December, requested the Salvadorian parties to arrive at a negotiated political solution in order to establish a democratically elected government, and reiterated its appeal to all States to abstain from intervening in the internal situation there.<sup>(54)</sup>

The Commission and the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue efforts to establish direct contacts with the Government of Guatemala on the human rights situation in that country (p. 963). A Special Envoy of the Commission reported in December on human rights in Bolivia (p. 957). The Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities urged the Secretary-General to continue efforts to persuade the Government of Iran to prevent further attacks on the Baha'i religious community and to grant them religious freedom (p. 965).

A Special Rapporteur of the Commission reported in December<sup>(10)</sup> on ways in which the international community could better cope with the human rights aspects of mass exoduses (p. 965). The taking of hostages was affirmed by the Commission as a grave human rights violation (p. 966). The Commission also deplored harsh and punitive treatment of individuals and groups as a result of their efforts to enjoy human rights (p. 966).

Working groups of the Commission and the Sub-Commission continued to deal on a confidential basis with communications from individuals and groups alleging denial or violation of human rights (p. 966).

As at 31 December, 20 States had become parties to one or both of the 1977 Protocols Additional to the 1949 Geneva Conventions concerning respect for human rights in armed conflicts, including two States which adhered during the year to Protocol I, on the protection of victims of international armed conflicts (p. 968). In December, the General Assembly decided to seek government views on a new proposal by Jordan for the promotion of a new international humanitarian order, encompassing human rights, disaster relief and development issues.<sup>(50)</sup>

The drafting of a convention on the rights of the child continued in a working group of the Commission on Human Rights, spurred by an Assembly request in November that the Commission give the highest priority to completion of the draft.<sup>(42)</sup> Suggestions to curb the exploitation of child labour were examined by the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities (p. 971). Following action by the Commission emphasizing the role of youth in the promotion and protection of human rights, the Assembly, in November, called for the adoption of measures for the implementation and enjoyment by youth of human rights, particularly the right to education and to work.<sup>(38)</sup>

The relations between human rights, peace and development were examined at a seminar in August 1981 (p. 973). Acting on recommendations in a study by the Sub-Commission's Special Rapporteur on the duties of the individual to the community and limitations of rights,<sup>(9)</sup> the Commission decided to consider in 1982 the setting of further standards in this field, and the Council endorsed the appointment of a Special Rapporteur for a study on the status of the individual and contemporary international law (p. 975). The importance of action to ensure the use of scientific and technological progress in the interests of peace and for the benefit of mankind was stressed by the Commission in March and by the Assembly in November.<sup>(40)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights, E/1981/25 & Corr.1 and Add.1; <sup>(2)</sup>CERD, A/36/18; <sup>(3)</sup>Group of Three, E/CN.4/1417; <sup>(4)</sup>Human Rights Committee, A/36.40; <sup>(5)</sup>Secretary-General, A/36/75; <sup>(6)</sup>SCDPDM, E/CN.4/1512; <sup>(7)</sup>Seminar on protection against racial discrimination, ST/HR/SER.A/11; <sup>(8)</sup>Special Rapporteur on human rights in Chile, A/36/594; <sup>(9)</sup>Special Rapporteur on individual's duties to community (E/CN.4, Sub.2, 432, Rev.2), Sales No. E.82.XIV.1; <sup>(10)</sup>Special Rapporteur on mass exoduses, E/CN.4/1503; <sup>(11)</sup>Special Representative on human rights in El Salvador, A/36/608; <sup>(12)</sup>Working Group on draft convention on protection of migrant workers, A/C.3/36/10; <sup>(13)</sup>Working Group on implementation of International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, E/1981/64; <sup>(14)</sup>Working Group on Slavery, E/CN.4/Sub.2/486 & Corr.1; <sup>(15)</sup>Working Group on Southern Africa, E/CN.4/1429 & Corr.1.

Resolution:

Economic and Social Council: <sup>(16)</sup>1981/21 (p. 887), <sup>(17)</sup>1981/27 (p. 903), <sup>(18)</sup>1981/30 (p. 866), 6 May; <sup>(19)</sup>1981/35 (p. 885), <sup>(20)</sup>1981/36 (p. 881), <sup>(21)</sup>1981/37 (p. 902), <sup>(22)</sup>1981/38 (p. 939), <sup>(23)</sup>1981/39 (p. 905), <sup>(24)</sup>1981/40 (p. 915), <sup>(25)</sup>1981/41 (p. 950), <sup>(26)</sup>1981/41 (p. 910), 8 May.

General Assembly: <sup>(27)</sup>2106 A (XX), annex, 21 Dec. 1965 (YUN 1965, p. 440); <sup>(28)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 419); <sup>(29)</sup>ibid. (p. 423); <sup>(30)</sup>3068 (XXVIII), annex, 30 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 103), <sup>(31)</sup>36/8 (p. 867), <sup>(32)</sup>36/9 (p. 894), <sup>(33)</sup>36/10 (p. 896), <sup>(34)</sup>36/11 (p. 874), <sup>(35)</sup>36/12 (p. 873), <sup>(36)</sup>36/13 (p. 948), 28 Oct. 1981; <sup>(37)</sup>36/22, 9 Nov. (p. 899); <sup>(38)</sup>36/29, 13 Nov. (p. 973); <sup>(39)</sup>36/55 (p. 881), <sup>(40)</sup>36/56 A (p. 977), <sup>(41)</sup>36/56 B (p. 907), <sup>(42)</sup>36/57 (p. 970), <sup>(43)</sup>36/

58 (p. 934).<sup>(44)</sup>36/59 (p. 900).<sup>(45)</sup>36/60 (p. 902).<sup>(46)</sup>36/61 (p. 904). 25 Nov.;<sup>(47)</sup>36/133 (p. 928).<sup>(48)</sup>36/134 (p. 941).<sup>(49)</sup>36/135 (p. 932).<sup>(50)</sup>36/136 (p. 969). 14 Dec.;<sup>(51)</sup>36/151 (p. 906).<sup>(52)</sup>36/152 (p. 925).<sup>(53)</sup>36/154 (p. 942).<sup>(54)</sup>36/155 (p. 962).<sup>(55)</sup>36/157 (p. 954).<sup>(56)</sup>36/160 (p. 886).<sup>(57)</sup>36/162 (p. 876).<sup>(58)</sup>36/163 (p. 913).<sup>(59)</sup>36/164 (p. 346).<sup>(60)</sup>36/165 (p. 888).<sup>(61)</sup>36/169 (p. 935).<sup>(62)</sup>36/171 (p. 910). 16 Dec.

Publications: Yearbook on Human Rights for 1975-1976, Sales No. E.80.XIV.1; 1977-1978, Sales No. E.81.XIV.1.

## Action against discrimination

### Elimination of racial discrimination

Decade for Action to Combat  
Racism and Racial Discrimination

Implementation of the Programme for the Decade

The Commission on Human Rights, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly continued in 1981 to follow action taken in implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, launched by the Assembly in 1973.<sup>(6)</sup> Work began in preparation for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, scheduled for 1983 (p. 868).

As called for in the Programme, the Secretary-General submitted two reports on activities relating to the Decade. His annual report to the Economic and Social Council on this topic<sup>(3)</sup> summarized actions, suggestions and trends emerging from the work of United Nations bodies, specialized agencies and regional inter-governmental organizations through mid-March, and transmitted information on activities by non-governmental organizations (NGOs). A report to the Assembly in September contained information on legislative, administrative and other measures taken by two Governments- Bulgaria and Greece-and on the activities of one NGO.<sup>(2)</sup>

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.** By a resolution of 23 February 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights urged States to create social and other conditions which would exclude the emergence of all forms of racial discrimination, or to combat them where they existed. States were invited to establish adequate, efficient and easily accessible recourse procedures for victims of racial discrimination, and to ensure that complaints of racial discrimination were dealt with expeditiously and that victims received full and immediate compensation. The Commission recommended that States adopt measures to ensure the widest possible dissemination of information and teaching designed

to suppress human rights violations and racial discrimination. International organizations and United Nations organs and bodies were requested to intensify activities aimed at teaching and publicizing material on racial discrimination and apartheid.

The resolution was adopted by 32 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

In co-operation with the Special Committee against Apartheid and the Commission, the United Nations Division of Human Rights organized a Seminar on Effective Measures to Prevent Transnational Corporations and Other Established Interests from Collaborating with the Racist Régime of South Africa (Geneya, 29 June-3 July) (p. 188).

**CERD ACTIVITIES.** In April and August, CERD (p. 871) reviewed activities relating to the Decade, including its own participation in seminars and other events.<sup>(1)</sup> It was invited to participate as an observer in the work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and, as a contribution to the Conference, it designated two of its members to prepare studies (p. 870).

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** On 6 May, the Economic and Social Council, by a recorded vote of 42 to 10, adopted a 19-nation resolution on the Programme for the Decade.<sup>(5)</sup> It contained a draft resolution for action by the General Assembly, proposing a number of measures against racial discrimination (p. 865).

Explaining the negative votes of the European Community (EC) members, the United Kingdom said the draft contained elements which were not acceptable in the context of the Decade, such as its provisions on the Middle East situation; also, the text made no reference to the role of negotiation and international pressure in solving the problems of southern Africa, and its endorsement of armed struggle was unacceptable.

Israel said that some of the accusations made and actions recommended in the resolution were part of an anti-Israel campaign motivated by racial prejudice and political animosity; it was nonsense to seek to portray Israel's policies or practices as racial discrimination. Recalling that it had refused to endorse the Decade, the United States did not participate in the vote.

Argentina, though voting in favour, said it would have abstained on paragraph 3, reaffirming support for the national liberation struggle, because it believed that resolutions promoting armed struggle were incompatible with United Nations purposes. Chile said it would have abstained on paragraph 8, on the ground that the competence to impose sanctions lay with the Security Council. Ireland could not accept the

manner in which the resolution assimilated the situations in the Middle East and southern Africa. Mexico explained that it would have abstained on paragraph 2, condemning racism in southern Africa, all occupied Arab territories and elsewhere, and on paragraph 10, singling out countries in regard to collaboration with South Africa.

Reservations on the reference to armed struggle were voiced by the Bahamas, Ecuador and Fiji, which voted for the resolution as a whole. The Bahamas, Chile, Fiji and Spain also had reservations on the singling out of certain States.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. Based on the text recommended by the Council, the General Assembly adopted on 28 October a resolution<sup>(8)</sup> inviting Member States and organizations to expand activities in support of the Programme for the Decade. The Assembly strongly condemned apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa, occupied Arab territories and elsewhere, including denial of the right to self-determination; and reaffirmed its support for the national liberation struggle against racial discrimination, apartheid, colonialism and foreign domination and for self-determination by all available means, including armed struggle. It called on States to declare punishable by law any dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred, and to outlaw organizations based on racial hatred and prejudice, including neo-Nazi and Fascist organizations. The Assembly noted progress on preparatory work for the Conference against racial discrimination (p. 868) and decided on the dates and place of Preparatory Sub-Committee sessions (p. 869).

With reference to southern Africa, the Assembly reaffirmed the right of Namibia to self-determination and independence (p. 1145), vigorously condemned South African aggression against neighbouring States (p. 215), requested the Security Council urgently to consider the imposition of full mandatory sanctions against South Africa (p. 168), approved the Declaration adopted in April by the International Seminar on the Implementation and Reinforcement of the Arms Embargo against South Africa (p. 173), and vigorously condemned collaboration with South Africa by certain Western countries, Israel and other States and by transnational corporations and other organizations (p. 180). It also asked for continued efforts to protect the rights of migrant workers and their families (p. 884).

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 121 to 19, with 6 abstentions, following its approval by the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee on 15 October by 110 votes to 19, with 4 abstentions. Paragraph 12,

calling for measures declaring punishable the dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority, was adopted by 116 votes to none, with 25 abstentions. The text incorporated an oral amendment by Algeria, sub-amended by Morocco, affecting a preambular paragraph on migrant workers.

In another resolution of 28 October, on the self-determination of peoples, the Assembly called for maximizing all forms of assistance by States and organizations to victims of racial discrimination and apartheid through recognized national liberation movements.<sup>(9)</sup>

Explaining the votes of the Nordic States against the resolution on the Decade, Sweden said that, despite their advocacy of the elimination of racial discrimination, racism and all ideologies based thereon, they were unable to accept provisions referring to armed struggle and the arbitrary accusations against certain countries. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, reaffirmed the reservations expressed in the Economic and Social Council (p. 864).

The United States announced that it would not participate in the vote on the ground that, although it fully supported the original objectives of the Decade, it could not agree that the concept of racism should be extended to include Zionism, as the Assembly had done in 1975.<sup>(7)</sup>

Among those abstaining in the vote, Japan said the text contained provisions on which it had serious reservations. Spain objected to what it called the unnecessary violence of some of the expressions used and the unjustifiable accusations against a group of countries with a well-established tradition of action against racism. Portugal abstained on the ground that the text introduced elements not relevant to the objectives originally defined for the Decade.

Though voting in favour, several States, including Chile, the Dominican Republic, Fiji, Turkey and Zaire, expressed reservations on the selective condemnation of specific countries. Argentina, Chile and the Dominican Republic objected to the support expressed for armed struggle. Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland reserved their position on the imposition of sanctions.

The Ivory Coast thought the resolution should have included a paragraph requesting States with the right of veto in the Security Council to use it with moderation in cases where sanctions against States practising racial discrimination were being considered. Kuwait expressed a reservation on the provision concerning migrant workers. Uruguay reiterated its reservations made in 1978 with regard to the Declaration and the Programme of Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination<sup>(10)</sup>

(mentioned in the resolution's preamble); it also voiced reservations on the condemnation of collaboration with South Africa by certain States and the request to the Security Council to impose sanctions.

During the Third Committee's debate on racial discrimination, Bulgaria said that racial discrimination, closely linked with social discrimination, was still a part of capitalist society. The Byelorussian SSR described racial discrimination as a direct result of capitalism and said it was being used to exploit workers and arouse hostility between groups. Czechoslovakia stated that countries where racism was rife could prevent discrimination by legislation and information. Poland made the point that equality of rights was an empty slogan for some Governments and their repudiation of that principle was tolerated by what was called the world's humanitarian majority. In the view of the Ukrainian SSR, the problem of eliminating racial discrimination was not limited to apartheid; racism existed wherever imperialism ruled and vestiges of imperialism remained. The USSR considered that the proclamation of the Decade and the measures contained in its Programme had mobilized world public opinion against racism and had been partly responsible for the fact that many peoples had thrown off the colonial yoke.

Indonesia said former colonial Powers had maintained racial discrimination in some countries to further their interests, and in some newly independent countries racial minorities continued to control vital sectors. Iraq said it would boycott all organizations practising racial discrimination and would demand stronger measures against organizations co-operating with them. Japan saw the need for a sober and objective evaluation of international, regional and national activities aimed at eliminating racial discrimination, so that further measures could be elaborated. New Zealand observed that, since situations caused by racial prejudice were often the result of actions by people who lacked understanding of the nature of prejudice, the United Nations should explore ways of educating Governments and peoples about the dangers of racial discrimination and should seek better ways of overcoming them. Viet Nam said racial discrimination often occurred in the heart of allegedly civilized States which posed as the champions of human rights.

Morocco remarked that a second decade against racial discrimination might be needed in view of the failure to achieve the objectives of the current Decade, owing mainly to lack of more decisive financial measures. The United Republic of Tanzania said that efforts to implement the Programme of Action were being made

by countries in which racial discrimination was almost non-existent, while the architects and practitioners of discrimination either were silent or gave a vague picture of their activities.

Nicaragua saw a need for international machinery to enable States to eliminate all types of discriminatory actions, especially through education of youth and widespread teaching of human rights. Teaching youth about the horrors of racism was necessary, said Trinidad and Tobago, in view of the emergence of several reactionary organizations devoted to the spread of racist doctrines.

France said it was not enough for a State's constitution to prohibit discriminatory practices; all countries should adopt comprehensive anti-racist laws, as France had done. Greece thought the United Nations should be credited with having created an awareness of the true size of the problem of racial discrimination. The United States said the United Nations should deal even-handedly with all forms of discrimination, wherever they occurred; in addition, inquiry into racial discrimination should focus not merely on a country's ideology and laws but also on whether the laws were enforced.

India and Yugoslavia were among those which regarded implementation of the Programme for the Decade as unsatisfactory. A number of States urged additional action against apartheid in South Africa and described steps they were taking to ensure that nothing was done to encourage that policy.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>CERD, A/36/18; S-G, (2)A/36/515, <sup>(3)</sup>E/1981/15 & Add.1, 2.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 7(XXXVII), 23 Feb. <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/30, 6 May, text following. GA: <sup>(6)</sup>3057(XXVIII) & annex, 2 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 523); <sup>(7)</sup>3379(XXX), 10 Nov. 1975 (YUN 1975, p. 599); <sup>(8)</sup>36/8, 28 Oct. 1981, text following; <sup>(9)</sup>36/9 para. 15, 28 Oct. (p. 895).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(10)</sup>978, p. 666.

Financial implications: S-G statement, E/1981/L.32.

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR.5-7, 11, 14 (16 Apr.-6 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.4-14, 18, 20, 22 (25 Sep.-16 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.42 (28 Oct.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/30

42-10 (recorded vote) Meeting 14 6 May 1981

19-nation draft (E/1961/L.16); agenda item 2.

Sponsors: Algeria, Barbados, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cuba, Cyprus, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sudan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 3057(XXVIII) of 2 November 1973, in which the Assembly proclaimed the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and approved the Programme for the Decade,

Recalling also the other-relevant General Assembly resolutions, particularly resolution 34/24 of 15 November 1979, in

## Human rights

which the Assembly adopted the four-year programme of activities designed to accelerate progress in the Implementation of the Programme for the Decade,

Bearing in mind General Assembly resolution 35/33 of 14 November 1980, in which the Assembly decided to hold in 1983, as an important event of the Decade, a second world conference to combat racism and racial discrimination and invited the Economic and Social Council to begin the preparatory work for the conference at its first regular session of 1981,

Convinced that effective implementation of the Programme for the Decade will help to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin,

Recalling its resolution 1980/7 of 24 April 1980,

1. Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the Secretary-General submitted in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3057(XXVIII);

2. Recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution:

[Text as in General Assembly resolution 36/8 below, except for the fifteenth preambular paragraph.]

"Aware of the need to promote solutions to the problems of discrimination facing migrant workers and their families,

Recorded vote in Economic and Social Council as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Chile, China, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, USSR, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Ireland, Italy, Norway, United Kingdom.

General Assembly resolution 36/8

121-19-6 (recorded vote) Meeting 42 28 October 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/38/621) by vote (110-19-4). 15 October (meeting 20); draft recommended by Economic and Social Council (resolution 1981/30). orally amended by Algeria and sub-amended by Morocco; agenda item 74.

Implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming its resolve to bring about the total and unconditional eradication of racism, racial discrimination and apartheid, which still represent serious obstacles to further progress and to the Strengthening of international peace and security.

Recalling that, in its resolution 3057(XXVIII) of 2 November 1973 and in the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination annexed thereto, and in other relevant resolutions, it called upon all peoples, Governments and institutions to continue their efforts to eradicate racism, racial discrimination and apartheid and thus to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin.

Taking into account the Declaration and the Programme of Action adopted by the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination,

Recalling that in the programme of activities to be undertaken during the second half of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, contained in the annex to its resolution 34/24 of 15 November 1979, it called upon all States, United Nations organs and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to intensify their efforts to achieve the speediest attainment of the objectives of the Decade, aimed at the complete and final elimination of all forms of racism and racial discrimination.

Bearing in mind the resounding victory of the people of Zimbabwe, achieved as a result of the struggle which it waged for

the reconquest of its sovereignty and independence against the racist colonial régime that was oppressing it,

Expressing its serious concern, however, at the situation prevailing in South Africa and throughout southern Africa as a result of the policies and actions of the apartheid régime, particularly its efforts to perpetuate and strengthen racist domination of the country, its policy of "bantustanization", its brutal repression of opponents of apartheid and its renewed acts of aggression against neighbouring States,

Reaffirming that apartheid is a crime against humanity,

Particularly concerned at the persistence of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist minority régime of South Africa,

Disappointed that the talks between the United Nations and the South African racist and illegal occupation régime aimed at reaching a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia have thus far failed because of the bad faith of that régime.

Reaffirming that any collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa constitutes a hostile act against the oppressed people of South Africa and a contemptuous defiance of the United Nations and the International community,

Considering that such collaboration strengthens the racist régime, encourages it to persist in its repressive and aggressive policy and seriously aggravates the situation in southern Africa, thus constituting a threat to international peace and security,

Seriously concerned at the fact that the principal Western and other trading partners of South Africa are continuing to collaborate with the racist régime and that their collaboration constitutes the main obstacle to the abolition of that régime and the elimination of the inhuman and criminal system of apartheid.

Alarmed at the persistent collaboration of certain Western States and Israel with the racist régime of South Africa in nuclear matters.

Aware of the constant need to mobilize public opinion against any political, military, economic and other assistance granted to the racist régime of South Africa.

Aware of the need to promote solutions to the problems of discrimination facing migrant workers and their families, wherever such problems exist,

Recalling its resolution 35/33 of 14 November 1980, in which it decided to hold in 1983 a Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which, while reviewing and assessing the activities undertaken during the Decade, should have as its main purpose the formulation of ways and means and of specific measures aimed at ensuring the full and universal implementation of United Nations resolutions and decisions on racism, racial discrimination and apartheid,

Stressing the importance of attaining the objectives of the Decade,

Convinced that the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination will make a useful and constructive contribution to the attainment of those objectives,

1. Proclaims that the elimination of all forms of racism and of discrimination based on race and the attainment of the objectives of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and of the programme of activities to be undertaken during the second half of the Decade are matters of high priority for the international community and, therefore, for the United Nations;

2. Strongly condemns the policies of apartheid, racism and racial discrimination pursued in southern Africa, all occupied Arab territories and elsewhere, including the denial of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence;

3. Reaffirms its strong support for the national liberation struggle against racism, racial discrimination, apartheid, colonialism and foreign domination and for self-determination by all available means, including armed struggle;

4. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence;

5. Vigorously condemns the repeated acts of aggression committed by South Africa against neighbouring States.

particularly against Angola, Botswana, Mozambique and Zambia;

6. Expresses its profound solidarity with the front-line States that are victims of the racist aggression and destabilization attempts of the Pretoria régime;

7. Once again invites all Member States, United Nations organs, specialized agencies, intergovernmental organizations, national liberation movements, anti-apartheid and anti-racist organizations and other solidarity groups to strengthen and enlarge the scope of their activities in support of the objectives of the Programme for the Decade;

6. Again requests the Security Council to consider, as a matter of urgency, the imposition of full mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations against the racist régime of South Africa, including, in particular, an embargo on the delivery of oil and oil products to South Africa and the strengthening of the embargo on arms, with a view to putting an end to all military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa;

9. Approves the Declaration of the International Seminar on the Implementation and Reinforcement of the Arms Embargo against South Africa, held in London from 1 to 3 April 1981 under the sponsorship of the Special Committee against Apartheid;

10. Vigorously condemns the collaboration of certain Western countries, Israel and other States and of transnational corporations and other organizations which are maintaining or continuing to increase their collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa, particularly in the political, economic, military and nuclear fields, thereby encouraging that régime to persist in its inhuman and criminal policy of brutal oppression of the peoples of southern Africa and in its denial of human rights;

11. Calls once again upon all Governments which have not yet done so to take legislative, administrative and other measures in respect of their nationals and the bodies corporate under their jurisdiction that own enterprises in southern Africa in order to put an end to such enterprises;

12. Calls upon all States to adopt, as a matter of high priority, measures declaring punishable by law any dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred and outlawing organizations based on racial hatred and prejudice, including neo-Nazi and Fascist organizations and private clubs and institutions established on the basis of racial criteria or propagating ideas of racial discrimination and apartheid;

13. Invites Member States, the organs and bodies of the United Nations system and the specialized agencies to continue their efforts with a view to the protection of the rights of all migrant workers and their families;

14. Takes note of the progress made by the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1981 in connection with the preparatory work for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination;

15. Decides that the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, established by the President of the Economic and Social Council in accordance with Council decision 1981/130 of 6 May 1981, shall hold its first session in New York during the first quarter of 1982, for a period of two weeks, and shall report to the Council at its first regular session of 1982, the Council being the Preparatory Committee for the Conference;

16. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Preparatory Sub-Committee with all necessary assistance;

17. Further requests the Secretary-General to appoint in 1982, after consultation with the regional groups, a Secretary-General of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, who shall have the rank of Assistant Secretary-General and shall be responsible for the organization of the Conference and co-ordination with Member States, organs and bodies of the United Nations, specialized agencies and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations;

18. Invites Member States to continue to co-operate with the Secretary-General as part of the Programme for the Decade and the preparations for the Conference;

19. Invites the appropriate organs and bodies of the United Nations system to contribute to the preparations for the Conference;

20. Expresses its satisfaction to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the Special Committee against Apartheid, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Commission on Human Rights, through its Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on Southern Africa, for their contribution to the Implementation of the Programme for the Decade and invites them to include in their activities the preparations for the Conference;

21. Decides to consider at its thirty-seventh session the status of preparations for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination;

22. Decides to consider at its thirty-seventh session, as a matter of high priority, the item entitled "Implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination".

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom.

Abstaining: Dominican Republic,<sup>a</sup> Guatemala, Japan, Malawi, Portugal, Spain.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to vote in favour.

#### Preparations for the Second World Conference

The Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly took further action in 1981 to prepare for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, scheduled for 1983. The main purpose of the Conference, decided on by the Assembly in November 1980, was to formulate ways and means and specific measures to ensure the full and universal implementation of United Nations decisions on racial discrimination and apartheid.<sup>(3)</sup>

After the Council decided in May 1981 to establish a Preparatory Sub-Committee (p. 869) the Assembly, in its resolution of 28 October on implementation of the Programme for the Decade,<sup>(1)</sup> took note of the Council's progress



and invited Member States to continue to co-operate with the Secretary-General in the preparations. It also invited the contribution of United Nations bodies, specifically CERD and those dealing with apartheid, Namibia, colonial countries, Palestinians and human rights. The Secretary-General was requested to appoint in 1982, after consultation with the regional groups of States, a Secretary-General of the Conference, with the rank of Assistant Secretary-General, who would be responsible for organization and co-ordination with States and organizations.

In a resolution of the same date<sup>(5)</sup> on the status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid,<sup>(2)</sup> the Assembly requested the Economic and Social Council, in preparing for the Conference, to give special attention to activities aimed at the eradication of apartheid.

In the Third Committee's debate on racial discrimination, Austria expressed the view that, by concentrating on procedures and activities to ensure the fullest possible implementation of international instruments and United Nations resolutions, the Conference could assess the results of the Decade and ensure the continuation of efforts to combat racism. Chile thought the Conference should consider the problems posed by colonialism and neo-colonialism, the treatment of ethnic minorities and the enslavement of entire peoples. The Congo and the German Democratic Republic said the Conference could contribute to the mobilization against racism and apartheid. Egypt spoke of the need to co-ordinate efforts and proposals by United Nations organs in connection with Conference preparations. Indonesia supported the plan to hold the Conference but observed that regional and subregional meetings attended by prominent figures and public leaders were no less important. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya called for maximum publicity for the Conference by information media.

New Zealand hoped the Conference would find a way to bring about changes in the social attitudes and practices which gave rise to racial discrimination and were to be found in varying degrees in every society. Denmark, speaking for the Nordic States, hoped preparations for the Conference would be based on the Decade's original aims, avoiding the divisive issues raised in recent years. Tunisia and Venezuela believed the Conference not only should review the Decade's activities but should formulate specific measures to ensure full and universal implementation of United Nations decisions on the subject. The United Arab Emirates hoped the Conference would give new impetus to the liberation

struggle of Africans and Palestinians. Yugoslavia thought the Conference should sum up the results of the Decade, analyse weaknesses and attempt to find ways of pursuing the struggle against racism.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>3057(XXVIII), annex, 2 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 524); <sup>(2)</sup>3068(XXVIII), annex, 30 Nov. 1973 (ibid., p. 103); <sup>(3)</sup>35/33, para. 18, 14 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 805); <sup>(4)</sup>36/8, 28 Oct. 1981 (p. 867); <sup>(5)</sup>36/13, para. 12, 28 Oct. (p. 949).

Establishment of the Preparatory Sub-Committee. On 6 May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Economic and Social Council authorized its President, in consultation with the regional groups of States, to appoint a geographically representative committee of 23 United Nations Member States that would act as the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference. The Sub-Committee would be concerned, in particular, with the Conference's provisional agenda, provisional rules of procedure, organization of work, date and place, cost, modalities of representation and documentation.

This decision was adopted by a recorded vote of 46 to none, with 7 abstentions. The text was introduced by Algeria on behalf of 15 sponsors.

Belgium said it had to abstain in the vote because the decision could not be considered separately from the resolution dealing with the substance of the Decade (p. 864), which Belgium had voted against. Also abstaining, the United Kingdom said that, although it associated itself with the intention of the European Community members to join in the preparatory work for the Conference, the Council resolution on the Decade had reinforced his delegation's hesitations due to past disagreements about the scope of the Decade.

Voting in favour, Ireland said that, although prospects for the Preparatory Sub-Committee were not auspicious, it had not lost all hope that the Committee would perform a positive role. Denmark stated that it had cast a positive vote in the expectation that the Conference preparations would be carried out on the basis of the original goals of the Decade. The USSR said it did not oppose the establishment of the Sub-Committee out of respect for the wishes of developing countries, but it hoped the costs would be met from savings within the budget.

In its resolution of 28 October on the Decade against racial discrimination,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly decided that the Sub-Committee should hold its first session in New York for two weeks during the first quarter of 1982 and report to the Council at its first regular session of 1982, the Council being the Preparatory Committee.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/8, paras. 15 & 16, 28 Oct. (p. 868). Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/130, 6 May, text following.

Financial implications: S-G statement, E/1981/L.32.  
Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.5-7, 11, 14 (16 Apr.-6 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/130

46-0-7 (recorded vote)

15-nation draft (E/1981/L.17): agenda item 2.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Burundi, Cuba, Cyprus, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

#### Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council—recalling its resolution 1980/7 of 24 April 1980 and recalling in particular General Assembly resolution 35/33 of 14 November 1980, by which the Assembly decided to hold, in 1983, a second world conference to combat racism and racial discrimination—authorized its President, in consultation with the regional groups, to appoint, on the basis of equitable geographical distribution and prior to the completion of the Council's work for 1981, a committee of twenty-three Member States, which, acting as the Preparatory Sub-Committee of the Council, in consultation with the Secretary-General, should complete the preparations for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, in particular with respect to:

- (a) Provisional agenda;
- (b) Provisional rules of procedure;
- (c) Organization of work;
- (d) Date and venue of the Conference;
- (e) Cost;
- (f) Modalities of representation;
- (g) Documentation.

Recorded vote in Economic and Social Council as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Chile, China, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, USSR, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, United Kingdom.

**Membership of the Sub-Committee.** The President of the Economic and Social Council reported to the Council on 25 November 1981 on his consultations with the regional groups concerning the appointment of the 23 members of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference. He stated that the Groups of Asian, Latin American and Eastern European States had nominated candidates and he expected to receive shortly the candidatures from the African Group. The Chairman of the Group of Western European and other States had informed him that no State had shown interest in taking part in the Sub-Committee's work.

On an oral proposal by the President, the Council decided without vote on the same day to authorize him to proceed with the appointment of the States nominated, on the understanding that he would pursue efforts to complete the Sub-Committee's membership.<sup>(1)</sup>

By a letter of 15 December,<sup>(2)</sup> the President informed the Secretary-General that he had ap-

pointed 19 States (see APPENDIX III for the Sub-Committee's membership).

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/202, 25 Nov., text following.

Letter: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC President, 15 Dec., E/1981/120.

Meeting record: ESC, E/1981/SR.45 (25 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1961/202

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President: agenda item 2.

#### Appointment of the members of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination

At its 45th plenary meeting, on 25 November 1981, the Council, after hearing a statement by the President concerning the appointment of twenty-three members of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, agreed that, without prejudice to the provisions of Council decision 1981/130 of 6 May 1981, the President would proceed with the appointment of the States so far nominated by the regional groups on the understanding that he would pursue his efforts, with a view to completing the membership of the Preparatory Sub-Committee.

**Participation of CERD.** The Economic and Social Council, by a decision of 25 November 1981 orally proposed by the President and adopted without vote, invited the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) to designate one of its members to participate as an observer in the work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference.<sup>(5)</sup> The action was taken in response to a wish expressed by CERD in August that it be represented by one of its members in the Sub-Committee.<sup>(2)</sup> This wish was communicated to the Council in a note by the United Nations Secretariat.<sup>(1)</sup>

In April, as part of its contribution to the Conference, CERD designated two of its members to undertake studies on the implementation of two articles of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.<sup>(3)</sup> José D. Ingles (Philippines) was named Special Rapporteur for a study on the implementation of article 4 of the Convention (on punishment for the dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred) and Georges Tene-kides (Greece) was named Special Rapporteur for a study on the implementation of article 7 (on measures against racial prejudices).

In a resolution of 28 October on the activities of CERD, the General Assembly requested CERD to explore the possibility of preparing an additional study for the Conference, on the implementation of subparagraph (e) of article 5 (guarantee of economic, social and cultural rights) in conjunction with paragraph 2 of article 2 (measures to ensure the rights of certain racial groups).<sup>(4)</sup>

Preparation of this study was suggested by Yugoslavia. Greece, however, thought it too early to undertake such studies, which it felt

might upset the legal balance of the Convention. Canada thought it unnecessary for CERD to consider a report on the problems of minorities and indigenous populations (p. 883) when those topics were being dealt with by other bodies.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>Secretariat, E/1981/L.58.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>CERD/A/36/18.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>2106 A (XX), annex, 21 Dec. 1965 (YUN 1965, p. 440); <sup>(4)</sup>36/12, paras. 11 & 12, 28 Oct. 1981 (p. 873).

Decision: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/203, 25 Nov., text following.

Meeting record: ESC/E/1981/SR.45 (25 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/203

Adopted without vote

Draft orally proposed by President; agenda item 2.

Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World

Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination

At its 45th plenary meeting, on 25 November 1981, the Council decided to invite the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to designate one of its members to participate, as an observer, in the work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

## Convention against racial discrimination

### Implementation of the Convention

CERD ACTIVITIES. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), set up under article 8 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination,<sup>(2)</sup> held two sessions in 1981: the twenty-third from 23 March to 10 April at Geneva and the twenty-fourth from 4 to 21 August in New York.

At those sessions, CERD devoted three quarters of its meetings to an examination of reports and additional information submitted by 37 States parties under article 9 of the Convention, concerning legislative, judicial, administrative or other measures they had adopted to give effect to the provisions of the Convention. Representatives of 34 reporting States (all but Madagascar, Rwanda and Sweden) participated in the consideration of their respective reports. The annual report of CERD to the General Assembly<sup>(1)</sup> summarized the views of Committee members on each country report and the statements by the representatives of the States parties concerned.

The reports examined were from: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Holy See, India, Israel, Ivory Coast, Kuwait, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab

Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

At each of its 1981 sessions, the Committee requested the Secretary-General to send reminders to States whose reports were overdue. These numbered 44 States at the March/April session and 36 States at the August session.

In addition, CERD examined copies of petitions, reports and other information concerning Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted to it by the Trusteeship Council (p. 1120) and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. CERD submitted to the Assembly recommendations on implementation of the principles and objectives of the Convention in 10 Territories: in Africa, Namibia and Western Sahara; in the Pacific Ocean, Guam and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; in the Indian Ocean, the Cocos (Keeling) Islands; in the Caribbean area, Belize (before its independence), the British Virgin Islands and the United States Virgin Islands; and in the Atlantic Ocean, Bermuda and St. Helena.

During both 1981 sessions, the Committee discussed its activities within the framework of the Decade against racial discrimination (p. 864), including the possibility of holding sessions in developing countries, and its participation in preparations for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (p. 870). At both sessions, it agreed to hold its first session of 1982 in an African city, subject to General Assembly approval.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 28 October,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly took note of the CERD report, commended the Committee for paying greater attention to Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories, and called on United Nations bodies and administering Powers to provide information. It invited States parties to furnish information on implementation of the Convention against racial discrimination, including information on the demographic composition of their population and their relations with South Africa. It called for legislative, socio-economic and other measures to eliminate or prevent discrimination based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin. It reiterated its grave concern that some States parties were being prevented from fulfilling their Convention obligations in parts of their territories.

The Assembly urged Member States to adopt political, economic and other measures to eliminate apartheid in South Africa and Namibia; commended CERD for taking up discrimination against migrant workers (p. 884); called on States parties to protect the rights of national or

ethnic minorities and indigenous populations (p. 883); and requested CERD to explore the possibility of preparing an additional study for the Conference against racial discrimination (p. 870).

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 145 to 1, with 1 abstention. The Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee approved the 22-nation draft, as orally revised by the sponsors and orally amended by Australia, on 16 October, by a recorded vote of 134 to 1. The Committee decided, by votes of 115 to 1, with 19 abstentions, and 112 to none, with 20 abstentions, respectively, to retain paragraph 2, urging measures against apartheid, and paragraph 5, inviting the submission of information on implementation of the Convention, including information on relations with South Africa.

The oral revisions by the sponsors included an additional paragraph commending CERD for paying attention to measures by States parties to assure recourse procedures for victims of racial discrimination, and a substitution that had the Assembly commend CERD for paying greater attention to (rather than concentrating attention on) apartheid. In addition, the revised text had the Assembly note the decision of CERD to hold its first 1982 session at Nairobi, Kenya, and request the Secretary-General to explore the possibility of holding the session in the context of the Decade against racial discrimination; the original version would have had the Assembly approve the CERD decision, request the Secretary-General to arrange for the session and, as an exceptional measure, provide for the additional expenses in the context of the Programme for the Decade. Australia's oral amendment, which was accepted by the sponsors, concerned the location of the new paragraph.

Introducing the resolution, Yugoslavia said the debate on racial discrimination had stressed the importance and necessity of further universalization and more consistent implementation of the Convention.

The United States said it would vote against the resolution because of paragraph 2.

Voting for the resolution but abstaining on paragraph 5, Denmark (also on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden) and the United Kingdom (for the European Community (EC) members) also voiced reservations on paragraph 2. In addition, the EC members reserved their position on paragraph 3, commending CERD for paying greater attention to the elimination of apartheid; in their view, the paragraph gave a distorted picture of the Committee's mandate and activities.

Also voting in favour, Australia, Austria, Denmark (for the Nordic States), Japan and the

United Kingdom (for the EC members) thought any additional expenses entailed by holding a session away from United Nations Headquarters should comply with established rules (specifying that the extra costs be met by the host country). Australia also stated that, if the tendency for resolutions on CERD to deal mainly with apartheid gained strength, that body might in the long run be diverted from universal humanitarian concerns and from acting as a group of independent experts. Austria regretted that the resolution contained elements having little to do with the CERD report, while Chile thought the resolution contained political considerations alien to the Convention. New Zealand expressed concern that there was a tendency to focus attention only on certain countries or regions.

The Syrian Arab Republic, welcoming the added paragraph on recourse procedures, stated that Israel had not introduced appeal procedures in its jurisdiction, with consequences for the occupied territories.

In the Third Committee's debate on the report of CERD, Botswana found it disheartening that countries which practised discrimination had not submitted reports. Kenya expressed the view that States not yet parties to the Convention should at least be guided by it. Remarking that not all parties were actively engaged in eliminating racial discrimination, the United Republic of Tanzania appealed to them not to prevent others from doing so.

Pakistan favoured a strengthening of the functions of CERD and a widening of its scope so that it could examine the situation in all signatory States in regard to racial discrimination and other matters for which the Convention gave it a mandate. Uruguay thought it important that CERD be careful to avoid politicization and not to exceed its mandate.

Addressing specific aspects of CERD activities, France thought that body should make general suggestions and recommendations based on its examination of reports and information from States parties, from which universally applicable lessons could be drawn. The Netherlands suggested that CERD consider drawing attention to the possibility of States parties requesting its advice on specific questions concerning implementation of the Convention, and also consider whether it might adopt both general recommendations on implementation and suggestions to specific States on action against racial discrimination.

Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany voiced concern that a number of States parties had failed to submit reports and that some reports were incomplete. For the Nordic States, Denmark warned that failure to submit reports

on time might erode the Convention's control procedures. Yugoslavia said CERD should give more attention to the problem and not merely send out routine reminders.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>CERD, A/36/18.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2106 A (XX), annex, 21 Dec. 1965 (YUN 1965, p. 443); <sup>(3)</sup>36/12, 28 Oct. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.3/36/L.13/Add.1; S-G statements, A/C.3/36/L.13 & Rev.1 & Add.2.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.4-14, 18, 20, 22 (25 Sep.-16 Oct.); plenary. A/36/PV.42 (28 Oct.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/12

145-1-1 (recorded vote) Meeting 42 28 October 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/623) by recorded vote (134-1), 16 October (meeting 22): 22-nation draft (A/C.3/38/L.8). orally amended by Australia and orally revised: agenda item 82 (a).

Sponsors: Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ghana, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Jordan, Madagascar, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 35/40 of 25 November 1980 on the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and 36/11 of 28 October 1981 on the status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, as well as its other relevant resolutions on the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination,

Having considered the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination on its twenty-third and twenty-fourth sessions, submitted under article 9, paragraph 2, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination,

Emphasizing that It is important for the successful struggle against all practices of racial discrimination, including the vestiges and manifestations of racist ideologies wherever they exist, that all Member States should be guided in their internal and foreign policies by the basic provisions of the Convention,

Mindful of the obligation of the States parties to comply fully with the provisions of the Convention,

Welcoming the continued co-operation of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination with the competent specialized agencies and other United Nations bodies, especially with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the International Labour Organisation,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination on its twenty-third and twenty-fourth sessions;

2. Strongly condemns the policy of apartheid in South Africa and Namibia as the most abhorrent form of racial discrimination and urges all Member States to adopt effective political, economic and other measures in order to secure the elimination of that policy and to achieve the full implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other United Nations bodies;

3. Commends the Committee for paying greater attention to the question of the elimination of the policy of apartheid in South Africa and Namibia, as well as to the elimination of acts and practices of racial discrimination in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories and in all other Territories to which General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960 applies;

4. Calls upon the United Nations bodies concerned to ensure that the Committee is supplied with all relevant infor-

mation on all the Territories to which General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) applies and urges the administering Powers to co-operate with these bodies by providing all necessary information in order to enable the Committee to discharge fully its responsibilities under article 15 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;

5. Once again invites States parties to the Convention to furnish the Committee, in accordance with its general guidelines, with the information on the implementation of the provisions of the Convention, including information on the demographic composition of their population and on their relations with the racist régime of South Africa;

8. Calls upon all Member States to adopt effective legislative, socio-economic and other necessary measures for elimination or prevention of discrimination based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin;

7. Commends the Committee for paying due attention to the steps taken by the States parties to the Convention to assure within their Jurisdiction the availability of appropriate recourse procedures for the victims of racial discrimination;

8. Further commends the Committee for taking up the problems of discrimination of migrant workers and requests States parties to the Convention to protect fully the rights of those workers;

9. Calls upon States parties to the Convention to protect fully, through the introduction of relevant legislative and other measures, the rights of national or ethnic minorities, as well as the rights of indigenous populations;

10. Reiterates its grave concern that some States parties to the Convention, owing to reasons beyond their control, are being prevented from fulfilling their obligations under the Convention in parts of their respective territories;

11. Takes note with appreciation of the Committee's plans to participate in the preparations and the work of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, to be held in 1983;

12. Requests the Committee to explore the possibility of preparing also for the Conference, in addition to studies on the implementation of articles 4 and 7 of the Convention, a study on the implementation of subparagraph (e) of article 5 in conjunction with paragraph 2 of article 2;

13. Takes note of the decision of the Committee to hold its spring 1982 session at the United Nations offices at Nairobi and requests the Secretary-General to explore the possibility of holding this session within the context of the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

#### Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States.

Abstaining: Malawi.

### Accessions and ratifications

As at 31 December 1981, there were 111 States parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, adopted by the General Assembly in 1965.<sup>(2)</sup> The parties *italics* indicate those adhering in 1981) were:

Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Eight of the States parties—Costa Rica, Ecuador, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Uruguay—had made declarations under article 14 of the Convention, recognizing the competence of CERD to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups within their jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the State party concerned of any of the rights set forth in the Convention. Iceland submitted its declaration during 1981. Under article 14, the Committee was to be competent to exercise this function when at least 10 States parties were bound by such declarations.

The Secretary-General submitted in September his annual report to the General Assembly on the status of the Convention, listing the States which had signed, ratified, acceded or succeeded to it as at 1 September.<sup>(1)</sup>

By a resolution of 28 October,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly expressed satisfaction with the increase in the number of States that had ratified or acceded to the Convention. It reaffirmed its conviction that universal adherence to the Convention and implementation of its provisions were necessary to realize the objectives of the Decade for Action

to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (p. 864). It requested States which had not become parties to do so and appealed to parties to consider the possibility of making the declaration provided for in article 14.

The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, which approved the text on 15 October in the same manner, on the basis of a 31-nation draft introduced by Belgium. It incorporated an amendment by Costa Rica, Ecuador and Uruguay, adding the provision by which the Assembly appealed to States parties to consider the possibility of making a declaration under article 14. This amendment was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 50 abstentions.

Introducing the new paragraph, Uruguay said its purpose was to correct the shortcoming that, without such a declaration, victims of a violation of the rights provided for in the Convention had no recourse and were unable to ensure respect for their rights.

During the Third Committee's debate on racial discrimination, calls for more ratifications of the Convention were made by Australia, Egypt, Hungary, India, Mongolia, New Zealand, Romania, Rwanda, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela and Zaire.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/453.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2106 A (XX), annex, 21 Dec. 1965 (YUN 1965, p. 440); <sup>(3)</sup>36/11, 28 Oct. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.4-14, 18, 20(25 Sep.-15 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.42 (28 Oct.).

### General Assembly resolution 36/11

Adopted without vote Meeting 42 28 October 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/623) without vote. 15 October (meeting 20); 31-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.7), amended by 3 nations (A/C.3/36/L.12); agenda item 82 (b).

Sponsors of draft: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Hungary, India, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Sponsors of amendment: Costa Rica, Ecuador, Uruguay.

Status of the international Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3057(XXVIII) of 2 November 1973, 3135(XXVIII) of 14 December 1973, 3225(XXIX) of 6 November 1974, 3381 (XXX) of 10 November 1975, 31/79 of 13 December 1976, 32/11 of 7 November 1977, 33/101 of 16 December 1978, 34/26 of 15 November 1979 and 35/38 of 25 November 1980.

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the international Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;

2. Expresses its satisfaction with the increase in the number of States that have ratified the Convention or acceded thereto;

3. Reaffirms once again its conviction that ratification of or accession to the Convention on a universal basis and implementation of its provisions are necessary for the realiza-

tion of the objectives of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination;

4. Requests States that have not yet become parties to the Convention to ratify it or accede thereto;

5. Appeals to States parties to the Convention to consider the possibility of making the declaration provided for in article 14 of the Convention;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to submit to the General Assembly annual reports concerning the status of the Convention, in accordance with Assembly resolution 2106 A (XX) of 21 December 1965.

#### Measures against nazism and fascism

The Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly adopted similar resolutions in 1981 concerning measures against Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist activities and other ideologies and practices based on racial intolerance, hatred and terror.

By a resolution of 23 February,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted by a roll-call vote of 38 to none, with 1 abstention, the Commission condemned all totalitarian or other ideologies and practices, in particular Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist ones, based on racial or ethnic exclusiveness or intolerance, hatred, terror and systematic denial of human rights. It urged States to draw attention to the threats to democratic institutions by those ideologies and practices, and to consider taking measures to prohibit or otherwise deter activities by groups and organizations practising them. It also called on international, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to initiate or intensify measures against such ideologies and practices. The Commission appealed to States to become parties to relevant human rights instruments.

As requested by the Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(8)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted in April 1981 a report (with addenda in September and December) summarizing comments by 30 States on problems in regard to this topic and their suggestions on national and international measures to eradicate nazism, fascism and related ideologies based on racial intolerance, hatred and terror.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Economic and Social Council, on 8 May,<sup>(10)</sup> took note of the report and decided to transmit it to the Assembly. The decision, orally proposed by the Chairman of the Second (Social) Committee, was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Committee on 5 May.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 16 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(9)</sup> repeating most of the provisions of the Commission's resolution. In addition, it invited Member States to adopt, in accordance with their constitutions and with international human rights instruments, measures declaring punishable by law any dissemination of ideas

based on racial superiority or hatred and of war propaganda, including Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist ideologies. It called again on States to submit their comments for inclusion in a further report by the Secretary-General, and requested the Commission to continue consideration of the subject in 1982.

The Assembly adopted this resolution without vote, after similarly adopting an amendment by the Netherlands. The revised 14-nation text had been recommended by the Third Committee on 3 December by a recorded vote, requested by the Ukrainian SSR, of 125 to none, with 13 abstentions, after the Committee rejected, by 58 votes to 52, with 18 abstentions, a proposal by Australia, Canada, Greece, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom to delete paragraph 4, by which the Assembly invited States to adopt measures declaring punishable any dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority. The subsequent amendment by the Netherlands, presented in the Assembly, added to this paragraph the qualifying phrase stating that such measures should be in accordance with States' constitutional systems and with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights<sup>(3)</sup> and the International Covenants on Human Rights.<sup>(4)</sup>

Other amendments by the five Western States were accepted in Committee by the resolution's sponsors. They altered the terminology used to describe the ideologies and practices addressed by the resolution, to read "all totalitarian or other ideologies and practices, in particular Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist, based on racial or ethnic exclusiveness or intolerance, hatred, terror, systematic denial of human rights and fundamental freedoms, or which have such consequences". This phrase replaced varying references in five paragraphs of the original draft to nazism and fascism, and to Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist activities and all other forms of totalitarian ideologies and practices based on racial intolerance, hatred and terror, and those based on the systematic denial of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The revised phrase was also used to specify the title under which this subject was to be considered by the Commission.

According to another change proposed by the five delegations and accepted by the sponsors, the Assembly urged States to draw attention to the threats to democratic institutions by such ideologies and practices and to consider taking measures, in accordance with their constitutional systems and with the Declaration of Human Rights and the Covenants on Human Rights, to prohibit or otherwise deter activities by groups or organizations or whoever was practising those ideologies. This replaced a paragraph by which States would have been urged to give due consid-

eration to implementing a 1971 Assembly resolution on nazism<sup>(6)</sup> in accordance with national constitutional systems and with the Declaration and Covenants, and especially to taking measures against activities of groups and organizations practising nazism, fascism, neo-fascism and other ideologies based on racial intolerance, hatred and terror.

Introducing the draft in the Committee, the German Democratic Republic said it reflected profound international concern at the upsurge of activities of groups and organizations which spread and practised nazism, fascism and neo-fascism with increasing international co-ordination, thereby threatening peace and security.

In the Assembly, the United States dissociated itself from the consensus on the resolution, saying it could not accept the view that government repression of the dissemination of ideas was an appropriate or effective way to oppose totalitarianism; in the Committee, where it abstained in the vote, the United States described the text as a cynical propagandistic exercise by totalitarian States.

Reservations on paragraph 4, on measures against dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority, and on paragraph 5, containing an appeal to ratify or accede to certain conventions, were voiced by Japan and Sweden. Norway and others objected to paragraph 4 on the ground that it might be interpreted as limiting freedom of speech and of the press. Israel said it supported the resolution despite the questionable motives of its authors and the totalitarian character of their regimes and despite the fact that the propaganda it contained was extraneous to the central theme of the resolution.

Canada abstained because it could not accept the ideas in paragraph 4. Austria said it wished to change its vote from abstaining to supporting because, although paragraph 4 had been retained, the other amendments had made the draft acceptable.

Australia, Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Turkey and the United Kingdom, though voting in favour, voiced reservations on paragraph 4; Belgium also thought that parts of the resolution were contrary to basic principles to which it subscribed, such as those in the European Convention on Human Rights. Portugal expressed reservations on the references in the twelfth preambular paragraph to the possibility of elaborating a draft declaration and in paragraph 5 to the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity<sup>(5)</sup> and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the

Crime of Apartheid,<sup>(7)</sup> some of whose provisions were contrary to the Portuguese legal order.

Albania thought the draft failed to draw attention to the main political, economic and social causes of fascism and nazism, and the Fascist acts of aggression by the imperialist super-Powers.

During the Committee's debate, concern at the resurgence of fascism and neo-fascism and calls for United Nations action to deal with the problem were voiced by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR. Bulgaria stated that growing social insecurity in Western countries was creating favourable conditions for the reactivation of nazism, fascism and neo-fascism. To allow Fascist theories or other ideas based on intolerance and hatred to be propagated without hindrance, Hungary stated, showed a misunderstanding of democracy; democratic institutions could only gain from legal measures to put an end to such fundamentally anti-social activities. The United Nations would not be fulfilling its duty to the millions of people killed in the Second World War and the millions of victims of Fascist terror if it did not strive to remove the threat of a revival of fascism and nazism, the USSR declared.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/209 & Add. 1,2.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Rights: (report, E/1981/25): 3(XXXVII), 23 Feb. GA: <sup>(3)</sup>217 A (III), 10 Dec. 1948 (YUN 1948-49, p. 535); <sup>(4)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 419); <sup>(5)</sup>2391 (XXIII), annex, 26 Nov. 1968 (YUN 1968, p. 609); <sup>(6)</sup>2839 (XXVI), 18 Dec. 1971 (YUN 1971, p. 410); <sup>(7)</sup>3068 (XXVIII), annex, 30 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 103); <sup>(8)</sup>35/200, paras. 3 & 5, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 816); <sup>(9)</sup>36/162, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(10)</sup>ESC: 1981/157, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 19 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 68, 72(19Nov.-3Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16Dec.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/157

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote. 5 May (meeting 19); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 7.

Report of the Secretary-General on measures to be taken against Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist activities and all other forms of totalitarian ideologies and practices based on racial intolerance, hatred and terror  
At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Secretary-General on measures to be taken against Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist activities and all other forms of totalitarian ideologies and practices based on racial intolerance, hatred and terror and decided to transmit it to the General Assembly.

General Assembly resolution 36/162

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) by recorded vote (125-0-13), 3 December (meeting 72); 14-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.70), amended by 5 nations (A/C.3/36/L.92, amendment to delete para. 4 excepted); amended in Assembly by Netherlands (A/36/L.55); agenda item 12.



Sponsors of draft: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Leo People's Democratic Republic, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Sponsors of amendments: Australia, Canada, Greece, Netherlands, United Kingdom.

Measures to be taken against Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist activities and all other forms of totalitarian ideologies and practices based on racial intolerance, hatred and terror  
The General Assembly,

Recalling that the United Nations emerged from the struggle against nazism, fascism, aggression and foreign occupation, and that the peoples expressed their resolve in the Charter of the United Nations to save future generations from the scourge of war,

Bearing in mind the suffering, destruction and death of millions of victims of aggression, foreign occupation, nazism and fascism,

Reaffirming the purposes and principles laid down in the Charter, which are aimed at maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and achieving international co-operation,

Emphasizing that all totalitarian or other Ideologies and practices, in particular Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist, based on racial or ethnic exclusiveness or intolerance, hatred, terror, systematic denial of human rights and fundamental freedoms, or which have such consequences, may jeopardize world peace and constitute obstacles to friendly relations between States and to the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Reaffirming that the prosecution and punishment of war crimes and crimes against peace and humanity, as laid down in General Assembly resolutions 3(I) of 13 February 1946 and 95(I) of 11 December 1946, constitute a universal commitment for all States,

Recalling its resolutions 2331 (XXII) of 18 December 1967, 2438(XXIII) of 19 December 1968, 2545(XXIV) of 11 December 1969, 2713(XXV) of 15 December 1970, 2839(XXVI) of 18 December 1971, 34/24 of 15 November 1979 and 35/200 of 15 December 1980,

Recalling also the Declaration on Social Progress and Development, the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Underlining the importance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and other relevant international instruments,

Reaffirming that all totalitarian or other ideologies and practices, in particular Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist, based on racial or ethnic exclusiveness or intolerance, hatred, terror, systematic denial of human rights and fundamental freedoms, or which have such consequences, are incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights, the international Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, the international Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and other relevant international instruments,

Commending the fact that a number of States provided the Secretary-General with their comments on the problems discussed in his report,

Acknowledging the fact that a number of States have set up legal regulations which are suited to prevent the activities of Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist groups and organizations,

Welcoming Commission on Human Rights resolution 3(XXXVII) of 23 February 1981 providing measures on this subject, including the possibility of elaborating a draft declaration,

Noting with deep concern that the proponents of Fascist ideologies have, in a number of countries, intensified their activities and are increasingly co-ordinating them on an international scale,

1. Again condemns all totalitarian or other ideologies and practices, in particular Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist, based on racial or ethnic exclusiveness or intolerance, hatred, terror, systematic denial of human rights and fundamental freedoms, or which have such consequences;

2. Urges all States to draw attention to the threats to democratic institutions by the above-mentioned ideologies and practices and to consider taking measures, in accordance with their national constitutional systems and with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights, to prohibit or otherwise deter activities by groups or organizations or whoever is practising those ideologies;

3. Calls upon the appropriate specialized agencies as well as intergovernmental and international non-governmental organizations to initiate or intensify measures against the ideologies and practices described in paragraph 1 above;

4. Invites Member States to adopt, in accordance with their national constitutional systems and with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights, as a matter of high priority, measures declaring punishable by law any dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred and of war propaganda, including Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist ideologies;

5. Appeals to all States that have not yet done so to ratify or to accede to the International Covenants on Human Rights, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, and the international Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid;

6. Calls once again upon all States to provide the Secretary-General with their comments on this question;

7. Requests the Commission on Human Rights to continue the consideration of this subject at its thirty-eighth session under the title "Measures to be taken against all totalitarian or other ideologies and practices, in particular Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist, based on racial or ethnic exclusiveness or intolerance, hatred, terror, systematic denial of human rights and fundamental freedoms, or which have such consequences";

8. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a report, through the Economic and Social Council, to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session in the light of the discussion that would take place in the Commission on Human Rights and on the basis of comments provided by States and international organizations.

#### International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

As in previous years, the International Day, for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was observed at a meeting of the Special Committee against Apartheid held on 20 March 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> Statements were made by the Secretary-General, the President of the Security Council, other United Nations officials, representatives of the regional groups of States and observers from national liberation movements. The Day commemorated the date (21 March 1960) when 69 demon-

strators against the "pass laws" of the apartheid system were killed and 180 others were wounded at Sharpeville, South Africa.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee against Apartheid, A/36/22.

#### Role of the mass media

As requested by the General Assembly in 1978,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted in January 1981 a study on education activities and activities of the mass media in the fight against racial discrimination.<sup>(1)</sup> The study examined the potential and limitations of the media in that fight, and international and national action to inform and educate the public. Among its main conclusions were: research should be conducted into racial discrimination in communication, including a study of distribution, control, ownership, support, resources, production, presentation, content, availability, exposure, consumption, use and influence; journalistic procedures in reporting on racial issues should be questioned, as they did not appear adequate for balanced coverage; minorities should have access to mass media professions, especially journalism; the media should publicize meetings and United Nations activities on racial discrimination; and United Nations public information activities against racism should be strengthened.

In March, the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) submitted a progress report to the Economic and Social Council on UNESCO action to study the role of the mass media in combating racial discrimination and apartheid.<sup>(2)</sup> The report stated that the 1978 UNESCO Declaration on Fundamental Principles concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and International Understanding, to the Promotion of Human Rights and to Countering Racism, Apartheid and Incitement to War<sup>(5)</sup> had been translated and issued in 16 languages. Press reaction to the Declaration in France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom had been studied, and three regional seminars on it had been organized in 1980. Other 1981-1983 activities included a study on the possibility of improving the communication media available to national liberation movements and three seminars that would discuss the role of the media in countering racial discrimination and apartheid.

On 6 May 1981, the Council took note of this report, on an oral proposal by its President adopted without vote.<sup>(4)</sup>

Commenting on the Secretary-General's report during the debate on racial discrimination in the Assembly's Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, Argentina said it was necessary to study the attitudes of information

disseminators, since they determined the point of view from which events were perceived. India observed that, since racial stereotypes and pejorative portrayals of racial groups had a lasting impact on attitudes, it was important to ensure that such portrayals in the mass media did not create or intensify prejudices. Kenya supported the views expressed in the report and observed that the oppressed people of South Africa and the poor should be given the means to express themselves through the mass media.

New Zealand stressed the need for a balanced approach in presenting information and commended the report's suggestion that effective information dissemination could be achieved by the use of a more informal style in United Nations reports and communications. Nigeria pointed out that non-governmental organizations as well as governmental authorities had a vital role to play and their cumulative effort represented a strong link in the international drive against racial discrimination. Pakistan regretted that the mass media in some advanced countries which influenced media elsewhere had not joined in efforts to combat racial discrimination. Support for the report's recommendations was also voiced by Egypt and Jamaica.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/75; <sup>(2)</sup>UNESCO Director-General, E/1981/36.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 33/99, sect. III para. 4 (c), 16 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 675). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1981/131, 6 May 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1978, p. 1101.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.5-7, 15 (16 Apr.--6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/131

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 2.

Role of the mass media in combating racism, racial discrimination and apartheid

At its 15th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council took note of the progress report of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on the role of the mass media in combating racism, racial discrimination and apartheid.

#### Protection against racial discrimination

Under the programme for the second half (1980-1983) of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, adopted by the General Assembly in 1979,<sup>(2)</sup> the United Nations Division of Human Rights organized at Managua, Nicaragua, from 14 to 21 December 1981, a seminar for members of the Economic Commission for Latin America on recourse procedures and other protection available to victims of racial discrimination and activities to be undertaken nationally and regionally, with particular reference to indigenous populations (p. 883).

The participants reached a consensus, set out in the seminar report,<sup>(1)</sup> on the need to: exchange

and disseminate information on violations of the rights of indigenous peoples; exert pressure aimed at changing the views of international bodies and banks which financed development plans affecting indigenous peoples; organize information programmes and activities for a broad audience on the problems of indigenous groups; facilitate contacts and the exchange of information and experience among indigenous organizations; publicize within indigenous groups the abuses such groups suffered in various countries of the region and the forms of struggle and alternatives they had devised; further indigenous culture in a coherent and integrated manner rather than through isolated manifestations; facilitate the compilation and dissemination of educational material aimed at strengthening ethnic consciousness; and grant to developing countries the resources needed to guarantee the development of peoples, including minorities.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Seminar, ST/HR/SER.A/11.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 34/24, annex, para. 11, 15 Nov. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 807).

### Other aspects of discrimination

#### Declaration against religious intolerance

On 25 November 1981, the General Assembly adopted without vote a resolution by which it proclaimed the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief.<sup>(8)</sup>

The eight-article Declaration proclaimed the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. It stated that no one should be subject to discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief; that such discrimination should be condemned as a human rights violation; that States should act to prevent and eliminate such discrimination; and that the parents or legal guardians of the child had the right to organize life within the family in accordance with their religion or belief. The Assembly enumerated nine freedoms as included in the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, and declared that the rights and freedoms set forth in the Declaration should be accorded in national legislations in such a manner that everyone should be able to practise them.

The Declaration was drafted by a Working Group of the Commission on Human Rights, open to all members of the Commission, which completed its work at meetings between 4 February and 5 March 1981. A preliminary draft had been prepared in 1964 by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities,<sup>(10)</sup> and work on the draft had continued in working groups established by the

Commission at each of its annual sessions since 1974. Adoption of the draft Declaration was recommended by the Commission on 10 March by 33 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Commission's draft was passed on to the Assembly by the Economic and Social Council in a resolution of 8 May, with a recommendation that it be considered with a view to adaption.<sup>(4)</sup> The Council adopted the resolution by 45 votes to none, with 6 abstentions, following approval on 5 May by its Second (Social) Committee by a vote of 45 to none, with 5 abstentions. Following changes in the text as a result of consultations conducted by the Chairman of the Assembly's Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, the Committee approved the revised text without vote on 9 November.

After adopting the Declaration, the Assembly decided to consider further in 1982 the item "Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance".<sup>(5)</sup> This decision was taken, without vote, on 25 November 1981 on the recommendation of the Third Committee where, on 9 November, the 26-nation text, introduced by the Netherlands, was approved in the same manner.

As the text of the preamble, the first four articles and paragraph 1 of article 5 had been agreed on at previous sessions, discussion in the Commission's Working Group in 1981 focused on the remaining part of article 5 and articles 6 and 7. The Group did not adopt the proposed additional articles 8 (to ensure equal rights of citizens irrespective of their attitude to religion, equality of all religions before the law and no coercion to profess or not to profess a religion, and to prohibit the State and church from interference in one another's affairs) and 9 (stating that religion and belief, as used in the Declaration, included religious, non-religious and atheistic convictions), as well as another additional article (stating that nothing in the Declaration would affect, modify or add to the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights<sup>(7)</sup> or other international instruments relating to the elimination of intolerance and discrimination based on religion or belief).<sup>(2)</sup>

In the Council's Second Committee, an amendment by the Byelorussian SSR<sup>(1)</sup> to have the draft transmitted to States for comments was rejected by 25 votes to 10, with 13 abstentions. Following this vote, the Byelorussian SSR said it would not insist on a vote on a second amendment, which would have had the Council recommend that the Commission consider the draft again in 1982 with a view to adopting it by consensus.

As a result of consultations in the Assembly's Third Committee, amendments were made to five paragraphs of the Commission's text.

In the second preambular paragraph, stating that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights<sup>(5)</sup> and the International Covenants on Human Rights<sup>(6)</sup> proclaimed the principles of non-discrimination and equality before the law and the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief, the final phrase, "including the right to choose, manifest and change one's religion or belief", was deleted. The third preambular paragraph was amended to insert the word "whatever" before "belief" in the statement that infringement of the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief had brought wars and suffering. The same change was made to article 1, paragraph 1, and in that paragraph the phrase "or to adopt" was deleted from a sentence stating that the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion included freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief. The phrase "or to adopt" was also removed from article 1, paragraph 2, which had stated that no one should be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice. Finally, a new article 8 was added, which stated that nothing in the Declaration should be construed as restricting or derogating from any right defined in the Declaration of Human Rights and the Covenants on Human Rights.

An oral amendment by Indonesia was not acted upon. Stating that religion should never be imposed on anyone, Indonesia suggested that article 1 (2) be amended to add "or any kind of persuasion" to the prohibition against coercion in the choice of religion or belief.

Commenting on the agreed text, Cuba said its participation in the consensus conformed to the principles of religious freedom established in its Constitution. The German Democratic Republic said the Declaration did not embrace the same rights and guarantees for atheism as it did for religious activities. Poland held that it disregarded the rights of persons who did not profess any religion or belief. Czechoslovakia similarly believed that the Declaration lacked balance. Sweden agreed to participate in the adoption of the Declaration without vote on the understanding that it did not restrict already established freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, including the right to choose, practise or change a religion or belief. Viet Nam stated that any attempt to use religion as a pretext for subversive activities against the Vietnamese task of nation-building must be condemned.

Some States expressed reservations or understandings on particular provisions of the Declaration.

China, speaking of article 5 on the religious upbringing of children, stated its understanding that, under the influence of their parents, guard-

ians or others, children could decide to participate or not to participate in religious activities and, as they grew older, to adopt or not to adopt a religion. Egypt stressed that the Declaration should never be used as a pretext for interfering in a State's internal affairs or be exploited for political ends; it also reserved its position on the mention in article 8 of the Covenants on Human Rights, which it had not ratified. Iraq reserved the position of the members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference on any wording in the Declaration contrary to Islamic law or to any legislation or act based on that law. The Syrian Arab Republic stated that two provisions ran counter to the spirit and letter of its Constitution or to its religious and cultural traditions: article 6 (f), on voluntary financial and other contributions, and article 7, on the incorporation of rights and freedoms in national legislation.

The USSR said it supported the adoption of the Declaration without vote, on the understanding that: protection for freedom of religion and belief included freedom not to profess any religion, to have atheistic beliefs and to propagandize them without restrictions; no one should be subject to discrimination on religious grounds or for holding atheistic beliefs; freedom of conscience presupposed the inadmissibility of using religion to the prejudice of the State, society or its citizens; education was secular in many countries and schools were separate from the church; and no provision of the Declaration could permit interference in the internal affairs of States. Bulgaria made similar points, adding that the Declaration was one-sided in protecting the rights of a certain category of institutions and in enumerating, in article 6, rights that had no importance for a person who had no religion while failing to protect him against intolerance and discrimination and his children against religious propaganda.

Yugoslavia expressed reservations with regard to two provisions: article 6 (b), whose clause on the right to establish and maintain charitable or humanitarian institutions contrasted with Yugoslav law prohibiting religious communities from establishing institutions which did not serve the direct needs of their believers; and article 6 (h), which recognized a right to observe days of rest in accordance with religious beliefs, whereas in Yugoslavia religious holidays were private and the right to days of rest could not be based on them. Romania had reservations on the same provisions and on two others: regarding article 5 (2), on religious education, such education in Romania could be provided only at places of worship; and regarding article 6 (i), on communications in matters of religion or belief, such communications should be conducted in accordance with national legislation.

Speaking during the Committee debate on human rights issues, Ghana characterized the adoption of the Declaration as a milestone in the history of human rights, while Chile thought the Declaration was only a first step which should lead to a convention. The United States said the Declaration not only was in line with the dream of the authors of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights, but also was an act of fidelity to those who had entrusted the United Nations with the task of realizing that dream.

The Declaration was supported by a number of States, including Argentina, Australia, Canada, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Uganda and the United Kingdom (speaking for the European Community members). Malawi welcomed the clause (article 1 (3)) recognizing the freedom to manifest religions and beliefs subject to limitations prescribed by law.

Speaking before the adoption of the changes agreed upon in consultations, most Eastern European countries regarded the text submitted by the Council as unsatisfactory and said further work was needed before it could be adopted. In Bulgaria's opinion, instead of guaranteeing that no one should be subject to coercion which would impair the freedom to have a religion or belief of one's choice, the draft attempted to force societies and individuals that professed non-religious or atheistic beliefs to adopt religious beliefs. The Byelorussian SSR and others believed it better not to restrict the principle of tolerance to religious creeds but to extend it explicitly to atheistic beliefs. The German Democratic Republic also felt the Declaration would have been better balanced if principles governing the relationship between State and church had been laid down in a manner compatible with the situation in each State. The German Democratic Republic, Hungary and the Ukrainian SSR maintained that the Declaration should take into account the situations of different States, while the USSR thought it gave a one-sided interpretation of freedom of conscience.

Iran said the United Nations was a secular body, and secular bodies were not qualified to deal with religious matters; Iran accepted the Declaration in so far as it was in total conformity with Islamic jurisprudence.

Amendment rejected: <sup>(1)</sup>Byelorussian SSR, E/1981/C.2/L.18 (para. 2 not pressed).

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Rights, E/1981/25.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Rights: 20(XXXVII), 10 Mar. <sup>(4)</sup>ESC: 1981/36, 8 May, text following. GA: <sup>(5)</sup>217 A (III), 10 Dec. 1948 (YUN

1948-49, p. 535); <sup>(6)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 419); <sup>(7)</sup>ibid. (p. 423); <sup>(8)</sup>36/55, 25 Nov. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(9)</sup>GA, 36/412, 25 Nov., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(10)</sup>1964, p. 350.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 18, 19 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.27-37, 43 (22 Oct.-9 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/36

4 5 - 0 - 6 M e e t i n g 1 8 8 M a y 1 9 8 1

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46 and Corr.1) by vote (45-0-5), 5 May (meeting 18); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda item 7.

#### Draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief

The Economic and Social Council, Recalling General Assembly resolution 3267(XXIX) of 10 December 1974, in which the Assembly requested the Commission on Human Rights to submit, through the Economic and Social Council, to the Assembly a single draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief,

Expressing its appreciation to the Commission on Human Rights for having concluded the elaboration of a draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief,

Recommends to the General Assembly that it should consider the draft Declaration annexed to the present resolution with a view to adopting and solemnly proclaiming it, at its thirty-sixth session, as the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief.

#### ANNEX

Draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief

[Text as in General Assembly resolution 36/55 below, except for the second and third preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 1, and omitting article 8.]

Considering that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights proclaim the principles of non-discrimination and equality before the law and the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief, including the right to choose, manifest and change one's religion or belief,

Considering that the disregard and infringement of human rights and fundamental freedoms, in particular of the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, have brought, directly or indirectly, wars and great suffering to mankind, especially where they serve as a means of foreign interference in the internal affairs of other States and amount to kindling hatred between peoples and nations,

...

#### Article 1

1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching.

2. No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice.

...

General Assembly resolution 36/55

Adopted without vote Meeting 73 25 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/684) without vote. 9 November (meeting 43); draft Declaration recommended by Economic and

Social Council (resolution 1981/36, annex) as amended following consultations (A/C.3/36/L.45); agenda item 75.

#### Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief

The General Assembly,

Considering that one of the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations is that of the dignity and equality inherent in all human beings, and that all Member States have pledged themselves to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the United Nations to promote and encourage universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion,

Considering that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights proclaim the principles of non-discrimination and equality before the law and the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief,

Considering that the disregard and infringement of human rights and fundamental freedoms, in particular of the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or whatever belief, have brought, directly or indirectly, wars and great suffering to mankind, especially where they serve as a means of foreign interference in the internal affairs of other States and amount to kindling hatred between peoples and nations.

Considering that religion or belief, for anyone who professes either, is one of the fundamental elements in his conception of life and that freedom of religion or belief should be fully respected and guaranteed,

Considering that it is essential to promote understanding, tolerance and respect in matters relating to freedom of religion or belief and to ensure that the use of religion or belief for ends inconsistent with the Charter, other relevant instruments of the United Nations and the purposes and principles of the present Declaration is inadmissible,

Convinced that freedom of religion or belief should also contribute to the attainment of the goals of world peace, social justice and friendship among peoples and to the elimination of ideologies or practices of colonialism and racial discrimination.

Noting with satisfaction the adoption of several, and the coming into force of some, conventions, under the aegis of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies, for the elimination of various forms of discrimination.

Concerned by manifestations of intolerance and by the existence of discrimination in matters of religion or belief still in evidence in some areas of the world,

Resolved to adopt all necessary measures for the speedy elimination of such intolerance in all its forms and manifestations and to prevent and combat discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief,

Proclaims this Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief:

#### Article 1

1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have a religion or whatever belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching.

2. No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have a religion or belief of his choice.

3. Freedom to manifest one's religion or belief may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

#### Article 2

1. No one shall be subject to discrimination by any State, institution, group of persons or person on the grounds of religion or belief.

2. For the purposes of the present Declaration, the expression "intolerance and discrimination based on religion or belief" means any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on religion or belief and having as its purpose or as its effect nullification or impairment of the recognition, enjoyment or exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms on an equal basis.

#### Article 3

Discrimination between human beings on the grounds of religion or belief constitutes an affront to human dignity and a disavowal of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and shall be condemned as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and enunciated in detail in the International Covenants on Human Rights, and as an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations between nations.

#### Article 4

1. All States shall take effective measures to prevent and eliminate discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief in the recognition, exercise and enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms in all fields of civil, economic, political, social and cultural life.

2. All States shall make all efforts to enact or rescind legislation where necessary to prohibit any such discrimination, and to take all appropriate measures to combat intolerance on the grounds of religion or belief in this matter.

#### Article 5

1. The parents or, as the case may be, the legal guardians of the child have the right to organize the life within the family in accordance with their religion or belief and bearing in mind the moral education in which they believe the child should be brought up.

2. Every child shall enjoy the right to have access to education in the matter of religion or belief in accordance with the wishes of his parents or, as the case may be, legal guardians, and shall not be compelled to receive teaching on religion or belief against the wishes of his parents or legal guardians, the best interests of the child being the guiding principle.

3. The child shall be protected from any form of discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief. He shall be brought up in a spirit of understanding, tolerance, friendship among peoples, peace and universal brotherhood, respect for freedom of religion or belief of others, and in full consciousness that his energy and talents should be devoted to the service of his fellow men.

4. In the case of a child who is not under the care either of his parents or of legal guardians, due account shall be taken of their expressed wishes or of any other proof of their wishes in the matter of religion or belief, the best interests of the child being the guiding principle.

5. Practices of a religion or belief in which a child is brought up must not be injurious to his physical or mental health or to his full development, taking into account article 1, paragraph 3, of the present Declaration.

#### Article 6

In accordance with article 1 of the present Declaration, and subject to the provisions of article 1, paragraph 3, the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief shall include, *inter alia*, the following freedoms:

(a) To worship or assemble in connection with a religion or belief, and to establish and maintain places for these purposes;

(b) To establish and maintain appropriate charitable or humanitarian institutions;

(c) To make, acquire and use to an adequate extent the necessary articles and materials related to the rites or customs of a religion or belief;

(d) To write, issue and disseminate relevant publications in these areas;

(e) To teach a religion or belief in places suitable for these purposes;

(f) To solicit and receive voluntary financial and other contributions from individuals and institutions;

(g) To train, appoint, elect or designate by succession appropriate leaders called for by the requirements and standards of any religion or belief;

(h) To observe days of rest and to celebrate holidays and ceremonies in accordance with the precepts of one's religion or belief;

(i) To establish and maintain communications with individuals and communities in matters of religion or belief at the national and international levels.

#### Article 7

The rights and freedoms set forth in the present Declaration shall be accorded in national legislations in such a manner that everyone shall be able to avail himself of such rights and freedoms in practice.

#### Article 8

Nothing in the present Declaration shall be construed as restricting or derogating from any right defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights.

#### General Assembly decision 36/412

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/684) without vote. 9 November (meeting 43); 26-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.37): agenda item 75.

Sponsors: Australia, Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Germany, Federal Republic of Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Suriname, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

#### Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance

At its 73rd plenary meeting, on 25 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, recalling its resolution 36/55 of 25 November 1981 by which it proclaimed the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief, decided to consider further at its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance".

#### Minorities

At its February/March 1981 session, the Commission on Human Rights, through an informal Working Group open to all Commission members, continued work on a draft declaration on the rights of persons belonging to national, ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities. Basing its work on a revised draft prepared by its Chairman/Rapporteur in 1980, the Group reached preliminary agreement on six preambular paragraphs.<sup>(1)</sup>

On 10 March 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> after receiving the Working Group's report, the Commission decided to establish at its 1982 session an open-ended working group to continue consideration of the revised draft declaration, originally proposed by Yugoslavia in 1978.<sup>(5)</sup>

On 28 October 1981, by its resolution on the activities of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD),<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly called on States parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All

Forms of Racial Discrimination<sup>(3)</sup> to protect fully, through legislative and other measures, the rights of national or ethnic minorities and of indigenous populations.

During the debate in the Third Committee on racial discrimination, Yugoslavia expressed the view that the adoption of a declaration on the rights of minorities would contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights, E/1981/25.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Rights: 21 (XXXVII), 10 Mar. GA: <sup>(3)</sup>2106 A (XX), annex, 21 Dec. 1965 (YUN 1965, p. 440); <sup>(4)</sup>36/12, para. 9, 28 Oct. 1981 (p. 873).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1978, p. 722.

#### Indigenous populations

On 11 March 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights expressed hope that its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities would make recommendations to the Commission on the promotion and protection of the human rights of indigenous peoples, and endorsed the Sub-Commission's request that the Secretary-General assist the Special Rapporteur appointed by the Sub-Commission to study the topic, as authorized by the Economic and Social Council in 1971.<sup>(3)</sup>

The first part of the study was submitted to the Sub-Commission in 1981 by the Special Rapporteur, José R. Martínez Cobo (Ecuador).<sup>(1)</sup> Based on the situation in 37 countries, it dealt with the following aspects: composition of indigenous populations; basic principles, including constitutional provisions and basic legal status; general measures to prohibit, prevent and eliminate discrimination; measures adopted by the United Nations; other international action through conferences and organizations; and language. Conclusions and recommendations were to be submitted later.

On 8 September,<sup>(5)</sup> the Sub-Commission requested the Special Rapporteur to submit the supplementary parts of his final report in 1982, along with conclusions and proposals that were to include draft principles on the rights of indigenous populations.

Also on that date,<sup>(4)</sup> the Sub-Commission, through the Commission, requested authorization from the Economic and Social Council to establish annually a working group on indigenous populations. The group would meet for up to five working days before the annual sessions of the Sub-Commission in order to review developments pertaining to the promotion and protection of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous populations. It would examine information to be requested by the Secretary-General annually from Governments, specialized agen-

cies, regional intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations, particularly those of indigenous peoples. The group would analyse such materials and submit its conclusions to the Sub-Commission. It would give special attention to the evolution of standards concerning the rights of indigenous populations, taking account of both similarities and differences in the situations and aspirations of such populations throughout the world.

During the debate in the General Assembly's Third Committee on racial discrimination, Australia expressed interest in a proposed study by CERD touching on problems of indigenous peoples (p. 870) and remarked that more thought should be given to defining norms for their special situation, taking their views into account. Denmark, on behalf of the Nordic States, expressed the belief that CERD could make a substantial contribution to promoting and protecting the human rights of indigenous peoples.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Special Rapporteur, E/CN.4/Sub.2/476 & Add. 1-6.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 22(XXXVII). 11 Mar. <sup>(3)</sup>ESC: 1589(L). para. 7, 21 May 1971, (YUN 1971, p. 414). SCPDPM report, E/CN.4/1512, 8 Sep. 1981: <sup>(4)</sup>2(XXXIV), <sup>(5)</sup>3(XXXIV).

#### Protection of migrant workers

Work continued in 1981 on an international convention on the protection of the rights of all migrant workers and their families (see below), and the Economic and Social Council, in May, requested that studies be carried out on the welfare of such workers (p. 886). In addition, the General Assembly, by a resolution of 28 October on the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination,<sup>(2)</sup> invited Member States, United Nations bodies and specialized agencies to continue efforts to protect the rights of all migrant workers and their families. By another resolution of 28 October,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly commended CERD for taking up the problems of discrimination against migrant workers and requested the parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination<sup>(1)</sup> to protect fully the rights of those workers.

The resolution on the Decade, which had been recommended by the Council, was orally amended in the Assembly's Third Committee by Algeria, with a sub-amendment by Morocco. Affecting a preambular reference to the need to promote solutions to discrimination problems facing migrant workers and their families, the amendment added the phrase "wherever such problems exist". The word "problems", proposed by Morocco, replaced "discrimination" in the original Algerian amendment. Morocco, which

had originally proposed that the paragraph be qualified by the phrase "in certain parts of the world", felt that, as there were some excellent host countries, it would be appropriate to use less categorical wording.

Speaking in explanation of vote, Kuwait said it found the operative paragraph on migrant workers unsatisfactory. Kuwait and Oman had previously voiced reservations on the original paragraph, observing that the Third Committee was already working on a draft convention on the subject. Yugoslavia responded that migrant workers were victims of discrimination based on race, colour and origin.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>2106 A (XX), annex, 21 Dec. 1965 (YUN 1965, p. 440); <sup>(2)</sup>36/8, para. 13, 28 Oct. 1981 (p. 868); <sup>(3)</sup>36/12, para. 8, 28 Oct. (p. 873).

#### Draft convention

ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS. By a resolution of 12 March 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> adopted by 34 votes to none, with 6 abstentions, the Commission on Human Rights welcomed the fact that the Working Group on the Drafting of an International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families established by the General Assembly in 1979,<sup>(7)</sup> had begun work in 1980.<sup>(11)</sup> The Commission expressed hope that the Assembly would complete the elaboration of the convention in 1981.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. By a resolution of 8 May,<sup>(6)</sup> the Economic and Social Council expressed the conviction that the drafting of a convention would facilitate the exchanges of view needed for protecting the human rights and improving the situation of migrant workers and their families. The Council expressed hope that the Working Group would make substantial progress at its May session and that the drafting of the convention would be completed during the 1981 Assembly session. The Council decided to consider at its first regular session of 1982 measures to improve the situation and ensure the human rights and dignity of migrant workers, and to monitor the status of work done to protect the rights of migrant workers and their families.

The Working Group's progress was also welcomed by the Council in a resolution of 6 May concerned mainly with studies on migrant workers.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Council adopted the 8 May resolution, by 50 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Second (Social) Committee, which approved the orally revised draft on 5 May by a recorded vote, requested by Algeria, of 44 to none, with 2 abstentions. The draft was sponsored by 10 nations and introduced by



Algeria. As a result of the oral revision by the sponsors, the Council decided to monitor work done with a view to protecting the rights of migrant workers and their families, rather than work relating to the elaboration of a convention, as the original text had provided.

**WORKING GROUP ACTION.** As authorized by the General Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(9)</sup> the Working Group on the Drafting of an International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families, open to all United Nations Members, held 15 meetings at Headquarters from 11 to 22 May 1981 and 16 meetings from 12 October to 20 November. A preliminary draft convention was presented in May by Algeria, Barbados, Egypt, Mexico, Pakistan, Turkey and Yugoslavia, and proposals for a framework for the convention were submitted by Finland, Greece, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Spain and Sweden.

By the end of its October/November meetings, held during the 1981 Assembly session, the Working Group had provisionally agreed on a 21-paragraph preamble and on 17 articles, on the understanding that this text would be examined further in order to simplify it and adopt a single text in cases where alternative wording remained for some provisions. The Group agreed that part I of the convention would contain, in articles 1 to 6, provisions on the scope of the convention and definitions, while part II would deal with general principles concerning fundamental human rights applicable to all migrant workers and their families. The Group completed the first reading of articles 7 to 23 of part II and postponed the remaining work to its next session.

The Group was unable to adopt a report at its May session owing to lack of time. The Chairman, Antonio Gonzalez de León (Mexico), by a letter of 25 May,<sup>(1)</sup> transmitted to the Secretary-General a draft report he had prepared on that session, together with working papers submitted by participants. Communications proposing amendments to the draft report—sent by Denmark (on behalf of the Nordic States), Italy, the Netherlands, Spain and the United States—were circulated by the Secretary-General in a note of 22 September.<sup>(2)</sup> The report of the Working Group, annexing the provisionally agreed texts,<sup>(3)</sup> was submitted to the Assembly's Third Committee in November.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** After examining the Working Group's report, the General Assembly, by a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(10)</sup> decided that the Group should meet again for two weeks in New York in May 1982 as well as during the 1982 Assembly session to continue and, if possible, to complete its task. The resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval

by the Third Committee on 30 November of a 23-nation draft.

Introducing this text, Mexico observed that elaborating a convention on this subject was particularly difficult because of its complexity and the delicacy of the situations often created by the movements of migrant workers. Nevertheless, there was need for a legal framework to deal with the problems posed by those movements. Above all, it was important to preserve the basic rights of human beings.

The United States, while not opposing the adoption of the resolution without vote, believed that the International Labour Organisation (ILO) should elaborate the convention; it also wondered whether, in view of the administrative and financial implications, the Working Group should hold an inter-sessional meeting. Morocco explained that it had not become a sponsor of the resolution because no mention was made (in the operative paragraphs) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.<sup>(8)</sup>

In the Third Committee, the need for a convention to protect the rights of migrant workers was stressed by Argentina, Pakistan and Yugoslavia. The Netherlands said the convention should include provisions reflecting the right of States to determine and apply immigration laws but should not reiterate previously codified civil and political rights, as the current draft sought to do.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Working Group Chairman, 25 May, A/36/378.

Note: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, circulating communications from States, A/36/383.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>Working Group, A/C.3/36/10.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 37(XXXVII), 12 Mar. ESC: <sup>(5)</sup>1981/21, para. 3, 6 May (p. 887); <sup>(6)</sup>1981/35, 8 May, text following. GA: <sup>(7)</sup>34/172, para. 3, 17 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 876); <sup>(8)</sup>34/180, annex, 18 Dec. 1979 (ibid., p. 895); <sup>(9)</sup>35/198, para. 3, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 875); <sup>(10)</sup>36/160, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(11)</sup>1980, p. 857.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.3/36/L.83/Add. 1; 5th Committee report, A/36/811; S-G statements, A/C.3/36/L.83, A/C.5/36/88. Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 10, 15, 17, 18 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 63, 66 (19-30 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.73 (14 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/35

5 0 - 0 - 2 M e e t i n g 1 8 8 M a y 1 9 8 1

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/47) by recorded vote (44-0-2), 5 May (meeting 18); 10-nation draft (E/1981/C.2/L.16), orally revised: agenda item 8.

Sponsors: Algeria, Barbados, Ecuador, Egypt, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

Measures to improve the situation and ensure the human rights and dignity of all migrant workers and their families  
The Economic and Social Council,

Mindful of the need for international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, intellectual or

humanitarian nature and in developing and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion,

Recalling in that regard the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and of the international Covenants on Human Rights,

Mindful of the contribution made by migrant workers to the economic growth and the social and cultural development of the host countries,

Noting, in particular, that the problems of migrant workers, which are becoming more serious in some regions for political and economic reasons and for social and cultural reasons, constitute a matter of grave concern and continue to be of the greatest importance to certain countries,

Mindful of the important contribution made by the International Labour Organisation in the protection of the rights of all migrant workers,

Appreciating also the efforts of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in matters relating to migrant workers,

Deeply concerned at the fact that, despite the general effort made by Member States, regional intergovernmental organizations and various United Nations bodies, migrant workers are still unable fully to exercise their rights in the social field and in the labour field as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

Emphasizing, therefore, the efforts that must still be made effectively to protect the rights of all migrant workers and their families and to improve their living conditions,

Recalling its resolution 1981/21 of 6 May 1981, recommended for adoption by the Commission for Social Development, and resolution 37(XXXVII) of 12 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights,

Recalling its resolution 1980/16 of 30 April 1980,

1. Welcomes the fact that the Working Group on the Drafting of an International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families, established in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 34/172 of 17 December 1979, began its work during the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly;

2. Expresses its conviction that the drafting of that convention will further facilitate the exchanges of views needed for protecting the human rights and improving the situation of migrant workers and their families;

3. Expresses the hope that substantial progress will be made by the Working Group during the inter-sessional meeting to be held in May 1981 in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/198 of 15 December 1980, so that the Working Group may fully discharge its mandate and complete the drafting of the convention during the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly;

4. Decides to consider at its first regular session of 1982 the item entitled "Measures to improve the situation and ensure the human rights and dignity of all migrant workers" and to monitor the status of work done with a view to protecting the rights of all migrant workers and their families.

General Assembly resolution 36/160

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, 30 November (meeting 66): 23-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.68): agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Cape Verde, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Ghana, India, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Mali, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

Measures to improve the situation and ensure the human rights and dignity of all migrant workers

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming the permanent validity of the principles and standards embodied in the basic instruments regarding the international protection of human rights, in particular in the

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Covenants on Human Rights and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women,

Taking into account the principles and standards established within the framework of the International Labour Organisation and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; and the importance of the task carried out in connection with migrant workers and their families in other specialized agencies and in various organs of the United Nations,

Reiterating that, in spite of the existence of a body of principles and standards already established, there is need to make further efforts to improve the situation and ensure the human rights and dignity of all migrant workers and their families,

Recalling its resolution 34/172 of 17 December 1979, in which it decided to create a working group open to all Member States to elaborate an international convention on the protection of the rights of all migrant workers and their families,

Recalling also its resolution 35/198 of 15 December 1980, in which it renewed the mandate of the Working Group on the Drafting of an International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families and requested it to continue its work,

Having examined the progress made by the Working Group during its inter-sessional meeting held from 11 to 22 May 1981 and the contributions of various Governments.

Having also examined the report of the Working Group during the current session of the General Assembly,

1. Takes note of the report of the Working Group on the Drafting of an International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families and expresses its satisfaction with the substantial progress that the Working Group has so far made in the accomplishment of its mandate;

2. Decides that, in order to enable the Working Group to complete its task as soon as possible, the Working Group shall hold again an inter-sessional meeting of two weeks' duration in New York, in May 1982, immediately after the first regular session of the Economic and Social Council;

3. Invites the Secretary-General to transmit to Governments the report of the Working Group so as to allow the members of the Working Group to continue their task during the inter-sessional meeting to be held in May 1982, as well as to transmit the results obtained in that meeting in order that the General Assembly may consider them during its thirty-seventh session;

4. Also invites the Secretary-General to transmit the above-mentioned documents to the competent organs of the United Nations and to international organizations concerned, for their information, so as to enable them to continue their co-operation with the Working Group;

5. Decides that the Working Group shall meet during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly to continue and, if possible, to complete the elaboration of an international convention on the protection of the rights of all migrant workers and their families.

#### Studies on migrant workers

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. By a resolution of 6 May 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the Economic and Social Council reaffirmed the need to consider the situation of migrant workers in an interrelated manner, and invited Member States to present research findings and government reports to the Secretary-General. It welcomed the progress made by the Working Group on a convention on

the rights of migrant workers (p. 884). The Council requested the Secretary-General to include in the 1982-1983 budget comprehensive studies with recommendations on the welfare of migrant workers, and to ensure that reports requested by the Council in 1975<sup>(2)</sup> and 1979<sup>(3)</sup> (on principles concerning migrant workers and their families embodied in international instruments, and on national legislative and administrative regulations) were presented to the Commission for Social Development in 1983. In addition, the Council recommended that the welfare of migrant workers be included in the Commission's 1983 agenda.

The resolution was adopted, by 51 votes to none, with 3 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, which approved the draft on 29 April by a vote, requested by the Federal Republic of Germany, of 48 to none, with 3 abstentions. The draft originated in the Commission for Social Development, which approved it on 17 February.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** Recalling the Economic and Social Council resolution, the General Assembly, on 16 December, reaffirmed the Council's request to include in the 1982-1983 budget studies on questions concerning migrant workers which would take account of, and complement, studies by ILO.<sup>(6)</sup>

The Assembly took this decision, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, which approved the orally revised draft in the same manner on 1 December. The sponsors were Algeria, Barbados, India, Italy, Mexico, Pakistan, Turkey and Yugoslavia. Mention of ILO studies was added by the sponsors after the United States orally proposed an amendment to have this request met within 1982-1983 appropriations by eliminating an equivalent programme of lower priority. After the draft decision was revised the United States withdrew its amendment.

In a resolution of 18 December on budget and programme matters,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly decided not to endorse a June recommendation by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination<sup>(\*)</sup> to delete activities on the welfare of migrant workers from the proposed budget for 1982-1983 on the ground that they would duplicate the work of ILO.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>CPC, A/36/38.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1926 A (LVIII), para. 6, 6 May 1975 (YUN 1975, p. 684); <sup>(3)</sup>1979/12, para. 6, 9 May 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 761); <sup>(4)</sup>1981/21, 6 May 1981, text following. <sup>(5)</sup>GA: 36/235, sect. XVIII, 18 Dec. (p. 1274).

Decision: <sup>(6)</sup>GA: 36/434, 16 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-10, 11 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 66, 68 (19 Nov.-1 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/21

51 - 0 - 3 Meeting 146 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) by vote (48-0-3). 29 April (meeting 11): draft by Commission for Social Development (E/1981/26); agenda item 10.

Welfare of migrant workers and their families

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolutions 1926(LVIII) of 6 May 1975 and 1979/12 of 9 May 1979,

Conscious of the fact that in certain regions the problems of migrant workers are becoming more serious as a result of current economic trends and related social and cultural issues,

Concerned about the fact that, despite the efforts of Member States and international organizations, migrant workers and their families are, to a great extent, not always able to enjoy all the benefits of the application of the basic principle of equality of opportunity and treatment with regard to their working and living conditions,

Noting that the social provisions of bilateral agreements concluded between labour-employing and labour-supplying countries are often limited to general statements,

Taking into account the conventions and recommendations of the international Labour Organisation concerning migration for employment, migrant workers, migration in abusive conditions and the promotion of equality of opportunity for the treatment of workers,

Recognizing the need for further efforts to improve the welfare of migrant workers and their families as well as the preservation of their identity,

Recalling the World Population Plan of Action, adopted by the World Population Conference, in which, *inter alia*, both labour-employing and labour-supplying countries were urged, if they had not yet done so, to conclude bilateral or multilateral agreements which would protect and assist migrant workers and safeguard the interests of the countries concerned,

1. Reaffirms the need for the United Nations to consider the situation of migrant workers in an interrelated manner, bearing in mind that the principle of equality of treatment extends to include the living conditions of migrant workers and their families, particularly with regard to housing, health, education and cultural and social welfare;

2. Invites Member States to present existing research findings and governmental reports to the Secretary-General so as to obtain an overall view of the situation of migrant workers and their families;

3. Welcomes the progress made by the Working Group on the Drafting of an International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families, established in accordance with General Assembly resolution 34/172 of 17 December 1979;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to include in the programme budget for 1982-1983 studies on the questions concerned with the welfare of migrant workers and their families, and to undertake those studies in a comprehensive manner to include common recommendations;

5. Also requests the Secretary-General to ensure, taking into account the views of the Governments and organizations concerned, that the reports requested in Economic and Social Council resolutions 1926(LVIII) and 1979/12 shall be presented to the Commission for Social Development at its twenty-eighth session;

6. Recommends the inclusion of the question of the welfare of migrant workers and their families in the agenda of the twenty-eighth session of the Commission for Social Development to permit an exchange of views and to promote further attention to this specific group.

General Assembly decision 36/434

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, 1 December (meeting 68); 8-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.87), orally revised; agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Barbados, India, Italy, Mexico, Pakistan, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

#### Welfare of migrant workers and their families

At its 101st plenary meeting, on 16 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, recalling Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/21 of 6 May 1981 and taking note of the views expressed at the second regular session of 1981 of the Council with respect to the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the work of its twenty-first session, reaffirmed the request in Council resolution 1981/21 to include in the programme budget of the United Nations for 1982-1983 studies on the questions concerned with the welfare of migrant workers and their families which would take account of, and complement, the studies already undertaken by the International Labour Organisation.

#### Protection of the human rights of non-citizens

Work continued in 1981 on the drafting of a declaration on the human rights of individuals who were not citizens of the country in which they lived. A Working Group established under a 1980 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(3)</sup> open to all United Nations Members and chaired by Pera Caroline Wells (Australia), held nine meetings between 29 September and 27 November 1981. It provisionally adopted three articles in addition to the two which a similar group had provisionally adopted in November 1980.<sup>(6)</sup> The discussion was based mainly on a revised draft declaration presented in 1979 by a Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, Baroness Elles (United Kingdom),<sup>(5)</sup> transmitted to the Assembly by the Economic and Social Council in 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> and on amendments and proposals submitted to the Group by several countries and by the Chair in the light of informal consultations.

In 1981, the Working Group provisionally adopted article 3 of the draft declaration, stating that every State was to make public any laws, regulations or administrative provisions distinguishing between nationals and aliens; article 4, specifying the rights of aliens, including the rights to life, liberty and security of person, protection against arbitrary interference, equal access to and treatment by judicial organs and authorities, choice of a spouse, freedom of thought and religion, retention of language and culture, liberty of movement, travel from the country, freedom of expression, manifestation of religion or belief and freedom of peaceful assembly; and article 5, providing that no alien be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention. Some proposed wording for these articles on which the Working Group did not reach agreement, including the proposed mention of the rights to be reunited with a spouse or other family members, to return to one's country of nationality and to

own property, were to be examined further at its next session.

On 16 December, the Assembly adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(4)</sup> by which it took note of the Working Group's report<sup>(1)</sup> and of the fact that, although it had done useful work, it had not had sufficient time to conclude its task. The Assembly decided to establish, in 1982, an open-ended working group for the purpose of concluding the elaboration of the draft declaration and expressed hope that it would be adopted in 1982.

This resolution originated in a draft: by 16 nations, introduced by the United Kingdom, which the Third Committee approved on 1 December, also without vote.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Working Group, A/C.3/36/11.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC: 1980/29, 2 May 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 882). GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/199, para. 2, 15 Dec. 1980 (ibid., p. 883); <sup>(4)</sup>36/165, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(5)</sup>1979, p. 816; <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 867.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/811; S-G statements, A/C.3/36/L.81, A/C.5/36/81.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 63, 68 (19 Nov.-1 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.66 (8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/165

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote. 1 December (meeting 68): 16-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.73/Rev.1): agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Jamaica, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, United Kingdom, Uruguay.

Question of the international legal protection of the human rights of individuals who are not citizens of the country in which they live

The General Assembly,

Bearing in mind Economic and Social Council resolutions 1790(LIV) of 18 May 1973 and 1871 (LVI) of 17 May 1974 concerning the question of the international legal protection of the human rights of individuals who are not citizens of the country in which they live,

Noting Commission on Human Rights resolutions 8(XXIX) of 21 March 1973, 11 (XXX) of 6 March 1974, 16(XXXV) of 14 March 1979, and 19(XXXVI) of 29 February 1980, on the same subject,

Noting also resolution 9(XXXI) of 13 September 1978 of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities,

Recalling that the Economic and Social Council, by its resolution 1980/29 of 2 May 1980, decided to transmit to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session the text of the draft declaration on the human rights of individuals who are not citizens of the country in which they live, prepared by the Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, the Baroness Elles, and amended by the Sub-Commission, together with the comments on the text received from Member States in response to Council decision 1979/36 of 10 May 1979, and recommended that the Assembly should consider the adoption of a declaration on the subject,

Recalling also its resolution 35/199 of 15 December 1980, in which it decided to establish an open-ended working group for the purpose of concluding the elaboration of the draft declaration on the human rights of individuals who are not citizens of the country in which they live.

Having considered the report of the Working Group.

1. Takes note of the report of the Working Group and of

the fact that, although the Working Group has done useful work, it has not had sufficient time to conclude its task;

2. Decides to establish, at its thirty-seventh session, an open-ended working group for the purpose of concluding the elaboration of the draft declaration on the human rights of individuals who are not citizens of the country in which they live;

3. Expresses the hope that a draft declaration on the human rights of individuals who are not citizens of the country in which they live will be adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Discrimination in the administration of criminal justice

On 9 September 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities requested its Special Rapporteur, Abu Sayeed Chowdhury (Bangladesh), to continue work on and submit in 1982 his study on discriminatory treatment of members of racial, ethnic, religious or linguistic groups at various levels in the administration of criminal justice, such as police, military, administrative and judicial investigations, arrest, detention, trial and execution of sentences, including the ideologies or beliefs contributing or leading to racism in the administration of criminal justice. The study was authorized by the Economic and Social Council in May 1980.<sup>(2)</sup> A preliminary draft report<sup>(1)</sup> was discussed at the Sub-Commission's 1981 session.

Under the United Nations programme of advisory services in human rights (p. 937), a regional training course on human rights guarantees in the administration of criminal justice was organized at the Institute of Criminology in Canberra, in collaboration with the Government of Australia. It was attended by participants from 19 countries in Asia and the Pacific.

Draft report: <sup>(1)</sup>E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.766.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1980/28, 2 May 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 803); <sup>(3)</sup>SCPDPM (report, E/CN.4/1512), 5(XXXIV), 9 Sep. 1981.

## Civil and political rights

### International Covenant and Protocol

#### Accessions and ratifications

As at 31 December 1981, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol thereto, which were adopted by the General Assembly in 1966<sup>(2)</sup> and entered into force on 23 March 1976,<sup>(4)</sup> had been ratified or acceded to by 69 and 27 States, respectively.

The States which had ratified or acceded to the Covenant (*italics indicate those acceding in 1981*) were:

Australia, Austria, Barbados, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile,

Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

The Optional Protocol had been ratified or acceded to by the following States (*italics indicate those acceding in 1981*):

Barbados, Canada, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Iceland, Italy, Jamaica, Madagascar, Mauritius, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Suriname, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

In addition, Senegal made a declaration during the year under article 41 of the Covenant, recognizing the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State party claimed that another State party was not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant. A total of 14 parties had made such a declaration: Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United Kingdom.

The Commission on Human Rights, on 10 March,<sup>(1)</sup> and the General Assembly, on 25 November,<sup>(3)</sup> again invited all States that had not done so to become parties to the International Covenants on Human Rights (p. 933), including the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol, and invited the parties to consider making a declaration under article 41. They requested the Secretary-General to submit reports in 1982 on the status of both instruments.

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 16(XXXVII), 10 Mar. GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 423); <sup>(3)</sup>36/58, 25 Nov. 1981 (p. 934).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1976, p. 609.

#### Implementation of the Covenant

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE ACTION. The Human Rights Committee, established under article 28 of the International Covenant on Civil

and Political Rights,<sup>(2)</sup> held three sessions during 1981: the twelfth at United Nations Headquarters from 23 March to 10 April, the thirteenth at Geneva from 13 to 31 July, and the fourteenth at Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany, from 19 to 30 October.

During those sessions, the Committee considered reports and additional information submitted by 11 States parties under article 40 of the Covenant, on measures adopted to give effect to civil and political rights and progress made in their enjoyment. The reports were submitted by Barbados, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Mali, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal and the United Republic of Tanzania. The Committee also concluded consideration of 13 communications submitted under article 2 of the Optional Protocol to the Covenant<sup>(3)</sup> by individuals claiming to be victims of violations of civil and political rights, and adopted its views on the merits of those cases. The cases concerned Canada (two), Finland (one), Mauritius (one), Sweden (one) and Uruguay (eight). The Committee also discussed matters concerning publicity for its work.

By a decision of 22 July on periodicity of reports, the Committee requested States parties, after the consideration of their initial report (due within a year following the entry into force of the Covenant for each of them) or additional information requested by the Committee, to submit subsequent reports every five years. On 27 July, it adopted guidelines regarding the form and content of reports.

The Committee adopted five general comments on 28 July concerning implementation of the Covenant. In summary, these were:

(1) States should pay immediate attention to their reporting responsibilities, as only a small number of reports had been submitted on time.

(2) Some reports had been too brief and general to satisfy reporting requirements under the Covenant, while others had been incomplete in regard to national legislation, machinery and court decisions.

(3) States not only must respect rights but also must undertake specific activities to enable individuals to enjoy them, including steps to publicize the Covenant and familiarize authorities with its provisions.

(4) In order to help ensure the equal right of men and women to the enjoyment of civil and political rights, laws and measures which inherently drew a distinction between the sexes should be reviewed in so far as they adversely affected those rights, and States should report specific information about all legislative and other measures in that area.

(5) Although the Covenant authorized limited

derogation from certain rights under an officially proclaimed public emergency threatening the life of the nation, it was unclear in a few cases whether a state of emergency had been officially declared, whether rights from which the Covenant allowed no derogation had been affected and whether other States parties had been informed as the Covenant required; measures taken in such situations must be exceptional and temporary, must last only as long as the nation's life was threatened, and must be reported to other States parties and to the Committee.

The fifth annual report of the Committee,<sup>(1)</sup> covering its three sessions between 20 October 1980 and 31 July 1981, was adopted at the conclusion of the thirteenth session and was submitted through the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly. The Council, on 21 October, authorized the Secretary-General to transmit the report directly to the Assembly.<sup>(5)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By its resolution of 25 November on the International Covenants on Human Rights,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly noted with appreciation the report of the Human Rights Committee and urged States parties to submit their reports to the Committee as speedily as possible and to provide additional information when the Committee requested. It also took note of the Committee's decisions on periodicity and guidelines for those reports, as well as of the adoption of general comments. It emphasized the importance of the strictest compliance by States parties with their obligations under the Covenant and the Protocol, and expressed appreciation that the Committee continued to strive for uniform standards of implementation. The Assembly welcomed measures by the Secretary-General to improve publicity for the Committee's work and requested him to report in 1982 on the most appropriate steps for publication of its documents.

During the debate on human rights in the Assembly's Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, France expressed the view that the Human Rights Committee's role in examining national reports was to be concerned with the interests of States rather than with censuring them when it found adverse aspects, and to act as guide and adviser by suggesting measures for remedying shortcomings; in addition, when the Assembly considered the Committee's report, it should avoid going into questions of human rights violations and should concentrate on principles and on the practical ideas contained in the general comments and recommendations, thus contributing to the preparation of a practical guide for States parties. The Federal Republic of Germany considered that a frank and critical dialogue in the United

Nations and the co-operation of States with the Human Rights Committee were among the best ways of strengthening respect for human rights.

In Mongolia's view, the Human Rights Committee should bear in mind the existence of different social and economic systems and the wide diversity in levels of development; the achievement of human rights was a long-term process and implementation of the Covenant should be judged accordingly. The USSR said the Committee should continue to work constructively, in a spirit of strengthening friendly relations among States.

Referring to the Human Rights Committee's decision on the periodic reporting procedure, Canada believed it insufficient for States to submit a report once every five years; whenever the Committee had serious reason to believe that certain fundamental provisions of the Covenant had been breached, it should request the State concerned to report urgently on the status of respect for human rights. The German Democratic Republic, however, thought the Committee's decision guaranteed that all States would be treated equally and that ad hoc reports from individual States would not be demanded at random. The Netherlands thought the five-year interval was well chosen because it allowed serious evaluation and the improvement of legislation and enforcement measures. New Zealand and Portugal also endorsed the Committee's decision.

Bulgaria regretted that some Western countries parties to the Covenant maintained their reservations regarding article 20, thus admitting their unwillingness to prohibit war propaganda and propaganda of national, racial or religious hatred. Rwanda was pleased to see the Committee stress that the Covenant applied in emergencies as well as in normal times.

Morocco remarked that any failure by a member of the Committee to live up to the qualities of integrity, impartiality, judgement and discretion might jeopardize the confidence of Governments in that body and provide an easy opportunity for those with interventionist aims. Romania voiced concern at what it called the tendency of certain members to base themselves on documentation other than the legislation and internal practices of States parties, whereas the Committee had been established exclusively to study the reports of States parties.

Italy and the Netherlands expressed the view that the Human Rights Committee's general comments on the reports by States parties should be addressed to individual States; if the Committee was unable to agree on that point, Italy added, the Assembly should provide it with a clear interpretation. The Netherlands and the United Kingdom endorsed the Committee's

proposal to have its official records published in annual volumes, the United Kingdom adding that the cost should be met from savings elsewhere in the budget. Uruguay said the Committee should respect the confidentiality of the communications it received under the Optional Protocol and not reproduce them in full in its report; Uruguay was engaged in a dialogue with the Committee and was confident that its procedural errors could be remedied.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Human Rights Committee, A/36/40.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec.

1966 (YUN 1966, p. 427); <sup>(3)</sup>ibid., p. 431; <sup>(4)</sup>36/58,

Decision: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/193, para. (c), 21 Oct. (p. 1091).

Meeting record: ESC, E/1981/SR.42 (21 Oct.).

### Self-determination of peoples

ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS. In the context of its continuing consideration of the right of peoples to self-determination, the Commission on Human Rights, on 6 March 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> reaffirmed once more the legitimacy of peoples' struggle for independence, territorial integrity and liberation from colonial or foreign domination and foreign occupation by all available means, including armed struggle. It demanded the immediate and unconditional release of all people detained or imprisoned as a result of their struggle for self-determination, independence and fundamental rights. The Commission reaffirmed that the use of mercenaries against national liberation movements and States was a criminal act (p. 1216).

Referring to specific instances, the Commission reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Namibians, South Africans and Palestinians, and of all peoples under alien and colonial domination, to self-determination, national independence, territorial integrity, national unity and sovereignty without external interference. It condemned South Africa's massacres of innocent people (p. 944) and aggression against neighbouring front-line States (p. 214), as well as Israel's aggression against Arab civilians (p. 956). It also condemned the policy of States which maintained relations with South Africa (p. 945).

The resolution was adopted by a roll-call vote of 31 to 8 (Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States), with 3 abstentions.

The Commission adopted four other resolutions under its agenda item on the self-determination of peoples, concerning Afghanistan (p. 896), Kampuchea (p. 897), Western Sahara (p. 898) and the territories occupied by Israel (p. 955).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 28 October, the General Assembly adopted two resolutions on the right of peoples to self-determination.

By the first of these,<sup>(9)</sup> it reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle for independence, territorial integrity, national unity and liberation from colonial and foreign domination and foreign occupation by all available means, including armed struggle. It reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Namibians, the Palestinians and all peoples under alien and colonial domination to self-determination, national independence, territorial integrity, national unity and sovereignty without external interference, and strongly condemned the continued violations of those peoples' human rights. It strongly condemned Governments which did not recognize the right to self-determination and independence of all peoples under such domination, notably those of Africa and the Palestinians. It demanded the immediate and unconditional release of all persons detained or imprisoned as a result of their struggle for self-determination and independence, full respect for their rights, and the observance of prohibitions against torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.

The Assembly called on States to outlaw the recruitment and financing of mercenaries (p. 1216) and called for assistance to peoples under colonial and foreign rule (p. 1100). It condemned South Africa for armed attacks on the front-line States (p. 214), including Angola (p. 221); condemned policies of countries whose relations with South Africa encouraged it to persist in suppressing the people's aspirations; demanded application of the mandatory arms embargo (p. 173); noted with satisfaction the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 165); and demanded implementation of the Assembly's resolution of 14 September on a Namibia settlement(s) and the release of imprisoned South African and Namibian children (p. 199). It noted a decision to hold a referendum in Western Sahara (p. 1194) and contacts between the Comoros and France concerning the Comorian island of Mayotte (p. 223). Israeli expansionist activities and bombing of Palestinians were condemned (p. 265), as was Israeli aggression against Lebanon (p. 291). The Assembly also urged support to the Palestinians through the Palestine Liberation Organization in their struggle for self-determination and independence.

This resolution was adopted by a vote of 120 to 17, with 9 abstentions. The Third Committee approved the revised text on 16 October by a vote of 111 to 17, with 8 abstentions, on the basis of a draft introduced by Angola on behalf of the African Group. Paragraphs 18 and 19, on the Palestinians and on Israel and Lebanon, were

orally revised twice by the sponsors prior to the Committee's approval of the draft.

After the second revision, Lebanon withdrew two amendments it had proposed. One of these,<sup>(1)</sup> to paragraph 2, would have added to the reaffirmation of the legitimacy of the struggle for independence and other political goals the phrase "without prejudice to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the host countries and peoples of the area". The second amendment<sup>(2)</sup> would have affected the provision on Israel and Lebanon.

By its second resolution on self-determination,<sup>(10)</sup> the Assembly reaffirmed that the realization of the right of all peoples, including those under colonial, foreign and alien domination, to self-determination was fundamental for the effective guarantee, observance, preservation and promotion of human rights. It declared firm opposition to foreign military intervention, aggression and occupation, called for their immediate cessation, and requested the Commission on Human Rights to continue to give special attention to the violation of human rights, especially the right to self-determination, resulting from foreign military intervention, aggression or occupation. The Secretary-General was requested to report on that issue in 1982.

This resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Third Committee on 16 October, where the draft was introduced by Pakistan on behalf of 16 nations.

The title of the resolution and three paragraphs were orally revised by the sponsors, taking into account some suggestions by Ethiopia. The original title, "Importance of the universal realization of the rights of peoples to self-determination", was changed to "Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination". To the international instruments listed in the first preambular paragraph (reaffirming the importance of the right to self-determination for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights), the Assembly's 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples<sup>(5)</sup> was added. The fourth preambular paragraph, expressing grave concern that millions of people had been and were being uprooted as refugees as a consequence of foreign intervention and occupation, was expanded to include displaced persons. To operative paragraph 1, whereby the Assembly reaffirmed the right of peoples to self-determination, the sponsors specified "all" peoples, "including those under colonial, foreign and alien domination".

The legitimacy of the struggle of peoples under colonial and alien domination to (exercise their right to self-determination and independence by all necessary means at their disposal



was again affirmed by the Assembly in a resolution of 1 December 1981 on decolonization.<sup>(11)</sup>

Introducing the draft of the first resolution on behalf of the African Group, Angola said the text was the result of a consensus among the African States. Violations of the human rights of peoples under colonial subjugation and foreign domination, such as in southern Africa and the territories under Israeli occupation, became the concern of all mankind.

Explaining the opposition of the European Community (EC) members to this text, the United Kingdom objected to what it called the allusions to the nature of some States' relations with southern Africa, unbalanced references to the Middle East situation, encouragement of armed struggle, the idea that relations with another State meant approval or encouragement of its policy, and omission of references to flagrant violations of self-determination in Afghanistan and Kampuchea. Also voting against, Israel opposed the inclusion of the two paragraphs condemning Israeli expansionist activities and aggression against Lebanon.

Reservations to specific paragraphs were voiced by several others: by Argentina, Australia, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Chile, Fiji, Panama, Singapore, Turkey and the United States on paragraph 11, condemning relations of members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and others with South Africa; by Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland on paragraph 13, taking note with satisfaction of the Paris Declaration on sanctions; by Argentina and Chile on paragraph 14, concerning Namibia; by Panama (paragraph 18), Argentina and Thailand (paragraph 19), Burma, Chile, Costa Rica and the United States on the paragraphs condemning Israel's expansionist activities and aggression; and by Argentina, Australia, Chile, Costa Rica, Fiji and Uruguay on paragraph 2, reaffirming the legitimacy of armed struggle. Portugal stated that isolating South Africa was not the best way to solve the Namibian problem and the apartheid question.

Introducing the second resolution on self-determination, Pakistan said the sponsors were motivated not only by a grave concern over the violation of the right to self-determination but also by the resulting plight of millions of refugees.

Explaining their position on this resolution, Ethiopia and India said the fact they had not opposed its adoption without vote did not imply a change in their position on resolutions on self-determination, for which they had not voted, adopted by the Commission on Human Rights and referred to in the preamble. Ethiopia added that the resolution's title should have included a reference to independence for colonial countries.

Panama said it should have mentioned indirect military intervention, which was the most common form of interference in the internal affairs of States. The USSR considered that the resolution should have contained warnings against imperialists and hegemonists who continued to deny peoples their right to self-determination, interfered openly in the internal affairs of States and sought to repress the liberation movements of oppressed peoples.

Democratic Kampuchea and the United States said they had joined in the consensus because the resolution applied to Afghanistan and Kampuchea. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, said the resolution dealt primarily with situations in which the right of sovereign States to self-determination had been violated by foreign military intervention and occupation.

During the Third Committee's debate on self-determination of peoples, Australia expressed the view that the United Nations and its Members had the responsibility to oppose foreign military intervention, aggression and occupation, which led to the suppression of the right to self-determination and other human rights; the right to self-determination was not confined to colonial situations. A General Assembly resolution of November 1980 on self-determination,<sup>(7)</sup> Canada said, placed the denial of self-determination, traditionally linked to a colonial situation, in the equally legitimate context of foreign military intervention and occupation. The Federal Republic of Germany said it was important for the United Nations to ensure that the old form of colonialism was not superseded by an ideologically motivated neo-colonialism and a new policy of hegemony; implementation of the basic rights of the individual and of the right to self-determination could not be attained one without the other. Whenever illegal force was used internationally, said Greece, the right to self-determination was violated.

Portugal remarked that, in several parts of the world, the right to self-determination was regarded with contempt, and the territorial integrity of States and their right to choose their system of government were blatantly disregarded. The United Kingdom stated that the achievement of independence by over 40 of its formerly dependent Territories demonstrated its attachment to the right to self-determination; if the international community sat by while that right was violated in certain countries, it would contribute to the erosion of the principle of self-determination. The United States said there were two opposed concepts of self-determination: one of them had led the Western countries to renounce their empires, while the other had resulted in the consoli-

dation and expansion of the last remaining empire.

Bulgaria observed that there were about 20 colonial Territories with a total population of 3 million which had not been able to exercise their right to self-determination and independence; the maintenance of Western military bases constituted a further obstacle to that independence. The USSR saw it as intolerable that a significant number of small territories and enclaves still remained under colonialism.

Czechoslovakia stated that fallacious interpretations of the right to self-determination went along with attempts to create artificial problems and to misuse the term for selfish motives in regions where development conflicted with the interests of world imperialism and hegemonism. The German Democratic Republic said imperialist policies violated the right to self-determination and threatened the vital interests of all peoples. Poland voiced dismay at attempts to divert the discussion of self-determination away from the struggle to eliminate all vestiges of colonialism and neo-colonial domination. Romania commented that respect for the sovereignty of peoples was an essential element in the right to self-determination.

The right to self-determination was so generally recognized, said Afghanistan, that even advocates of colonialism, neo-colonialism, aggression and domination shed crocodile tears over the sufferings of oppressed peoples. Iraq stated that any agreement violating the right to self-determination should be considered as null and void. Kuwait considered that no practical measures had been taken to ensure even the partial implementation of United Nations resolutions on self-determination, mainly because the Western countries saw them as an expression of Utopian dreams that could not be realized in the modern world. Madagascar remarked that exercise of the right to self-determination was a prerequisite for the exercise of other rights. Morocco said the Assembly must protect the self-determination of independent peoples and the international community must do all it could to ensure implementation of the right of self-determination of the individual. Viet Nam said the current stage of the struggle for self-determination was marked by attempts by former colonial forces to regain control of the territories they had lost and to impose their own model of society or development.

In Uruguay's view, universal respect for self-determination could not be guaranteed if States did not meet the obligation not to impede exercise of that right by the people of another State or act in any way incompatible with such exercise. Venezuela said the United Nations must encourage the struggle not only against classic

colonialism but also against new, subtle forms of pressure exerted by one State against another, particularly in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Some speakers stressed the economic aspects of self-determination. Bangladesh said it could not be universally realized unless the economic and social balance between countries was redressed. The Philippines remarked that economic emancipation was essential in the elimination of political domination. In Hungary's view, the right to self-determination implied the right of peoples to struggle with every means for their liberation and to choose freely their path of social and economic development. In a similar vein, Yugoslavia said the right to development was an important aspect of the right to self-determination; without it, there could be no peace, freedom, progress or prosperity. Zaire called attention to links with the rights to development, to health and to use of natural resources.

Also during the debate, various speakers called for implementation of the right to self-determination in reference to Afghanistan, Cyprus, Kampuchea, Namibia, the Palestinians, South Africa and Western Sahara.

The Secretary-General submitted to the Assembly in September a report<sup>(3)</sup> on action taken, pursuant to a November 1980 Assembly resolution,<sup>(6)</sup> with regard to implementation of the right to self-determination. The report summarized replies received from 18 Governments, two regional intergovernmental organizations and four non-governmental organizations.

Amendments withdrawn: Lebanon, <sup>(1)</sup>A/C.3/36/L.16, <sup>(2)</sup>A/C.3/36/L.17.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/403 & Add.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 14(XXXVII), 6 Mar. GA: <sup>(5)</sup>1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49); <sup>(6)</sup>35/35 A, 14 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 840); <sup>(7)</sup>35/35 B, 14 Nov. 1980 (ibid., p. 841); <sup>(8)</sup>ES-8/2, 14 Sep. 1981 (p. 1153); <sup>(9)</sup>36/9, 28 Oct., text following; <sup>(10)</sup>36/10, 28 Oct., text following; <sup>(11)</sup>36/68, para. 4, 1 Dec. (p. 1098).

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.4-14, 18, 20, 22, 24 (25 Sep.-20 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.42 (28 Oct.).

General Assembly resolution 36/9

120-17-9 Meeting 42 28 October 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/622) by vote (111-17-8), 16 October (meeting 22): draft by Angola. for African Group (A/C.3/36/L.11), orally revised; agenda item 81.

Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights  
The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2649(XXV) of 30 November 1970, 2955(XXVII) of 12 December 1972, 3070(XXVIII) of 30 November 1973, 3246(XXIX) of 29 November 1974, 3382(XXX) of 10 November 1975, 33/24 of 29 November 1978, 34/44 of 23 November 1979 and 35/35 of 14 November 1980, and Security Council resolutions 418(1977) of 4 November 1977 and 437(1978) of 10 October 1978,

Recalling a/so its resolutions 2465 (XXIII) of 20 December 1968, 2548 (XXIV) of 11 December 1969, 2708 (XXV) of 14 December 1970, 3103 (XXVIII) of 12 December 1973 and 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974 concerning the use and recruitment of mercenaries against national liberation movements and sovereign States,

Recalling further its relevant resolutions on the question of Palestine, in particular resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974, 34/65 A to D of 29 November and 12 December 1979 and 35/13 A to F of 3 November 1980,

Recalling a/so the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, on the question of Namibia, and its resolution ES-8/2 of 14 September 1981,

Recalling the resolutions on Namibia adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-seventh ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 15 to 26 June 1981, particularly resolutions CM/Res. 855 (XXXVII) and CM/Res.865 (XXXVII),

Deeply concerned at the continued terrorist acts of aggression committed by the racist Pretoria régime against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Zambia and other neighbouring States,

Taking note of the Political Declaration adopted by the First Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity and the League of Arab States, held at Cairo from 7 to 9 March 1977,

Considering that the denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination, sovereignty, independence and return to Palestine and the repeated acts of aggression by Israel against the peoples of the region constitute a serious threat to international peace and security,

Reaffirming its faith in the importance of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960,

Reaffirming the importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, national sovereignty and territorial integrity and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples as imperatives for the full enjoyment of all human rights,

Reaffirming that "bantustanization" is incompatible with genuine independence, national unity and sovereignty and has the effect of perpetuating the power of the white minority and the racist system of apartheid in South Africa,

Reaffirming the obligation of all Member States to comply with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions of the United Nations regarding the exercise of the right to self-determination by peoples under colonial and alien domination,

Reaffirming also that the system of apartheid imposed on the South African people constitutes an inadmissible violation of the rights of that people and a constant threat to international peace and security,

We/coming the independence of Belize,

Reaffirming the national unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros,

Gravely concerned at the continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the continued violations of the human rights of the peoples still under colonial and foreign domination and alien subjugation,

1. Calls upon all States to implement fully and faithfully the resolutions of the United Nations regarding the exercise of the right to self-determination by peoples under colonial and alien domination;

2. Reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples for independence, territorial integrity, national unity and liberation from colonial and foreign domination and foreign occupation by all available means, including armed struggle;

3. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the Namibian people, of the Palestinian people and of all peoples under alien and colonial domination to self-determination, national independence, territorial integrity, national unity and sovereignty without external interference;

4. Takes note with satisfaction of resolution AHG/Res. 103 (XVIII) adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981, and the decision of its Implementation Committee to organize and conduct a general and free referendum on self-determination in Western Sahara;

5. Takes note of the contacts made by the Government of the Comoros and the Government of France in the search for a just solution to the integration of the Comorian island of Mayotte into the Comoros in accordance with the resolutions of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations on this question;

6. Condemns the policy of "bantustanization" and reiterates its support for the oppressed people of South Africa in their just and legitimate struggle against the racist minority régime of Pretoria;

7. Further condemns South Africa for its increased oppression of the Namibian people, for the massive militarization of Namibia and for its armed attacks on the front-line States with the aim of destabilizing their Governments;

8. Also condemns strongly the recent invasion and occupation of part of the territory of Angola by troops of the racist Pretoria régime;

9. Reaffirms that the practice of using mercenaries against national liberation movements and sovereign States constitutes a criminal act and that the mercenaries themselves are criminals, and calls upon the Governments of all countries to enact legislation declaring the recruitment, financing and training of mercenaries in their territories, and the transit of mercenaries through their territories, to be punishable offences, and prohibiting their nationals from serving as mercenaries, and to report on such legislation to the Secretary-General;

10. Strongly condemns the continued violations of the human rights of the peoples still under colonial and foreign domination and alien subjugation, the continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia, and South Africa's attempts to dismember its territory, the perpetuation of the racist minority régime in southern Africa and the denial to the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights;

11. Also condemns the policies of those members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of other countries whose political, economic, military, nuclear, strategic, cultural and sporting relations with the racist minority régime in South Africa encourage that régime to persist in its suppression of the aspirations of peoples for self-determination and independence;

12. Again demands the immediate application of the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, imposed under Security Council resolution 418 (1977), by all countries, particularly by those countries that maintain military and nuclear co-operation with the racist Pretoria régime and continue to supply related matériel that régime;

13. Takes note with satisfaction of the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, the Special Declaration on Namibia and the reports of the technical and political committees adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981;

14. Demands the immediate implementation of General Assembly resolution ES-8/2 of 14 September 1981, on Namibia;

15. Further calls for a maximization of all forms of assistance given by all States, United Nations organs, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations to the victims of racism, racial discrimination and apartheid through their national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity;

16. Strongly condemns all Governments which do not recognize the right to self-determination and independence of all Peoples still under colonial and foreign domination and alien subjugation, notably the peoples of Africa and the Palestinian people;

17. Strongly condemns the ever-increasing massacres of innocent and defenceless people, including women and children, by the racist minority Pretoria régime in its desperate attempt to thwart the legitimate demands of the people;

18. Strongly condemns the expansionist activities of Israel in the Middle East and the continuous bombing of Palestinian civilians, which constitute a serious obstacle to the realization of the self-determination and independence of the Palestinian people;

19. Strongly condemns the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the continuous bombardment and destruction of its cities and villages, and all acts that constitute a violation of its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, and the security of its people, and hinder the full implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978;

20. Urges all States, competent organizations of the United Nations system, specialized agencies and other international organizations to extend their support to the Palestinian people through its representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization, in its struggle to restore its right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations;

21. Demands the immediate and unconditional release of all persons detained or imprisoned as a result of their struggle for self-determination and independence, full respect for their fundamental individual rights and the observance of article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, under which no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment;

22. Demands the immediate release of children detained in Namibian and South African prisons;

23. Reiterates its appreciation of the material and other forms of assistance that peoples under colonial and foreign rule continue to receive from Governments, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations, and calls for a maximization of this assistance;

24. Urges all States, specialized agencies and competent organizations of the United Nations system to do their utmost to ensure the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to intensify their efforts to support peoples under colonial, foreign and racist domination in their just struggle for self-determination and independence;

25. Requests the Secretary-General to give maximum publicity to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the widest possible publicity to the struggle being waged by oppressed peoples for the realization of their self-determination and national independence;

26. Decides to consider this item again at its thirty-seventh session on the basis of the reports that Governments, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations have been requested to submit concerning the strengthening of assistance to colonial territories and peoples.

General Assembly resolution 36/10

Adopted without vote Meeting 42 28 October 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/622) without vote. 16 October (meeting 22); 16-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.10), orally revised. Incorporating oral amendment by Ethiopia; agenda item 81.

Sponsors: Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan.

Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination

The General Assembly.

Reaffirming the importance, for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights, of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and embodied in the International Covenants on Human Rights, as well as in the Declaration on

the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960,

Welcoming the progressive exercise of the right to self-determination by peoples under colonial, foreign or alien occupation and their emergence into sovereign statehood and independence,

Deeply concerned at the continuation of acts or threats of foreign military intervention and occupation, which are endangering, or have already resulted in the suppression of, the right to self-determination of an increasing number of sovereign peoples and nations,

Further expressing grave concern that, as a consequence of the persistence of such actions, millions of people have been and are being uprooted from their homes as refugees and displaced persons, and emphasizing the urgent necessity of concerted international action to alleviate their conditions,

Recalling the relevant resolutions regarding the violation of the right of peoples to self-determination and of other human rights as a result of military intervention and foreign aggression and occupation, adopted by the Commission on Human Rights at its thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh sessions,

Reiterating its resolution 35/35 B of 14 November 1980,

Taking note of the note by the Secretary-General of 1 October 1981,

1. Reaffirms that the universal realization of the right of all peoples, including those under colonial, foreign and alien domination, to self-determination is a fundamental condition for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights and for the preservation and promotion of such rights;

2. Declares its firm opposition to acts of foreign military intervention, aggression and occupation, since these have resulted in the suppression of the right of peoples to self-determination and of other human rights in certain parts of the world;

3. Calls upon those States responsible to cease immediately their military intervention and occupation of foreign countries and territories, and to cease all acts of repression, discrimination, exploitation and maltreatment, particularly the brutal and inhuman methods reportedly employed for the execution of these acts against the peoples concerned;

4. Deplores the plight of the hundreds of thousands of refugees and displaced persons who have been uprooted by the aforementioned acts and reaffirms their right to return to their homes voluntarily in safety and honour;

5. Requests the Commission on Human Rights to continue to give special attention to the violation of human rights, especially the right to self-determination, resulting from foreign military intervention, aggression or occupation;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to report on this issue to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, under the item entitled 'Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights'.

Afghanistan

On 6 March 1981, the Commission on Human Rights adopted, by a roll-call vote of 31 to 8 (Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Ethiopia, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, USSR), with 3 abstentions, a resolution on the Afghanistan situation<sup>(\*)</sup> by which it reaffirmed its most profound concern that the people of Afghanistan continued to be denied their right to self-determination and to determine their own government and choose their economic, political and social system free from outside intervention,

subversion, coercion or constraint. The Commission called for the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops and for a political settlement on the basis of full respect for Afghanistan's independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-aligned status, and strict observance of the principle of non-intervention and non-interference.

The Commission appealed for humanitarian assistance to Afghan refugees and affirmed their right to return home. It urged all concerned to work towards a settlement ensuring that the Afghan people would determine their destiny free from outside interference, and to co-operate with the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative (p. 232) in their efforts to resolve the situation. It decided to consider the matter in 1982 with high priority.

By a resolution of 9 September 1981, <sup>(3)</sup> adopted by 19 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions, the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities expressed satisfaction at the call for immediate foreign troop withdrawal from Afghanistan and deep sympathy with and support for the refugees, and called on the Commission to reaffirm the need for a political settlement on the basis set out in its March resolution.

A reaffirmation of the right of the Afghan people to determine their own form of government and to choose their economic, political and social system free from outside intervention, subversion, coercion or constraint was included in a General Assembly resolution of 18 November on the Afghanistan situation.<sup>(2)</sup>

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 13 (XXXVII), 6 Mar.; <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/34, para. 2, 18 Nov. (p. 237); <sup>(3)</sup>SCPDP (report, E/CN.4/1512), 11 (XXXIV), 9 Sep.

#### Kampuchea

The Commission on Human Rights, by a resolution of 6 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> reiterated its condemnation of gross and flagrant violations of human rights in Kampuchea. It affirmed that the primary violation of human rights there was the persistence of foreign occupation which prevented the people from exercising their right to self-determination. The Commission called for a cessation of hostilities and the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of foreign forces. It called on all parties to join in the search for a comprehensive solution through a United Nations-sponsored international conference in accordance with an October 1980 General Assembly resolution<sup>(2)</sup> and requested the Secretary-General to appoint a Special Representative to assist him in implementing that resolution.

The Commission requested its Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities to review material on human rights in Kampuchea and to

submit it to the Commission in 1982, along with recommendations. The Commission recommended that the Economic and Social Council consider the situation with a view to ensuring the full enjoyment of the human rights and freedoms of the Kampuchians, including the right to self-determination, and decided to keep the situation under review in 1982 as a priority matter.

The resolution was adopted by a roll-call vote of 26 to 9 (Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, USSR), with 6 abstentions.

The Council, on 8 May,<sup>(5)</sup> endorsed the Commission's resolution, welcomed the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General to achieve a peaceful solution in South-East Asia, reaffirmed the Commission's call to all parties to join in the search for a peaceful solution through a United Nations-sponsored conference and noted with appreciation the visit to the area (23 March-11 April) by the Secretary-General's Special Representative. The decision was taken by a recorded vote of 42 to 8, with 1 abstention, following approval by the Second (Social) Committee on 5 May by a recorded vote of 39 to 7, with 1 abstention.

By a resolution of 10 September,<sup>(4)</sup> adopted by 17 votes to 4, the Sub-Commission requested that material on human rights in Kampuchea reviewed by one of its members, Asbjorn Eide (Norway), be transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights in 1982. Endorsing United Nations resolutions on Kampuchea designed to bring about the withdrawal of foreign forces and to enable its people freely to determine their own form of government without coercion or domination, the Sub-Commission reiterated its recommendation that the Commission keep the situation under review.

The right of the Kampuchians to determine their destiny was one of the principal components of a just and lasting resolution to the Kampuchean problem listed by the General Assembly in its resolution of 21 October 1981 on the Kampuchean situation.<sup>(3)</sup>

#### Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 11 (XXXVII), 6 Mar. GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/6, 22 Oct. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 334); <sup>(3)</sup>36/5, para. 2, 21 Oct. 1981 (p. 246). <sup>(4)</sup>SCPDP (report, E/CN.4/1512): 13 (XXXIV), 10 Sep.

Decision: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/154, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-15, 16, 17, 19 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/154

42-8-1 (recorded vote)

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) by recorded vote (39-7-1). 5 May (meeting 19); 21-nation draft (E/1981/C.2/L.13); agenda item 7.

Sponsors: Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Thailand, United Kingdom.

The right of peoples to self-determination and its application to peoples under colonial or alien domination or foreign occupation

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council endorsed resolution 11 (XXXVII) of the Commission on Human Rights, by which the Commission, *inter alia*, called for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Kampuchea, thus allowing the full enjoyment by the Kampuchean people of their fundamental human rights and freedoms, including the right to self-determination. The Council welcomed the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General aimed at achieving a peaceful solution to the situation in South-East Asia and endorsed the Commission's call to all parties concerned to join in the search for a peaceful solution to the Kampuchean problem through an international conference sponsored by the United Nations in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/6 of 22 October 1980. The Council noted with appreciation the recent visit to the area by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

Recorded vote In Economic and Social Council as follows:

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Q Belorussian SSR, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, India, Nicaragua, Poland, USSR.

Abstaining: Algeria.

#### Western Sahara

On 6 March 1981, the Commission on Human Rights adopted a resolution <sup>(1)</sup> emphasizing the determination of the United Nations to co-operate full with the Organization of African Unity (OAU) with a view to enabling the people of Western Sahara to exercise its right to self-determination and independence. The Commission deplored the continuance of the occupation of Western Sahara by Morocco, preventing the people of that Territory from exercising its right to self-determination and independence and other human rights. It decided to follow the situation closely and to consider it in 1982 as a high-priority matter.

The resolution was adopted by a roll-call vote of 26 to 5 (Iraq, Morocco, Senegal, United States, Zaire), with 11 abstentions.

The General Assembly, by its resolution of 28 October 1981 on the self-determination of peoples, <sup>(2)</sup> took note with satisfaction of the resolution on a general and free referendum on self-determination in Western Sahara, adopted in June by the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government, and the decision by the OAU Implementation Committee in August to organize and conduct such a referendum (p. 1193). A resolution reaffirming the right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination and independence, and reaffirming the determination of the United Nations to co-operate with OAU on

the referendum, was adopted by the Assembly on 24 November. <sup>(3)</sup>

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>commission on Human Rights: (report, E/1981/25): 12(XXXVII), 6 Mar. GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/9, para. 4, 28 Oct. (p. 895); <sup>(3)</sup>36/46, 24. Nov. (p. 1196).

#### Rights of prisoners and detained persons

##### Capital punishment

##### Arbitrary or summary executions

The Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities decided on 3 September 1981 to draw the attention of the Commission on Human Rights to the increasing scale of politically motivated executions and recommended that the Commission request the Economic and Social Council to call on Governments to abolish capital punishment for political offences. <sup>(3)</sup>

Pursuant to a December 1980 General Assembly resolution, <sup>(1)</sup> the Council, on 21 October 1981, decided to add the item 'Arbitrary or summary executions' to the 1982 agenda of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control. <sup>(4)</sup> The decision, orally proposed by the Council President, was taken, without vote.

By a resolution of 9 November 1981, <sup>(2)</sup> adopted without vote, the Assembly condemned summary and arbitrary executions and strongly deplored the increasing number of the former as well as the continued incidence of the latter in different parts of the world. It noted with concern the occurrence of politically motivated executions, urged all States concerned to respect the minimum standard of legal safeguards and again requested the Secretary-General to use his best endeavours in cases where that minimum standard appeared not to be respected. The Assembly invited Member States and organizations to answer the Secretary-General's request for their views on the problem and requested the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control to examine the problem in 1982 with a view to making recommendations.

The resolution was adopted on the recommendation of the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, which approved the 14-nation draft, introduced by Belgium, without vote on 26 October.

Speaking during the debate on human rights in the Third Committee, Norway expressed hope that the Commission on Human Rights would deal with the question of arbitrary or summary executions. The United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Community members, urged States resorting to summary executions to put an end to that practice-an appeal also made by Denmark and expressed particular

concern at reports of such executions in Iran. In reply, Iran said it was shocked at the support being given to criminals.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>35/172, para. 3, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 790); <sup>(2)</sup>36/22, 9 Nov. 1981, text following.

<sup>(3)</sup>SCDPDM (report, E/CN.4/1512): I(XXXIV), 3 Sep.

Decision: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC: 1981/194, 21 Oct., text following.

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR.42 (21 Oct.). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR. 15-17, 19, 21, 23-26, 27-29 (12-26 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.49 (9 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/194

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by Council President: agenda Item 2.

Addition of an Item to the agenda for the seventh session of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control

At its 42nd plenary meeting, on 21 October 1981, the Council, pursuant to paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 35/172 of 15 December 1980, decided to add the item entitled 'Arbitrary or summary executions' to the agenda for the seventh session of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control.

General Assembly resolution 36/22

Adopted without vote Meeting 49 9 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/38/645) without vote. 26 October (meeting 29); 14-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.24); agenda item 90.

Sponsors: Austria, Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Ghana, Japan, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Uruguay.

Arbitrary or summary executions

The General Assembly,

Having regard to the provisions bearing on capital punishment in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, particularly its articles 6, 14 and 15,

Recalling its resolution 2393(XXIII) of 26 November 1968, in which it invited Governments of Member States, inter alia, to ensure the most careful legal procedures and the greatest possible Safeguards for the accused in capital cases in countries where the death penalty obtained,

Recalling also its resolution 35/172 of 15 December 1980 on arbitrary or summary executions,

Bearing in mind its resolution 35/171 of 15 December 1980, in which it, inter alia, endorsed the Caracas Declaration, adopted by consensus at the Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, annexed to that resolution,

1. Condemns the practice of summary executions and arbitrary executions;
2. Strongly deplores the increasing number of summary executions as well as the continued incidence of arbitrary executions in different parts of the world;
3. Notes with concern the occurrence of executions that are widely regarded as being politically motivated;
4. Urges all States concerned to respect the minimum standard of legal Safeguards referred to in paragraph 1 (a) of General Assembly resolution 35/172;
5. Again requests the Secretary-General to use his best endeavours in cases where this minimum standard of legal safeguards appears not to be respected;
6. Invites Member States, specialized agencies, regional intergovernmental organizations and relevant non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council to answer the Secretary-General's request for their views and observations concerning the problem of arbitrary executions and summary executions;
7. Requests the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control to examine the problem of arbitrary executions and summary executions at its seventh session with a view to making recommendations.

Draft second optional protocol to the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 25 November 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> invited further comments from Member States on a 1980 draft resolution<sup>(4)</sup> proposing measures aiming at the ultimate abolition of capital punishment through the adoption of a second optional protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Assembly decided to consider in 1982 the elaboration of such a protocol.

The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, which similarly approved the revised 14-nation draft on 3 November.

Comments on the idea of elaborating a second optional protocol were received in 1981 from 25 Governments in response to a December 1980 Assembly request.<sup>(3)</sup> They were circulated to the Assembly in a report of the Secretary-General.<sup>(5)</sup>

Introducing the draft resolution, the Federal Republic of Germany said that, despite the interest in the Committee, the small number of comments from Governments suggested that the time had not come to take a decision on a second protocol.

Guyana and Morocco explained that their participation in the consensus on the resolution did not reflect any commitment on their part with respect to the substance; Guyana added that it would have abstained if there had been a vote. Singapore declared that its participation implied no change in its position on capital punishment.

During the debate in the Committee, several countries, including Austria, Canada, the Netherlands, Portugal and Uruguay, favoured the universal abolition of capital punishment, while Iran, Japan, the Ukrainian SSR, Zaire and others did not favour this approach. India, while appreciating the humanitarian concerns behind the proposal, thought it premature to take a substantive decision, as most countries had not abolished capital punishment. Norway believed that the idea needed further study and that a decision should be postponed.

Australia thought it necessary to reduce the incidence of capital punishment, eliminate summary executions, progressively reduce the number of capital offences and guarantee the accused the right of due process and appeal. In Austria's view, the proposed protocol would have to be optional to meet legal and other difficulties in a number of States and to give them time to prepare public opinion and adjust legislation. France said it agreed in principle with the proposed protocol. The Federal Republic of Germany was not convinced that the protocol should require States to seek to abolish the death

penalty; in the long term the protocol could become universally valid, but its optional character would ensure the decision-making freedom of the countries that had not ratified it. Supporting the elaboration of a protocol, the Netherlands said it would never seek to force Governments which maintained capital punishment to change their position, but it asked them to allow other countries to move towards abolition through a request to the Commission on Human Rights to elaborate a draft.

The German Democratic Republic, on the other hand, thought the preparation of a second protocol would probably raise many problems. Hungary said that, although socialist criminal law advocated the eventual abolition of capital punishment, and in Hungary death sentences were not imposed for economic crimes and crimes against property, the protection of society required the retention of capital punishment for crimes against humanity, the gravest crimes against life and acts of terrorism. Japan believed it inappropriate to create an international instrument which would not be applied uniformly throughout the world and thought the majority public opinion in each country should be fully taken into account; in Japan, the death penalty existed for a very limited number of particularly heinous offences and was regarded as a deterrent. Morocco hoped that those who favoured abolition would refrain from making value judgements on the death penalty, which remained in force in 115 countries for reasons which those States evidently considered valid.

Romania believed that the proposal for such a protocol raised several political and legal difficulties, and that the question should first be studied by the Commission on Human Rights and the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control. The Ukrainian SSR stated that the idea of a second protocol had provoked considerable disagreement; such a protocol would encroach on the prerogative of a State to decide how it would combat crime. Uganda said it considered the death penalty an effective deterrent to crime and it was unlikely that Uganda would be able, at least in the near future, to adhere to any instrument enjoining abolition; however, it did not oppose adoption of a protocol and encouraged all other countries in a position to do so to abolish the death penalty. In Zaire's opinion, any attempt to introduce an instrument to be uniformly applied throughout the world was clearly unwarranted; the issues had philosophical, cultural, historical, religious and legal implications which could not be dealt with superficially without calling into question the principle of autonomy and cultural identity of peoples.

Madagascar said it had eliminated the death

penalty except for extremely serious cases; the death sentence had only a deterrent power, as clemency was almost automatically granted by the President. The Philippines explained that, as the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights was under consideration by its Government, it could not be a party to a second optional protocol; however, a bill for abolition of the death penalty was before the National Assembly.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/441 & Add.1,2.

Resolution and decision: Res.: (GA, 36/59, 25 Nov., text following, Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/437, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 789).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 783.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.27-38 (22 Oct.-3 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/59

Adopted without vote Meeting 73 25 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/663) without vote, 3 November (meeting 38): 14-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.33/R.1); agenda item 87.

Sponsors: Austria, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, Uruguay.

#### Capital punishment

The General Assembly,

Recalling its decision 35/437 of 15 December 1980,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General,

1. Invites Member States to submit further comments and observations on the draft resolution entitled "Measures aiming at the ultimate abolition of capital punishment (draft Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights)", submitted at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, and requests the Secretary-General to submit to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report containing the views expressed by Governments;

2. Decides to consider at its thirty-seventh session, under the item entitled "International Covenants on Human Rights", the idea of elaborating a draft of a second optional protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.

#### Treatment of prisoners and detained persons

##### Draft Body of Principles

A working group open to all members of the General Assembly's Sixth (Legal) Committee, established by the Committee on 22 September 1981, continued work on a draft Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment. The Assembly had decided in December 1980 to establish such a group,<sup>(2)</sup> after an open-ended working group of the Third Committee<sup>(5)</sup> had begun reviewing a draft adopted in 1978 by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

The 1981 working group, chaired by Luigi Ferrari Bravo (Italy), held 14 meetings between 12 October and 25 November. Following the example of the 1980 group, which had provisionally adopted six principles and parts of a seventh, it continued to elaborate the principles



on the understanding that it would reconsider the texts once definitions had been accepted. Taking up where the earlier group had left off, the working group provisionally adopted two further principles and parts of two others, which were set out in its report.<sup>(1)</sup>

The approved principles included the following: A person who believed that a violation of the principles had occurred or was about to occur would have the right to report the matter to the appropriate authorities (principle 6, paragraph 3); the treatment of detained persons would be appropriate to their unconvicted status and they would be kept separate from prisoners whenever possible (principle 7); arresting, detaining and investigating authorities would exercise only those powers granted by law, subject to recourse to a judicial or other authority (principle 8); and a detained person must be heard promptly by a judicial or other authority and be given the right to defend himself or be assisted by counsel (principle 9, paragraph 1).

On 10 December, the Assembly decided to refer the draft Body of Principles to its 1982 session and to establish another open-ended working group to conclude consideration of the draft.<sup>(3)</sup> The decision was taken without vote following its approval by consensus in the Sixth Committee on 1 December, on an oral proposal by Sweden.

Introducing the draft decision, Sweden expressed hope that it would soon be possible to agree on a complete draft Body of Principles, for which the fruitful work of the Committee's working group would provide a good basis. Sweden believed that the method of work used in 1981, which had proved satisfactory, should be used again.

Report <sup>(1)</sup>Working group, A/C.6/36/L.16.

Resolution and decision: Res: <sup>(2)</sup>GA. 35/177, para. 3, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 847). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/426, 10 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references. <sup>(4)</sup>1978, p. 698; <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 842.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.2, 15, 63 (22 Sep., 7 Oct. & 1 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.92 (10 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/426

Adopted without vote

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/784) by consensus, 1 December (meeting 63); oral proposal by Sweden; agenda item 125.

Draft Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment

At its 92nd plenary meeting, on 10 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Sixth Committee, decided:

(a) 'To refer to its thirty-seventh session the draft Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment for further consideration by the Sixth Committee;

(b) To establish, at its thirty-seventh session, an open-ended working group to conclude the consideration of the draft Body of Principles with a view to its adoption by the General Assembly.

Torture and other cruel treatment

Draft convention

Work continued in 1981 in the Commission on Human Rights on a draft convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The General Assembly, in November, requested the Commission to submit a completed draft in 1982.

A working group open to all Commission members, meeting at Geneva from 26 to 30 January 1981 and during the Commission's session until 6 March, provisionally adopted two additional articles and revised or adopted portions of several others which it had considered in 1979<sup>(7)</sup> and 1980.<sup>(8)</sup> The newly approved articles provided for compensation for victims of torture and for the prevention of other acts of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. The working group did not complete work on two articles relating to extradition and on provisions for implementing the future convention. Sixteen draft articles were transmitted to the Commission in the group's report, which was reproduced in the Commission's report to the Economic and Social Council.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Council, on 8 May,<sup>(4)</sup> authorized a meeting of an open-ended working group for a period of one week prior to the 1982 session of the Commission, to complete work on the draft convention. The resolution was adopted without vote, following its approval by the Second (Social) Committee on 5 May in the same manner.

Adoption of the resolution had been recommended to the Council by the Commission on 10 March. The Commission recognized that it was advisable to continue work on the draft convention in a working group which should meet before its 1982 session and decided to accord high priority at that session to consideration of the draft.<sup>(3)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. The Economic and Social Council resolution was welcomed by the General Assembly on 25 November. In addition, the Assembly requested the Commission on Human Rights to complete the drafting of the convention as a matter of high priority in 1982, including provisions for its implementation.

The Assembly adopted the resolution, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, which similarly approved the 15-nation draft on 3 November. Introducing the text in the Committee, Sweden said that, despite the divergent opinions expressed in the Commission's working group, the sponsors felt that the group could complete its work on the draft in 1982.

During the Committee debate on human rights, the progress made in drafting a convention was welcomed by several countries, includ-

ing Madagascar, Norway and Uganda. Portugal said the moral commitment to stamp out torture must be backed by a legal commitment; accordingly, the completion of a draft convention should be given highest priority. Bulgaria, Hungary and Madagascar stated that their legislation contained all legal provisions to prevent anyone from being subjected to torture and other cruel treatment. Sierra Leone noted that the Charter of the organization of African Unity prohibited torture and other cruel treatment.

As at 16 October 1981, the Secretary-General had received, in accordance with a December 1980 resolution,<sup>(5)</sup> unilateral declarations against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment from Australia, the Bahamas and Egypt. He transmitted the three declarations in a report to the Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights, E/1981/25;

<sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/426 & Add. I.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission Rights: 25(XXXVII), 10 Mar. 1981/37, 8 May, text following. GA: <sup>(5)</sup>35/178, para. 4, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 849); <sup>(6)</sup>36/60, 25 Nov. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(7)</sup>1979, p. 841; <sup>(8)</sup>1980, p. 845.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 18 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.27, 28, 32-36, 37, 38 (22 Oct.-3 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/37

Adopted without vote Meeting 18 8 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May (meeting 18); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda Item 7.

Draft convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/178 of 15 December 1980, by which the Assembly requested the Commission on Human Rights to complete as a matter of urgency, at its thirty-seventh session, the drafting of a convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, and Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/32 of 2 May 1980, by which the Council authorized a meeting of an open-ended working group of the Commission on Human Rights for a period of one week prior to the thirty-seventh session of the Commission to complete the work on a draft convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment,

Considering that it was not found possible to complete the work on the draft convention during the thirty-seventh session of the Commission,

Taking note of resolution 25(XXXVII) of 10 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights,

1. Authorizes a meeting of an open-ended working group for a period of one week prior to the thirty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights to complete the work on a draft convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Commission on Human Rights at its thirty-eighth session all relevant material relating to the draft convention.

General Assembly resolution 36/60

Adopted without vote Meeting 73 25 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/685) without vote, 3 November (meeting 38); 15-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.34); agenda item 91 (a).

Sponsors: Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Jamaica, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

The General Assembly,

Recalling the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 3452(XXX) of 9 December 1975.

Bearing in mind article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Recalling also its resolutions 32/62 of 8 December 1977, in which it requested the Commission on Human Rights to draw up a draft convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment in the light of the principles embodied in the Declaration, and 32/63 of 8 December 1977,

Noting that, in its resolution 11 of 5 September 1980, the Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders expressed the belief that the draft convention should be finalized at the earliest possible time.

1. Welcomes Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/37 of 8 May 1981, by which the Council authorized an open-ended working group of the Commission on Human Rights to meet for a period of one week prior to the thirty-eighth session of the Commission to complete the work on a draft convention;

2. Requests the Commission on Human Rights to complete as a matter of highest priority, at its thirty-eighth session, the drafting of a convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, with a view to submitting a draft, including provisions for the effective implementation of the future convention, to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

3. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment".

#### Draft Principles of Medical Ethics

Following consideration by the Economic and Social Council in May 1981, the General Assembly decided in November to seek further comments from Member States on a revised set of draft Principles of Medical Ethics relevant to the role of health personnel in the protection of imprisoned and detained persons against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

The draft Principles, originally in the form of a draft Code of Medical Ethics, had been endorsed by the Executive Board of the World Health Organization (WHO) in 1979.<sup>(6)</sup> As revised by a group of States during the 1981 Assembly session, principle 1 stated that prisoners and detainees had the same rights as others to the protection of physical or mental health and treatment of disease. Principles 2 to 4 declared it to be in contravention of medical ethics for health personnel to participate in torture or other cruel treatment, to be involved with prisoners or detainees in any relationship other than medical, to assist in interrogation, and to certify prisoners fit for punishment that might adversely affect their health. Principle 5 stated that partici-

pation of health personnel in any procedure for restraining prisoners was not in conformity with medical ethics unless it was necessary for health or safety reasons, and principle 6 declared that there might be no derogation from the other principles on any ground.

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** By a resolution adopted without vote on 6 May, the Economic and Social Council recommended that the Assembly take measures to finalize the draft Code in 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> The text was approved without vote by the Second Committee on 29 April.

The resolution was sponsored by Denmark (which introduced it), Finland, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain and Sweden. They orally revised it by deleting from the operative paragraph the phrase "so as to be able to adopt the draft Code".

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 25 November,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to circulate the revised draft Principles among Member States for further comments and decided to consider the question again in 1982 with a view to adopting them. The draft Principles were annexed to the resolution.

The resolution was adopted without vote, following its approval by the Third Committee on 3 November in the same manner. In response to a suggestion by the USSR, the 14 sponsors orally changed their text to delete a phrase stating that the draft Principles had been revised "in the light of the replies received by the Secretary-General". The USSR remarked that revision of the draft should be the task of all States and not only of the sponsors.

An initial set of comments and suggestions received as at 15 October 1981 from 12 States, a specialized agency and 5 non-governmental organizations was submitted to the Assembly in a report by the Secretary-General,<sup>(\*)</sup> as requested by the Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(4)</sup>

Introducing the resolution in the Third Committee, the Netherlands said the sponsors felt it desirable that States should submit further comments so that the Principles could be adopted in 1982. In revising the WHO draft, the sponsors had had the following points in mind: the purpose was the elimination of all forms of torture and inhuman treatment; the Principles should be applicable to both physicians and other health personnel; in general, "health" should be understood to cover both physical and mental health; there should be no escape clause for physicians who contravened the Principles on the pretext of duress; and the Principles should be clear and not need an explanation.

Explaining its position, Guyana said it supported the idea of a code of medical ethics but

believed that the draft Principles should be improved; it would have abstained had the resolution been put to vote. Japan asked that its written observations on the draft be taken into account.

Mexico and Morocco voiced reservations on the definition of torture in the footnote to principle 2, on the ground that it would endorse legal sanctions which could cause pain or suffering. The Netherlands responded that this definition had appeared in the Assembly's 1975 Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.<sup>(3)</sup>

During debate in the Committee prior to the revisions introduced by the sponsors of the resolution, a number of countries expressed support for the draft Code. Madagascar said its adoption would be an important step towards establishing international norms, while Portugal viewed it as an important part of the struggle to eliminate torture. Australia and New Zealand also favoured its adoption.

Several countries were critical of aspects of the original WHO draft. Bulgaria, though welcoming the idea of a code, thought its principles needed further work to ensure that it reflected more fully the common interests of States. Hungary declared its full support but said the draft Principles could not be accepted in their current form. Uganda believed the draft required further study and harmonization; in particular, the emphasis on physicians rendered it difficult to make the code applicable to all medical and paramedical workers, and the inclusion of the concept of duress raised some complex issues, since in certain cases the subjective application of that concept could negate some of the basic premises of the Code. Sierra Leone considered that the Code should apply to all medical personnel, not only to doctors. Cuba suggested the insertion of a paragraph stating that medical ethics, by its very nature, was opposed to any form of torture or other cruel treatment.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/140 & Add.1.4.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC: 1981/27, 6 May, text following. GA: <sup>(3)</sup>3452(XXX), annex, article 1, 9 Dec. 1975 (YUN 1975, p. 624); <sup>(4)</sup>35/179, paras. 1 & 2, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 849); <sup>(5)</sup>36/61, 25 Nov. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1979, p. 843.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-10, 12 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.27, 28, 32-36, 37, 38 (22 Oct.-3 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/27

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote. 29 April (meeting 12); S-nation draft (E/1981/C.2/L.9), orally revised: agenda item 10.

Sponsors: Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden.

#### Draft Code of Medical Ethics

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/179 of 15 December 1980, in which the Assembly requested the Economic and Social Council to consider the draft Code of Medical Ethics, taking into account the comments and recommendations submitted, with a view to presenting the draft Code to the Assembly,

Recalling also resolution 11 of the Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, in which the hope was expressed that the General Assembly would adopt the draft Code, subject to any amendments which might appear to be necessary,

Taking note of the revised report of the Secretary-General requested in General Assembly resolution 35/179,

Convinced that the adoption of a code of medical ethics constitutes an important step in the progressive setting of international standards within the field of human rights,

Recommends that the General Assembly should take measures to finalize the draft Code of Medical Ethics at its thirty-sixth session.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/61

Adopted without vote Meeting 73 25 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/685) without vote. 3 November (meeting 38): 14-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.38). orally amended by USSR and orally revised; agenda item 91 (b).

Sponsors: Australia, Austria, Costa Rica, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Portugal, Sweden, United States.

#### Draft Code of Medical Ethics

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, as unanimously adopted in General Assembly resolution 3452(XXX) of 9 December 1975,

Recalling its resolution 31/85 of 13 December 1976, in which it invited the World Health Organization to prepare a draft code of medical ethics relevant to the protection of persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment,

Expressing its appreciation to the Executive Board of the World Health Organization which, at its sixty-third session in January 1979, endorsed the principles set forth in a report entitled "Development of codes of medical ethics" containing, in an annex, a draft body of principles prepared by the council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences and entitled "Principles of medical ethics relevant to the role of health personnel in the protection of persons against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment",

Recalling also resolution 11 adopted on 5 September 1980 by the Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, in which the Congress expressed the hope that the General Assembly would adopt the draft Code, subject to any amendments which might appear to be necessary,

Taking note with appreciation of the Guidelines for Medical Doctors concerning Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in relation to Detention and Imprisonment, adopted by the twenty-ninth World Medical Assembly, held in Tokyo in October 1975,

Bearing in mind Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/27 of 6 May 1981, in which the Council recommended that the General Assembly should take measures to finalize a draft Code at its thirty-sixth session,

Recognizing that throughout the world significant medical activities are increasingly being performed by health personnel other than physicians, such as physicians' assistants, physical therapists and nurse practitioners,

Alarmed that not infrequently members of the medical profession or other health personnel are engaged in activities which are difficult to reconcile with medical ethics,

Convinced of the need to set standards in this field which ought to be implemented by members of the medical profession and other health personnel as well as by government officials,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the comments on the proposed principles of medical ethics endorsed by the Executive Board of the World Health Organization which were received by the Secretary-General from Governments, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to circulate among Member States for their further comments the revised draft principles of medical ethics set forth in the annex to the present resolution;

3. Decides to consider this question at its thirty-seventh session with a view to adopting the draft Principles of Medical Ethics relevant to the role of health personnel in the protection of persons against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

#### ANNEX

Draft Principles of Medical Ethics relevant to the role of health personnel in the protection of persons against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment:

1. Prisoners and detainees have the same rights to the protection of physical or mental health and the treatment of disease as those who are not in prison or detained.

2. It is a gross contravention of medical ethics for health personnel, in particular physicians, having clinical responsibility for prisoners or detainees, to engage, actively or passively, in acts which constitute participation in, complicity in, incitement to or attempts to commit, torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.\*

3. It is a contravention of medical ethics for health personnel, in particular physicians, to be involved in any relationship with prisoners or detainees that is not a medical relationship in the sense that its purpose is the protection or improvement of the physical or mental health of the prisoner or detainee.

4. It is also a contravention of medical ethics for health personnel, in particular physicians:

(a) To apply their knowledge and skills in order to assist in methods of interrogation;

(b) To certify prisoners or detainees fit for any form of punishment that may adversely affect physical or mental health.

5. Participation of health personnel, in particular physicians, in any procedure for restraining prisoners or detainees, is not in conformity with medical ethics unless it is determined by purely medical criteria in a manner which presents no hazard to the health of prisoners or detainees and is necessary for the physical or mental health and safety of the prisoner himself and/or of his fellow prisoners or detainees or of his guardians.

6. There may be no derogation from the foregoing principles on any ground whatsoever, including public emergency.

\* For the purpose of the present Declaration, torture means any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted by, or at the instigation of, a public official on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or confession, punishing him for an act he has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating him or other persons; it does not include pain or suffering arising only from. Inherent in or incidental to lawful sanctions to the extent consistent with the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners. Torture constitutes an aggravated and deliberate form of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

#### UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture

The General Assembly, on 16 December 1981,<sup>(7)</sup> decided to extend the mandate of the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile, established in 1978,<sup>(6)</sup> so that it could receive volun-

tary contributions for distribution, through established channels of assistance, as humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of torture and their relatives. Priority was to be given to aiding victims of violations by States in which the human rights situation had been the subject of United Nations resolutions. The Trust Fund was redesignated as the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture, to be administered by the Secretary-General with the advice of a Board of Trustees. The Assembly adopted arrangements proposed by the Secretary-General for the Fund's management, authorized the Board to solicit contributions and appealed to Governments to respond to requests for contributions.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 96 to 15, with 33 abstentions, following its approval by the Third Committee on 30 November by 73 votes to 17, with 40 abstentions.

The resolution originated in the Commission on Human Rights, which approved it on 11 March along with a recommendation to the Economic and Social Council that the Secretary-General be requested to submit to the Council in 1982 proposals on the Fund's management.<sup>(4)</sup> On 8 May,<sup>(5)</sup> by 33 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions, the Council recommended that the Assembly adopt the Commission's draft but, as the result of an oral amendment by Denmark approved without vote, it altered the accompanying request to ask that proposals on management be submitted to the Assembly in 1981 rather than to the Council in 1982.

The draft was approved on 5 May by the Second Committee by 34 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions, after it rejected, by 23 votes to 8, with 16 abstentions, amendments by the USSR designed to maintain the existing title and mandate of the Fund.<sup>(1)</sup> The amendments would have retained the emphasis on Chile while having the Assembly decide to study the possibility of using the Fund to assist torture victims generally.

The Assembly's attention was drawn to the Council resolution by the Secretary-General in a report of 30 September.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Secretary-General's proposals on the Fund's management, annexed to a note of 29 September<sup>(2)</sup> and approved by the Assembly in its December resolution, covered solicitation and acknowledgement of pledges, collection of contributions, Secretariat arrangements for operation and control, and reporting. It provided for submission to the Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights of an annual report on available funds, contributions and expenditures.

Explaining its opposition to the resolution in the Third Committee, the Ukrainian SSR said it ran counter to the original aim of the Fund, which was to help the victims of Chilean reactionaries.

The USSR said that, at a time when the human rights situation in Chile was continuing to deteriorate, conversion of the Trust Fund for Chile into a Fund for Victims of Torture would hamper United Nations efforts; establishment of such a fund would be an implicit recognition that torture was a normal, everyday occurrence. Viet Nam also found such conversion inadvisable, as did the Byelorussian SSR, which said it would run counter to all Assembly resolutions on human rights and would lead to a decrease in assistance to the victims of the Chilean junta.

Mexico and Yugoslavia said their abstentions in the Committee vote (Mexico voted affirmatively in the Assembly) did not imply opposition to a Fund for Victims of Torture; however, they could not support the abolition of the Trust Fund for Chile.

Explaining its vote for the resolution, Costa Rica said it recognized the humanitarian nature of assistance to all torture victims. Denmark, also speaking on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, described the resolution as an important step in United Nations endeavours to protect the human rights of the individual. The Netherlands, though regretting that the creation of such a fund was necessary, said it had always supported the idea of transforming the Trust Fund for Chile into a more general fund. New Zealand saw the establishment of the Fund as a practical step towards alleviating the situation of victims and helping them resume a normal life.

During the debate in the Committee, Australia said the establishment of the Fund was indicative of the potential of the United Nations to direct resources to areas of genuine humanitarian need. The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community members, hoped the Committee would support the provision of humanitarian assistance to victims of torture and their relatives, torture being one of the worst human rights violations.

Amendments rejected: <sup>(1)</sup>USSR, E/1981/C.2/L.19.

Note: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/540.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/560.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 35(XXXVII), 11 Mar. <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/39, 8 May, text following. GA: <sup>(6)</sup>33/174, 20 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, P. 709); <sup>(7)</sup>36/151, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12, 13, 14-17, 18 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 66 (19-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/39

33 - 5 - 11 Meeting 188 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) by vote (34-5-10), 5 May (meeting 18): draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/125), orally amended by Denmark; agenda item 7.

United Nations voluntary fund for victims of torture  
The Economic and Social Council,

Taking note of resolution 35(XXXVII) of 11 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights.

1. Recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution:

[Text as in General Assembly resolution 36/151 below.]

2. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session specific proposals for the arrangements for the management of the fund in accordance with the principles set forth in paragraph 1 (a) of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly.

General Assembly resolution 36/151

96-15-33 (recorded vote) Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) by vote (73-17-40), 30 November (meeting 66): draft recommended by Economic and Social Council (resolution 1981/39); agenda item 12.

United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture  
The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 33/174 of 20 December 1978, by which it established a United Nations Trust Fund for Chile as a voluntary fund to receive contributions and distribute humanitarian, legal and financial aid to persons whose human rights had been violated by detention or imprisonment in Chile,

Recalling also its resolution 35/190 of 15 December 1980, by which it requested the Commission on Human Rights to study the possibility of extending the mandate of the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile,

Taking note of Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/39 of 8 May 1981 and Commission on Human Rights resolution 35(XXXVII) of 11 March 1981,

Noting that all Governments have an obligation to respect and promote human rights in accordance with the responsibilities they have undertaken under various international instruments,

Noting with deep concern that acts of torture take place in various countries.

Considering the plight of victims of torture wherever it takes place,

Recognizing the need to provide assistance to the victims of torture in a purely humanitarian spirit.

1. Decides:

(a) To extend the mandate of the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile, established by General Assembly resolution 33/174, in order to make it capable of receiving voluntary contributions for distribution, through established channels of assistance, as humanitarian, legal and financial aid to individuals whose human rights have been severely violated as a result of torture and to relatives of such victims, priority being given to aid to victims of violations by States in which the human rights situation has been the subject of resolutions or decisions adopted by either the Assembly, the Economic and Social Council or the Commission on Human Rights;

(b) To redesignate the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile as United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture;

(c) That the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture shall be administered in accordance with the Financial Regulations of the United Nations by the Secretary-General, with the advice of a Board of Trustees of the Fund, composed of a chairman and four members with wide experience in the field of human rights, acting in their personal capacity, to be appointed by the Secretary-General with due regard to equitable geographical distribution and in consultation with their Governments;

(b) To adopt the arrangements for the management of the Fund set forth in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General;

(e) To authorize the Board of Trustees of the Fund to promote and solicit contributions and pledges;

(f) To request the Secretary-General to give the Board of Trustees of the Fund all the assistance it may require:

2. Appeals to all Governments to respond favourably to requests for contributions to the Fund.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen,<sup>1</sup> Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq,<sup>2</sup> Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Qatar,<sup>3</sup> Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Seychelles, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mozambique, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Romania, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

<sup>1</sup>Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

#### Detention on grounds of mental illness

A preliminary report on a study of guidelines, principles and guarantees for the protection of persons detained on grounds of mental ill-health or suffering from mental disorder was examined in 1981 by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, which had entrusted the study in September 1980 to one of its members, Erica-Irene A. Daes (Greece).<sup>(4)</sup> On 10 September 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the Sub-Commission requested Mrs. Daes, as Special Rapporteur for the study, to submit her final report in 1982, including a draft body of guidelines related to procedures for determining whether adequate reasons existed for detaining persons on grounds of mental ill-health or mental disorder, principles for the treatment and protection of persons suffering from mental disorder, and guarantees for protection of the human rights of persons suffering from mental disorder.

By a resolution of 25 November 1981, adopted without vote,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Commission on Human Rights to continue considering the protection of those detained on grounds of mental ill-health, in the light of the action being taken by the Sub-Commission, with a view to submitting a report to the Assembly in 1983, through the Economic and Social Council.

The Third Committee approved the 15-nation draft, orally amended by India, on 3 November, also without vote. The amendment, accepted by the sponsors, replaced a preambular paragraph

by which the Assembly would have expressed concern at reports from several parts of the world of persons being detained in mental institutions on account of their political views and on other non-medical grounds with a paragraph by which the Assembly expressed conviction that detention of persons in medical institutions on account of their political views or on other non-medical grounds was a violation of their human rights.

Introducing the resolution in the Committee under its agenda item on human rights and scientific and technological developments (p. 976), the United Kingdom said the benefits and abuses produced by such developments should be considered together, and it was the task of Governments and the international community to maximize the benefits and avert the abuses. The text referred to no specific situations and made no reference to the 1981 Sub-Commission resolution on the item. The sponsors hoped it would be viewed from a strictly humanitarian point of view.

During the human rights debate in the Committee, the United States cited reports of what it called serious violations in the USSR of the human rights of some of its citizens through abuse of psychiatric treatment during detention, including the administration of drugs to healthy persons. The USSR rejected the statement and asserted that United States authorities kept thousands of innocent people in psychiatric hospitals and prisons, where they were forced to participate in experiments to test chemicals and poisons.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Special Rapporteur, E/CN.4/Sub.2/474.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/56 B, 25 Nov., text following;  
<sup>(3)</sup>SCPDP (report, E/CN.4/1512), 20(XXXIV), 10 Sep.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 862.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.27-36, 37, 38 (22 Oct.-3 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/56 B

Adopted without vote Meeting 73 25 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/661) without vote. 3 November (meeting 38): 15-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.32), orally amended by India: agenda item 85.

Sponsors: Botswana, Costa Rica, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Italy, Lesotho, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Sierra Leone, Singapore, United Kingdom.

#### The General Assembly.

Recalling its resolution 33/53 of 14 December 1978, in which it requested the Commission on Human Rights to urge the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to undertake as a matter of priority a study of the question of the protection of those detained on the grounds of mental ill-health with a view to formulating guidelines,

Recalling also its resolution 35/130 B of 11 December 1980, in which it welcomed the action taken by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to implement General Assembly resolution 33/53,

Convinced that detention of persons in mental institutions on account of their political views or on other non-medical grounds is a violation of their human rights,

Noting with satisfaction the work being undertaken by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities on this subject in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 33/53 and 35/130 B,

Requests the Commission on Human Rights to continue its consideration of this question in the light of the action being taken by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, with a view to submitting a report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, through the Economic and Social Council.

#### Extradition of Ziad Abu Eain

In 1981, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly appealed for the release of the Palestinian Ziad Abu Eain, who was extradited to Israel in December 1981 from the United States.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. On 8 May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Economic and Social Council appealed to the United States to release Mr. Abu Eain. It stated that he had been illegally detained in a United States prison for over a year, that the sole basis for "probable cause" against him was a statement in Hebrew made by a person in Israeli custody and that no United States court would sustain a trial on the basis of such "evidence".

This resolution, sponsored by Algeria, Iraq, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco and the Sudan, was adopted by a recorded vote of 24 to 14, with 12 abstentions. Algeria requested an immediate vote while Iraq asked that it be recorded.

A motion by the United States not to take a decision on the resolution was rejected by 22 votes to 18, with 12 abstentions. Introducing the motion, the United States remarked that rule 54 of the Council's rules of procedure, requiring that proposals be circulated in writing 24 hours before they were put to the vote, had not been respected. The United States considered the resolution unacceptable also by reason of its contents, as the preamble was tendentious and distorted the facts, while the operative paragraph attacked the integrity of United States judicial processes and its fulfilment of treaty obligations. Mr. Abu Eain had been charged with planting a bomb in a market (on 14 May 1979 at Tiberias, Israel), causing death to two civilians and injury to 30. Israel had applied to the United States for his extradition and the issue was before United States courts.

Spain explained that it had voted for the motion in the light of rule 54; once 24 hours had elapsed, the question could be considered on humanitarian grounds by other appropriate bodies.

Explaining the negative votes on the resolution cast by the members of the European Com-

munity (EC), the United Kingdom said they had not had time to study the case, which involved complex legal and constitutional issues; the Council should not act so quickly and on the basis of so little information, especially since the case was subject to normal judicial proceedings.

Brazil and Cyprus, though voting in favour, said their support of the text did not imply any judgement of the United States legal and judicial system; Cyprus added that it would have preferred a different wording and that its positive vote should be interpreted as an appeal. The USSR said it had cast a positive vote because it believed that the text concerned a further flagrant violation by Israel of the human rights of the Arab Palestinians.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 16 December, four days after the extradition of Mr. Abu Eain from the United States to Israel, the Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(3)</sup> by which it strongly deplored this action and demanded that he be immediately released and that the United States, being responsible for his safety, facilitate his safe transfer to the country of his choice. It requested the Secretary-General to report by 31 December on implementation of the resolution and decided to retain the item on its agenda. The preamble described Mr. Abu Eain as a Palestinian national from occupied Palestinian territory and a Jordanian citizen, illegally detained in prison in the United States for over two years. It added that the sole basis for "probable cause" against him had been a statement in Hebrew extracted from a person in Israeli custody with no knowledge of that language and whose statement had later been recanted.

The resolution, sponsored by 20 Arab States and introduced by Kuwait, was adopted by a recorded vote of 75 to 21, with 43 abstentions.

During debate in the Assembly and the Third Committee, Jordan said the detention of Mr. Abu Eain set a dangerous precedent for the United States judicial process and universal norms of human rights. Although a Palestinian from the occupied West Bank, Mr. Abu Eain was legally a citizen of Jordan; the imprisonment of a national of a third country, Jordan, at the request of a second party, Israel, on the basis of a treaty between the United States and Israel, was tantamount to the taking of a hostage; it was unprecedented for someone to be extradited to a State other than his own. Since the West Bank was Jordanian territory, the trial of Mr. Abu Eain under Israeli laws would be unlawful and a human rights violation. The United States court had not considered testimony by 11 witnesses that Mr. Abu Eain had been at Ramallah, more than 120 miles from Tiberias, when the explosion occurred; the only contrary witness had

been forced to sign a paper in Hebrew, a language which he did not understand, and had later retracted his incrimination.

The United States opposed the resolution as an unwarranted and misguided disparagement of the American judicial system. It said Israel's request for extradition had been independently and impartially reviewed at three levels of the United States judiciary, up to the Supreme Court, before the Secretary of State had authorized extradition. The United States frequently extradited fugitives to stand trial in countries of which they were not nationals. Regarding the statement in Hebrew mentioned in the preamble, evidence had been presented to the effect that its author understood the statement and had made it freely; the allegation that he had recanted should be considered at the trial. The resolution disregarded the procedural rights of due process accorded to Mr. Abu Eain, misrepresented the nature of the evidence on which probable cause had been found for the belief that he had committed the crimes for which extradition was requested, and took a cavalier attitude towards the international consequences of treating terrorist acts as "political". Mr. Abu Eain was assured a fair trial in an Israeli civilian court.

Israel rejected the Assembly resolution as an intervention in matters within its domestic jurisdiction. It expressed surprise that a certain group of States should preoccupy and pre-empt the Assembly's time in the case of a single individual accused of terrorist murder, whose legal rights were fully guaranteed, and at a time when millions of people were systematically deprived of human rights. Israel would not go into the substance of the matter, since it was sub judice.

Austria explained that it had cast a negative vote mainly for legal reasons; it could not subscribe to a text that implied criticism of the judicial system of a Member State and considered that the third and fourth preambular paragraphs (relating to details of the case) were not fully consistent seemed unbalanced. Denmark (speaking also for Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden) and the Netherlands, although sympathizing with the raising of humanitarian issues in the Assembly and other United Nations organs, found some judgements and views contained in the text unacceptable. The Federal Republic of Germany made the same point, objecting to the implied endorsement of armed struggle, the criticism of the United States judicial system, the allegation that Mr. Abu Eain had been detained illegally in the United States and the appeal to the United States to facilitate his safe transfer to the country of his choice.

Ireland found it particularly unacceptable that the resolution characterized the proceedings



of the United States Administration and courts as illegal, and found it unwarranted that the Assembly strongly deplored the United States actions; also, the act of violence had occurred within Israeli boundaries and not in the occupied territories, as the text might imply. The United Kingdom said it voted against the text principally because it contained immoderate and unjustified attacks on the handling of the case in the United States in accordance with established procedures; had the resolution been directed at humanitarian aspects, the United Kingdom position would have been different.

Basing its negative vote on legal grounds, Costa Rica advanced several arguments: that the United Nations had repeatedly refused to consider individual human rights violations, that it was counter to the principle of non-intervention to assume that the Assembly could express a judgement, that the case concerned a person accused of a common crime and that the United States had obtained guarantees from Israel regarding the trial of the accused.

Explaining its abstention in the vote, Chile said its policy was not to express a judgement on judicial matters exclusively within the internal jurisdiction of States. Saint Lucia said that, while the United States had acted on proper grounds in honouring the extradition agreement, the nature of the act was not without political content; the Assembly was not a law court, but was the custodian of the legitimate rights and interests of all States and peoples.

France recalled its opposition in principle to the extradition of persons persecuted for political reasons but said the Assembly should not pronounce on the case of Mr. Abu Eain, if only because it lacked the necessary information. Greece thought the text raised complex and delicate legal questions and might be construed as interference in a State's judiciary system; however, Greece hoped that the United States would exercise its influence to make sure that Mr. Abu Eain was given a fair trial and that his human and legal rights were safeguarded. Spain abstained on the ground that the contradictory allegations were difficult to verify in a political forum such as the Assembly, which was not in a position to evaluate judicial cases; moreover, the resolution seemed to call into question the United States judicial system. Turkey said that, while it could not but oppose terrorist acts, especially against civilians, it did not have all the necessary information about the case and did not believe matters pertaining to national court decisions could be discussed by the United Nations.

Voting in favour, Bangladesh said it was not fully conversant with the facts and legal back-

ground of the case; however, in the well-known context of Israeli actions in respect of the Arab countries and the cause of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Bangladesh recognized the humanitarian appeal of the resolution. India said that, given Israel's record with regard to the treatment of Arabs and Palestinians in the occupied territories and its general attitude of not respecting international opinion and convention, there was reason to be concerned, on humanitarian grounds, about Mr. Abu Eain's treatment. The USSR said it had voted for the resolution because it dealt with a manifestation of the flagrant and massive violation of human rights by Israeli authorities in the occupied Arab territories and the United States encouragement of that policy.

Prior to the extradition, Jordan submitted to the Third Committee on 28 October a draft decision, revised the following day, by which the Assembly would have requested its President to communicate on its behalf to the United States the concerns expressed on behalf of Mr. Abu Eain and to appeal that he not be extradited to Israel.<sup>(1)</sup> This proposal, submitted in connection with the agenda item on torture and other cruel treatment (p. 901), was subsequently withdrawn. Jordan later told the Assembly that it had not pressed for action at that time because it had thought it could save Mr. Abu Eain's life through quiet diplomacy.

When Jordan raised this issue in the Committee, the United States asked that it be ruled out of order on the ground that the issue was a domestic matter that did not fall within the scope of the item on torture. The Chairman responded that the United Nations Legal Counsel had advised him that it would not be appropriate for Jordan to raise the case under that item. However, in a roll-call vote requested by the United States, the Committee decided, by 65 votes to 19, with 31 abstentions, to approve a motion by Jordan to allow its statement to be heard.

Explaining their negative votes on this motion, Australia, Austria, Denmark, Ireland, Liberia and Sweden said they had voted on procedural grounds on the basis of the Legal Counsel's findings. The United States said its objections had been procedural, because the matter could have been taken up under another item.

Among those voting to allow Jordan to be heard, Cuba and Democratic Yemen said they wanted the case to be discussed. The Syrian Arab Republic stated that representatives had never required permission from the Committee before explaining cases of human rights violations. The United Arab Emirates said the United States should endeavour to ensure freedom of

speech in the United Nations. Spain and the Upper Volta said they had taken a procedural stand without reference to the substance of the matter.

In the Committee debate, the Syrian Arab Republic said that, presumably, an Arab could not get a fair hearing in United States courts when the interests of Israel were at stake.

On 18 December, in deciding to resume its 1981 session at a date to be announced, the Assembly listed the question of human rights relating to the case of Mr. Abu Eain among the topics to be taken up when it resumed.<sup>(4)</sup>

(The report by the Secretary-General, requested by the Assembly on 16 December, was submitted in January 1982.)

Draft decision withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Jordan, A/C.3/36/L.39/Rev.1.  
Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/42, 8 May, text following; <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/171, 16 Dec., text following. Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/461, item 12, 18 Dec. (p. 350).

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR. 18, 19 (8 May).  
GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.27, 28, 32, 33, 34-36, 43 (22 Oct.-9 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/42

24-14-12 (recorded vote) Meeting 19 8 May 1981  
6-nation draft (E/1981/L.39); agenda item 7.

Sponsors: Algeria, Iraq, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Sudan.

Human fights questions: the case of Ziad Abu Eain

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 32/14 of 7 November 1977, in which the Assembly, inter alia, reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle for independence, territorial integrity, national unity and liberation from colonial and foreign domination and alien subjugation by all available means,

Bearing in mind that the Government of Israel defiantly considers internationally recognized and legitimate resistance by the Palestinian population under illegal occupation as "common crimes" and that the Israeli authorities of occupation systematically violate the human rights of the Palestinian population under Israeli military occupation,

Noting that Mr. Ziad Abu Eain has been detained illegally in a United States prison for over a year pending his extradition to Israel.

Noting also that the sole basis for "probable cause" against Mr. Ziad Abu Eain is a Hebrew language statement made by a person who was in Israeli custody,

Noting further that no United States court will sustain a trial of a person on the basis of such "evidence".

Appeals to the Government of the United States of America to release Mr. Ziad Abu Eain from the United States prison in which he is being detained.

Recorded vote in Economic and Social Council as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussia<sup>a</sup> SSR, China, Cyprus, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Senegal, Sudan, USSR, Yugoslavia.

Against: Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Italy, Norway, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Ecuador, Kenya, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Spain, Thailand, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Zaire.

General Assembly resolution 36/171

75-21-43 (recorded vote) Meeting 101 16 December 1981  
20-nation draft (A/36/L.58); agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Question of human rights relating to  
the case of Mr. Ziad Abu Eain

The General Assembly,

Recalling the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

Recalling its resolution 32/14 of 7 November 1977 and other pertinent resolutions in which the General Assembly, inter alia, reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle for independence, territorial integrity, national unity and liberation from colonial and foreign domination and alien subjugation by all available means,

Noting that Mr. Ziad Abu Eain, a Palestinian national from occupied Palestinian territory and a Jordanian citizen, was illegally detained in prison in the United States of America for over two years,

Noting a/s/o that the sole basis for "probable cause" against Mr. Ziad Abu Eain was a statement in Hebrew extracted from a person who had no knowledge of the Hebrew language and who was in Israeli custody, whose statement was later recanted,

Deeply concerned that the Government of the United States has extradited Mr. Ziad Abu Eain and delivered him to Israel, the occupying Power,

1. Strongly deplores the action of the Government of the United States of America in extraditing Mr. Ziad Abu Eain to Israel, the occupying Power;

2. Demands that Mr. Ziad Abu Eain be immediately released and that the Government of the United States, being responsible for his safety, should facilitate his safe transfer to the country of his choice;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly no later than 31 December 1981 on the implementation of the present resolution;

4. Decides to retain item 12 on the agenda of its thirty-sixth session for the sole purpose of further considering the question of human rights relating to the case of Mr. Ziad Abu Eain.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana,<sup>a</sup> Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malts, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Spain, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

<sup>a</sup>Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

## Disappearance of persons

The problem of enforced or involuntary disappearance of persons was considered in 1981 by the Commission on Human Rights and its Working Group on this subject, the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection

of Minorities, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

**WORKING GROUP REPORT (JANUARY/FEBRUARY).** The five-member Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances presented to the Commission on Human Rights in January 1981 a report<sup>(1)</sup> on its activities at the three sessions it had held at Geneva (9-13 June, 15-19 September, 8-19 December 1980) since its establishment in February 1980.<sup>(10)</sup>

The Group had received information from Governments, organizations and individuals on a total of 11,000 to 13,000 cases in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Cyprus, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, the Philippines, South Africa and Uruguay. It transmitted this material to the respective Governments with a request for views and further information, and authorized its Chairman to perform this function when urgent reports of disappearances were received between sessions. Under this authorization, the Chairman transmitted reports to the Governments of Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, El Salvador and Peru. During its December 1980 session the Group met with representatives of Argentina (also at its September session), Cyprus, Indonesia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru and Uruguay, and of the Turkish Cypriot community. After analysing some of the information, the Group concluded that it warranted the deepest concern for the danger to the life, liberty and security of the disappeared persons and for the anguish and sorrow caused to their relatives.

The Group's principal recommendation was that the Commission continue to give close consideration to enforced or involuntary disappearances and their underlying causes, and that it select a mechanism to take action between Commission sessions. It also recommended that the Commission call on Governments to co-operate with the United Nations on this topic, furnish information, ensure the cessation of all disappearances and undertake urgent and thorough investigations, and it urged greater publicity for United Nations actions on the subject. It further recommended the ratification and full implementation of the relevant United Nations instruments, in particular the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (p. 889).

The Group met again at Geneva on 13 February 1981 to review information received since its December 1980 session. An addendum to its report described communications relating to cases in Nicaragua, Paraguay and Uruguay.

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND ITSSUB-COMMISSION.** On 26 February<sup>(11)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights, noting that the Working Group had not always obtained

the full co-operation of government authorities, extended the term of the Group's mandate for another year. It requested the Working Group to report in 1982 with conclusions and recommendations, and to bear in mind the obligation to discharge its mandate with discretion so as to protect persons providing information or to limit the dissemination of information provided by Governments. The Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities was requested to continue studying the most effective means for eliminating enforced or involuntary disappearances, with a view to making general recommendations.

In a resolution of the same date<sup>(12)</sup> on human rights in Chile (p. 951), the Commission expressed deep concern at the lack of information on numerous disappeared persons. It once more urged the Chilean authorities to investigate and clarify the fate of persons who had disappeared for political reasons, to inform relatives of the outcome and to institute criminal proceedings against those responsible. The Chilean judiciary was called upon to employ fully and without restrictions its power under habeas corpus and amparo in order to prevent disappearances and other violations.

On 8 May 1981,<sup>(13)</sup> the Economic and Social Council approved the one-year extension of the Working Group's mandate. The decision, taken on a draft by the Commission, was adopted without vote, following its approval by the Second (Social) Committee on 5 May in like manner.

The Sub-Commission, on 10 September,<sup>(14)</sup> expressed hope that Governments would respond to Working Group requests for information and enable the Group's members to visit. Expressing its conviction that the extension of the Working Group's mandate was indispensable, it recommended that the Commission consider the following action: taking steps to make world public opinion aware of the grave nature of the phenomenon of disappearances and of United Nations action to eliminate the practice; regarding a Government's failure to supply requested information within a reasonable time as confirmation of the occurrence of events; urging States to repeal or refrain from adopting laws which could impede inquiries; giving attention to the need for special measures to protect informants, including relatives; and requesting the Working Group to prepare for the 1982 Sub-Commission session a report that would permit the Sub-Commission to continue making recommendations. The Sub-Commission decided to accord the subject high priority in 1982.

The Sub-Commission's resolution was adopted by 15 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

**WORKING GROUP ACTION (MAY-DECEMBER).** The Working Group on disappearances held its

fourth, fifth and sixth sessions in 1981 (New York, 11-15 May; Geneva, 14-18 September; Geneva, 30 November-7 December), and adopted on 7 December a report to the Commission on Human Rights.<sup>(2)</sup>

During the year the Group continued to receive information and forward it to the Governments concerned. The information related to the countries dealt with in 1980 (excluding Peru), as well as Guinea, Honduras, Iran, Lesotho, Sri Lanka, Uganda and Zaire. Governments, humanitarian organizations, relatives of reported missing persons and other reliable sources were contacted for further information. The Group approached eight Governments regarding urgent reports of the disappearance of some 55 persons, of whom 18 were later reported to be free or in prison and one was said to have been found dead. It met with representatives of the Governments of Argentina, El Salvador, Mexico and Uruguay. It explored with Governments the possibility of visiting several countries; Mexico agreed to such a visit, to take place in 1982.

The Group concluded that the number of disappeared persons was increasing and that such cases were receiving world-wide publicity and attracting widespread protest. Although it was not aware of any country where disappearances had been reported which did not provide for the basic right of relatives to be informed in such cases, in all too many cases the constitutional and legal safeguards had yielded no result. The Group commended the example of countries which had set up special machinery to investigate disappearances, and endorsed recommendations by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights that Governments should keep central records on detained persons so that relatives and others could learn promptly of arrests, that arrests should be made only by competent authorities and that arrested persons should be kept in premises designated for that purpose. It considered that the problem could be solved by the proper implementation of existing national laws.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** The General Assembly dealt with the disappearance of persons in three resolutions adopted on 16 December. In a general resolution on the subject,<sup>(6)</sup> it welcomed the decision of the Commission on Human Rights to extend the term of the Working Group's mandate; requested the Commission to continue to study the question as a matter of priority and to take any step necessary to the pursuit of the Group's task; and appealed to all Governments to co-operate. The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, which similarly approved the orally revised text on 30 November.

By the second resolution, the Assembly urged continuation of the tracing of missing persons in Cyprus, called on the parties to assist in investigations and requested the Secretary-General to continue to provide his good offices.<sup>(7)</sup> In a resolution on human rights in Chile, the Assembly urged the Chilean authorities to investigate and clarify the fate of persons who had disappeared for political reasons, to inform their relatives of the outcome of the investigation and to prosecute and punish those responsible.<sup>(5)</sup>

In order not to prejudge the Commission's decisions, the 13 sponsors of the resolution on the Working Group's mandate deleted from paragraph 3 the phrase "with all due effectiveness" in reference to the pursuit of the Group's task.

Introducing the text, France said the question of involuntary or enforced disappearances was one of profound concern to the international community, which looked to the Commission to take the necessary measures. The resolution made it clear that the Working Group had aroused considerable hope.

The extension of the Group's mandate was welcomed in the Third Committee by several speakers, including Cyprus, Denmark, New Zealand, Sweden and the United Kingdom, the last on behalf of the EC members. Norway commended the Group's analysis and hoped the report on its 1981 sessions would be comprehensive and would pave the way for further action. Several speakers referred in particular to the fate of missing persons in Chile, dealt with in a report by the Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Chile (p. 951).

Reports: Working Group. <sup>(1)</sup>E/CN.4/1435 8: Add.1, (2)E/CN.4/1492.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 26 Feb.: <sup>(3)</sup>9(XXXVII), paras. 4-6; <sup>(4)</sup>10(XXXVII). GA, 16 Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>36/157, para. 4 (e) (p. 955); <sup>(6)</sup>36/163, text following; <sup>(7)</sup>36/164 (p. 346). <sup>(8)</sup>SCPDPM (report, E/CN.4/1512): 15(XXXIV), 10 Sep.

Decision: <sup>(9)</sup>ESC: 1981/139, 8 May, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(10)</sup>1980, p. 843.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 18, 19(27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 64, 66(19-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/139

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote. 5 May (meeting iS); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda item 7.

Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council approved the decision of the Commission on Human Rights, in its resolution 10(XXXVII) of 26 February 1981, to extend for one year the term of the mandate of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, as set forth in Commission resolution 20(XXXVI) of 29 February 1980, and to request the Secretary-General to continue to provide the

Working Group with all necessary assistance, in particular the staff and resources it needs to perform its functions in an effective and expeditious manner, and if necessary to make the arrangements required to ensure the continuity of the work of the Secretariat

#### General Assembly resolution 36/163

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, 30 November (meeting 66); 13-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.71), orally revised; agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Senegal, Sweden, United Kingdom

#### Question of involuntary or enforced disappearances

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 33/173 of 20 December 1978, entitled "Disappeared persons", and its resolution 35/193 of 15 December 1980 on the question of involuntary or enforced disappearances,

Bearing in mind Commission on Human Rights resolution 10(XXXVII) of 26 February 1981, in which it was decided to extend for one year the term of the mandate of the Working Group dealing with involuntary or enforced disappearances, and Economic and Social Council decision 1981/139 of 8 May 1981, by which the Council approved the Commission's decision,

Convinced that the action taken, in consultation with the Governments concerned, to promote the implementation of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 33/173 and other United Nations resolutions relevant to the plight of missing or disappeared persons should be continued,

Expressing its emotion at the anguish and sorrow of the families of victims of involuntary or enforced disappearances,

1. Welcomes the decision of the Commission on Human Rights to extend for one year the term of the mandate of the Working Group as laid down in Commission resolution 10(XXXVII);

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Working Group for the work done and to those Governments that have co-operated with it;

3. Requests the Commission on Human Rights to continue to study this question as a matter of priority and to take any step it may deem necessary to the pursuit of the task of the Working Group, when it considers the report to be submitted by the Group at its thirty-eighth session;

4. Appeals to all Governments to provide the Working Group and the Commission on Human Rights with the full co-operation warranted by their strictly humanitarian objectives and their working methods based on discretion;

5. Renews its request to the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Working Group with all necessary assistance.

### Other aspects of civil and political rights

#### Conscientious objectors

The Commission on Human Rights, by a resolution of 12 March 1981<sup>(1)</sup> adopted by 25 votes to 3, with 12 abstentions, welcomed the replies of Governments in response to its March 1980 request<sup>(4)</sup> for information on national legislation and other measures and practices relating to conscientious objection to military service and alternative service. It requested the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities to study the question of conscientious objection, in particular

the implementation of a 1978 General Assembly resolution recognizing the right to refuse service in military or police forces used to enforce apartheid!!') with a view to making recommendations.

Responding to this resolution, the Sub-Commission, on 10 September,<sup>(3)</sup> requested two of its members, Asbjorn Eide (Norway) and Chama L. C. Mubanga-Chipoya (Zambia), to analyse the various dimensions of conscientious objection to military service and its interrelationships with the promotion and protection of human rights, and to report in 1982 with conclusions and recommendations.

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 40(XXXVII), 12 Mar.; <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 33/165, 20 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 217); <sup>(3)</sup>SCPDP (report, E/CN.4/1512), 14(XXXIV), 10 Sep. 1981.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 869.

#### Independence of the judicial system

In June 1981, the Special Rapporteur for the study on the independence and impartiality of the judiciary, jurors and assessors and the independence of lawyers, L. M. Singhvi (India), presented to the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities a progress report<sup>(1)</sup> on the study, which had been authorized by the Economic and Social Council in May 1980.<sup>(4)</sup> He noted that the topic had been discussed at various United Nations and non-governmental meetings, and said a questionnaire had been addressed to Governments, organizations and institutions. An August addendum to the report<sup>(2)</sup> reproduced draft principles on the independence of the judiciary prepared by a committee of experts convened by the International Association of Penal Law and the International Commission of Jurists (Siracusa, Italy, 25-29 May).

On 10 September,(") the Sub-Commission requested the Special Rapporteur to continue his study and submit a final report in 1982.

Reports: Special Rapporteur, <sup>(1)</sup>E/CN.4/Sub.2/481, <sup>(2)</sup>E/CN.4/Sub.2/481/Add.1.

Resolution and decision: RES.: <sup>(3)</sup>SCI'DPM (report, E/CN.4/1512), 21(XXXIV), 10 Sep. Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1980/124,2 May 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 848).

#### Slavery

The Working Group on Slavery, established in 1974 by the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities,(") held its seventh session at Geneva from 10 to 14 August 1981 and adopted its report on 20 August.<sup>(2)</sup> It reviewed developments on slavery and the slave trade, including statements by the Anti-Slavery Society for Protection of Human Rights, the Minority Rights Group and the International Abolitionist Federation alleging the continuation of slavery-like practices in Ethiopia, Mauritania and other countries. The Working Group also discussed

debt bondage, the sale of children and child labour, child prostitution, sexual mutilation of female children, and apartheid and colonialism as collective forms of slavery.

The Working Group adopted several recommendations for consideration by the Sub-Commission. It proposed the inclusion of a standing item in the Sub-Commission's agenda on discrimination against women and children, and suggested that that body consider a proposal for an International Anti-Slavery Year. The Group further recommended: that the attention of Mauritania be drawn to assistance programmes of the United Nations and specialized agencies, including human rights advisory services; that Ethiopia be invited to comment on a statement by the Anti-Slavery Society on alleged forced labour in that country; that statements on child labour in Greece and Jamaica, by the International Council of Women and the Anti-Slavery Society, respectively, be submitted to those Governments for information and observations; and that the statement of the Minority Rights Group on exploitation of child prostitution in some Asian countries through intermediary agencies based in Western countries be brought to the attention of the Netherlands and other Governments.

The Working Group also made several recommendations with regard to prostitution (see below) and recommended that the plight of Bihari families stranded in Bangladesh as a result of the war of independence from Pakistan in 1971 be brought to the attention of the relevant United Nations organs so that effective steps could be taken for their transport, rehabilitation, resettlement and employment.

After considering the Working Group's report, the Sub-Commission, on 10 September 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> recommended that the Commission on Human Rights: appeal to United Nations Member States to take measures against prostitution; recognize that apartheid was a slavery-like practice and endorse the call for mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa (p. 165); request that the statements made to the Group by the three non-governmental organizations (NGOs), together with the Group's recommendations, be transmitted to the Governments and organizations concerned; call on parties to anti-slavery conventions to report regularly on the situation in their countries, and on other States and organizations to supply information to the Group; and request the United Nations Department of Public Information to increase public awareness of slavery and slavery-like institutions and practices and to mobilize action for their eradication. The Sub-Commission sought authorization to send a delegation to study the

situation in Mauritania and ascertain the country's needs.

The Sub-Commission's Special Rapporteur on slavery, Benjamin Charles George Whitaker (United Kingdom), continued work on updating an earlier report on the topic, in accordance with a Ma 1980 Economic and Social Council decision.<sup>(5)</sup> In a July 1981 progress report,<sup>(1)</sup> he stated that he had received replies to a questionnaire (annexed to the report) from 21 States and a number of organizations. The Sub-Commission, on 10 September,<sup>(4)</sup> invited him to submit his final report in 1982.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Special Rapporteur, E/CN.4/Sub.2/478;  
<sup>(2)</sup>Working Group, E/CN.4/Sub.2/486 & Corr.1.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: SCPDPM (report, E/CN.4/1512), 10 Sep.: <sup>(3)</sup>16(XXXIV), <sup>(4)</sup>17(XXXIV).

Decision: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1980/123, 2 May 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 883).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1974, p. 676.

#### Prostitution

The Economic and Social Council, on 8 May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to undertake an inquiry among Member States and international organizations on the status of the question of traffic in persons and exploitation of the prostitution of others, and to report to the General Assembly in 1982. The resolution, sponsored by France and Japan, was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Second (Social) Committee on 5 May.

The resolution was orally revised by its sponsors to include international NGOs among the organizations mentioned. Also in its revised version, the text referred to prostitution as a form rather than a new form of slavery.

On the recommendation of the Working Group on Slavery (see above), made in August 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities, in its resolution of 10 September on slavery,<sup>(4)</sup> recommended that the Commission on Human Rights appeal to Member States: to ratify and implement the 1949 Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others;<sup>(3)</sup> to undertake concerted action against all enterprises promoting prostitution and traffic in persons, and to include relevant information in their reports concerning the Convention; to intensify research into the economic, social, psychological, sexual and emotional causes of prostitution and pimping; and to promote the social reintegration of victims of prostitution. The Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women (p. 982) would be invited to consider supporting projects to rehabilitate prostitutes in poor areas.

In its resolution of 10 September on the work of its Working Group on the Encouragement of Universal Acceptance of Human Rights Instruments,<sup>(5)</sup> the Sub-Commission decided to consider in 1982 whether to include the Convention on prostitution in the list of instruments considered by the Group (p. 936).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Working Group, E/CN.4/Sub.2/486 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC: 1981/40, 8 May text following.

<sup>(3)</sup>GA: 317(IV), annex. 2 Dec. 1949 (YUN 1948-49, D. 613). SCPDPM (report, E/CN.4/1512), 10 Sep. 1981:

<sup>(4)</sup>16(XXXIV), <sup>(5)</sup>19(XXXIV).

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-16, 17, 19 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/40

Adopted without vote Meeting 18 8 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May (meeting 19); P-nation draft (E/1981/C.2/L.12), orally revised; agenda item 7.

Sponsors: France, Japan.

Combating the traffic in persons and the exploitation of the prostitution of others

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolution 1980/4 of 16 April 1980, in which it requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the application of the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others,

Recalling a/so resolution 1(XXVII) of 4 April 1978 of the Commission on the Status of Women,

Considering the provisions of resolution 43 on the exploitation of the prostitution of others and traffic in persons, adopted by the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women,

Considering that slavery may be defined as the condition of a person who is entirely under the domination of another,

Having been informed that, for these reasons, the Working Group on Slavery of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities has been invited to collaborate in the preparation of a study on procuring,

Considering further that these practices, frequently condemned by various United Nations bodies, constitute a flagrant violation of human rights,

Considering that the combating and suppression of such traffic involves a number of different national and international organizations,

Requests the Secretary-General to undertake an inquiry among the Governments of Member States and the international organizations concerned--the regional commissions, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Interpol and the international non-governmental organizations concerned--on the status of the question and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, so that, with full knowledge of the facts, joint measures can be envisaged to put an end to this form of slavery.

## Economic, social and cultural rights

### International Covenant

#### Accessions and ratifications

As at 31 December 1981, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted by the General Assembly in

1966<sup>(1)</sup> and in force since 3 January 1976,<sup>(2)</sup> had been ratified or acceded to by the following 71 States (italics indicate those adhering in 1981):

Australia, Austria, Barbados, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 419).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1976, p. 609.

### Implementation of the Covenant

#### Reports from States parties

At its third session, held in New York from 14 to 29 April 1981, the Economic and Social Council's Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights<sup>(1)</sup> considered reports submitted by 22 States parties on their implementation of specific provisions of the Covenant. On each report, the Group heard statements by, and put questions to, the respective State representative. Under a programme established by the Council in 1976,<sup>(2)</sup> reports required under the Covenant were to be submitted in three biennial cycles or stages, each stage covering a related group of articles.

From the first stage (due 1 September 1977), the Working Group examined reports submitted in 1980 by Czechoslovakia and Madagascar<sup>(4)</sup> concerning rights covered by articles 6 to 9 of the Covenant (the right to work and to favourable conditions of work, the rights of trade unionists and the right to social security). At the request of the Syrian Arab Republic, the Group deferred consideration of its report<sup>(5)</sup> until 1982. Reports received later in 1981 from Barbados, Canada, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Kingdom (the last covering the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man)<sup>(6)</sup> were also to be examined in 1982.

The Group also considered<sup>(23)</sup> second-stage reports (due 1 September 1979) on rights covered by articles 10 to 12 (protection of the family, mothers and children; an adequate living stan-

dard; and physical and mental health) from the following 21 States: Australia, Austria, Byelorussian SSR, Chile, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iraq, Mongolia, Norway, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, USSR, United Kingdom (covering the Channel Islands, the Isle of Man and dependent Territories), United Republic of Tanzania.<sup>(7)</sup> Reports received in 1981 from Panama (two) and the Ukrainian SSR<sup>(8)</sup> were to be examined in 1982.

Reports relating to the third stage (due 1 September 1981), on rights covered by articles 13 to 15 (education, including compulsory education, and participation in cultural life) were received during 1981 from the Byelorussian SSR, the German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, Japan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Mongolia, Norway, Romania, Sweden, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR.<sup>(9)</sup>

The Secretary-General submitted to the Council in February a note listing the reports received from States<sup>(1)</sup> and an analytical summary of reports on rights covered by articles 10 to 12 received from 11 States since the submission of a similar report in January 1980.<sup>(10)</sup> In March 1981, he transmitted to the Council the first report of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations relating to provisions in article 11 of the Covenant recognizing the right of rural populations to an adequate standard of living and the right of everyone to be free from hunger,<sup>(2)</sup> and the fourth report of the International Labour Organisation on the work of its Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.<sup>(3)</sup>

On 17 April, after consideration of the report of Chile, the Chairman made a statement summing up discussions in the Working Group during which some members had referred to expressions by United Nations bodies of concern on human rights in Chile (p. 951). He said members of the Group believed that Chile should provide additional information concerning rights covered by articles 10 to 12.

On the Working Group's recommendation, the Council, on 8 May, decided without vote to request States parties that had not submitted their reports to do so as soon as possible.<sup>(15)</sup> The decision was orally amended by Barbados to include reference to the 1976 Council resolution establishing the programme under which States were to furnish their reports.

Referring during the Council debate to the reporting system established under the Covenant, Canada remarked that States parties had a right to expect that the examination of reports should be at least at the same level as for the In-

ternational Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.<sup>(13)</sup> Denmark felt it was necessary to expand the Working Group's reports to the Council, drawing on the experience of the Human Rights Committee (p. 889) and the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (p. 871). France considered that the Group's reports should include a summary of individual national reports, a description of areas in which the State's activities could be strengthened or improved, and a technical opinion about the factors and difficulties preventing States from fulfilling their obligations under the Covenant; the control exercised by the Council through the reporting system must have an impact on national and international public opinion.

The Federal Republic of Germany remarked that the work methods and sessional character of the Group did not allow for a more detailed examination of national reports; the Council should receive a report from the Group which reflected the different quality of national reports and the different co-operation of States' representatives. A change of the reporting system was also advocated by Italy.

Expressing dissatisfaction with the current monitoring system, Japan hoped that ways for effectively monitoring the implementation of the Covenant would continue to be explored. The Netherlands suggested that the Group consider making recommendations to the Council as to whether it should transmit the reports of States parties to the Commission on Human Rights for study and general recommendation or for information. In New Zealand's view, the Group's reports might give broader coverage of its activities in monitoring national reports and might draw attention to ways in which such reports could be improved; also, reducing the frequency of national reports would increase the Group's effectiveness. Norway thought the ideal solution was to have the Group present substantive reports giving a faithful picture of how the States parties discharged their obligations, the measures adopted and the progress made in achieving observance of the rights recognized in the Covenant.

In Brazil's view, there was no reason for States not parties to the Covenant to concern themselves with measures taken by States parties; the Council should not have to analyse national reports. The USSR felt that the existing monitoring method was the best because the Group could analyse each State's legislation and compare the relative progress made in the implementation of the provisions of the Covenant without questioning the economic and social structure of individual States.



Noting that States parties were under a contractual obligation to submit their reports, Cyprus felt that only a reminder rather than an appeal was required to parties which had not met that obligation.

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 25 November 1981 on the International Covenants on Human Rights,<sup>(14)</sup> urged States parties to the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to submit their reports as soon as possible.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/18.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>FAO, transmitted by S-G note: E/1981/22.

<sup>(3)</sup>ILO, transmitted by S-G note: E/1981/41. States parties: <sup>(4)</sup>E/1978/8/Add.18, 29; <sup>(5)</sup>E/1978/8/Add.25; <sup>(6)</sup>E/1978/8/Add.30-33; <sup>(7)</sup>E/1980/6/Add.1-12, 13/Rev.1, 14-16 & 16/Corr.1, 17-19, 21, 22, 25 & 25/Corr.1, 26; <sup>(8)</sup>E/1980/6/Add.20, 23, 24; <sup>(9)</sup>E/1982/3 & Add.1-8, 10-13, 15 & 15/Corr.1; <sup>(10)</sup>analytical summary by S-G, E/1980/22/Add.1 & Add.1/Corr.1. <sup>(11)</sup>Working Group: E/1981/64 & Add.1.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(12)</sup>ESC: 1988(LX), 11 May 1976 (YUN 1976, p. 615). GA: <sup>(13)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 423); <sup>(14)</sup>36/58, para. 5, 25 Nov. 1981 (p. 934).

Decision: <sup>(15)</sup>ESC: 1981/159, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: Working Group, E/1981/WG.1/SR.1-19 (14-29 Apr.); plenary. E/1981/SR.15, 18, 19 (6 & 8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/159

Adopted without vote

Draft by Working Group (E/1981/64), orally amended by Barbados; agenda item 3.

Reports called for under article 16 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

At its 19th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council decided to request States parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights that had not yet submitted their reports in conformity with article 16 of the Covenant and Council resolution 1988(LX) of 11 May 1976 to do so as soon as possible.

#### Arrangements for the Working Group

Organization of work. On 8 May 1981, the Economic and Social Council decided without vote on several aspects of future arrangements for the Working Group.<sup>(8)</sup> It added "of Governmental Experts" to the Group's name, making it the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It decided that the Group would meet for three weeks each year, starting one week before the Council's first regular session (rather than during the session as in the past). The Group's other work methods were to remain as established by the Council in 1979.<sup>(3)</sup> A list of States parties to the Covenant and an indication of the status of submission of their reports were to be annexed to the Group's reports. At the end of the Group's discussion of each State's report, representatives of specialized agencies could

make general statements on matters in their field, with the reporting States being free to respond. Analytical summaries of States' reports, prepared by the Secretariat and originally authorized in 1978,<sup>(6)</sup> were to be discontinued.

The Council also decided on the agenda (p. 919), membership (p. 920) and officers (p. 921) of the Working Group.

The Council's action was based on the Group's recommendations, made on 29 April 1981.<sup>(2)</sup>

Also on 8 May, the Council decided without vote to review, at its first regular session of 1982, the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group.<sup>(9)</sup> This decision was proposed by the Netherlands, which orally revised it to delete a phrase stating that the review would take place in the Council's Second (Social) Committee and a paragraph by which this would have been taken up as a separate agenda item. On an oral amendment by Cyprus, the Working Group's methods of work were omitted from the scope of the review.

The Cyprus amendment was accepted by the Council after the Byelorussian SSR and the USSR said its acceptance, and the revisions by the sponsor, would make a consensus possible.

The composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group had been inconclusively discussed by the Council in February 1981. On 6 February, it decided to review the matter further at its first regular session (April/May) and fixed the dates for the Group's 1981 session.<sup>(7)</sup> It also took note of the appointment of 15 States as members of the Group. This decision, based on a draft by the President following informal consultations, was adopted without vote.

In this decision, the Council also noted a January 1981 report of the Secretary-General, which it had requested in May 1980,<sup>(4)</sup> containing his comments on this topic as well as the views and suggestions of 18 Governments.<sup>(1)</sup> In his comments on organization and administrative arrangements, the Secretary-General noted that all the Governments which had expressed their views had supported an extension of the Group's meetings to three or more weeks annually, or to as many as required for the reports to be thoroughly examined. Some Governments had suggested changes, such as having the Group meet between Council sessions or use rules of procedure similar to those of the Human Rights Committee rather than of the Council. The Secretary-General expressed the opinion that existing work methods were adequate to permit a thorough and expert examination of reports from States, provided that the difficulties relating to composition, membership, and timing and dura-

tion of meetings were resolved and that the Group was given sufficient time for its work.

In the Council's February discussion, Brazil explained that it did not object to the consensus reached; however, if the decision taken at that time had been put to a vote, it would have abstained because of its position that States not parties to the Covenant should not be obliged to cover the related expenses through the regular United Nations budget.

Speaking in the Council in May on the original proposal by the Netherlands, the USSR said a further review of the Group's arrangements in 1982 would be tantamount to a review of the Covenant and would have considerable financial implications. Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR and the German Democratic Republic also appealed to the Netherlands to withdraw the proposal, saying it called into question the compromise reached in the Working Group. The Byelorussian SSR expressed concern at what it saw as the intention to transform the review process, intended to consider only organizational matters, into a continuous review that could only destroy the Group's work. Also opposed to the draft was Ecuador, which felt that the proposal would reopen the entire debate on the report of the Working Group.

Australia, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, New Zealand, Spain and the United Kingdom supported the Netherlands proposal, which its sponsor said was strictly procedural and would guarantee a thorough review of the monitoring system.

Stating that matters relating to the Covenant were exclusively the concern of the States parties, Brazil declared that it would not participate in any of the debates or votes.

Australia, Cyprus, the Federal Republic of Germany and others expressed support for all the draft decisions and for the Working Group's recommendations, with the reservations that summary records of meetings (Australia) and analytical summaries of national reports (Cyprus) should continue to be provided.

Denmark felt that the steps suggested for a review of the arrangements of the Working Group were not adequate; the Council should, for example, consider the possibility of an inter-sessional role for the Group. Norway, on the other hand, suggested that the Working Group meet parallel with the first regular Council session of each year, thereby saving the heavy cost involved in inter-sessional meetings; the Group's report could then be considered by the Council at its second regular session.

Concerning the participation of the specialized agencies, the United Kingdom expressed hope that their role under the Covenant could

be made more effective. France, though agreeing with the Secretary-General's view that the reports submitted by the agencies should be considered together with those of States parties, said the possibility of considering them separately should not be ruled out; the reports could include information on the agencies' own activities.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** The General Assembly, in its resolution of 25 November 1981 on the International Covenants on Human Rights, noted the Council's May decision on further review of the Working Group's arrangements and said it looked forward to results at the Council's first session of 1982.<sup>(5)</sup>

During the human rights debate in the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, the Byelorussian SSR expressed concern that a number of States, mostly from one region, paid more attention to organizational aspects than to the activities of the Working Group. Romania believed that the Council's decisions would improve the work of the Group, while the USSR said the methods of work already approved for the Group would provide a good basis for its efficient operation.

Canada said the Working Group had not fully carried out its mandate to study national reports. In the opinion of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Group had not reached the standard of the Human Rights Committee. Japan did not believe the same reporting system should be applied to the two Covenants, since the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights called for the progressive implementation of rights to the extent of a State's resources. Portugal welcomed the organizational arrangements proposed for the Group but believed additional progress could be made in the review planned for 1982. The United Kingdom hoped the Group would develop the same effective and methodical approach to reports taken by the Human Rights Committee.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/6 & Add.1.2; <sup>(2)</sup>Working Group, E/1981/64.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(3)</sup>1979/43, 11 May 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 872); <sup>(4)</sup>1980/24, para. 2, 2 May 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 877). <5>GA: 36/58, para. 6, 25 Nov. 1981 (p. 934).

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(6)</sup>1978/9, 3 May 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 728); <sup>(7)</sup>1981/102, 6 Feb. 1981, text following; (8)1981/158, 8 May, text following; (9)1981/162, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: Working Group, E/1981/WG.1/SR.1-19 (14-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.1, 3, 15, 18, 19 (3, 6 Feb. & 6, 8 May).

#### **Economic and Social Council decision 1981/102**

Adopted without vote

Draft by President based on informal consultations (E/1981/L.11), orally revised; agenda item 2.

Review of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

At its 3rd plenary meeting, on 6 February 1981, the Council, having held formal and informal meetings to consider the future composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and pursuant to Council resolution 1980/24 of 2 May 1980:

(a) Decided to review the matter further at its first regular session of 1981;

(b) Took note of the report of the Secretary-General, submitted in accordance with Council resolution 1980/24;

(c) Took note of the appointment by the President of the Council, in conformity with its decision 1978/10 of 3 May 1978, of the following members of the Council, which are also States parties to the Covenant, as members of the Sessional Working Group: Barbados, Bulgaria, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Iraq, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nicaragua, Norway, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Zaire;

(d) Decided that the Working Group would hold its session from 14 April to 1 May 1981 at United Nations Headquarters;

(e) Urged the States members of the Sessional Working Group to include in their delegations experts in matters dealt with in the Covenant, who would participate in the work of the Group.

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/158

Adopted without vote

Draft by Working Group (E/1981/64); agenda item 3.

Review of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

At its 19th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and decided, in conformity with its decisions 1978/10 of 3 May 1978 and 1981/102 of 6 February 1981, to incorporate the following provisions into the methods of work of the Sessional Working Group, as set out in Council resolution 1979/43 of 11 May 1979:

#### Name

1. The name of the Group shall henceforth be "Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights".

#### Number of members

2. In accordance with Council decision 1978/10, the number of members shall remain at fifteen and the membership shall continue to be distributed equally among the geographical regions, subject to review when, in the opinion of the Council, an increase in the number of States parties to the Covenant makes such a review desirable,

#### Appointment of members

3. The members of the Working Group shall be appointed in accordance with paragraph 9 of Council resolution 1988(LX) of 11 May 1976 and subparagraph (a) of Council decision 1978/10, subject to further review if a situation arises in which a change seems to be necessary. The President of the Council shall, each year, appoint the members of the Working Group at the organizational session of the Council.

#### Time of meeting and reporting

4. The Working Group shall meet once yearly, starting one week before the first regular session of the Council, and shall submit its report to the Council for consideration at that session.

#### Duration of meetings

5. In principle, the duration of each session of the Working Group shall be three weeks, subject to review when the number of reports for consideration at any one session so warrants.

#### Amendments to the methods of work

6. Apart from those amendments to the methods of work set out in Council resolution 1979/43 arising out of the recommendations made by the Working Group at its 1981 session, as set forth in the present decision, the existing system shall be maintained.

#### Conclusions and recommendations

7. The Working Group shall function in accordance with Council resolution 1979/43 as amended by the present decision.

#### Review of the status of the submission of reports by States parties to the Covenant

8. A list of States parties to the Covenant shall be annexed to the report of the Working Group on each session, together with an indication of the status of submission of reports for consideration by the Working Group, in accordance with paragraph 14 of the methods of work set out in Council resolution 1979/43.

#### Incorporation of the understanding reached on the role and participation of specialized agencies

9. The representatives of the specialized agencies concerned may make general statements on matters relating to their field of competence at the end of the discussion by the Working Group of the report of each State party to the Covenant, and States parties presenting reports to the Working Group shall be free to respond to, or take into account, the general comments made by the specialized agencies.

#### Analytical summaries

10. The preparation of the analytical summaries authorized by the Council in its decision 1978/9 of 3 May 1978 shall be suspended. The Working Group shall continue to be provided with summary records.

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/162

Adopted without vote

Draft by Netherlands (E/1981/L.38). orally amended by Cyprus and orally revised; agenda item 3.

Future review of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

At its 19th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council, having considered the report of the Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, decided to review the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group at its first regular session of 1982.

Agenda for the 1982 session. On 8 May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Economic and Social Council approved without vote the Working Group's provisional agenda for 1982, which called for consideration of reports by States parties under all three phases of the reporting procedure (p. 917),

including for the first time the third phase, dealing with articles 13 to 15 (education and culture). The decision, including the provisional agenda, had been recommended by the Working Group on 29 April.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Working Group, E/1981/64.

Decision: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/160, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: Working Group, E/1981/WG.1/SR.1-19 (14-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR. 15, 18, 19 (6 & 8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/160

Adopted without vote

Draft by Working Group (E/1981/64); agenda item 3.

Provisional agenda for 1982 of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

At its 19th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council approved the provisional agenda for 1982 of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights set out below:

Provisional agenda for 1982 of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

1. Consideration of reports submitted in accordance with Council resolution 1988(LX) by States parties to the Covenant concerning rights covered by articles 6 to 9
  - Documentation
  - Reports submitted by Canada, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
  - Any other reports received by the Secretary-General
2. Consideration of reports submitted in accordance with Council resolution 1988(LX) by States parties to the Covenant concerning rights covered by articles 10 to 12
  - Documentation
  - Reports submitted by Panama and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
  - Any other reports received by the Secretary-General
3. Consideration of reports submitted in accordance with Council resolution 1988(LX) by States parties to the Covenant concerning rights covered by articles 13 to 15
  - Documentation
  - Reports received by the Secretary-General
4. Consideration of the report of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

**Membership.** The 15 members of the Working Group were appointed by the Economic and Social Council President (see APPENDIX III). The Council, on 6 February 1981, took note of the appointment and urged the Group's members to include in their delegations experts in matters dealt with in the Covenant.<sup>(5)</sup>

The composition and membership of the body assisting the Council in the consideration of reports from States parties to the Covenant was dealt with in the January report by the Secretary-General<sup>(1)</sup> on future arrangements for the Working Group (p. 917). The Secretary-General expressed the opinion that it should be constituted of persons possessing expertise and competence

in matters dealt with in the Covenant. Several of the replies received from States and reproduced in the report from Austria, Canada, Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Senegal and the United Kingdom-supported the establishment of a group of experts.

The Secretary-General recalled an April 1980 suggestion by the Working Group that consideration be given to appointing its members for two- or three-year terms from a list of candidates nominated by States parties.<sup>(7)</sup> He remarked that the adoption of such an approach would give more permanence to the machinery. The members could be elected by the Council, taking into account the principle of equitable geographical distribution and the representation of different legal and socio-economic systems; or they could be appointed by the Council President in consultation with the Secretary-General or with the Council members. The Secretary-General's approach was supported by a number of States; the replies ranged from proposals to maintain the current arrangements to proposals for the establishment of an expert committee whose members could be elected by States parties, following procedures similar to those under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.<sup>(3)</sup>

In its decision of 8 May on arrangements for the Working Group,<sup>(6)</sup> the Council kept the number of its members at 15, distributed equally among the geographical regions (three from each group), but added that this number should be reviewed when an increase in the number of States parties made a review desirable. The members would continue to be appointed each year by the Council President, as decided in 1978,<sup>(4)</sup> subject to further review if a change seemed necessary. These actions on membership had been Proposed by the Working Group on 29 April.<sup>(2)</sup>

During the debate, Canada, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway and the United Kingdom favoured the establishment of a group of independent experts, similar to the Human Rights Committee, to monitor implementation of the Covenant. As the two Covenants on human rights were equal, Canada remarked, it was only logical that adequate mechanisms should exist to monitor the implementation of both.

Bulgaria, Cyprus, France, India, New Zealand, the USSR and others preferred the establishment of a group of governmental experts. However, Cyprus observed that the current method, which limited the selection of experts to countries which were both States parties and Council members, implied that a non-expert who fulfilled those requirements would have to be preferred over an expert of a non-member country. India remarked that it would be diffi-

cult for an individual to specialize in more than one or two of the areas covered by the Covenant; member States could be urged to appoint one or more experts.

Though disappointed with the report of the Working Group, Japan said the monitoring body should remain an intergovernmental body whose members would appoint persons with expertise in their respective fields; to ensure continuity, its member States should be appointed for longer terms, perhaps three years. Italy too favoured a three-year term. A three-year membership, with one third of the Group being elected every year, was suggested by the Netherlands which, though favouring a body of independent experts, thought the solution of a sessional meeting of governmental experts should be tried out.

With regard to the Working Group's recommendation to retain the arrangement of 15 seats equally distributed among the five regional groups, the Netherlands suggested that the membership be distributed so that three regional groups would have three experts, one group would have two experts and one group would have four experts; in order to obtain that composition, the States parties within the Council should decide on the membership, possibly through election. India said it could not endorse the Netherlands suggestion for proportional representation, which was feasible only when the composition of a group was stable. Equitable geographical distribution was also advocated by France, while Italy felt that a change in that direction should be made as soon as the Covenant had been ratified by half of the United Nations Members. Norway thought the question should be continuously reviewed, taking into account in particular the number of countries ratifying the Covenant.

During the human rights debate in the General Assembly's Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, Mongolia said it did not support the idea of reorganizing the Working Group into a body of independent experts. The Netherlands reiterated its view that the composition of the Group did not reflect that of the States parties (p. 915) and repeated its suggestion for annual election of the members. Romania mentioned the need for equitable geographical distribution of the membership.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/6 & Add.1,2; <sup>(2)</sup>Working Group, E/1981/64.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA: 2200 A (XXI), annex, articles 28-32, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 427).

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(4)</sup>1978/10, paras. (a) & (b), 3 May 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 728); <sup>(5)</sup>1981/102, paras. (c) & (e), 6 Feb. 1981 (p. 918); <sup>(6)</sup>1981/158, paras. 2 & 3, 8 May (p. 919).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1980, p. 860.

Meeting records: ESC: Working Group, E/1981/WG.1/SK.1-19 (14-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.1, 3, 15, 18, 19 (3, 6 Feb. & 6, 8 May)

Officers. On the recommendation of the Working Group, made on 29 April 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Economic and Social Council decided without vote on 8 May on the geographical allocation of posts in the Group's Bureau (officers) for 1982.<sup>(2)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Working Group, E/1981/64.

Decision: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/161, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: Working Group, E/1981/WG.1/SR.1-19 (14-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR. 15, 18, 19 (6 & 8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/161

Adopted without vote

Draft by Working Group (E/1981/64); agenda item 3.

Bureau for 1982 of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

At its 19th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council decided that the Bureau for 1982 of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights should be constituted as follows:

Chairman: African States;

Vice-chairmen: Western European and other States. Asian States, Latin American States;

Rapporteur: Eastern European States.

## Other aspects of economic, social and cultural rights

### Right to development

ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS. On 11 March 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights expressed deep concern at the situation in regard to attainment of the objectives of the General Assembly's 1974 Declaration<sup>(4)</sup> and Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order<sup>(5)</sup> and the consequent adverse effects on the full achievement of human rights, including the right to development. It reaffirmed the right of all nations to pursue freely their economic and social development and to exercise full sovereignty over their natural resources without prejudice to any commitment arising out of international solidarity and economic co-operation. The Commission reiterated the need to ensure the realization of work, education, health and proper nourishment through the adoption of national and international measures, as a necessity for the full enjoyment of human rights; and reaffirmed that foreign occupation, colonialism, apartheid, racism, racial discrimination and the denial of the right of peoples to self-determination were serious impediments to economic and social progress.

The Commission urged the Secretary-General to complete before its 1982 session his study,

requested in February 1980,<sup>(12)</sup> on the regional and national dimensions of the right to development as a human right; and requested him to hold in August 1981 at United Nations Headquarters the seminar called for by the General Assembly in December 1980<sup>(7)</sup> on the relations between human rights, peace and development (p. 973).

The Commission decided to establish a working group of 15 government experts on the right to development and the realization of economic, social and cultural rights, which was to pay particular attention to the obstacles encountered by developing countries in their efforts to secure the enjoyment of human rights. The Working Group was requested to submit in 1982 a report with concrete proposals for implementation of the right to development and for a draft international instrument. The Commission decided to consider the question with high priority in 1982, with a view to adopting concrete measures on the basis of the Group's recommendations.

The resolution was adopted by a roll-call vote of 40 to 1 (United States), with 2 abstentions.

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** On 8 May 1981,<sup>(11)</sup> the Economic and Social Council approved the decision of the Commission on Human Rights to establish the Working Group on the right to development. It also approved the Commission's request that the Group hold three series of meetings at Geneva between July 1981 and the start of the Commission's 1982 session.

The Council took this decision, by 51 votes to 1, on the recommendation of the Second (Social) Committee, which approved the draft, submitted by the Commission, by a recorded vote, requested by Brazil, of 50 to 1.

**ACTIVITIES OF THE WORKING GROUP.** The Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development held two sessions at Geneva during 1981, from 20 to 24 July and from 23 November to 4 December.<sup>(2)</sup> Discussion focused on the following: scope and content of the right to development; means to ensure the realization, in all countries, of the economic, social and cultural rights enshrined in various international instruments; obstacles encountered by developing countries in their efforts to secure the enjoyment of human rights; and proposals for a draft international instrument on the right to development.

**ACTION BY THE SUB-COMMISSION ON DISCRIMINATION AND MINORITIES.** A progress report<sup>(1)</sup> on the preparation of a study on the new international economic order and the promotion of human rights, authorized by the Economic and Social Council in May 1980,<sup>(10)</sup> was submitted in August 1981 by the Special

Rapporteur responsible for the study, Raúl Ferrero Costa (Peru), to the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. The Special Rapporteur outlined the contents of the study, which was to include conclusions and recommendations.

The Sub-Commission, on 10 September,<sup>(9)</sup> requested its Special Rapporteur to continue his work with a view to submitting his final report in 1982.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** In a resolution of 14 December 1981 on measures for the advancement of human rights,<sup>(8)</sup> the General Assembly reiterated that establishment of the new international economic order was essential for the promotion and full enjoyment of human rights. It declared that the right to development was an inalienable human right and requested the Commission on Human Rights to take measures to promote that right, taking into account the work of the Working Group. The Assembly reaffirmed that, in order to ensure the full enjoyment of all human rights and complete personal dignity, it was necessary to promote the right to education and to work, health and proper nourishment, through adoption of national measures, including those providing for the right of workers to participate in management, and international measures, including the establishment of the new international economic order.

The text was orally revised by the sponsors to state the need to "promote" rather than "guarantee" the right to education and other rights; to delete the phrase "belonging to all peoples and to every individual" from the paragraph describing the right to development as an inalienable human right (Morocco had objected to the phrase as an unjustifiable extension of the meaning of the right to development); and to move to the preamble an operative paragraph recognizing that international peace and security were essential for full realization of the right to development. Taking into account an oral proposal by Morocco, the sponsors revised paragraph 7 to position the right to education ahead of the right to work.

Explaining its negative vote, the United States said the resolution was unacceptable because it sought to divert attention from individual to collective human rights; the right to development was an individual right to personal development and it was debatable whether it was inalienable. Along with the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, which abstained, said the draft prejudged the discussion in the Working Group; they also did not believe that the right to development or the establishment of a new international economic order were prerequisites for guaranteeing other human

rights. Italy, which also abstained, voiced a similar opinion, adding that the fact that reference was made to the human rights of peoples before the human rights of individuals could lead to mistaken interpretations.

Reservations on paragraph 8, characterizing the right to development as an inalienable human right, were expressed by Canada, which abstained, and by Ireland, the Netherlands and New Zealand, which voted for the resolution. They considered that a decision on the right to development was premature, since the results of the Working Group were not known. New Zealand added that it would have abstained had a vote been taken on the paragraph. Similarly, the United Kingdom, which abstained, believed that it was premature to refer to the right to development as though agreement had already been reached on a definition; it also had substantial reservations concerning the link between establishment of the new international economic order and the effective promotion and full enjoyment of human rights, as well as between international peace and security and the full realization of the right to development.

Finland (speaking for the five Nordic States) and the Netherlands expressed a similar opinion about paragraph 8, despite their favourable votes on the resolution as a whole; Finland added that the right to development was the right of the individual to participate fully in the development process and to enjoy its benefits, while the right of nations and peoples to development had been enshrined in the Assembly's 1974 Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States,<sup>(6)</sup> a document that dealt with collective rights, which were different from individual rights.

Also voting in favour, Australia rejected any idea that States might be exempted from the obligation to protect the rights of the individual on the basis that it was necessary to change international economic relations. Costa Rica deemed it inappropriate to give second place to human beings by stating that the right to development was an inalienable human right, and thought the resolution gave the impression that human rights could not be promoted unless a new international economic order was established. Sweden said the right of the individual fully to participate in and benefit from development should be confirmed; however, the resolution might give rise to other interpretations which could not be contained in the concept of human rights. Turkey, while sharing the view that the exercise of fundamental human rights could be facilitated by economic welfare and social justice, said those factors were neither determining elements nor essential conditions for the existence of and respect for human rights.

Casting a positive vote in the Assembly after abstaining in Committee, Belgium said the text attached exclusive importance to a certain type of rights. Belgium, Guatemala and Italy also expressed reservations on paragraph 7, which referred to the need for national measures on the right of workers to participate in management and international measures including the establishment of the new international economic order.

During the debate, Cuba stated that development consisted primarily of attention to the human person, who must be at the centre of any development effort. Czechoslovakia thought the restructuring of international economic relations on a more just and equitable footing was of crucial importance in promoting the international protection of human rights. Democratic Yemen and the Lao People's Democratic Republic held the implementation of the new international economic order to be essential for the effective enjoyment and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms. India considered that efforts to establish a new international economic order would be strengthened by universal acceptance of the right to development; to view human rights in an integrated manner, it was necessary to take into account the developmental dimension of human rights and the human rights dimension of development.

Madagascar observed that, since the right to development had been recognized by the Assembly as a fundamental human right, the rights of the people had priority, but that did not mean that individual rights should be sacrificed. Viet Nam saw the right to development as including all aspects of economic, social and individual development, including the right to a decent standard of living, clothing, housing, access to education, adequate medical care, and a harmonious and dignified life. Yugoslavia stated that the imposition of foreign development models on a country constituted a violation of the human rights of the country and its people.

Costa Rica, on the other hand, expressed the view that the original clear distinction between mandatory rights, such as the right to freedom, and programmatic rights, such as economic and social rights, had been blurred for political motives.

Australia emphasized that it was not sufficient in the human rights context to talk about the need for a new international economic order; the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee must examine the human rights dimension of that issue and work to have the question considered in other forums. France stressed the need to establish a balance between two concepts: that every individual should enjoy human

rights irrespective of the conditions in the society to which he or she belonged, and that respect for human rights was the foundation of freedom, justice and peace.

The Netherlands agreed in principle that the establishment of a new international economic order was an essential element for the effective promotion of human rights, but did not accept that respect for human rights depended on the achievement of development; there were human rights and fundamental freedoms that could never be derogated from, even in situations of underdevelopment. The United States saw the concept of development as complex and going far beyond material and economic matters to include the full flowering of spiritual life and the growth of liberty.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Special Rapporteur, E/CN.4/Sub.2/477;  
<sup>(2)</sup>Working Group, E/CN.4/1489.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 36(XXXVII), 11 Mar. GA: 3201(S-VI), 1 May 1974 (YUN 1974, p. 324); <sup>(5)</sup>3202(S-VI), 1 May 1974 (ibid., p. 326); <sup>(6)</sup>3281 (XXIX), 12 Dec. 1974 (ibid., p. 403); <sup>(7)</sup>35/174, para. 6, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 882); <sup>(8)</sup>36/133, 14 Dec. 1981 (p. 928). <sup>(9)</sup>SCPDPM (report, E/CN.4/1512): 22(XXXIV), 10 Sep.

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(10)</sup>1980/126, 2 May 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 880); <sup>(11)</sup>1981/149, 8 May 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(12)</sup>1980, p. 865.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 19(27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/149

51-1

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) by recorded vote (50-1), 5 May (meeting 19); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda item 7.

Realization of the economic, social and cultural rights contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and In the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and study of the special problems faced by developing countries In their efforts to achieve those rights At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council took note of resolution 36(XXXVII) of 11 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights, and approved the decision of the Commission to establish a working group of fifteen governmental experts appointed by the Chairman of the Commission, taking into account the need for equitable geographical distribution, to study the scope and contents of the right to development and the most effective means to ensure the realization, in all countries, of the economic, social and cultural rights enshrined in various international instruments, paying particular attention to the obstacles encountered by developing countries in their efforts to secure the enjoyment of human rights; the Council also approved the Commission's request to the Working Group to hold three meetings at Geneva, the first in the month of July 1981, the second towards the end of 1981, for a period of two weeks, and the third for one week before the beginning of the thirty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights. The Council requested the Secretary-General to provide all necessary assistance to the Working Group.

#### Right to education

UNESCO REPORT. In accordance with a General Assembly resolution of December

1980,<sup>(3)</sup> an interim report on measures taken by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) for the effective implementation of the right to education, prepared by the UNESCO Director-General, was transmitted to the Assembly by the Secretary-General in October 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> Referring to the UNESCO education programme (p. 1411), the Director-General stated that \$280.1 million had been allocated for 1981-1983, including \$105.7 million under the regular programme. Extra-budgetary allocations for projects in developing countries had increased from \$99.6 million in 1979-1980 to an estimated \$174.4 million in 1981-1983.

It was becoming increasingly clear, the Director-General stated, that full exercise of the right to education was not only a moral imperative but also a prerequisite for social progress and economic growth; the right to education and its democratization, which included guaranteeing free access of all to education and equality of educational opportunity, was a fundamental human right and should be a central concern of UNESCO. Emphasis should be placed on the needs of disadvantaged groups—such as refugees, migrant workers, physically and mentally handicapped persons, and minorities—and on the need for equality of educational opportunity for women. Eradication of illiteracy, through promotion of universal primary education and literacy training for adults, was an unquestionable priority. To ensure greater relevance of education to the needs of society, the links between education and the world of work must be strengthened.

These points were set out in a resolution adopted by the UNESCO General Conference at its September/October 1980 session and appended to the Director-General's report. Also appended was a resolution on the right to education adopted by the UNESCO Executive Board in May 1981, stating that UNESCO would be in a position to prepare a final report on the topic in 1982.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 16 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly again invited States to consider adopting legislative, administrative and other measures, including material guarantees, to ensure full implementation of the right to universal education through free and compulsory primary education, universal and gradually free secondary education, equal access to all educational facilities and access of youth to science and culture. Specialized agencies were invited to co-operate with UNESCO to ensure a high priority for education in development activities. The Assembly appealed again to all States, in particular the developed countries, to support actively through



fellowships and other means, including the general increase of resources, the efforts of developing countries to educate and train national personnel for industry, agriculture and other economic and social sectors. The UNESCO Director-General was requested to submit in 1982 a report on full implementation of the right to education.

The resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Third Committee on 30 November of a 55-nation draft.

Introducing this text, Romania said it reiterated, developed and brought up to date the ideas contained in the 1980 Assembly resolution on the right to education.<sup>(3)</sup> The sponsors, aware of the ever more disquieting phenomenon of the persistence of illiteracy in numerous areas, had included a new preambular paragraph recognizing that the eradication of illiteracy had a special priority and urgency.

Though joining in the consensus on the resolution, Brazil believed that paragraph 1, inviting States to adopt measures to ensure full implementation of the right to universal education, should not lead to encroachment on national legislation or be interpreted as urging Governments to bear the entire cost of secondary education; and that paragraphs 2 and 3, inviting States to determine the means for implementing the provisions on the role of education in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade<sup>(2)</sup> and inviting the co-operation of specialized agencies, could have the effect of splitting up the Strategy, of which all the objectives, not just the social ones, should be supported by developing countries.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNESCO Director-General, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/524.

Resolution: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/56, annex, sect. III O, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 517); <sup>(3)</sup>35/191, para. 8, 15 Dec. 1980 (ibid., p. 880); <sup>(4)</sup>36/152, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 1271.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 63, 66 (19-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/152

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, 30 November (meeting 66); 55-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.55); agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Jordan, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

#### The right to education

The General Assembly,

Recalling Its resolutions 34/170 of 17 December 1979 and 35/191 of 15 December 1980 on the right to education,

Recalling the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted by its resolution 2200 A (XXI) of 16 December 1966, which recognizes the right of everyone to education,

Bearing in mind the importance of the Convention against Discrimination in Education, adopted on 14 December 1960 by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,

Reaffirming the paramount importance of the implementation of the right to education for the full development of the human personality and for the enjoyment of other fundamental human rights and freedoms,

Recognizing that for the effective implementation of the right to education the eradication of illiteracy has a particular priority and urgency,

Convinced that the educational process could bring a substantial contribution to social progress, national development, mutual understanding and co-operation among peoples and to strengthening peace and international security,

Recalling that the establishment of the new international economic order requires effective support for the improvement and expansion of educational systems and for the training of specialized personnel and qualified cadres for the economic development of the developing countries,

Convinced of the topicality and urgency of the provisions on education contained in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recalling that, since its establishment, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization has constantly striven for the effective realization of the right to education and equality of educational opportunities for all, without distinction as to race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, economic status or birth and that, for many years past, activities directed to securing the right to education and the extension and improvement of educational and training systems in member States, more particularly in the developing countries, have occupied a central place in that organization's programme,

Taking note with satisfaction of the interest shown by the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 34/170 and 35/191,

1. Invites again all States to consider the adoption of appropriate legislative, administrative and other measures, including material guarantees, in order to ensure the full implementation of the right to universal education through, inter alia, free and compulsory primary education, universal and gradually free-of-charge secondary education, equal access to all educational facilities and the access of the young generation to science and culture;

2. Invites all States to give all necessary attention to defining and determining in a more precise manner the means for implementing the provisions concerning the role of education in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

3. Invites all specialized agencies to co-operate with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to ensure education a high priority in the implementation of various programmes and projects within the framework of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

4. Appeals again to all States, in particular the developed countries, to support actively through fellowships and other means, including the general increasing of resources for education and training, the efforts of the developing countries in the education and training of national personnel needed in industry, agriculture and other economic and social sectors;

5. Expresses its thanks to the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization for the report on the right to education, prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution 35/191;

6. Requests the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report dealing with the questions raised in resolution 35/191 and

also in the present resolution, on the basis of the broad lines of approach established in the draft medium-term plan of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization for 1984-1989, with a view to fostering the full implementation of the right to education.

## Advancement of human rights

The Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly continued consideration in 1981 of the item entitled "Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms". The Secretary-General submitted a report on international conditions and human rights. Under this agenda item, the Assembly also considered the proposal for a High Commissioner for Human Rights (p. 929) and national institutions for human rights (p. 941).

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In response to requests made by the General Assembly in 1979<sup>(5)</sup> and 1980,<sup>(6)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted in October 1981 a report on current international conditions and human rights.<sup>(3)</sup> The report referred in general terms to situations with negative effects on the human rights of individuals and peoples, such as: racial discrimination and apartheid; patterns of alien subjugation, domination and exploitation; threats or uses of force to establish new ties of dependency or extend existing ones; the existence of an unjust system of international economic relations; obstacles to the establishment of the new international economic order; and the arms race.

As possible ways in which States could contribute to eliminating massive and flagrant violations of human rights and the rights of peoples, the Secretary-General mentioned: full implementation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international human rights instruments; establishment of a new international economic order and promotion of the right to development (p. 921); utilization of resources spent on arms for assistance to the needy and disadvantaged; the exercise by States of the political will needed to change conditions and policies leading to the violation of human rights; cultivation of public opinion by teaching, training, education and information dissemination (p. 940); the fight against racial discrimination (p. 864); and implementation of the right to self-determination of peoples and other activities against colonialism, foreign domination and occupation (p. 891).

Among the United Nations activities designed to advance human rights, the Secretary-General

referred to approaches for dealing with human rights violations, including his good offices, diplomatic and conciliatory approaches, fact-finding and complaint procedures, public consideration in United Nations organs and assistance measures. To strengthen human rights activities, he suggested that the Assembly consider ways in which awareness of the human rights dimension of issues such as peace, disarmament, development and the establishment of a new international economic order could be heightened, and that periodic reviews of the world human rights situation be undertaken by the Assembly with the assistance of the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council.

ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS. At the beginning of its 1981 session, the Commission on Human Rights established, as decided in March 1980,<sup>(9)</sup> a sessional Working Group, open to all its members, to continue an analysis and to make recommendations on the further promotion and encouragement of human rights, including the Commission's programme and work methods, alternative approaches in the United Nations system for improving the enjoyment of human rights and the co-ordination of specific human rights activities within the system.

The Working Group met between 12 February and 4 March 1981. Its debate focused on three areas: an inter-sessional role for the Commission's officers and the possible need for convening emergency sessions of the Commission; the Commission's future work and programme; and the Secretariat's resource needs. References were also made to the proposed establishment of a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (p. 929).

The general view stated in the Group's report (reproduced in the Commission's report to the Economic and Social Council)<sup>(1)</sup> was that the matters raised required further consideration before decisions could be taken. The Group therefore expressed the view that consideration should continue at the 1982 Commission session as a matter of high priority.

Noting that the report of the Working Group contained a number of ideas which merited further study, the Commission, on 10 March 1981, decided to establish at its 1982 session an open-ended working group to continue the analysis and make recommendations.<sup>(4)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 14 December,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Commission on Human Rights to continue work on this topic. It reaffirmed the importance of States' undertaking specific obligations by adhering to international human rights instruments (p. 937), said that standard-setting

work within the United Nations system and the implementation of international instruments should be encouraged, and reiterated that the international community should accord priority to the search for solutions to mass and flagrant violations of human rights of peoples and individuals (p. 967). After calling for measures to promote the right to development (p. 922), it affirmed that efforts to promote and protect civil and political rights as well as economic, social and cultural rights should continue, and reiterated the need to ensure economic and political stability, nationally and internationally, for the full enjoyment, promotion and observance of human rights of peoples and individuals.

The resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 135 to 1, with 13 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, which approved the 20-nation draft on 13 November, as revised in writing and orally, by a recorded vote of 118 to 1, with 16 abstentions. The vote in Committee was requested by the United States, and Yugoslavia requested that it be recorded.

The draft resolution was introduced by Cuba, which revised it orally on behalf of the sponsors. A preambular reference to work for human rights "through the existing structures of the United Nations system" was deleted. Paragraph 6, originally reaffirming the need to create satisfactory conditions at the national and international levels for the full promotion and protection of the human rights of individuals and peoples, was reworded to have the Assembly reiterate the need to ensure economic and political stability at the national and international levels for the full enjoyment, promotion and observance of human rights of peoples and individuals. Paragraphs on the right to development were also altered.

In a vote requested by Sweden, the words "of peoples and individuals" at the end of paragraph 6 were retained by 102 to 4, with 24 abstentions.

In a separate decision,<sup>(8)</sup> the Assembly, on 25 November, took note of the report of its Third Committee on the review and co-ordination of human rights programmes of United Nations organizations and co-operation with other international human rights programmes.<sup>(2)</sup> The decision, orally proposed by the President, was adopted without vote. The Committee's report contained no recommendations.

The United States, in voting against the resolution, cited its provisions on the right to development and the establishment of a new international economic order, and rejected the attempt to establish prerequisites for the respect or enjoyment of human rights. Abstaining, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom voiced reservations on the

same provisions, as did Belgium, which abstained in Committee but voted affirmatively in the Assembly.

With regard to other aspects of the resolution, Canada thought it hazardous to emphasize certain rights, thus diminishing the importance of others; Canada also said it would have expected the draft to reflect the Assembly's concern for other serious and flagrant human rights violations, such as torture, inhuman or degrading treatment of prisoners, and arbitrary and summary executions. Italy felt that the fact that reference was made to the human rights of peoples before those of individuals could lead to mistaken interpretations and was unclear. The United Kingdom thought the resolution did not give due attention to civil and political rights.

Belgium stated that the text attached exclusive importance to a certain type of rights and placed excessive emphasis on international as opposed to national responsibility for promoting human rights. Though voting in favour, Ireland felt there should be no economic or political prerequisites for the protection and promotion of human rights, while New Zealand found the text unbalanced in giving economic, social and cultural rights priority over civil and political rights.

Sweden explained that its vote in favour was due to efforts by the sponsors to improve the text, which, however, represented a continued erosion of the concept of human rights as one which essentially concerned the relationship between State power and the individual. Turkey thought the principle of the exercise of human rights through safeguarding individual freedom and ensuring the participation of all citizens in decision-making was not adequately expressed in the text.

Brazil said it had voted in favour on the understanding that paragraph 2, reaffirming that adherence to international instruments was of paramount importance for the promotion of human rights, did not imply interference in the decision-making of sovereign countries. Guatemala and Malaysia also expressed reservations on that paragraph.

Belgium and Guatemala had reservations on paragraph 3, on priority for mass and flagrant human rights violations, and the Federal Republic of Germany regretted that the text emphasized certain categories of violations. Belgium also reserved its position on paragraph 6, on the need to ensure economic and political stability for the full enjoyment of human rights.

During the human rights debate in the Committee, several countries, including Bulgaria and Hungary, considered the existing United Nations structure for dealing with human rights to

be satisfactory. Bulgaria called for measures to enable both the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights to function more effectively. Brazil thought the aim of the search for alternative approaches should be to perfect the existing system. The German Democratic Republic, India and the USSR believed that the solution lay not in searching for new procedures but in utilizing existing possibilities in the United Nations system.

The Byelorussian SSR found the operation of United Nations human rights organs hampered by unnecessary links and by an increase in new working groups and other bodies. In Poland's view, simplification of the work of the international bodies concerned with human rights would suffice to ensure that procedures functioned more effectively.

Chile, on the other hand, thought the United Nations system for the protection of human rights required a radical overhaul and not simple changes such as those under study in the Commission; human rights bodies had become more politicized and there was a need for precise rules governing the actions of States, organizations and individuals. Finland and the United Kingdom, the latter speaking for the European Community (EC) members, also considered the international machinery for the implementation of human rights standards to be inadequate.

In France's opinion, the results of the search for ways to improve the enjoyment of human rights had been meagre; the Commission's Working Group on the subject should define the main lines of proposals made by delegations, after which its Chairman could submit a document listing the questions of greatest interest, in order to fix priorities.

Hungary said it was the role of the United Nations to establish universally accepted guidelines and norms, while regarding it as the responsibility of Governments to protect and promote human rights through implementation of those norms. The Netherlands stated that the search for alternative approaches should not distract attention from conventional approaches, based on human rights instruments, which should receive universal ratification; at the same time, it was important to elaborate general norms in more detailed conventions.

With regard to the functioning of the Commission on Human Rights, Canada and France suggested that it might hold two regular sessions every year, and the Netherlands and Venezuela favoured the holding of emergency or special sessions. Australia, Canada, the Netherlands and Venezuela supported the idea of inter-sessional meetings of the Commission's officers to deal with gross violations of human rights. Hungary

and Mongolia opposed inter-sessional meetings, saying the officers were not in a position to express the political will of the Commission; in addition, Hungary did not think the Commission should hold emergency sessions.

Referring to the Secretary-General's report on international conditions and human rights, Australia endorsed its general conclusion that the Assembly should consider ways in which awareness of the human rights dimensions of issues confronting the United Nations could be heightened and that periodic reviews of the world human rights situation be undertaken. Canada and Cuba suggested that such a study be issued every two years. Ecuador suggested that the Assembly commission an annual report on the human rights situation in each country, including non-member States, and that every State be required to give an account of what was happening at home before expressing views on the situation in other countries.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights, E/1981/25; <sup>(2)</sup>3rd Committee, A/36/692; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/462.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission on Human Rights: 23(XXXVII), 10 Mar. GA: <sup>(5)</sup>34/46, para. 12, 23 Nov. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 866); <sup>(6)</sup>35/174, para. 7, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 882); <sup>(7)</sup>36/133, 14 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(8)</sup>GA: 36/411, 25 Nov., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(9)</sup>1980, p. 851.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.35, 37-40, 42, 43, 49, 50 (29 Oct.-16 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73, 97 (25 Nov., 14 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/411

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 73.

Review and co-ordination of human rights programmes of organizations in the United Nations system and co-operation with other international programmes in the field of human rights

At its 73rd plenary meeting, on 25 November 1981, the General Assembly took note of the report of the Third Committee.

General Assembly resolution 36/133

135-1-13 (recorded vote) Meeting 97 14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/731) by recorded vote (118-1-16), 13 November (meeting 49); 20-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.41/Rev.1), orally amended by Morocco and orally revised; agenda item 79 (a).

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Benin, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Grenada, Guyana, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Syrian Arab Republic, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms  
The General Assembly,

Recalling the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations to achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion,

Reiterating the importance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the International Covenants on Human Rights In promoting respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Bearing in mind its resolution 32/130 of 16 December 1977, in which it decided that the approach to the future work within the United Nations system with respect to human rights questions should take into account the concepts set forth in that resolution,

Recognizing that work should continue towards safeguarding human rights in a comprehensive manner to ensure the dignity of human beings and, in that regard, that active efforts should be made to implement the concepts set forth in resolution 32/130, in conformity with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights,

Further recognizing that the establishment of the new international economic order is an essential element for the effective promotion and the full enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all,

Reiterating its profound conviction that all human rights and fundamental freedoms are indivisible and interdependent, and that equal attention and urgent consideration should be given to the implementation, promotion and protection of both civil and political rights, and economic, social and cultural rights,

Welcoming the decision of the Commission on Human Rights in its resolution 36(XXXVII) of 11 March 1981 to set up a working group to study the scope and contents of the right to development and the most effective means to ensure the realization, in all countries, of the economic, social and cultural rights enshrined in various international instruments, and noting with satisfaction the commencement of the work of the working group,

Recalling that, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 32/130, all human rights and fundamental freedoms of the human person and of peoples are inalienable,

Emphasizing that the right to development is an Inalienable human right,

Recognizing that international peace and security are essential elements In the full realization of the right to development,

Taking note with appreciation of the report of the Seminar on the Relations that Exist between Human Rights, Peace and Development, organized by the United Nations at its Headquarters from 3 to 14 August 1981,

Taking note with satisfaction of the study on present international conditions and human rights, prepared by the Secretary-General in accordance with the request made by the General Assembly in paragraph 12 of its resolution 34/46,

Recalling its resolutions 34/46 of 23 November 1979 and 35/174 of 15 December 1980, as well as Commission on Human Rights resolution 36(XXXVII),

1. Requests the Commission on Human Rights to continue its current work on the overall analysis with a view to further promoting and improving human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the question of the Commission's programme and working methods, and on the overall analysis of the alternative approaches and ways and means for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, in accordance with the provisions and concepts of General Assembly resolution 32/130, bearing in mind also other relevant texts;

2. Reaffirms that it is of paramount importance for the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms that Member States should undertake specific obligations through accession to, or ratification of, international instruments in this field and, consequently, that the standard-setting work within the United Nations system in the field of human rights and the universal acceptance and implementation of the relevant international instruments should be encouraged;

3. Reiterates that the international community should accord, or continue to accord, priority to the search for solu-

tions to mass and flagrant violations of human rights of the peoples and individuals affected by situations such as those mentioned in paragraph 1 (e) of resolution 32/130, paying due attention also to other situations of violations of human rights;

4. Further reiterates that the establishment of the new international economic order is an essential element for the effective promotion and the full enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all;

5. Affirms that the efforts of the United Nations and its Member States to promote and to protect civil and political rights as well as economic, social and cultural rights should continue;

6. Reiterates the need to ensure economic and political stability at the national and international levels for the full enjoyment, promotion and observance of human rights of peoples and individuals;

7. Reaffirms that in order to ensure the full enjoyment of all human rights and complete personal dignity it is necessary to promote the right to education and the right to work, health and proper nourishment, through adoption of measures at the national level, including those that provide for the right of workers to participate in management, as well as adoption of measures at the international level, including the establishment of the new international economic order;

8. Declares that the right to development is an inalienable human right;

9. Requests the Commission on Human Rights to take the necessary measures to promote the right to development, taking into account the work of the Working Group set up under Commission resolution 36(XXXVII);

10. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly, from the thirty-eighth session on, a biennial progress report bringing up to date the study on international conditions and human rights;

11. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan. Algeria. Angola. Antigua and Barbuda. Argentina. Australia. Austria. Bahamas. Bangladesh. Barbados. Belgium. Benin. Bhutan. Bolivia. Botswana. Brazil. Bulgaria. Burma. Burundi. Byelorussian SSR. Cape Verde. Central African Republic. Chad. Chile. China. Colombia. Comoros. Costa Rica. Cuba. Cyprus. Czechoslovakia. Democratic Kampuchea. Democratic Yemen. Denmark. Djibouti. Dominican Republic. Ecuador. Egypt. El Salvador. Equatorial Guinea. Ethiopia. Fiji. Finland. France. Gabon. Gambia. German Democratic Republic. Ghana. Greece. Grenada. Guatemala. Guinea. Guinea-Bissau. Guyana. Haiti. Honduras. Hungary. Iceland. India. Indonesia. Iran. Iraq. Ireland. Ivory Coast. Jordan. Kenya. Kuwait. Lao People's Democratic Republic. Lebanon. Lesotho. Liberia. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Madagascar. Malaysia. Maldives. Mali. Malta. Mauritania. Mauritius. Mexico. Mongolia. Morocco. Mozambique. Nepal. Netherlands. New Zealand. Nicaragua. Niger. Nigeria. Norway. Oman. Pakistan. Papua New Guinea. Paraguay. Peru. Philippines. Poland. Qatar. Romania. Rwanda. Saint Lucia. Samoa. Sao Tome and Principe. Senegal. Seychelles. Sierra Leone. Singapore. Solomon Islands. Somalia. Sri Lanka. Sudan. Suriname. Swaziland. Sweden. Syrian Arab Republic. Thailand. Togo. Trinidad and Tobago. Tunisia. Turkey. Uganda. Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates. United Republic of Cameroon. United Republic of Tanzania. Upper Volta. Uruguay. Venezuela. Viet Nam. Yemen. Yugoslavia. Zaire. Zambia. Zimbabwe.

Against: United States.

Abstaining: Bahrain. Canada. Germany. Federal Republic of, Israel. Italy. Jamaica. Japan. Luxembourg. Malawi. Portugal. Saudi Arabia. Spain. United Kingdom.

## UN machinery

Proposal for a UN

High Commissioner for Human Rights

Establishment of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, pro-

posed for the first time in 1965 by Costa Rica,<sup>(8)</sup> was discussed again in 1981 by the Commission on Human Rights, its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and the General Assembly.

On 10 March, the Commission decided to inform the Assembly, through the Economic and Social Council, that it had not reached a decision on the establishment of the post.<sup>(6)</sup> The decision was taken by 25 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

On 10 September,<sup>(5)</sup> by 15 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions, the Sub-Commission decided to inform the Commission that it was convinced that the number and scale of gross violations of human rights in many parts of the world required urgent and effective United Nations action and that the establishment of such a post would be highly valuable. On the same day, by 15 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions, the Sub-Commission decided to consider in 1982 the positive role a High Commissioner should play in the full enjoyment of human rights and requested the Secretary-General to provide it with information on the establishment of such an office.<sup>(7)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 14 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Commission on Human Rights to consider this question with the attention it deserved and to report in 1982. It decided to examine in 1982 what steps might be taken in regard to the matter.

The resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Third Committee on 27 November of a twice-revised 20-nation draft. Introducing the original version of this draft, Costa Rica said the sponsors believed that the establishment of a post of High Commissioner would be an important step towards achieving effective human rights machinery and would produce positive results similar to those achieved by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

In the second revision of their draft, the sponsors took account of amendments proposed by Algeria, Cuba, India and Yugoslavia,<sup>(1)</sup> which after the revision were not pressed to a vote. The amendments, proposed to the initial version of the draft, were: from the preamble, to delete the words "with regret" from a paragraph noting the Commission's inability to reach a decision on the matter and to delete a paragraph stating that a decision must be made; in operative paragraph 1, to delete "as a matter of the highest priority" from the request for Commission consideration; in paragraphs 2 and 3, to have the Commission submit the results of its discussions rather than its "substantive recommendations"; and in paragraph 3, to delete phrases that would have had

the Assembly decide "to take action . . . with a view to reaching a decision".

Endorsing the amendments, Yugoslavia said the original draft resolution would have prejudged the Commission's opinion. Argentina, Brazil, the Byelorussian SSR and Ethiopia also supported the amendments.

Italy, one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, submitted sub-amendments<sup>(2)</sup> that would have altered the four-nation amendments by: adding a preambular paragraph noting that the Commission had been seized of this important question since 1978; adding the phrase "with the urgency required by the importance of the issue" to the request for Commission consideration; urging the Commission to submit "concrete proposals" rather than the results of its discussions; and adding a phrase to have the Assembly decide to examine the possibility of acting on those proposals in 1982. Some elements of these sub-amendments, which were endorsed by Lesotho, were later incorporated into the final text.

After the sponsors submitted the first revision of their proposal, India orally proposed another set of amendments that would have: replaced a request that the Commission consider the question "with the attention required by the importance of the issue" by the phrase "as one of the issues deserving its attention among others to be discussed under the relevant item of its agenda"; had the Commission submit "the results of its deliberations" to the Assembly through the Economic and Social Council, rather than have it submit "conclusions and recommendations" directly to the Assembly; and had the Assembly also consider the views expressed by States at the 1981 Assembly session when it took up the Commission's report in 1982. These amendments were endorsed by Algeria, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Indonesia, Kuwait and Yugoslavia.

Italy, supported by Costa Rica, orally proposed sub-amendments to India's amendments that would have had the Commission consider the question as an issue deserving "priority" rather than "attention", and would have added the phrase "including the proposals adopted" to the request for the results of the Commission's deliberations. These sub-amendments were endorsed by the Netherlands, while Ethiopia said it could not support them.

Explaining their position on the text finally approved, Bangladesh, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Oman, Pakistan and Yugoslavia said that, had the draft been put to the vote, they would have abstained; Yugoslavia believed that the text still contained some formulations prejudicial to the Commission's work. Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, India and the USSR

stated that they had joined in the consensus because the text was procedural.

In the Third Committee debate, support for the post of a High Commissioner was expressed by, among others, Australia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, France, Ireland, Lesotho, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, the United Kingdom (speaking for the EC members) and Venezuela. Australia regarded the resolution as giving the Commission a mandate to look thoroughly into the question. Nigeria said that in view of the changed political climate in that country it would hardly be logical for it to oppose the appointment of a High Commissioner; however, since a number of others were unable to support the idea without further consideration, Nigeria would accept the resolution without prejudging the issue.

Canada believed that a High Commissioner would contribute to promoting and protecting human rights throughout the world, since its incumbent would serve as an intermediary in finding specific solutions. In Costa Rica's opinion, the main question in relation to such a post was improving the capacity of the international community to react to human rights violations; an independent expert could hold the post and discharge its functions satisfactorily, as in the case of UNHCR. Chile also considered the example of UNHCR worthy of imitation. France cautioned that the person occupying the post could fully discharge his functions only if he enjoyed broad international support. Jamaica said the proposal to create a post of High Commissioner should not be regarded as something to be warded off because it might be used for interference in internal affairs of countries; such an official could not trespass without being called to account.

New Zealand hoped the Sub-Commission's recommendation would give new impetus to the question. Somalia thought such a post would complement the activities of other United Nations bodies. Spain hoped that the post would be established as soon as possible. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, thought the appointment of a High Commissioner would be an effective way of helping the Secretary-General between sessions of the Commission.

The Eastern European countries, as well as others such as Brazil, Cuba, Madagascar, the Philippines and the Syrian Arab Republic, opposed the creation of such a post. A number of speakers, among them Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cuba, India, Madagascar, Mongolia, Oman, Poland, Romania, the USSR and Viet Nam, held the view that existing human rights machinery was sufficient, or that it should be improved before new organs were created. Democratic

Yemen believed it would encroach on the sphere of existing bodies. Romania said attention should centre on a global review and evaluation by the Commission before the Assembly considered the creation of such a post.

In Yugoslavia's opinion, a High Commissioner would only be able to play the role of an international policeman to see how far developing countries implemented certain human rights concepts. Ethiopia did not think a policeman's role would be the best approach; promotion of human rights should be pursued through persuasion rather than coercion. The Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR believed that the existence of a High Commissioner would provide an opportunity to interfere in the internal affairs of States. The Syrian Arab Republic added that the Assembly could always ask the Secretary-General to intervene in special cases, as it had done in the past.

Bulgaria thought that a High Commissioner for Human Rights could do no more than offer good offices to help States in the implementation of their internal human rights policies; however, good offices were an exclusive prerogative of the Secretary-General. Madagascar held it preferable to encourage accession to the International Covenants on Human Rights;<sup>(3)</sup> the greater the number of States complying with the obligations imposed by those Covenants, the greater would be the number of measures to promote and protect human rights.

The USSR stated that establishment of a post of High Commissioner would divert attention from such urgent problems as apartheid and human rights violations in the territories occupied by Israel. Czechoslovakia and the Lao People's Democratic Republic suggested that, instead of seeking to establish a new body, priority should be given to the search for solutions to mass and flagrant human rights violations.

Amendments and sub-amendments not acted upon: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Cuba, India, Yugoslavia, A/C.3/36/L.44 (amendments); <sup>(2)</sup>Italy, A/C.3/36/L.46 (sub-amendments).

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 419); <sup>(4)</sup>36/135, 14 Dec. 1981, text following. <sup>(5)</sup>SCPDPM (report. E/CN.4/1512): 12(XXXIV), 10 Sep.

Decisions: <sup>(6)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 6(XXXVII), 10 Mar. <sup>(7)</sup>SCPDPM: 3(XXXIV), 10 Sep.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(8)</sup>1965, p. 494.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.35, 37-40, 42, 43, 55, 64 (29 Oct.-27 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.97 (14 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/135

Adopted without vote Meeting 97 14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/731) without vote. 27 November (meeting 64): 20-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.43/Rev.2): agenda item 79 (a).

Sponsors: Botswana, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Honduras, Italy, Jamaica, Lesotho, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sweden, United Kingdom.

Alternative approaches and ways and means in the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/175 of 15 December 1980, in which it decided to consider at its thirty-sixth session the question of the establishment of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights under the item entitled "Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms",

Having considered the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its thirty-seventh session,

Noting that the Commission on Human Rights informed the General Assembly that it had not been able to reach a decision at its thirty-seventh session on the desirability of the establishment of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights,

Noting also that the Commission on Human Rights has been seized of this question since its thirty-fourth session under the item entitled "Further promotion and encouragement of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the question of the programme and methods of work of the Commission: alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms",

1. Requests the Commission on Human Rights at its thirty-eighth session to consider this question with the attention it deserves;

2. Further requests the Commission on Human Rights to submit a report on its deliberations and their results to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, through the Economic and Social Council;

3. Decides to resume consideration of this question at its thirty-seventh session, also taking into account the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its thirty-eighth session and the views expressed by Member States at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly under the item entitled "Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms" and to examine what steps may be taken in this regard.

Review of the activities of the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities

On 10 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights, expressing appreciation for the valuable contribution of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities in the promotion and protection of human rights, requested it to indicate in its annual reports all matters requiring Commission approval, and asked the Secretary-General to draw Commission members' attention to relevant material as well as to other matters arising from those reports on which the Secretariat had already taken action. The Commission decided to allocate high priority to the annual consideration

of the Sub-Commission's report, particularly its recommendations, and drew the attention of States and Sub-Commission members to the nature of the Sub-Commission's work as a body of individually qualified experts elected in their personal capacity, and to the Commission's view that the practice of permitting alternates to represent Sub-Commission members might not on occasion be in keeping with its character.

On 4 September,<sup>(2)</sup> the Sub-Commission decided, by 20 votes to 2, to place on its 1982 agenda a new, high priority item on review of the status and activities of the Sub-Commission and its relationships with the Commission and other United Nations bodies.

During the human rights debate in the General Assembly's Third Committee, the United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, welcomed the Commission's decision to allocate high priority to the Sub-Commission's reports and recommendations.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 17(XXXVII), 10 Mar. Dec.. <sup>(2)</sup>SCPDP (report, E/CN.4/1512), 2(XXXIV), 4 Sep.

Medium-term plan for 1984-1989

On 12 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights took note of the draft section on human rights activities prepared by the Secretariat for inclusion in the United Nations medium-term plan for 1984-1989, to be considered by the General Assembly in 1982. The draft included four subprogrammes: implementation of international standards, instruments and procedures; elimination and prevention of discrimination and protection of minorities and vulnerable groups; advisory services, technical assistance and publications; and standard setting, research and studies. The Commission invited the Secretariat to bear in mind, when finalizing the plan, the observations made in the Commission.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 9(XXXVII), 12 Mar.

Commission on Human Rights

Report on the 1981 session

On 8 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Economic and Social Council took note of the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its thirty-seventh session (2 February-13 March 1981).<sup>(2)</sup> The decision, based on a draft by the Commission, was taken without vote, following its approval by the Second (Social) Committee on 5 May, also without vote.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/153, 8 May, text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Rights, E/1981/25 & Corr.1 & Add.1.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 19(27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).



Economic and Social Council decision 1981/153

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May (meeting 19); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda item 7.

Report of the Commission on Human Rights

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its thirty-seventh session.

Meeting services for the 1982 session

On the recommendation of the Commission on Human Rights, made on 13 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Economic and Social Council, on 8 May,<sup>(2)</sup> authorized three additional hours of meeting services per day during the 1982 Commission session. The Council acted without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 5 May. In requesting the extra services, the Commission cited its heavy work schedule and the requirements of its sessional working groups.

Decisions: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 11(XXXVII), 13 Mar.; <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/152, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records; ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 19 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/152

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May (meeting 19); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda item 7.

Meeting services for the Commission on Human Rights

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council, noting decision 11 (XXXVII) of 13 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights, decided to authorize three hours of additional meeting services per day during the thirty-eighth session of the Commission.

Agenda for the 1982 session

On 13 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights took note of the draft provisional agenda for its 1982 session, which consisted largely of items that had been on the 1981 agenda.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 12(XXXVII), 13 Mar.

## International human rights instruments

International Covenants on Human Rights

As at 31 December 1981, the International Covenants on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (p. 915) and on Civil and Political Rights (p. 889), which were adopted by the General Assembly in 1966<sup>(3)</sup> and entered into force in 1976,<sup>(5)</sup> had been ratified or acceded to by 71 and 69 States, respectively. In 1981, five States became parties to the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, while four became parties to the Covenant on Civil and Political

Rights. During the year, two States adhered to the Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, raising to 27 the total of States parties to that instrument.

A report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly included a list of States which, as at 1 September 1981, had signed, ratified or acceded to the Covenants and the Optional Protocol.<sup>(1)</sup>

On 10 March,<sup>(2)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights reaffirmed the importance of the Covenants as major parts of international efforts to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and urged States to become parties. It emphasized the importance of the strictest compliance by States parties with their obligations under the Covenants and encouraged Governments to publish and distribute their texts.

By a resolution of 25 November,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly again invited States to become parties to the Covenants and made recommendations on implementation of each of them. The Secretary-General was requested to continue to ensure that the Secretariat's Division of Human Rights was able to assist the Human Rights Committee and the Economic and Social Council in the implementation of their functions under the Covenants.

The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, which approved the text in like manner on 3 November, on the basis of a 14-nation proposal.

Introducing the resolution on behalf of the sponsors, Denmark stated that international protection of human rights could best be achieved by legally binding treaties and the establishment of suitable forms of international supervision and control. Universal application of the Covenants must continue to be the principal aim in realizing the international protection of human rights.

During the Third Committee's debate on human rights, the Byelorussian SSR said a number of developed capitalist States parties to the Covenants were not taking measures to fulfil their obligations, which included laying down in their constitutions and legislation the main rights set out in the Covenants; in practice, those rights were being interpreted to serve the interests of the ruling classes. Remarking that political and economic rights could not be separated, the German Democratic Republic said it was time to end the artificial division between the Covenants. The Ukrainian SSR said the Covenants had stood the test of time; it regretted, however, that over half of the United Nations membership had yet to accede to them.

The USSR observed that the Covenants had not been signed by some developed countries whose representatives used human rights as an excuse for attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of other States. Similar comments were made by Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary and Mongolia; Czechoslovakia added that only if States adhered to international instruments and ensured their implementation could those instruments govern all international relations and their reporting and monitoring systems be widely utilized.

Finland believed that all States could undertake the obligations set out in the Covenants, regardless of their stage of economic development; even those countries which did not wish to ratify the Covenants should remember that, as United Nations Members, they had pledged themselves to promote the enjoyment of human rights.

Italy expressed hope that the Covenants and other human rights conventions would in future provide a basis for the elaboration of a world code of human rights applied by all Member States. In Portugal's opinion, the Covenants meant that the observance of human rights was no longer merely a matter of domestic jurisdiction and that violators could be called to account not only before world opinion but also in international forums; it hoped that States not parties would nevertheless regard the Covenants as a minimum standard for their human rights policies.

Zimbabwe suggested that consideration be given to setting up a United Nations fund to enable the Covenants to be translated into languages accessible to ordinary people.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/455.

Resolutions. <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 16(XXXVII), 10 Mar. GA: <sup>(3)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 419); <sup>(4)</sup>36/58, 25 Nov. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1976, p. 609.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.27-36, 37, 38 (22 Oct.-3 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/58

Adopted without vote Meeting 73 25 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/663) without vote. 3 November (meeting 38): 14-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.36); agenda item 87.

Sponsors: Australia, Canada, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Iceland, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Sweden.

International Covenants on Human Rights

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 32/66 of 8 December 1977, 33/51 of 14 December 1978, 34/45 of 23 November 1979 and 35/132 of 11 December 1980,

Having noted the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,

Noting with appreciation that, following its appeal, more Member States have acceded to the International Covenants on Human Rights,

Bearing in mind the important responsibilities of the Economic and Social Council in relation to the International Covenants on Human Rights,

Recognizing the important role of the Human Rights Committee in the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol thereto,

Taking into account the important responsibilities of the Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,

1. Notes with appreciation the report of the Human Rights Committee on its eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth sessions and expresses satisfaction at the serious and constructive manner in which the Committee is continuing to undertake its functions;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the States parties to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that have extended their co-operation to the Human Rights Committee when submitting their reports under article 40 of the Covenant and urges States parties that have not yet done so to submit their reports to the Committee as speedily as possible;

3. Urges the States parties to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that have been requested by the Human Rights Committee to provide additional information to comply with that request;

4. Takes note of the decisions of the Human Rights Committee on the question of periodicity, and on guidelines regarding the form and content of reports from States parties under article 40, paragraph 1 (b), of the Covenant as well as the adoption by the Committee of general comments under article 40, paragraph 4, of the Covenant;

5. Commends the States parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights that have submitted their reports under article 16 of the Covenant and urges States that have not yet done so to submit their reports as soon as possible;

6. Takes due note of Economic and Social Council decision 1981/162 of 8 May 1981 concerning the review of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and looks forward to further results in this regard at the first regular session of the Council in 1982;

7. Again invites all States that have not yet done so to become parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as well as to consider acceding to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

8. Invites the States parties to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to consider making the declaration provided for in article 41 of the Covenant;

9. Appreciates that the Human Rights Committee continues to strive for uniform standards in the implementation of the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and of the Optional Protocol thereto;

10. Emphasizes the importance of the strictest compliance by States parties with their obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and, where applicable, the Optional Protocol thereto;

11. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to keep the Human Rights Committee informed of the activities of the Commission on Human Rights, the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and also to transmit the annual reports of the Human Rights Committee to those bodies;

12. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report on the status of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and

Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

13. Welcomes the measures taken by the Secretary-General to improve the publicity for the work of the Human Rights Committee and requests the Secretary-General to consider the most appropriate steps for the publication of the Committee's documentation and to report on this question to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

14. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to take all possible steps to ensure that the Division of Human Rights of the Secretariat is able to assist effectively the Human Rights Committee and the Economic and Social Council in the implementation of their respective functions under the International Covenants on Human Rights, taking into account General Assembly resolutions 3534(XXX) of 17 December 1975 and 31/93 of 14 December 1976.

#### Universal Declaration of Human Rights

##### Human Rights Day

A report on the annual observance of Human Rights Day on 10 December, the anniversary of the adoption by the General Assembly in 1948 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,<sup>(2)</sup> was presented by the Secretary-General to the Assembly in October 1981. This report<sup>(1)</sup> summarized information received from 27 countries on their 1980 celebration of the Day, the thirty-second anniversary of the Declaration.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/INF/36/4.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 217 A (III), 10 Dec. 1948 (YUN 1948-49, p. 535).

##### Thirty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 16 December 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> invited Member States and organizations to celebrate the thirty-fifth anniversary, in 1983, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It requested the Secretary-General to initiate United Nations activities and invited the United Nations Postal Administration to consider issuing commemorative postage stamps. The Assembly also decided to include in the provisional agenda of its 1983 session an item entitled "Thirty-five years of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: international co-operation for the promotion and observance of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights", and to hold a commemorative meeting to celebrate the anniversary, which fell on 10 December 1983.

An annex to the resolution contained measures suggested by the Secretary-General for the celebration. At the national level these included: messages and meetings of parliamentary and other public and private institutions on Human Rights Day; efforts by States to ratify or accede to international human rights instruments (p. 937); establishment or strengthening of national and local human rights institutions; encouragement of teaching programmes on human rights at various educational levels; dissemina-

tion of the Declaration in national languages, including minority languages; issuance of postage stamps; encouragement of participation by non-governmental organizations; and organization of an essay competition. Recommendations for measures by the United Nations included the organization of commemorative events and of an international seminar in 1983 at Geneva on the experiences of countries in the implementation of international human rights standards, and issuance and distribution of information material.

The Secretary-General's suggestions on the observance were made in a note of 2 October 1981<sup>(1)</sup> in which he recalled that, since the adoption of the Declaration in 1948,<sup>(2)</sup> the United Nations had provided for special observances every five years since the tenth anniversary.

The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, which similarly approved the 16-nation text on 30 November, as orally revised. Prior to the Committee's approval, the sponsors deleted from the annex a recommendation for the award of human rights prizes. Explaining this change, Canada thought the related cost estimates of \$80,800 to be excessive and suggested that human rights prizes be awarded on the fortieth anniversary of the Declaration, in 1988.

Introducing the resolution, Canada said the Declaration had won a special place in human affairs. Since 1948, the Assembly had thought it appropriate to mark the anniversary of its adoption and to celebrate it in certain years with special events. The resolution was intended to continue that tradition.

The USSR stated that human rights prizes should be awarded to deserving persons and that the practice of choosing the recipients without reference to the views of certain regional groups should be ended.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/500.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>217 A (III), 10 Dec. 1948 (YUN 1948-49, p. 535); <sup>(3)</sup>36/169, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/811; S-G statements, A/C.3/36/L.89, A/C.5/36/89.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 63, 66 (19-30 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.67 (8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/169

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote. 30 November (meeting 66); 16-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.78), orally revised; agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Australia, Austria, Canada, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Cyprus, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, India, Japan, Morocco, Samoa, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden.

Observance of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

The General Assembly,

Considering that the year 1983 will mark the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

which, conceived as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, has been and rightly continues to be a fundamental source of inspiration for national and international efforts for the protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Aware that for their full observance human rights must be ensured to all human beings and that this aim cannot be attained unless human rights are made known to them, particularly through teaching and education,

Recalling in this respect that the General Assembly, in proclaiming the Declaration, demanded that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, should strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms,

Recalling also its resolution 32/123 of 16 December 1977 concerning the observance of the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration,

Appealing to Member States, the specialized agencies and all international organizations, governmental and non-governmental, concerned with the protection and promotion of human rights, to take appropriate measures to ensure that the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration is the occasion of special efforts to promote international understanding, co-operation and peace as well as universal and effective respect for human rights, particularly by laying stress on the educational approach both within and outside formal school systems,

Desiring to give appropriate significance to the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration,

Taking note with appreciation of the suggestions contained in the note by the Secretary-General concerning the observance of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration,

1. Invites Member States, the specialized agencies and regional intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations to take appropriate measures, such as those set forth in the annex to the present resolution, to celebrate the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to initiate appropriate activities at the United Nations level, such as those indicated in the annex to the present resolution, to celebrate the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration;

3. Invites the United Nations Postal Administration to consider issuing commemorative postage stamps on the occasion of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration;

4. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-eighth session an item entitled "Thirty-five years of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: International co-operation for the promotion and observance of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights" and recommends that this item should be considered in plenary meeting;

5. Further decides to hold a special commemorative meeting to celebrate the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration, which falls on 10 December 1983, and requests the Secretary-General to make the necessary preparations for the programme of that meeting.

#### ANNEX

Suggested measures for the celebration of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

1. The following measures are suggested for possible action at the national level:

(a) Formal proclamation of 10 December 1983 as Human Rights Day;

(b) Issuing of special messages on 10 December 1983 by Heads of State or Government or other prominent civil personalities;

(c) Special meetings of parliamentary and other public and private institutions on Human Rights Day;

(d) Undertaking of special efforts by States that have not yet ratified or acceded to the international instruments of the United Nations in the field of human rights, including those instruments specifically related to the rights of women, to become parties to these international instruments;

(e) Establishment or strengthening of national or local institutions for the promotion and the protection of human rights;

(f) Encouragement of teaching programmes on human rights at the various levels of education;

(g) Dissemination of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in national languages, including the languages of minorities;

(h) Issuing of human rights postage stamps, first-day covers and special cancellations during 1983;

(i) Encouragement of non-governmental organizations to participate fully in the celebration and to organize activities of their own;

(j) Undertaking of activities within the framework of and in support of current Decades and International Years being prepared on human rights issues;

(k) Organization of a special essay competition for secondary or high school children on the topic "What the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should mean to our generation".

2. It is recommended that the following measures, among others, should be taken at the United Nations level:

(a) Organization of commemorative events at United Nations Headquarters, at the United Nations Office at Geneva and at the Vienna International Centre on or around 10 December 1983;

(b) Organization in 1983 at Geneva of a special international seminar to discuss the experiences of different countries in the implementation of international standards on human rights;

(c) Dissemination by the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat of appropriate public information, broadcasting and audio-visual material designed to draw attention to and emphasize the importance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the role played and work done by the United Nations to ensure the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

(d) Issuance of updated versions in all official languages of the United Nations of the publications *Human Rights: A Compilation of International Instruments* of the United Nations and *United Nations Action in the field of Human Rights*;

(e) Design and distribution of an appropriate United Nations poster to commemorate the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

#### Accessions and ratifications

The Working Group on the Encouragement of Universal Acceptance of Human Rights Instruments, established in 1979 by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities<sup>(5)</sup> and composed of five of its members, met between 19 August and 4 September 1981 to examine ways of encouraging Governments to adhere to such instruments and information submitted by Governments as to why they had not done so. Based on recommendations in the Group's report, reproduced in its own report to the Commission on Human Rights,<sup>(1)</sup> the Sub-Commission, by a resolution of 10 September<sup>(4)</sup> adopted by 20 votes to none, with 1 abstention, requested the Secretary-General to renew the invitation to Governments to inform the Sub-Commission of the circumstances which had so far not enabled them to become parties to nine instruments listed by the Sub-Commission in 1979, and decided to consider in 1982 whether to include in the list the

Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others (p. 915).

The General Assembly, by its resolution of 14 December 1981 on measures for the advancement of human rights, reaffirmed that it was of paramount importance for human rights that Member States should undertake specific obligations through adherence to international human rights instruments, and that the standard-setting work within the United Nations system in this field and the universal acceptance and implementation of the relevant international instruments should be encouraged.<sup>(2)</sup>

Guatemala and Malaysia voiced reservations on this paragraph, and Brazil explained that it had voted in favour of the resolution with the understanding that the paragraph did not imply interference in the freedom of countries to decide on adherence to international instruments.

Special efforts by States to become parties to human rights instruments, including those on the rights of women, were included among suggested measures for the celebration in 1983 of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (p. 935), annexed to an Assembly resolution of 16 December 1981.<sup>(3)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>SCPDP, E/CN.4/1512.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>36/133, para. 2, 14 Dec. (p. 929);

<sup>(3)</sup>36/169, annex, para. 1 (d), 16 Dec. (p. 936).

<sup>(4)</sup>SCPDP: 19(XXXIV), 10 Sep.

Yearbook reference: (5)1979, p. 854.

Publication: Human Rights International Instruments: Signatures, Ratifications, Accessions, etc., 1 July 1981, ST/HR/4/Rev.3.

#### Signatures

By a letter of 24 February 1981 to the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> Czechoslovakia stated that it did not recognize the legal validity of the signature on 17 October 1980, by the "so-called 'Government of Democratic Kampuchea'", of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (p. 994) and the two International Covenants on Human Rights (p. 933).

Democratic Kampuchea, by a letter of 3 August 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> denounced and condemned the accession of Viet Nam on 9 June to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.<sup>(3)</sup>

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Czechoslovakia, 24 Feb., A/36/129; <sup>(2)</sup>Democratic Kampuchea, 3 Aug., A/36/417.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 260 A (III), annex, 9 Dec. 1948 (YUN 1948-49, p. 959):

#### Other measures to advance human rights

##### Advisory services

In 1981, a seminar and a training course were held under the United Nations programme of ad-

visory services in the field of human rights. From 3 to 14 August, a Seminar on the Relations that Exist between Human Rights, Peace and Development was held in New York (p. 973). A regional training course was organized at Canberra, Australia, on human rights guarantees in the administration of criminal justice (p. 889).

During the year, 29 individual human rights fellowships were granted to nationals of the following countries: Algeria, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Greece, Haiti, Italy, Jordan, Mali, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, USSR, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia. The fellowships included awards for study on subjects dealing with the role of human rights in relation to women, children, immigrants and refugees; freedom of information; the environment; and other social and economic as well as civil and political factors.

In the absence of requests from Governments, no expert services were provided to countries in 1981. However, in response to requests from the Governments of the Central African Republic (see below), Equatorial Guinea (p. 938) and Uganda (p. 939), the Commission on Human Rights requested the Secretary-General to provide advisory services and other human rights assistance to those countries.

On 12 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights took note of a report by the Secretary-General describing 1980 activities under the advisory services programme.<sup>(2)</sup>

Decision: ("Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 8(XXXVII), 12 Mar.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, E/CN.4/1445.

##### Central African Republic

The Economic and Social Council, on 8 May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> approved a decision taken by the Commission on Human Rights on 9 March<sup>(1)</sup> to request the Secretary-General, in response to the interest displayed by the Central African Republic, to provide advisory services and other assistance to help that Government continue to guarantee the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Commission also invited States, specialized agencies, United Nations organs and humanitarian and non-governmental organizations to provide co-operation and assistance to the Central African Republic in human rights and other areas.

The Council adopted the decision without vote, following similar approval by the Second (Social) Committee on 5 May.

Resolution and decision: Res.: ("Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 15(XXXVII), 9 Mar. Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/140, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12, 17, 19(27 Apr.-5May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/140

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May (meeting 19); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda item 7.

Assistance to the Government of the Central African Republic in its efforts to guarantee the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council approved the decision of the Commission on Human Rights, in its resolution 15(XXXVII) of 9 March 1981, to request the Secretary-General, in response to the interest displayed by the Government of the Central African Republic, to provide advisory services and other forms of appropriate assistance to help that Government to continue to guarantee the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms in that country.

#### Equatorial Guinea

The human rights situation in Equatorial Guinea was under review in 1981 by the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council. A three-stage plan for the full restoration of human rights in that country was submitted to the Government and the Commission by a United Nations expert.

Fernando Volio Jiménez, the expert appointed in 1980<sup>(5)</sup> to study the human rights situation in Equatorial Guinea, presented a report<sup>(2)</sup> which was considered by the Commission in 1981. He described his visit to Equatorial Guinea (27 November-4 December 1980), preceded by talks in Spain, the former administering Power.

In his conclusions, the expert noted that the effects of 11 years of dictatorship were still to be seen. Economic and social conditions were distressing, with acute and widespread poverty. Working conditions were hard and national customs created unjust conditions for women. However, there had been positive changes; the country had a new body of legal norms which provided a suitable basis on which to found a system for the protection of human rights. Improvements seemed to have been made in health care, education and the administration of justice. Freedom of information seemed to have improved, although radio and television were State-controlled.

The expert recommended gradual transfer of power from the military Government to civilian authorities. For the full restoration of human rights, he recommended a three-stage plan, including: a review of existing legislation; the improvement of conditions with regard to education, the status of women, freedom of the press, public health and training of public employees; and the convening of a constitutional convention or constituent assembly to draft a constitution

that would be submitted for popular approval by referendum. For the practical implementation of that three-stage plan, approved by the Government of Equatorial Guinea, the expert made a number of recommendations, including the establishment by the Government of a review commission and the provision of United Nations and other external assistance.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. By a resolution of 8 May 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the Economic and Social Council reiterated its readiness to assist the Government of Equatorial Guinea, at its request, in the task of restoring human rights and requested the Secretary-General to invite the expert to continue to place his advice and assistance at the Government's disposal. The Council further requested the Secretary-General to draw up, in consultation with the expert and the Government, a draft plan of action for implementing the expert's recommendations. It asked the Secretary-General to consult Governments, United Nations organs and organizations and the Organization of African Unity to determine how they might be able to contribute towards the plan's implementation and to inform the Council of the results. The Council expressed appreciation to the Government for its efforts towards the restoration of human rights and invited it to continue its efforts to restore the democratic freedoms abolished by the former Government and to encourage citizen participation in that process.

The resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Council's Second Committee on 5 May. Adoption of the text was recommended on 11 March by the Commission on Human Rights, which decided to keep the human rights situation in Equatorial Guinea under review in 1982.<sup>(3)</sup>

By a note of 6 June 1981, the Secretary-General informed the Council that he could not submit in 1981 the draft plan of action requested by the Council, as consultations were still in progress.<sup>(1)</sup> The Council, on 16 July, invited the Commission to study the draft plan in 1982 and to make recommendations, which the Council would consider at its first regular session of 1982.<sup>(6)</sup>

The Council took the decision without vote. The draft was orally proposed by the President and amended by Canada to include the invitation to the Commission to study the plan and to make recommendations; the President further revised the text to have the Council consider the Commission's report.

The efforts of Equatorial Guinea to restore human rights, and the provision of United Nations assistance to help the Government in doing so, were welcomed in the Council by Bel-

gium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom. Belgium thought the experiment in Equatorial Guinea was extremely important because it was the first time that a country had requested United Nations aid in implementing human rights. The Federal Republic of Germany said much remained to be done in order to re-establish human rights firmly in the country and protect them against further infringement. Spain regretted that the plan of action had not been completed and urged the Secretary-General to expedite consultations.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/79.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Expert, E/CN.4/1439 & Add.1.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 31(XXXVII), 11 Mar. <sup>(4)</sup>ESC: 1981/38, 8 May, text following.

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(5)</sup>1980/137, 2 May 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 835); <sup>(6)</sup>1981/167, 16 July 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 18 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18, 37 (8 May, 16 July).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/38

Adopted without vote Meeting 18 8 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote. 5 May (meeting 18); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25): agenda item 7.

Assistance to the Government of Equatorial Guinea in its efforts to guarantee the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its decision 1980/137 of 2 May 1980 on the situation of human rights in Equatorial Guinea, as well as resolutions 15(XXXV) of 13 March 1979, 33(XXXVI) of 11 March 1980 and 31 (XXXVII) of 11 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights.

Taking note with appreciation of the report submitted by Professor Fernando Volio Jiménez, expert appointed by the Secretary-General in pursuance of resolution 33(XXXVI) of the Commission on Human Rights,

Bearing in mind General Assembly resolutions 34/123 of 14 December 1979 and 35/105 of 5 December 1980 on assistance to Equatorial Guinea,

Conscious of the need to ensure that such assistance should include a response to the human rights requirements of the situation.

Mindful of the efforts being made by the Government of Equatorial Guinea to ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in that country,

Noting that the Government of Equatorial Guinea would be prepared to accept the working plan submitted by the expert to assist it in its efforts to restore the full enjoyment of human rights in the country,

1. Expresses its appreciation to Professor Fernando Volio Jiménez, expert appointed in accordance with resolution 33(XXXVI) of the Commission on Human Rights, for his efforts to provide advice and assistance to the Government of Equatorial Guinea and also for his report;

2. Expresses its appreciation also to the Government of Equatorial Guinea for its efforts towards the restoration of human rights in Equatorial Guinea and for the co-operation extended to the expert, and invites the Government to continue its efforts to restore the democratic freedoms abolished by the former Government and to encourage the participation of the citizens in the restoration of the democratic system in the country;

3. Reiterates its readiness to assist the Government of Equatorial Guinea, at its request, in the task of restoring human rights in Equatorial Guinea and, to that end, requests the Secretary-General to invite the expert to continue to place his advice and assistance at the disposal of the Government of Equatorial Guinea, particularly with a view to the implementation of his recommendations to that Government, taking into account the political, economic and social conditions of the country;

4. Requests the Secretary-General, bearing in mind the need for co-ordination with other assistance activities, to draw up, in consultation with the expert and the Government and to submit to the Economic and Social Council for consideration at its second regular session of 1981, a draft plan of action for implementing those recommendations of the expert which he deems feasible;

5. Further requests the Secretary-General, in drawing up the draft plan of action, to consult Governments, other United Nations organs and the relevant parts of the United Nations Secretariat, specialized agencies, non-governmental organizations in consultative status and the Organization of African Unity, with a view to determining in what ways they may be able to contribute towards implementing the plan, and to inform the Council of the results of those consultations.

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/187

Adopted without vote

Draft orally proposed by President, amended by Canada and revised; agenda item 5.

#### Provision of expert services in the field of human rights to Equatorial Guinea

At its 37th plenary meeting, on 16 July 1981, the Council:

(a) Took note of the note by the Secretary-General on the implementation of Council resolution 1981/38 of 8 May 1981 regarding the provision of expert services in the field of human rights to Equatorial Guinea;

(b) Decided to invite the Commission on Human Rights to study at its thirty-eighth session the draft plan of action to be prepared by the Secretary-General in pursuance of Council resolution 1981/38, and to request the Commission to report to the Council, making any recommendations that it may consider to be appropriate;

(c) Decided to consider the draft plan of action, and the report of the Commission on Human Rights requested in paragraph (b) above, at its first regular session of 1982.

#### Uganda

The Economic and Social Council, on 8 May 1981, <sup>(2)</sup> approved the decision taken on 11 March by the Commission on Human Rights <sup>(1)</sup> to request the Secretary-General, in response to the interest expressed by the Government of Uganda, to provide advisory services and other assistance to help that Government continue to guarantee the enjoyment of human rights. The Commission also invited States, specialized agencies, United Nations organs and humanitarian and non-governmental organizations to support Uganda in its human rights efforts.

The Council decision, which had been recommended by the Commission, was adopted without vote, following its approval in the same manner by the Second Committee on 5 May.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 30(XXXVII), 11 Mar. Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/146, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 19(27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

## Economic and Social Council decision 1981/146

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote. 5 May (meeting 19); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25): agenda item 7.

Assistance to the Government of Uganda in its efforts to guarantee the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council approved the decision taken by the Commission on Human Rights, in its resolution 30(XXXVII) of 11 March 1981, to request the Secretary-General, in response to the interest expressed by the Government of Uganda, to provide advisory services and other forms of appropriate assistance to help that Government in taking appropriate measures to continue to guarantee the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms in that country.

## Termination of the periodic reports system

On the recommendation of the Commission on Human Rights, made on 13 March 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Economic and Social Council, on 8 May,<sup>(3)</sup> decided to terminate the periodic reporting system on human rights established in 1965,<sup>(1)</sup> under which Governments reported regularly to the United Nations on the human rights situation in their country and specialized agencies reported on matters pertaining to particular groups of rights. The Council decision was taken without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 5 May.

Resolution and decisions. Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1074 C (XXXIX), 28 July 1965 (YUN 1965, p. 487). Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 10(XXXVII), 13 Mar.; <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/151, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 19(27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

## Economic and Social Council decision 1981/51

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May (meeting 19); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25): agenda item 7.

## Periodic reports on human rights

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council, noting decision 10(XXXVII) of 13 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights, decided to terminate the periodic reporting system established by Council resolution 1074 C (XXXIX) of 28 July 1965.

## Public information activities in human rights

As requested by the Economic and Social Council in May 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General presented to the Commission on Human Rights in January 1981 a programme for United Nations dissemination of international human rights instruments in as many languages as possible.<sup>(1)</sup> The programme, to be implemented in two stages of two years each, foresaw for 1982-1983 the updating of the publication *Human Rights: A Compilation of international Instruments* and the reprinting of the pamphlet *The International Bill of Human Rights* in the six official languages of the General Assembly. These publications would be issued in additional

languages in 1984-1985, when the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would also be reissued in pamphlet form and additional copies of instruments in specific fields, such as non-discrimination and the abolition of torture, would be disseminated. The Secretary-General also informed the Commission about United Nations public information activities on human rights, including films, radio programmes, press releases and publications.

On 10 March 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Commission requested the Secretary-General to continue to implement the programmes referred to in his reports on public information activities in the field of human rights and to report each year on implementation. The Commission also invited him to consider ways of facilitating the stimulation of public interest in the promotion and protection of human rights and to report in 1982. It requested Governments to continue considering action to facilitate publicity on United Nations human rights activities.

On 8 May 1981, the Economic and Social Council approved the Commission's request that the Secretary-General continue to implement the programmes referred to in his reports and keep the Commission informed.<sup>(5)</sup>

The decision was adopted without vote, following its approval in the same manner by the Second Committee on 5 May, where the draft submitted by the Commission was orally amended by Brazil to replace a reference to reports on "this subject" with reports on "measures taken to enhance public information activities in the field of human rights".

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 14 December on national institutions for human rights,<sup>(4)</sup> requested the Secretary-General, in carrying out public information activities in the field of human rights, to give due attention to the role of national institutions and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) concerned with the promotion and protection of human rights. It also invited Member States to disseminate the texts of human rights instruments, including international conventions, in national or local languages.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-C, E/CN.4/1436.

Resolutions and decisions. Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 24(XXXVII), 10 Mar.; <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1980/30, para. 3, 2 May 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 872); <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/134, paras. 4 & 7, 14 Dec. 1981 (p. 942). Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/143, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 19(27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

## Economic and Social Council decision 1981/143

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote. 5 May (meeting 19); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25). orally amended by Brazil; agenda item 7.



Development of public information activities  
in the field of human rights

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council took note of resolution 24(XXXVII) of 10 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights, and approved the Commission's request to the Secretary-General to continue to implement the programmes referred to in his reports on measures taken to enhance public information activities in the field of human rights and to keep the Commission informed thereon.

National Institutions for human rights

In response to 1979 requests by the Commission on Human Rights<sup>(5)</sup> and the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted to the Assembly in October 1981 a report describing various types of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights.<sup>(1)</sup> In the area of protection, the report covered judicial and independent non-judicial institutions, legislative organs, administrative institutions such as the police, legal counselling and assistance, and the role of NGOs. It also dealt with special problems regarding the protection of persons in certain categories, including children and minorities. In the area of promotion, it covered participation in government, institutions for education and information dissemination, health care systems, social security and social welfare schemes, labour institutions, institutions to promote the rights of the child and racial harmony, and NGOs.

Taking note of this report, the Assembly, by a resolution of 14 December,<sup>(3)</sup> invited Member States to take steps to establish or strengthen national human rights institutions and to disseminate the texts of human rights instruments in national and local languages. The Secretary-General was requested to provide assistance for such dissemination, particularly to developing countries. The Assembly also recommended that Member States consider including material on human rights issues in their educational curriculum and that they encourage the exchange of experience in the establishment of national human rights institutions. It requested the Secretary-General to submit in 1983 a report providing details on various types of national human rights institutions and, in carrying out public information activities on human rights (p. 940), to give due attention to the role of national institutions.

The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, which similarly approved the lo-nation text on 9 November, as orally revised by the sponsors. In the revision, the phrase "drawing upon all available sources of information" was dropped from the request that the Secretary-General report on various types of national institutions.

Introducing the draft, India said the sponsors wished to reaffirm their belief in the important

role of national institutions in the promotion and protection of human rights. Several of the concepts in the draft were drawn from previous Assembly resolutions and the thrust of the text was to enhance public awareness of international human rights instruments.

The United States said its understanding was that the resolution, especially the requests to the Secretary-General to provide assistance and submit a report, would have no financial implications.

During the Committee debate on human rights, Madagascar said it had been applying most of the guidelines recommended by the 1978 Seminar on National and Local Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights.<sup>(4)</sup> Jamaica remarked that, if national institutions were functioning as they had been intended to do, there would be no need for further action.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/440.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>34/49, 23 Nov. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 870); <sup>(3)</sup>36/134, 14 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(4)</sup>1978, p. 697; <sup>(5)</sup>1979, p. 853.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.35, 37-40, 42, 43 (29 Oct.-9 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.97 (14 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/134

Adopted without vote

Meeting 97

14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/731) without vote. 9 November (meeting 43); IO-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.42). orally revised; agenda item 79 (b).

Sponsors: Australia, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Lesotho, Morocco, New Zealand, Peru, Sri Lanka, United Kingdom.

National institutions for the promotion  
and protection of human rights

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 32/123 of 16 December 1977, 33/46 of 14 December 1978 and 34/49 of 23 November 1979 concerning national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights,

Mindful of the guidelines on the structure and functioning of national and local institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights, endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 33/46,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights,

Mindful also of the need to create conditions, at the national and international levels, for the promotion and protection of the human rights of individuals and peoples,

Emphasizing the importance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights and other international human rights instruments for promoting respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Reiterating its conviction that all human rights and fundamental freedoms are indivisible and interdependent, and that equal attention and urgent consideration should be given to the implementation, promotion and protection of both civil and political rights, and economic, social and cultural rights,

Noting that the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council have been giving attention to the development of public information activities in the field of human rights,

1. Invites all Member States to take appropriate steps for the establishment or, where they already exist, the strengthening of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights;

2. Emphasizes the importance of the integrity and independence of such national institutions, in accordance with national legislation;

3. Draws attention to the constructive role that national non-governmental organizations can play in the work of national institutions;

4. Invites all Member States to take appropriate steps to disseminate the texts of human rights instruments, including international covenants and conventions, in their respective national or local languages in order to give the widest possible publicity to these instruments;

5. Recommends that all Member States should consider including material relevant to a comprehensive understanding of human rights issues in their educational curriculum;

6. Recommends that all Member States should take appropriate steps to encourage the exchange of experience in the establishment of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights;

7. Requests the Secretary-General, in carrying out public information activities in the field of human rights, to give due attention to the role of national institutions and non-governmental organizations concerned with the promotion and protection of human rights;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to provide all necessary assistance to Member States, upon their request, in the implementation of paragraph 4 above, high priority being accorded to the needs of developing countries;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session a report providing detailed information on the various types of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights, taking into account differing social and legal systems and the contribution that national institutions can make towards the implementation of the international human rights instruments;

10. Recommends that Member States should bring the present resolution to the attention of representatives of their national institutions;

11. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-eighth session a sub-item entitled "National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights".

#### Regional arrangements for human rights

In compliance with a December 1980 General Assembly request,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General, in a July 1981 report,<sup>(1)</sup> informed the Assembly that, subject to finalization of consultations, it had been decided to defer until 1982 the holding of a seminar of the Asian States on arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights. He also reported that, in connection with efforts currently under way in the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to elaborate an African Charter of human rights and to establish an African commission on human rights, he had maintained contacts with the OAU Secretary-General with a view to making United Nations assistance available.

The Assembly, by a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(\*)</sup> commended OAU on the adoption of the African Charter of Human and People's Rights. It noted with satisfaction that consultations had been held with Asian States on the holding of a seminar at Colombo, Sri Lanka, to consider arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights in the region, and requested the Secretary-General to organize that seminar in 1982 and report to the Assembly on its deliberations.

The resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Third Committee on 30 November. The 13-nation draft was introduced by Sri Lanka.

Explaining its position in the Committee, Viet Nam stated that the views of Asian States on human rights continued to differ owing to manipulation by certain Powers which had themselves violated human rights and were determined to impose their distorted version of facts; it would be difficult to prevent participants in the seminar from being misled and to ensure that the meeting contributed to improving the human rights situation in Asia. The Byelorussian SSR, Mongolia and the USSR also voiced reservations on the convening of the seminar, saying its objectives and agenda should be the subject of consultations with all Asian States. In addition, the USSR believed that the seminar should not entail additional expenditure.

India hoped for a constructive exchange of views at the seminar and a more substantive discussion once its conclusions were available. New Zealand welcomed Sri Lanka's offer to host the seminar.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/355.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/197, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 871); <sup>(3)</sup>36/154, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/811;

S-G statements, A/C.3/36/L.82, A/C.5/36/82 & Corr.1.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 63, 66 (19-30 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.66 (8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/154

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, 30 November (meeting 66); 13-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.61); agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Bangladesh. Ecuador. Ghana. Ireland. Jamaica. Kenya. Mali. New Zealand. Nigeria. Samoa. Senegal. Sri Lanka. Sweden.

#### Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights

The General Assembly.

Recalling its resolution 34/171 of 17 December 1979, in which it reiterated its appeal to States in areas where regional arrangements in the field of human rights do not yet exist to consider agreements with a view to the establishment within their respective regions of suitable regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights,

Recalling also its resolution 35/197 of 15 December 1980,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General.

Welcoming recent developments in the Organization of African Unity towards the establishment of regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights,

1. Commends the Organization of African Unity on the adoption of the African Charter of Human and People's Rights;

2. Notes with satisfaction that consultations were held with Member States of the Asian region with a view to the holding of a seminar at Colombo to consider appropriate arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights in the region;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to organize the above-mentioned seminar at Colombo in 1982 and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the deliberations of the seminar.

## Human rights violations

Situations involving alleged violations of human rights on a large scale in several countries were again examined in 1981 by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights, as well as by special bodies and officials appointed to examine some of these situations. The Assembly and/or the Council took action on South Africa and Namibia (see below), Chile (p. 951), the territories occupied by Israel (p. 955), Bolivia (p. 957), El Salvador (p. 958) and Guatemala (p. 963). Situations in Cyprus (p. 958) and Iran (p. 965) were raised before the Commission. The problems of mass exoduses (p. 965) and hostages (p. 966) were also under study, as were United Nations procedures for dealing with human rights violations (p. 966).

In addition, the United Nations offered assistance to the Central African Republic (p. 937), Equatorial Guinea (p. 938) and Uganda (p. 939), p where human rights violations under former regimes had been reported.

### South Africa and Namibia

WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES. The Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on Southern Africa, established in 1967 by the Commission on Human Rights,<sup>(6)</sup> submitted a report in January 1981 which dealt with developments concerning policies and practices violating human rights in South Africa and Namibia.<sup>(1)</sup> The report was based mainly on first-hand information which the Group had received in the form of testimony and written communications from individuals and organizations during a mission of inquiry from 4 to 29 August 1980, as well as an analysis of published information.

On the basis of the information received, the Group formulated the following conclusions: In South Africa, the situation had not changed; apartheid remained government policy, with repressive measures continuing against all those, mostly blacks, who sought to eliminate apartheid. Political repression, detention without trial, mass removal of populations, torture of political prisoners and detainees sometimes resulting in death, harassment of trade union leaders (p. 949) and students, and the exploitation of large numbers of black labourers had been noticeable. Some minor changes had taken place, such as enabling some blacks to participate in so-called white sporting events, but they were of form rather than substance. The number of persons sentenced to death had more than doubled in

1980 compared with the previous nine years. The Bantu homelands policy, involving forced mass removal of blacks from their traditional homes, continued to be at variance with the right of people to self-determination. Conditions of black workers continued to be precarious and widespread school boycotts had occurred.

The Group suggested that the Commission renew its request for Security Council action, not excluding resort to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations (on action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression) (p. 165). It reiterated its suggestion for a General Assembly study of the South African Government's legitimacy in view of its apartheid policy and its systematic refusal to apply the principles of the Charter and other international instruments, and an Assembly reaffirmation that the struggle against apartheid was legitimate and required United Nations assistance; in particular, persons in South Africa who refused to comply with its inhuman policies should be entitled to special consideration as refugees. Also, the Commission should urge countries to terminate political, economic, cultural and other collaboration with South Africa (p. 180), and authorize the Working Group to continue to study human rights violations there, with particular reference to the ill-treatment of women and children (p. 198).

Concerning Namibia (p. 1128), the Group noted that the basic measures taken by South Africa had been to facilitate the accession to power of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, against the wishes of United Nations bodies legally responsible for administering the Territory and in contravention of proposals endorsed by the Security Council. South Africa had consolidated its jurisdiction and military occupation, and its military incursions into border localities of Angola and Zambia had escalated. Black workers continued to suffer from discrimination, wage reduction and inequality, wretched working conditions especially in the mines, lack of medical care and a ban on trade union activities. For the first time, the Group had been informed of the existence of trained South African squads with licence to assassinate supporters of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). South African security laws, providing severe penalties of detention and imprisonment for "political offences", were still applied to Namibia, and the number of detainees had increased.

The Group reiterated its recommendations on the right of the Namibians to self-determination and independence and the enjoyment of human rights. It recommended that the Commission: call on South Africa to desist from using Namibia

for launching attacks against neighbouring States (p. 214); strongly condemn the violations of the territorial integrity of Angola which were causing massacres of civilians (p. 217); call on South Africa to conform to the international standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners; and authorize the Group to continue to study cases of torture and mutilation of refugees captured at Kassinga Camp in Angola and detained at the Hardap Dam Camp near Marienthal in southern Namibia. The Group recommended that a study be undertaken on the harmful effects of apartheid on women and children and that the Commission continue to institute inquiries in respect of persons suspected of having been guilty in Namibia of the crime of apartheid or of a serious violation of human rights.

The Working Group also submitted in January a study on ways of ensuring implementation of international instruments such as the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, including the establishment of the international jurisdiction envisaged by the Convention (p. 947).

Following the renewal of its mandate by the Commission in February (p. 945), the Working Group carried out a mission of inquiry in London from 29 June to 3 July 1981 to gather information for a report it was to present to the Commission in 1982.

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.** On 23 February 1981, the Commission on Human Rights adopted two resolutions on the report of the Working Group. By one of them,<sup>(3)</sup> it adopted the Group's conclusions and recommendations, renewed its mandate (p. 945) and suggested that the General Assembly refer to the International Court of Justice the question of whether a State like South Africa, pursuing apartheid and denying human rights, might lawfully continue to hold a place in the international community. By the other resolution,<sup>(2)</sup> concerned mainly with Namibia, the Commission requested the Security Council to consider imposing mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa, in particular a mandatory embargo on the supply of petroleum and petroleum products (p. 175), and to reinforce the arms embargo against South Africa (p. 172) by adopting comprehensive measures to end all military and nuclear collaboration with the apartheid régime.

In the resolution by which it renewed the Working Group's mandate, the Commission also denounced bantustanization; requested the Assembly to reaffirm that the struggle against apartheid justified the granting of United Nations assistance to those taking part in that struggle; and, referring to apartheid as a crime against

humanity, invited countries collaborating with South Africa to terminate such relations. The Commission appealed for ratification of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid and invited Member States to make observations on proposals for an international penal tribunal under that Convention (p. 947).

Provisions on Namibia were contained in both resolutions. In the more general one, the Commission condemned South Africa's increased military presence and its attempt to impose a puppet regime. It denounced and condemned South Africa's attacks on neighbouring States and, in the resolution concerned largely with Namibia, it called on that country to desist from aggression. Also in the latter resolution, the Commission welcomed the declared readiness of SWAPO to agree to a cease-fire and the placement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group in Namibia, reaffirmed the Namibians' right to self-determination and independence, and declared that only exercise of that right under conditions determined by the United Nations conformed to international law. It demanded that South Africa cease torture and ill-treatment of Namibian detainees and prisoners and that captured freedom fighters be granted prisoner-of-war status, and called for the immediate release of all Namibian political prisoners. It called on countries to prevent the recruitment of their nationals as mercenaries to fight with the South African army in Namibia, and appealed to States and United Nations organs to increase political, financial and material assistance to SWAPO.

The resolution by which the Commission endorsed the Group's recommendations and renewed its mandate was adopted by 33 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions, while the resolution on Namibia was adopted by a roll-call vote of 35 to none, with 6 abstentions.

On 6 March, in a resolution on the self-determination of peoples (p. 891),<sup>(4)</sup> the Commission condemned increasing massacres of innocent and defenceless people by the racist régime, as well as South Africa's aggression against neighbouring front-line States (p. 214) and death sentences passed against freedom fighters of the African National Congress of South Africa and SWAPO (p. 195). It called on South Africa to reprieve the sentences for humanitarian reasons.

On 8 May,<sup>(5)</sup> the Economic and Social Council decided to transmit to the Assembly, the Security Council and the Special Committee against Apartheid the more general of the Commission's resolutions on the Group's report. This decision, based on a draft approved by the Commission, was adopted without vote, following its approval

by the Second (Social) Committee on 5 May in the same manner.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Working Group, E/CN.4/1429 & Corr.1.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25 & Corr.1): <sup>(2)</sup>4(XXXVII). <sup>(3)</sup>5(XXXVII). 23 Feb.; <sup>(4)</sup>14(XXXVII), 6 Mar.

Decision: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/136, 8 May, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1967, p. 509.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 18(27Apr.-5May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18(8May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/136

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May (meeting 18); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda item 7.

Violations of human rights in southern Africa: report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council, noting resolution 5(XXXVII) of 23 February 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights, decided to transmit that resolution to the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Special Committee against Apartheid.

Continuation of the Working Group

The Commission on Human Rights, in its resolution of 23 February 1981<sup>(1)</sup> on the activities of the Working Group on Southern Africa (p. 943), renewed the Group's mandate. It decided that the Group should continue to examine policies and practices violating human rights in South Africa and Namibia, inquire about persons suspected of having been guilty in Namibia of the crime of apartheid or any other serious human rights violation, and bring immediately to the attention of the Commission Chairman particularly serious violations or violations calling for urgent action. The Group was requested: to examine reports on apartheid as a form of slavery and on child labour in South Africa; to study what the Commission might do or suggest for active participation in the struggle against apartheid; to investigate, in co-operation with the Special Committee against Apartheid, the conditions of imprisonment and the health of persons captured at Kassinga and imprisoned at the Hardap Dam Camp; to study the effects of apartheid on black women and children; and to submit a progress report in 1982 and a report on its findings in 1983.

On 8 May 1981, the Economic and Social Council approved the Commission's decision to renew the Working Group's mandate.<sup>(2)</sup> This decision, based on a draft approved by the Commission, was adopted without vote, following its approval by the Second Committee on 5 May in the same manner.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 5(XXXVII), 23 Feb. Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/137, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 18(27Apr.-5May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/137

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May (meeting 18); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda item 7.

Violations of human rights in southern Africa: mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council approved the decision of the Commission on Human Rights, 'in its resolution 5(XXXVII) of 23 February 1981, to renew the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts and to request the Secretary-General to provide every assistance and the resources required to enable the Ad Hoc Working Group to discharge its responsibilities in accordance with its terms of reference.

Foreign support of South Africa

Under the agenda item on adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other assistance to the colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa, the Commission on Human Rights adopted on 23 February 1981, by 30 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions, a resolution<sup>(2)</sup> calling for an end to all forms of assistance to the racist régime in South Africa (p. 180); affirming the inalienable right of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia to self-determination, independence and the enjoyment of their natural resources; and expressing full support for the May 1981 International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 165).

The Commission welcomed the September 1980 decision of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities<sup>(6)</sup> to mandate Special Rapporteur Ahmed Mohamed Khalifa (Egypt) to continue updating the list of banks, transnational corporations (TNCs) and other organizations assisting the South African régime, and to submit a revised report through the Sub-Commission for consideration by the Commission in 1982 (p. 188). It called on States, specialized agencies and non-governmental and other organizations to continue to publicize the report, and called on the countries in which the listed banks, TNCs and organizations were based to take action to end their trading, manufacturing and investing in South Africa and Namibia.

On 6 March, in a resolution on the self-determination of peoples (p. 891),<sup>(3)</sup> the Commission condemned the policy of States which maintained political, economic, military and other relations with South Africa, thus supporting, protecting and encouraging its persistence in suppressing aspirations for self-determination and independence.

The mandate of the Special Rapporteur was endorsed by the Economic and Social Council on 8 May.<sup>(5)</sup> The decision, based on a draft by the Commission, was adopted by 42 votes to 5,

with 6 abstentions, following its approval by the Second Committee on 5 May by 39 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.

The updated report was issued in July.<sup>(1)</sup> Noting it with satisfaction, the Sub-Commission, on 9 September,<sup>(4)</sup> invited the Special Rapporteur to continue updating the list for annual review. The Secretary-General was invited to give the report widest publicity. The Sub-Commission recommended to the Commission that the Group of Three set up under the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (see below) be asked to examine whether the actions of TNCs operating in South Africa came under the definition of the crime of apartheid and whether or not legal action could be taken under the Convention. The Sub-Commission also decided to give the matter high priority in 1982.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Special Rapporteur, E/CN.4/Sub.2/469.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): <sup>(2)</sup>8(XXXVII), 23 Feb.: <sup>(3)</sup>14(XXXVII), para. 9, 6 Mar. <sup>(4)</sup>SCPDP (report, E/CN.4/1512): 6(XXXIV), 9 Sep.

Decision: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/141, 8 May, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 809.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 19 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/141  
42-5-6

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) by vote (39-5-6). 5 May (meeting 19); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda item 7.

Adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to the colonial and racist régime in South Africa

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council noted resolution 8(XXXVII) of 23 February 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights and approved the decision of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, in its resolution 2(XXXIII) of 2 September 1980, to give Mr. Ahmed Khalifa, Special Rapporteur, a mandate to continue to update the list of banks, transnational corporations and other organizations giving assistance to the colonial and racist regime in South Africa and to submit a revised report, through the Sub-Commission, to the Commission on Human Rights.

#### Convention against apartheid

##### Ratifications and accessions

During 1981, seven more States adhered to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid which was adopted by the General Assembly in 1973<sup>(6)</sup> and entered into force on 18 July 1976.<sup>(9)</sup>

This brought to 65 the number of States (italics indicate those adhering in 1981) having ratified or acceded to the Convention as at 31 December 1981:

Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

In resolutions of 23 February on human rights violations in southern Africa<sup>(4)</sup> (p. 944) and on implementation of the Convention<sup>(5)</sup> (p. 947), the Commission on Human Rights appealed to States to ratify or accede to the Convention without delay. Appeals for adherence to the Convention were made by the General Assembly in resolutions of 28 October on the status of the Convention<sup>(7)</sup> and of 17 December on the situation in South Africa.<sup>(8)</sup>

During the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee's debate on racial discrimination, the Bahamas, Hungary, India, Jamaica, Mongolia, the Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, the USSR and Zaire were among those urging additional adherences to the Convention. Egypt and others deplored the fact that so few States had become parties. The Ukrainian SSR said it was significant that not one member of the Western Group had signed the Convention; the Byelorussian SSR said that was so because they wanted to continue co-operating with South Africa.

In notes verbales to the Secretary-General dated 12, 17 and 30 November, respectively, annexed to letters of the same dates, the USSR,<sup>(3)</sup> the Byelorussian SSR<sup>(1)</sup> and the Ukrainian SSR<sup>(2)</sup> stated that they regarded the accession to the Convention by "so-called 'Democratic Kampuchea'" as illegal and without legal force.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Byelorussian SSR, 17 Nov., A/36/703; <sup>(2)</sup>Ukrainian SSR, 30 Nov., A/36/762; <sup>(3)</sup>USSR, 12 Nov., A/36/674.

Resolutions: Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 23 Feb.: <sup>(4)</sup>5(XXXVII), <sup>(5)</sup>6(XXXVII), para. 2. GA: <sup>(6)</sup>3068(XXVIII), annex, 30 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 103); <sup>(7)</sup>36/13, para. 3, 28 Oct. 1981 (p.949); <sup>(8)</sup>36/172 A, para. 12, 17 Dec. (p. 162). Yearbook reference: <sup>(9)</sup>1976, p. 575.

#### Implementation of the Convention

ACTIVITIES OF THE GROUP OF THREE. The Group of Three, established under article IX of the Convention against apartheid<sup>(6)</sup> to consider

reports by States parties on measures, they had taken to implement the Convention's provisions, held its fourth session at Geneva from 26 to 30 January 1981<sup>(1)</sup> The Group, consisting of Bulgaria, Cuba and Nigeria for the 1981 session, considered first (initial) reports from six States parties (Burundi, Egypt, Mali, Qatar, Tunisia, Yugoslavia) and second reports from eight States (Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian SSR, USSR). Representatives of these States, except for Mali, attended the meetings to supplement the information in the reports.

In its conclusions and recommendations, the Group expressed the opinion that the presence of States' representatives at its meetings in connection with the consideration of reports should be continued. The Group called on States to provide more comprehensive information on measures taken and difficulties encountered in implementing article IV of the Convention, on suppression or prevention of encouragement of apartheid and prosecution and punishment for the crime of apartheid.

The Group appealed once again for the strengthening of international co-operation to implement fully the decisions of the Security Council and other United Nations organs aimed at the prevention, suppression and punishment of apartheid. In that connection, it drew attention to the importance of strengthening assistance to liberation movements in southern Africa.

The Group recommended that the list of individuals, organizations, institutions and State representatives responsible for crimes of apartheid drawn up by the Commission on Human Rights in accordance with article X, be brought again to the attention of United Nations Members and be further publicized. It also drew attention to the desirability of disseminating information relating to the Convention, its implementation and the work of the Group.

In accordance with the Group's recommendation, the list of those responsible for crimes of apartheid was published in the Bulletin of Human Rights (issue No. 28).

On 23 February,<sup>(5)</sup> the Commission took note with appreciation of the Group's report and recommendations, appealed for additional ratifications of the Convention (p. 946), commended States parties that had submitted their reports and appealed to others to do so as soon as possible. It requested that States parties be invited to comment on the study on implementation prepared by the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on Southern Africa (see below). The Commission decided that the Group of Three should meet for no more than five days before the 1982 Commission session.

The resolution was, adopted by 30 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

**STUDY BY THE WORKING GROUP ON SOUTHERN AFRICA.** In January 1981, the Commission's Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on Southern Africa (p. 943) submitted to the Commission a study on ways of ensuring implementation of international instruments such as the Convention, including the establishment of the international jurisdiction envisaged by the Convention.<sup>(3)</sup> The study suggested two alternative courses: (a) establishment of an international penal tribunal for the suppression and punishment of the crime of apartheid by means of a draft convention that would permit States to add other international crimes to the tribunal's jurisdiction; and (b) use of existing United Nations machinery along with an international panel of judges to adjudicate violations of the Convention against apartheid, to be established under an additional protocol to the Convention.

In a resolution of 23 February<sup>(4)</sup> on human rights violations in South Africa and Namibia (p. 944), the Commission invited Member States to make observations on the proposals for an international penal tribunal submitted by the Working Group.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 28 October,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Assembly also appealed to States parties to submit reports as soon as possible, appealed for additional ratifications of the Convention, and appealed to States and organizations to step up activities to enhance public awareness through denouncing the crimes committed by South Africa. States parties were called on to implement article IV of the Convention through legislative, judicial and administrative measures to prosecute, try and punish persons responsible for, or accused of, the crime of apartheid. The Secretary-General was requested to intensify dissemination of information on the Convention and its implementation. The Commission on Human Rights was invited to intensify, in co-operation with the Special Committee against Apartheid, its periodic compilation of the list of individuals, organizations, institutions and State representatives deemed responsible for the crime of apartheid. States parties and United Nations organs were called on to continue to provide information for the list.

The resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 124 to 1, with 23 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, which approved the 34-nation text on 15 October by 115 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions.

Introducing the resolution in the Committee, the German Democratic Republic stated that, during the more than five years of its existence, the Convention had succeeded in giving fresh

impetus to the struggle to eliminate the apartheid régime.

Voting against the resolution, the United States explained that, although it condemned apartheid it considered that apartheid not constitute a crime in the sense attributed to the term in international law; it was not a party to the Convention and had not encouraged others to sign or ratify it.

Explaining the abstentions of the European Community members, the United Kingdom said that, while categorically condemning apartheid, they considered that the Convention was flawed and would not help international measures aimed at eliminating apartheid. Austria abstained because it was not a party to the Convention but explained that that did not weaken its explicit position on apartheid. Japan and Portugal said the Convention contained provisions incompatible with their legislation—a point also made by Chile, which voted affirmatively in the Assembly.

Although voting for the resolution, Turkey said the incorporation of the Convention into Turkish legislation would raise a number of problems, as certain provisions were incompatible with its legal system. Uruguay also voiced reservations to certain legal concepts in the Convention, in particular concerning the legal competence of States parties in respect of acts by non-nationals committed outside the territory of those States, the unduly vague definition of apartheid as a crime and the mandate to implement the Convention conferred on a United Nations body some of whose members were not parties to that instrument.

The Secretary-General, in a report to the Assembly on the status of the Convention,<sup>(2)</sup> described steps taken in regard to it by United Nations bodies. Annexed to the report were a list of States which had signed, ratified or acceded as at 1 September 1981, as well as conclusions and recommendations of the Group of Three at previous sessions and comments by seven States parties.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Group of Three, E/CN.4/1417; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/454 & Add.1; <sup>(3)</sup>Working Group on Southern Africa, E/CN.4/1426.

Resolutions: Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 23 Feb.: <sup>(4)</sup>5(XXXVII), <sup>(5)</sup>6(XXXVII), GA: <sup>(6)</sup>3068(XXVIII), annex, 30 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 104); <sup>(7)</sup>36/13, 28 Oct. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.4-14, 18, 20 (25 Sep.-15 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.42 (28 Oct.).

General Assembly resolution 36/13

124-1-23 (recorded vote) Meeting 42 28 October 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/623) by vote (115-1-23), 15 October (meeting 20); 34-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.9); agenda item 82 (C).

Sponsors: Angola, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German

Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 3068(XXVIII) of 30 November 1973, by which it adopted and opened for signature and ratification the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, and its resolutions 3380(XXX) of 10 November 1975, 31/80 of 13 December 1976, 32/12 of 7 November 1977, 33/103 of 16 December 1978, 34/27 of 15 November 1979 and 35/39 of 25 November 1980,

Recalling also Commission on Human Rights resolutions 13(XXXIII) of 11 March 1977, 7(XXXIV) of 22 February 1978, 10(XXXV) of 5 March 1979, 12(XXXVI) and 13(XXXVI) of 26 February 1980 and 6(XXXVII) of 23 February 1981,

Convinced that the Declaration and the Programme of Action adopted by the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, as well as the programme of activities to be undertaken during the second half of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 34/24 of 15 November 1979, and their full implementation will contribute to the final eradication of all vestiges of apartheid, racism and racial discrimination,

Reaffirming its conviction that apartheid constitutes a total negation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and is a gross violation of human rights and a crime against humanity, seriously threatening international peace and security,

Strongly condemning South Africa's stepping up its policy of apartheid, repression and "bantustanization" and its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, thereby perpetuating on Namibian territory its odious policy of apartheid, racial discrimination and fragmentation,

Deeply concerned about South Africa's repeated acts of aggression against sovereign African States, which constitute a manifest breach of international peace and security,

Underlining that the strengthening of the existing mandatory arms embargo and the application of comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter are vital in order to compel the racist régime of South Africa to abandon its policy of apartheid,

Condemning the continued collaboration of certain States and transnational corporations with the racist regime of South Africa in the political, economic, military and other fields as an encouragement to the intensification of its odious policy of apartheid,

Commending the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa and the Special Declaration on Namibia, adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981,

Stressing the need to disseminate on a wider basis more information on the crimes committed by the racist regime of South Africa, taking into consideration the recommendation contained in the documents adopted by the International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid, held at Berlin, German Democratic Republic, from 31 August to 2 September 1981,

Underlining that ratification of and accession to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid on a universal basis and the implementation of its provisions without any delay are necessary for its effectiveness and would be a useful contribution towards achieving the goals of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

firmly convinced that the legitimate struggle of the oppressed peoples in southern Africa against apartheid, racism



and colonialism and for the effective implementation of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence demands more than ever all necessary support by the international community and, in particular, further action by the Security Council.

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid;

2. Commends those States parties to the Convention that have submitted their reports under article VII of the Convention, in particular those which presented their second reports, and appeals to those States parties that have not yet done so to submit their reports as soon as possible;

3. Appeals once again to those States that have not yet done so to ratify or to accede to the Convention without further delay;

4. Requests States parties to the Convention to take fully into account the guidelines prepared by the Group of Three of the Commission on Human Rights, established in accordance with article IX of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid;

5. Calls upon all States parties to implement fully article IV of the Convention by adopting legislative, judicial and administrative measures to prosecute, bring to trial and punish, in accordance with their jurisdiction, persons responsible for, or accused of, the acts enumerated in article II of the Convention;

6. Again calls upon all States parties to the Convention and the competent United Nations organs to consider the conclusions and recommendations of the Group of Three contained in its reports and to submit their views and comments to the Secretary-General;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to intensify his efforts through appropriate channels to disseminate information on the Convention and its implementation with a view to further promoting ratification of or accession to the Convention;

8. Requests the Commission on Human Rights to continue to undertake the functions set out in article X of the Convention and invites the Commission to intensify, in co-operation with the Special Committee against Apartheid, its efforts to compile periodically the progressive list of individuals, organizations, institutions and representatives of States deemed responsible for crimes enumerated in article II of the Convention, as well as of those against whom or which legal proceedings have been undertaken;

9. Requests the Commission on Human Rights to take into account General Assembly resolutions 33/23 of 29 November 1978 and 35/32 of 14 November 1980 as well as relevant documents of the Commission and its subsidiary organs in which it is reaffirmed, inter alia, that States giving assistance to the racist regime of South Africa become accomplices in the inhuman practices of racial discrimination and apartheid;

10. Calls upon all States parties to the Convention and competent United Nations organs to continue to provide the Commission on Human Rights, through the Secretary-General, with information relevant to the periodic compilation of the above-mentioned list as well as with information concerning the obstacles that prevent the effective suppression and punishment of the crime of apartheid;

11. Appeals to all States, United Nations organs, specialized agencies and international and national non-governmental organizations to step up their activities in enhancing public awareness through denouncing the crimes committed by the racist regime of South Africa;

12. Requests the Economic and Social Council, in preparing for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, to be held in 1983, to give special attention to the activities aimed at the eradication of apartheid;

13. Welcomes the active campaign waged by the Special Committee against Apartheid, in co-operation with the Commission on Human Rights, to publicize the importance of the Convention;

14. Requests the Secretary-General to distribute the above-mentioned list among all States parties to the Conven-

tion and all Member States and to bring such facts to the attention of the public by all means of mass communication;

15. Requests the Secretary-General to include in his next annual report under General Assembly resolution 3380(XXX) a special section concerning the implementation of the Convention.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Caps Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom.

## Trade union rights

In 1981, the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on Southern Africa continued to study allegations of infringements of trade union rights in South Africa, in response to 9979<sup>(3)</sup> and 1980<sup>(4)</sup> resolutions of the Economic and Social Council. The Group's report to the Commission on Human Rights (p. 943) included information conveyed to the Council through a note by the Secretariat<sup>(2)</sup> -on suppression of the right to organize trade unions and persecution of workers because of their activities, particularly as a consequence of strikes.

The Group reached the conclusion that the conditions of black workers, particularly agricultural workers, continued to be precarious as a result of unmitigated exploitation, low pay, ill-treatment and job insecurity. Their attempts to organize were stifled. The proposals of the 1979 Wiehahn Commission, set up to examine ways in which industrial relations in South Africa could be reformed, seemed to have failed; contrary to their stated objectives, the proposals had had the effect of enabling the South African Government to exercise greater control over African trade unions. Nor had the Code of Conduct of the European Economic Community (recommended to companies operating in the country) brought much change; on the contrary, it had provided transnational corporations with justification for continuing to operate in South Africa, where they had made huge profits at the expense of the African workers.

In March 1981, the Secretary-General transmitted to the Council a communication and covering letter of 29 July 1980 from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, containing allegations of infringements of trade union rights in 'South Africa,<sup>(1)</sup> including arrest and detention of trade unionists, police and State intervention in industrial disputes, and pressure on workers to dissociate themselves from their unions. With a view to having the allegations referred to the Fact-finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association, a body of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the Secretary-General sought the consent of South Africa (not an ILO member) to this procedure, but as at 10 February 1981 he had received no reply.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. By a resolution of 8 May,<sup>(5)</sup> the Economic and Social Council took note of the conclusions of the Working Group. It deplored the inhuman conditions of African workers, particularly in agriculture; condemned the continuing police and State interference in industrial disputes and demanded its cessation, as well as recognition of the right of black trade union movements to full freedom of association and unimpeded collective bargaining; and requested the Group to continue to study the situation and to report to the Commission on Human Rights and the Council in 1982.

By a decision of the same date,<sup>(6)</sup> the Council, noting that as at 1 May 1981 South Africa had not replied to the Secretary-General's request for consent to refer the allegations of infringement of trade union rights to ILO, decided to transmit them to the Working Group and requested it to report to the Commission and the Council in 1982.

The resolution and decision were adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Second (Social) Committee, which similarly approved the 18-nation drafts on 5 May, as revised by the sponsors in writing (resolution) and orally (resolution and decision).

Introducing the drafts in the Committee, Nigeria orally revised the decision by, inserting 1982 as the year in which the Working Group was to report and made two changes in the resolution: In paragraph 3, the Council, instead of regretting that the conditions of African workers continued to be unsatisfactory, deplored their inhuman conditions; and in paragraph 7, a phrase was inserted to specify that the question would be considered as a sub-item under the item "Human rights questions" instead of simply under that item.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/28.

Report <sup>(2)</sup>Working Group of Experts, transmitted by Secretariat note, E/1981/68.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(3)</sup>1979/39, para. 2, 10 May 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 874); <sup>(4)</sup>1980/33, para. 2, 2 May 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 873); <sup>(5)</sup>1981/41, 8 May 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(6)</sup>ESC: 1981/155, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-16, 17, 19 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/41

Adopted without vote Meeting 18 8 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May (meeting 19); 18-nation draft (E/1981/C.2/L.15/Rev.1), orally revised; agenda item 7.

Sponsors: Algeria, Barbados, Burundi, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Morocco, Nigeria, Senegal, Sudan, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts of the Commission on Human Rights on allegations of infringements of trade union rights in the Republic of South Africa

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolution 1979/39 of 10 May 1979 on the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts of the Commission on Human Rights on allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights in the Republic of South Africa,

Recalling also its resolution 1980/33 of 2 May 1980 on allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights in the Republic of South Africa,

Recognizing the contribution which the reports of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts have made and are continuing to make to the efforts of the United Nations to seek out and combat the violations of human rights, in particular the policies of apartheid and racial discrimination, pursued in South Africa and Namibia,

Having examined the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts requested by the Council in its resolution 1980/33.

Noting that the South African authorities, far from changing their policies of apartheid, are strengthening them by various means,

Noting also that the proposals for the reform of industrial relations in South Africa put forward by the Wiehahn Commission appear to have failed,

Noting further that the Code of Conduct of the European Economic Community has not brought about much appreciable change,

1. Congratulates the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts of the Commission on Human Rights on the work it has done;

2. Takes note of the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts requested in its resolution 1980/33 and of the conclusions contained therein;

3. Deplores the inhuman conditions of African workers, particularly agricultural workers;

4. Condemns the continuing police and State interference in industrial disputes in South Africa;

5. Demands the cessation of all police and State interference in industrial disputes and the recognition of the right of the black trade union movements in South Africa to full freedom of association and to unimpeded collective bargaining;

6. Requests the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts to continue to study the situation and to report thereon to the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council in 1982;

7. Decides to consider the question of allegations of infringements of trade union rights in the Republic of South Africa as a sub-item under the item entitled "Human rights questions" at its first regular session of 1982.

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/155

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May

(meeting 19): 18-nation draft (E/1981/C.2/L.14), orally revised: agenda item 7.

Sponsors: Algeria, Barbados, Burundi, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Morocco, Nigeria, Senegal, Sudan; United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

#### Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights in South Africa

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council, noting the allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights submitted by the international Confederation of Free Trade Unions and noting also that as at 1 May 1981 the Government of South Africa had not replied to the request of the Secretary-General, dated 29 October 1980, for consent by the Government of South Africa to refer the above-mentioned allegations of infringements of trade union rights to the Fact-finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association of the International Labour Organisation, in accordance with the provisions of Council resolution 277(X) of 17 February 1950, decided to transmit to the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts of the Commission on Human Rights, for consideration, the allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights in South Africa received by the Secretary-General from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and requested the Ad Hoc Working Group to report thereon to the Commission on Human Rights and to the Council in 1982.

### Chile

During 1981, the question of violations of human rights in Chile was again taken up by the Commission on Human Rights, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. A report by the Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Chile was submitted to the Commission and to the Assembly. The mandate of the Special Rapporteur was extended by the Council for another year.

ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS. On 26 February 1981,<sup>(6)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights commended the Special Rapporteur for the report he had submitted in 1980<sup>(2)</sup> and reiterated its indignation at the persistence and further deterioration of the human rights situation in Chile. It cited: the imposition of a new constitution and restrictive legislation; continuation of the state of emergency; increased detentions often followed by disappearances, torture and death; persecution of trade unionists, academics and church figures; limitations of economic, social and cultural rights; and extreme poverty and lack of protection.

The Commission strongly urged the Chilean authorities to respect and promote human rights and in particular to: end the state of emergency and restore democratic institutions and constitutional safeguards; ensure an immediate end to torture and other inhuman treatment, and punish those responsible; restore full enjoyment of civil and political rights; enable the judiciary to fulfil its duty to protect detainees; allow Chileans freely to enter, leave and live in their country, and restore Chilean nationality to persons deprived of it for political reasons; respect

economic, social and cultural rights, in particular of the indigenous population; and abandon the practice of banishment, which amounted to forced exile. The Commission expressed deep concern at the lack of information on numerous persons who had disappeared and urged the Chilean authorities to investigate and clarify their fate (p. 911). It called on the Chilean judiciary to employ fully its power under habeas corpus and amparo to protect individuals from arbitrary arrest and detention.

The Commission again urged the Chilean authorities to co-operate fully with the Special Rapporteur, and decided to extend his mandate for another year and have him report in 1982.

The resolution was adopted by a roll-call vote of 22 to 4 (Argentina, Brazil, United States, Uruguay), with 17 abstentions.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. On 8 May, the Economic and Social Council extended the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for another year and requested the Secretary-General to make arrangements for financing and staff.<sup>(11)</sup> The decision, based on a draft by the Commission, was adopted by 29 votes to 4, with 19 abstentions, following approval by the Second Committee on 5 May by 27 votes to 4, with 19 abstentions.

On the same date,<sup>(7)</sup> the Council recommended that the General Assembly redesignate the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile as a United Nations voluntary fund for victims of torture, as suggested by the Commission on 11 March.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL RAPPOREUR. The Special Rapporteur's 1981 report on the human rights situation in Chile was transmitted in November to the General Assembly by a note of the Secretary-General.<sup>(5)</sup> The report was based on the testimony of witnesses, on official and other documents published in the Chilean press, on reports and studies by national and international governmental and non-governmental organizations, and on documents and letters from individuals in Chile and elsewhere. The Special Rapporteur stated that the Chilean authorities had refused any contact with him and he expressed the view that no effort should be spared to secure their co-operation.

In his observations and recommendations, the Special Rapporteur said the country faced no emergency situation justifying the suspension of fundamental human rights. Nevertheless, new constitutional provisions and legislative instruments during the preceding few months authorized the simultaneous existence of various states of emergency involving serious limitations on individual freedoms and rights, giving the executive branch discretionary powers which the

judiciary was not equipped to monitor. The authorities systematically refused to respect the rights of political opponents to liberty, physical and moral integrity, and security of person. Individuals had been arrested, generally without warrant or decree, held incommunicado, and sometimes subjected to violence, maltreatment and harassment. Torture continued to be practised and murders, particularly of political dissidents, were committed by security agencies and anonymous groups.

The Special Rapporteur recommended that the Assembly request Chile to comply with its international obligations in matters relating to life, liberty, physical and moral integrity and safety, by ensuring that arrests were always made in public places and in the manner prescribed by law, and that those arrested were assured of a regular hearing before competent judges empowered to protect individual rights, monitor official acts and investigate official irregularities or offences. In addition, Chile should be asked to ensure that political prisoners were kept separate from other prisoners and that their ill-treatment and punishment were discontinued. He called for the exercise by the judiciary of its full power to investigate the fate of missing persons.

Concerning living conditions, the report stated that most people had had to reduce considerably their consumption of essential items, while the better-off minorities had increased their consumption appreciably. The purchasing power of the poor had been brutally reduced since 1973, while the wages of the better-off groups had tended to rise. There had been a tendency to eliminate certain workers' rights concerning wages and conditions of work, including the right to join forces for collective bargaining or the right to strike. Trade unions were subject to control by the labour department and their leaders were subjected to prosecution and detention. The situation of the indigenous population had continued to deteriorate, with indigenous communities being deprived of their lands and displaced.

Summing up his observations, the Special Rapporteur said it was not possible to report any improvement in the human rights situation in Chile. The new constitutional and institutional situation had not helped to reduce the scope of restrictions and violations or to change repressive measures. No measures had been adopted conducive to restoring the exercise of human rights. He concluded that the international community should continue to devote attention to the situation and use whatever means it deemed appropriate to ensure the full restoration of human rights.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(10)</sup> the General Assembly reiter-

ated its grave concern at the persistence and even deterioration of the human rights situation in Chile. It urged the Chilean authorities to respect and promote human rights through such steps as: ending the state of emergency and restoring democratic institutions and constitutional guarantees; ending arbitrary detention, intimidation and prosecution of persons who exercised their right to freedom of expression and opinion; respecting the human rights of political detainees; acting to prevent torture; investigating and clarifying the fate of persons who had disappeared for political reasons; restoring trade union rights; and guaranteeing the freedom of assembly and association and the freedom of citizens to enter and leave the country. The Chilean authorities were urged to co-operate with the Special Rapporteur, whose mandate the Commission on Human Rights was invited to extend for another year.

The resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 84 to 20, with 42 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, which approved the lo-nation text on 3 December, as revised by the sponsors, by a recorded vote of 83 to 20, with 36 abstentions.

Another draft resolution, submitted in the Committee by Algeria, Cuba, Mexico and Yugoslavia,<sup>(11)</sup> was subsequently withdrawn and its sponsors joined the sponsors of the resolution later adopted. The withdrawn text included provisions by which the Assembly would have: condemned the forced exile of Chilean parliamentarians and leaders; concluded that continued vigilance with regard to the grave situation prevailing in the country was essential, given the disdain shown by the Chilean authorities on human rights; called on the Chilean judiciary to assume fully its obligations so as to prevent disappearances and torture; and demanded that the authorities co-operate fully with the Special Rapporteur and abandon their unwarranted attitude of contempt for international mechanisms for human rights protection. The Assembly also would have expressed concern at specific aspects of the human rights situation; these were incorporated in the lo-nation draft.

Also on 16 December, as recommended by the Economic and Social Council, the Assembly decided to extend the mandate of the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile and to redesignate it as the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture.<sup>(9)</sup>

Introducing the resolution on human rights in Chile, the Netherlands said it was based essentially on the last paragraph of the Special Rapporteur's report, stating that it was not possible to report any improvement in the human rights

situation in Chile and that the international community should continue to give its attention to the question and do all it could to ensure the full restoration of rights.

Rejecting the resolution, Chile said it distorted the situation and flagrantly violated the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs. Chile could not accept selective and discriminatory treatment and the maintenance of the Special Rapporteur, and rejected the politicization of the United Nations human rights system. The resolution's claim that trade unions could not operate freely and that workers could not strike was absurd in view of the fact that there had been 57 strikes in Chile, involving more than 15,000 workers, since January 1981. Chile's gross domestic product had grown in recent years at a record rate of 7.2 per cent, the inflation rate had declined from 500 per cent in 1973 to about 10 per cent in 1981, and infant mortality had declined between 1973 and 1980 from 65.2 to 31.8 per thousand. Chile, like some other Latin American countries, was the victim of a campaign orchestrated and planned from outside, aimed at disturbing its tranquillity.

Also opposing the text, Argentina denounced what it called the tendency to make the United Nations a court of inquisition on human rights violations, which had only induced countries to deny the co-operation needed to pursue United Nations activities in this field. In Bolivia's view, the resolution was aimed at creating divisions in Latin America to facilitate penetration by extremists. Costa Rica thought the resolution reflected an inconsistent and selective human rights policy directed against Latin America, was the result of a mandate entirely outside the purview of the Special Rapporteur, did not take into account the institutionalization which Chile was attempting to carry out, and lacked objectivity in that it accused Chile of violations of which others, including some sponsors of the resolution, committed officially. Guatemala said there had been an evident improvement in the human rights situation in Chile.

Israel voted against the resolution on the ground that it was unbalanced and unjustifiably selective. The Philippines said it did not believe in appointing a Special Rapporteur to study the human rights situation in Chile or in any other country. The United States said that, although the human rights situation in Chile was not entirely satisfactory, it had improved considerably in that detention without trial and disappearances had stopped, most political prisoners had been released and the political opposition had some access to the media; the resolution, however, like the Special Rapporteur's report, took no account of the progress made

and required Chile to do things not demanded of any other country.

Abstaining, Colombia, Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Singapore and Solomon Islands also disagreed with the selective condemnation of countries. Colombia added that the text jeopardized the constitutional order of Chile and served political interests. Ecuador said that, although it was deeply disquieted by the continuing human rights violations in Chile, the resolution would have the Assembly meddle in internal affairs by stating that the new Chilean Constitution failed to reflect a freely expressed political will and by making a judgement on the Chilean judiciary. Peru also said the resolution betrayed a desire to intervene in internal affairs. Saint Lucia declared that every human rights violation by any country must be recorded and monitored; until that principle was observed, it would continue to abstain.

Supporting the resolution, Austria and Vanuatu said they favoured respect for human rights everywhere. Belgium said it had voted in favour out of concern for the human rights situation in Chile and because the Special Rapporteur's mandate should be extended; however, there were a number of shortcomings in United Nations action to protect human rights throughout the world. Canada felt the United Nations should envisage more effective machinery for dealing with human rights in Chile, such as making the Human Rights Committee responsible for maintaining a continuous dialogue with the Government to encourage it to fulfil its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.<sup>(8)</sup>

Reservations were also voiced by others. Portugal hoped the United Nations would revise the criteria applicable to situations in which human rights violations were verified; the different cases should be closely studied and receive equal treatment. Tunisia—which cast a negative vote in the Committee but voted in favour in the Assembly—said it was not convinced of the effectiveness of the United Nations approach, as could be seen by the failure of its efforts to re-establish the enjoyment of human rights in Chile; ways of ending human rights violations should be sought first at the national level and then regionally and internationally, rather than by dispatching special rapporteurs who were not recognized by the countries concerned.

The United Kingdom explained that it had voted for the text because the human rights situation in Chile was still a cause for concern, but it saw a tendency to introduce elements of selectivity and imbalance; human rights were violated in other countries, but the international community had not thought fit to appoint a special rappor-

teur for them. The USSR stated that the resolution was the minimum the United Nations could do to compel the Chilean junta to end human rights violations. Venezuela expressed reservations on some wording, saying that it would prevent the Special Rapporteur from complying with his mandate.

During the Third Committee's debate, Australia said the conclusion that the human rights situation in Chile had not improved was based on a thorough study, albeit from secondary sources; had the Special Rapporteur received co-operation from the Government, he might have been able to throw more light on some aspects. Cuba said that evidence of the deterioration of the situation in Chile could be found in the destruction of democratic institutions, growing restrictions on the exercise of human rights, many instances of arbitrary arrest and torture, lack of guarantees for citizens, and the prevailing sense of fear and insecurity.

New Zealand regretted that the Chilean authorities had not responded more vigorously to the concern expressed about human rights violations. Norway observed that it had been hoped that the authorities would co-operate with the Special Rapporteur in order to initiate a process which would ultimately restore the enjoyment of human rights. Sweden felt that the world should continue to focus attention on the human rights situation in Chile as long as its authorities did not respect the commitment undertaken when Chile had ratified the International Covenants on Human Rights. The United Kingdom said the European Community members were deeply disturbed by conclusions about cases of torture; they appealed to the Chilean authorities to pay heed to the widespread international concern those practices continued to arouse. Yugoslavia called for continued attention to the situation and efforts to improve it.

Hungary thought the international community should use whatever means it deemed appropriate to ensure the full restoration of human rights in Chile. The German Democratic Republic said the Fascist terror in Chile could not have persisted without the support of outside forces interested in maintaining it. Condemnation of the human rights situation in Chile was also voiced by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR.

OTHER DEVELOPMENTS. By a note verbale of 12 August,<sup>(2)</sup> Chile protested against remarks concerning the Chilean Government made on 11 August by a speaker invited to appear before the Special Committee against Apartheid on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggle of Women in South Africa and Namibia (p. 199).

In the General Assembly's Credentials Committee, which on 10 and 16 September approved the credentials of representatives to the eighth emergency special session<sup>(3)</sup> and the 1981 regular session,<sup>(4)</sup> respectively (p. 351), the USSR stated that it did not recognize the credentials of the delegates appointed by the regime of Augusto Pinochet in Chile. The United States, on the other hand, said there was no basis for the objection to the credentials of the Chilean representatives.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Cuba, Mexico, Yugoslavia, A/C.3/36/L.60.

Note verbale: <sup>(2)</sup>Chile, 12 Aug., A/36/435.

Reports: Credentials Committee, <sup>(3)</sup>A/ES-8/6/Add.1, <sup>(4)</sup>A/36/517; <sup>(5)</sup>Special Rapporteur, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/594.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(6)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 9(XXXVII), 26 Feb. <sup>(7)</sup>ESC: 1981/39, 8 May (p. 905). GA: <sup>(8)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 423); <sup>(9)</sup>36/151, 16 Dec. 1981 (p. 906); <sup>(10)</sup>36/157, 16 Dec., text following.

Decision: <sup>(11)</sup>ESC: 1981/138, 8 May, text following.

Yearbook reference <sup>(12)</sup>1980, p. 822.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.S, 12-17, 18 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 72 (19 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/138

29-4-19

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) by vote (27-4-19). 5 May (meeting 16); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25): agenda item 7.

#### Situation of human rights in Chile

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council approved the decision of the Commission on Human Rights, in its resolution 9(XXXVII) of 26 February 1981, in response to General Assembly resolution 35/188 of 15 December 1980, to extend the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Chile for another year. The Council requested the Secretary-General to make arrangements for the provision of adequate financial resources and staff for the implementation of Commission resolution 9(XXXVII).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/157

84-20-42 (recorded vote) Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) by recorded vote (83-20-36), 3 December (meeting 72): 10-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.64/Rev.1); agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Cuba, Denmark, France, Greece, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Sweden, Yugoslavia.

#### Protection of human rights in Chile

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming its responsibility to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all,

Underlining the obligation of Governments to protect and promote human rights and to carry out the responsibilities they have undertaken under various international instruments,

Determined to remain vigilant with regard to violations of human rights wherever they occur and to take measures in order to restore respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Recalling its resolutions 31/124 of 16 December 1976, 32/118 of 16 December 1977, 33/175 of 20 December 1978, 34/179 of 17 December 1979 and 35/188 of 15 December 1980 on the protection of human rights in Chile, and 33/173 of 20 December 1978 on disappeared persons,

Recalling also Commission on Human Rights resolution 11 (XXXV) of 6 March 1979 on violations of human rights in Chile, in which the Commission, *inter alia*, decided to appoint a Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Chile, and resolution 9(XXXVII) of 26 February 1981, in which It decided to extend the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for another year,

Deploing the fact that the Chilean authorities have consistently refused to co-operate with the Special Rapporteur appointed by the Commission on Human Rights and with other United Nations bodies in the field of human rights,

Deeply concerned about the persistence and, in certain respects, the deterioration of situations which affect the enjoyment and exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile, as stated in the report of the Special Rapporteur,

Expressing deep concern that the whereabouts of the numerous persons who have disappeared over the past years for political reasons are still unknown and that the Chilean authorities continue to fail to take urgent and effective measures to investigate and clarify the fate of persons who have disappeared,

Noting with grave concern that the new Constitution in force in Chile as from 11 March 1981, which was prepared with a lack of popular participation, not only fails to guarantee fully, but in certain respects allows interference with, human rights and fundamental freedoms,

1. Commends the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Chile for his report, prepared in accordance with Commission on Human Rights resolution 9(XXXVII):

2. Reiterates its grave concern at the persistence and, in some respects, the deterioration of the human rights situation in Chile, as stated by the Special Rapporteur, and particularly:

(a) The disruption of the traditional democratic legal order and its Institutions by the maintenance and expansion of emergency legislation and the promulgation of a constitution that fails to reflect a freely expressed popular will and clearly hampers the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Chilean people and allows interference with such rights and freedoms;

(b) The intensification of practices such as arbitrary detention and confinement in secret places, often accompanied by torture and inhuman or degrading treatment which, on occasion, result in unexplained deaths;

(c) The persecution, intimidation and imprisonment, as well as the banishment and forced exile, of a number of persons who participate in trade union, academic and cultural and humanitarian activities;

3. Reiterates also its great concern at the fact that the remedies of habeas corpus or amparo prove to be not effective owing to the fact that the judiciary in Chile does not fully exercise its powers in this respect and performs its functions with utmost restrictions;

4. Urges the Chilean authorities to respect and promote human rights in accordance with their obligations under various international instruments and, in particular, to take the following concrete steps that could enable the Commission on Human Rights to consider terminating the mandate of the Special Rapporteur:

(a) To put an end to the state of emergency, under which continued human rights violations occur, and to restore the democratic institutions and constitutional guarantees formerly enjoyed by the Chilean people;

(b) To put an end to arbitrary detentions, physical or psychological intimidation and prosecution of persons who exercise their right to freedom of expression and opinion, including the right to petition;

(c) To respect the human rights of persons detained for political reasons and to separate them from those detained for criminal offences;

(d) To take effective measures to prevent torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment resulting, *inter alia*, in unexplained deaths and to prosecute and punish those responsible for such practices;

(e) To investigate and clarify the fate of persons who have disappeared for political reasons, to inform the relatives of those persons of the outcome of the investigation and to prosecute and punish those responsible for such disappearances;

(f) To restore fully trade union rights, especially the freedom to form trade unions which can operate freely without governmental control and can exercise fully the right to strike;

(g) To guarantee the freedom of assembly and association, and the freedom of Chilean citizens freely to enter and leave the country, and to end the practice of banishment applied to nationals, a practice which amounts to forced exile from the country;

5. Urges once more the Chilean authorities to co-operate with the Special Rapporteur and to comply with their obligations under various international human rights instruments;

6. Requests the Commission on Human Rights at its thirty-eighth session to study thoroughly the report of the Special Rapporteur;

7. Invites the Commission on Human Rights to extend the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for another year and requests the Commission to report on the human rights situation in Chile, through the Economic and Social Council, to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Lebanon, Morocco, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Thailand, United States, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Burma, Chad, China, Colombia, Democratic Kampuchea, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Suriname, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Zaire.

### Territories occupied by Israel

During 1981, the question of human rights violations in the territories occupied by Israel as a result of 1967 hostilities in the Middle East was again considered by the Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. This was in addition to the consideration of political and other aspects by the General Assembly and other bodies (p. 300).

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.** On 11 February, the Commission on Human Rights adopted two resolutions on human rights violations in the occupied Arab territories and another on self-determination for the Palestinian people.

By the first resolution, <sup>(2)</sup> adopted by a roll-call vote of 31 to 3 (Australia, Canada, United

States), with 8 abstentions, the Commission reaffirmed that occupation constituted a fundamental violation of the human rights of the civilians in the territories. It expressed alarm that Israel's policy there was based on the so-called "Homeland" doctrine envisaging a Jewish State including those territories. It called on Israel to take immediate steps for the return of displaced Arabs to their homes and property, and declared that Israel's grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (p. 306) were war crimes and an affront to humanity. It rejected and condemned Israel's decision to annex Jerusalem and alter its character and status (p. 269), shared the Assembly's concern at reports of Israel's intention to legislate changes in the character and status of the occupied Syrian Golan Heights (p. 307), and condemned Israel's persistence in changing the character, demography, institutions and status of that area.

The Commission condemned specified policies and practices and demanded that Israel desist from them, including administrative and legislative measures to encourage and expand the establishment of settler colonies in the occupied territories, which demonstrated a determination to annex the territories. It reaffirmed that all such measures were null and void and that Israel's settlement policy in the territories constituted a flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention and United Nations resolutions. The Commission also condemned the June 1980 assassination attempts on the Mayors of Nablus, Ramallah and Al Bireh (p. 314), as well as the deliberate destruction of the Syrian city of Quneitra in 1974.<sup>(15)</sup> It called for implementation of resolutions on the return of the expelled Mayors of Hebron and Halhul (p. 313). It demanded that Israel cease all torture and ill-treatment of Arab detainees and prisoners, and called for their release. It renewed its request to the Secretary-General to collect information on detainees and make it available to the Commission in 1982.

The Commission reiterated its call not to recognize any changes carried out by Israel in the occupied territories and to avoid taking any action or extending any aid which Israel might use in pursuit of its annexation and colonization policies. It called on Israel to report on implementation of the resolution and decided to give the question high priority in 1982.

By the second resolution,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted by a roll-call vote of 41 to 1 (United States), the Commission condemned Israel's failure to acknowledge the applicability to the occupied territories of the Geneva Convention and expressed deep con-

cern at the consequences of Israel's refusal to apply it. The Commission called on Israel to abide by and respect its obligations arising from the Convention, the Charter of the United Nations and other international instruments, and urged the States parties to the Convention to exert all efforts to ensure respect for and compliance with its provisions in the occupied territories.

By its resolution on self-determination for the Palestinians,<sup>(4)</sup> the Commission reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination without external interference and the establishment of a fully independent and sovereign State in Palestine, and their right to return to their homes and property. It recognized the right of the Palestinians to regain their rights by all means in accordance with the United Nations Charter. It reaffirmed its concern that the 1978 Camp David agreements (between Egypt and Israel) had been concluded outside the United Nations framework and without the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO); rejected provisions which ignored, infringed, violated or denied Palestinian rights and envisaged continued Israeli occupation; strongly condemned all partial agreements which violated Palestinian rights; and declared invalid the Camp David agreements and others purporting to determine the future of the Palestinians and the occupied territories. It urged support to the Palestinians through PLO.

The Commission adopted the text by a roll-call vote of 25 to 9 (Australia, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States, Zaire), with 8 abstentions.

In its general resolution on the right of peoples to self-determination (p. 891), adopted on 6 March,<sup>(5)</sup> the Commission condemned Israel's expansionist policy, its practices in the region and continued aggression against Arab civilians, particularly the Palestinians, and the destruction of their villages and camps. It described these acts as serious obstacles to Palestinian self-determination and independence.

**ACTION BY THE SUB-COMMISSION ON DISCRIMINATION AND MINORITIES.** On 9 September,<sup>(14)</sup> the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities recommended that the Commission on Human Rights: reaffirm the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and the establishment of an independent State, as well as their right to return to their homes and property; urge Israel to withdraw from all the occupied territories, including Jerusalem; deplore human rights violations by Israeli authorities in the occupied territories; condemn the bombardment of Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon (p. 283);



and disapprove of Israel's refusal to implement United Nations resolutions on Jerusalem.

This resolution was adopted by 20 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

**OTHER ACTION.** The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, in its annual report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> issued in September, presented information on the situation and the treatment of civilians in the occupied territories. The Committee concluded that Israel's policy not only denied the right to self-determination but also was the source of continuing and systematic human rights violations (p. 301).

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 16 December, the General Assembly adopted seven resolutions on the situation in the territories occupied by Israel.

One of them<sup>(9)</sup> contained the Assembly's strong condemnation of a series of Israeli policies and practices, including annexation, establishment and expansion of Israeli settlements, expulsion and transfer of Arabs, confiscation of property, transformation and pillaging of cultural property, destruction of houses, mass arrests, ill-treatment of detainees, interference with religious freedoms, family customs, education, development and freedom of movement, and illegal exploitation of natural resources and population. The Assembly demanded that Israel desist from those policies and practices and, by another resolution,<sup>(s)</sup> determined that Israeli measures designed to change the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, had no legal validity.

By four other resolutions, the Assembly demanded that Israel facilitate the immediate return of the Mayors of Hebron and Halhul and the Islamic Judge of Hebron,<sup>(10)</sup> report on assassination attempts against three other mayors,<sup>(13)</sup> rescind orders for the closure of three universities,<sup>(12)</sup> and desist from repressive measures against Syrians in the Golan Heights.<sup>(11)</sup> The Assembly also reaffirmed that the 1949 Geneva Convention on the protection of civilians was applicable to the occupied territories and demanded that Israel comply with its provisions.<sup>(7)</sup>

In a resolution of 28 October on the right of peoples to self-determination,<sup>(6)</sup> the Assembly condemned the expansionist activities of Israel and bombing of Palestinian civilians, and urged support for PLO in its struggle for self-determination.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Israeli practices in occupied territories, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/579.

Resolutions: Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): <sup>(2)</sup>1 A (XXXVII), <sup>(3)</sup>1 B (XXXVII), <sup>(4)</sup>2

(XXXVII), 11 Feb.; <sup>(5)</sup>14(XXXVII), para. 6, 6 Mar. GA: <sup>(6)</sup>36/9 paras. 18 & 20, 28 Oct. (p. 896); <sup>(7)</sup>36/147 A (p. 307), <sup>(8)</sup>36/147 B (p. 305), <sup>(9)</sup>36/147 C (p. 305), <sup>(10)</sup>36/147 D (p. 314), <sup>(11)</sup>36/147 E (p. 308), <sup>(12)</sup>36/147 F (p. 316), <sup>(13)</sup>36/147 G (p. 315), 16 Dec. <sup>(14)</sup>SCPDPM (report, E/CN.4/1512): 9(XXXIV), 9 Sep. Yearbook reference: <sup>(15)</sup>1974, p. 231.

## Other countries

### Bolivia

A Special Envoy, appointed at the request of the Commission on Human Rights in March 1981, visited Bolivia in October to study the human rights situation in that country. The Commission acted at the request of the General Assembly, which in December 1980 had asked it to accept an invitation from the Bolivian Government to have a delegation from the Commission study the situation.<sup>(5)</sup>

The mandate of the Special Envoy, set by the Commission on 11 March 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> was to make a thorough study of the human rights situation in Bolivia. The Bolivian Government was invited to extend its co-operation and the Special Envoy was requested to report to the Commission in 1982 in a manner which would give the Government adequate opportunity to comment in writing. The Commission adopted this resolution by 29 votes to 3, with 8 abstentions.

The appointment of a Special Envoy was approved by the Economic and Social Council on 8 May,<sup>(4)</sup> on the Commission's recommendation. The decision was adopted by 38 votes to 3, with 13 abstentions, following its approval by the Second (Social) Committee on 5 May by 37 votes to 3, with 11 abstentions.

In accordance with the Commission's resolution, its Chairman, after consultations with the other officers, appointed Héctor Gros Espiell (Uruguay) as the Special Envoy. After visiting Bolivia from 20 to 27 October, the Special Envoy transmitted a report to the Government in November which was submitted in December as a document of the Commission.<sup>(1)</sup>

In this report, the Special Envoy said he was convinced that grave, massive and persistent violations of human rights had been committed after 17 July 1980 (the date of the assumption of power by a military Government). Violations of civil and political rights had been committed by State authorities as well as by groups apparently acting in collusion with, at the instigation of or without interference by the authorities. However, the situation appeared to have improved in the months prior to September 1981 and the most serious violations had not recurred with the same intensity.

Official statements by the Government which had come to power on 4 September, to the effect

that it would respect human rights, appeared to have had beneficial effects but had to be translated into deeds. The inadmissible activities of the Government's Special Security Service had to be eradicated, legal guarantees enforced, the efficacy of legal remedies guaranteed, and progress made towards ensuring freedom of expression, assembly and association and prohibiting torture, degrading treatment and arbitrary detention -all the subject of serious abuse since October 1980.

The report added that, on 28 December 1981, Bolivia had asked for an extension to mid-January 1982 of the time-limit for submission of its comments.

Report.: <sup>(1)</sup>Special Envoy, E/CN.4/1500.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 34(XXXVII), 11 Mar.

<sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/185, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 833). Dec.:

<sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1981/148, 8 May 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 19 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/148

38-3-13

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) by vote (37-3-11). 5 May (meeting 19): draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda item 7.

#### Situation Of human rights in Bolivia

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council took note of resolution 34(XXXVII) of 11 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights, and approved the Commission's decision to request its Chairman to appoint, after consultations within the Bureau, a Special Envoy of the Commission whose mandate will be to make a thorough study Of the human rights situation in Bolivia; the Council also requested the Secretary-General to give all necessary assistance to the Special Envoy of the Commission.

#### Cyprus

On 9 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights decided to postpone until 1982 debate on the question of human rights in Cyprus, on the understanding that action required by previous Commission resolutions continued to remain operative, including the request to the Secretary-General to provide a report on their implementation.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 5(XXXVII), 9 Mar.

#### El Salvador

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.** On 11 March 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights expressed deep concern at grave violations of human rights in El Salvador and deplored the murders, abductions, disappearances, terrorist acts and all grave violations reported there. It called on all parties to bring about a peaceful settlement and to seek an end to acts of violence, and urged the Government to take steps to ensure full respect for human

rights. The Commission emphasized that the people of El Salvador had the right to establish a democratically elected government, in an atmosphere free from intimidation and terror, and to determine their own future, free from outside interference.

It requested its Chairman to appoint, after consultations with other Commission officers, a Special Representative to investigate all grave human rights violations; to recommend steps the Commission could take to help secure the enjoyment of human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights; and to submit an interim report to the General Assembly in 1981 and a report on his findings to the Commission in 1982. The Government and others concerned were invited to extend their co-operation.

The resolution was adopted by 29 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** The decision to appoint a Special Representative was approved by the Economic and Social Council on 8 May.<sup>(5)</sup> The Council's decision, based on a draft by the Commission on Human Rights, was adopted by 40 votes to none, with 14 abstentions, following its approval by the Second (Social) Committee on 5 May by 37 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

**ACTION BY THE SUB-COMMISSION ON DISCRIMINATION AND MINORITIES.** On 9 September,<sup>(4)</sup> the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities recommended that the Commission on Human Rights continue to consider the human rights situation in El Salvador. It requested the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of the Commission and its Special Representative the information received by the Sub-Commission on grave human rights violations, and to inform the Sub-Commission in 1982 of the Special Representative's actions and of any consideration by other United Nations bodies. The resolution was adopted by 23 votes to 1.

**REPORT OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE.** The Secretary-General transmitted to the Assembly on 28 October an interim report by the Commission's Special Representative, José Antonio Pastor Ridruejo, on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador.<sup>(6)</sup>

For his analysis, the Special Representative used information from Governments, specialized agencies and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. During a visit to the country from 7 to 10 September, he interviewed a number of people, including the President, Vice-President and members of the Salvadorian junta; he also visited a refugee centre in San Salvador, interviewed two prisoners

detained in national police offices, and held talks with diplomatic representatives and private citizens. After that visit, the Special Representative talked with former junta members in exile, and heard statements and testimony from refugees.

After evaluating the information available, the Special Representative concluded that it was obvious that the great majority of the people did not exercise important economic, social and cultural rights at acceptable minimum levels. Wealth was inequitably distributed and the essential public services of the State, including educational and health services, were insufficient to meet the requirements of the majority. Consequently, far-reaching administrative and social reforms were necessary, especially agrarian reform.

As for civil and political rights, there had been a consistent pattern of gross violations which, in many cases, had culminated in attempts on human life. Members of the State apparatus, violent groups of the extreme right and armed groups of the extreme left were responsible. Deaths and other human rights violations had also resulted from armed clashes between regular forces of the Salvadorian army and opposition guerrilla groups. Executive and judicial organs had adopted a widespread attitude of passivity and inactivity with regard to human rights violations.

The ultimate objective, the Special Representative stated, should be a situation of peace and social justice in which human rights were respected and in which the Salvadorian people was the sole master of its destiny without any outside interference. To attain that objective, he suggested that democratic elections be held in a manner to be specified. He viewed the government plan for holding elections as legitimate and acceptable if and when they took place in a climate of peace in which the rights of free expression, association and assembly were fully respected, a complete and genuine voters' roll was available and the authenticity of the ballot was guaranteed. As a *sine qua non* for elections, the Government and other parties should take steps to end the serious human rights violations, including steps by the Government to control all members of the armed and security forces and all armed organizations and individuals committing such acts. The Government should demonstrate openness and flexibility in regard to other pacification measures, not excluding dialogue with the opposition.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 16 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Salvadorian parties to arrive at a negotiated political solution in order to establish

a democratically elected government. It deeply deplored all acts of violence and grave violations of human rights, drew attention to the fact that the rules of international law were applicable to armed conflicts not of an international character, and requested the parties to apply a minimum standard of protection to the affected population. The Assembly reiterated its appeal to all States to abstain from intervening in the internal situation in El Salvador and to suspend all arms supplies and any type of military support, so as to allow the political forces in that country to restore peace and security. It urged the Government to ensure full respect for human rights, primarily by creating conditions that could lead to a political solution through full participation of all representative political forces. The Commission on Human Rights was requested to examine the situation thoroughly in 1982.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 69 to 22, with 53 abstentions, following its approval by the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee on 3 December by a recorded vote of 65 to 21, with 54 abstentions.

In the Committee, the 10 sponsors orally revised their text by inserting a new paragraph urging the parties to co-operate and not interfere with the activities of humanitarian organizations dedicated to alleviating the suffering of civilians.

Introducing the draft, Mexico said it reflected the concern of many Governments and democratically minded people at the seriousness of the situation, confirmed in the interim report of the Special Representative. El Salvador, as well as all of Central America, could be in serious danger if the internal struggles continued indefinitely and the conflict became increasingly internationalized. The text was not directed against anyone; its sponsors were trying to promote the self-determination of the Salvadorian people and to defend its fundamental rights, thus contributing to the maintenance of peace and security in the region.

El Salvador rejected the resolution as biased and said it overstepped the humanitarian sphere and included highly political considerations which fell exclusively under internal jurisdiction; also, it presented the situation out of context and included elements that were not in keeping with the facts. El Salvador recognized neither the legitimacy of the Special Representative's nomination nor the validity of his interim report, which contained partial judgements, twisted information, showed a desire to interfere in internal affairs and did not reflect the positive attitude of the Government, which had allowed him complete freedom of action and movement. The report gave preference to information and organizations belonging to the extremist opposi-

tion and to information from politically motivated sources; it omitted many details on terrorist acts committed by the extremists, to whose uncontrolled violence the Government was compelled to respond. The Government was taking steps aimed at democratization and the establishment of social justice and, in spite of great difficulties, at restoring peace.

Among those voting against the resolution, Bolivia said it was reprehensible, by a seeming defence of human rights, to attempt to clear the way for international terrorism. Brazil stated that it was for the Salvadorian people alone to decide, without outside interference, on the means of achieving a wise democratic and pluralistic solution. Colombia expressed concern that the noble cause of human rights had become an instrument serving the political designs of a certain ideology, supported by those who did not care much about human rights and did not respect them in their own societies but who considered the protection of human rights useful in their efforts to introduce destabilizing factors into States or regions where they wanted to prevent the strengthening of democratic institutions.

Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Haiti, Paraguay, the Philippines and Venezuela also opposed the singling out of Latin American countries for alleged human rights violations and the interference in their internal affairs. Costa Rica added that the resolution did not reflect the complexity of El Salvador's problems and ignored the efforts by the people and Government to attain peace and justice. Venezuela condemned all human rights violations in El Salvador but opposed the resolution as interference in the country's internal affairs, in violation of the principle of self-determination.

Also casting a negative vote, Israel characterized the resolution as unbalanced and unjustifiably selective. Morocco believed that the resolution took a position in the conflict by contrasting the Government and the armed organizations, giving preference to the latter and thus endowing them with a dimension disproportionate to their political and military weight; Morocco also opposed attempts to compromise efforts for free elections safeguarded from foreign intervention, and thought the best contribution the United Nations could make to reducing tensions in the region would be to support the electoral process. In the view of the United States, the resolution denied the possibility of elections under any conditions foreseeable in practical terms and recommended that the Government begin talks for the purpose of sharing power with the violent Marxist-Leninist minority trying to overthrow it; that approach contrasted with the endorse-

ment of the Government's plans to hold elections in March 1982, given on 7 December 1981 by the General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS).

Among countries abstaining in the vote, Australia thought it inappropriate for the resolution to indicate the procedures for a political solution; it should tackle problems from a purely humanitarian standpoint. In New Zealand's opinion, the resolution was not sufficiently objective and would not contribute to peace and harmony; it regretted that efforts to tone down some passages-particularly paragraphs 2 and 3 and the preambular paragraph which spoke of a passive attitude among the authorities with respect to human rights violations- had not been successful. Singapore believed that the text sought to impose a political solution on the people of El Salvador instead of leaving them to choose their own future, through the ballot box rather than the bullet. Tunisia thought it was essentially up to OAS to find solutions to the problems of one of its members.

Portugal found the text unbalanced and expressed reservations on paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 requesting a negotiated political solution, regretting acts by governmental paramilitary organizations and other armed groups, and appealing for a suspension of military support). Spain said the resolution was polemical and would not help to end the violence; the situation was not due solely to the Government but resulted from a social and economic imbalance exacerbated by external intervention. The United Kingdom said the resolution was unbalanced and did not recognize the lawlessness and violence in El Salvador and the difficulties any Government would have in remedying the situation.

Though supporting certain provisions, particularly the vigorous condemnation of violations, Canada said the resolution included points which went beyond the information given in the Special Representative's report. Though supporting the resolution's appeal to States to abstain from intervention and the call for measures by the Government to ensure respect for human rights, Ecuador said that laying down conditions for reaching a settlement constituted interference in internal affairs. Fiji, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Peru and Solomon Islands abstained because of the text's selective approach; Peru also thought it tried to intervene in El Salvador's internal affairs and said the fact that its sponsors recognized certain political forces in the country was contrary to international law.

Ethiopia said it had voted for the resolution out of respect for human rights but had reservations on some paragraphs. Ghana voted for the text in the belief that the problems in El

Salvador should not be seen in an East-West context but rather in terms of the basic interest of the Salvadorian people. Kenya said it would have voted against some provisions if they had been put to the vote. Vanuatu, although agreeing that other situations of human rights violations merited international attention, could not accept that as a reason not to vote for what it believed to be the principles of the Charter of the United Nations; however, it expressed concern that the southern part of the western hemisphere was being singled out in examining possible human rights violations.

Though endorsing the condemnation of violence in El Salvador and the appeals for peace-making and full respect for human rights, Belgium believed the resolution was incomplete because it did not stress the need for free and democratic elections; a comprehensive political solution prior to elections was an option neither realistic nor democratic. Finland, while supporting the appeal for a peaceful settlement, said some provisions appeared tendentious and even contrary to the conclusions in the Special Representative's report. France said the resolution responded to the gravity of the situation; only a political settlement of national reconciliation, through economic and social reforms and the elimination of outside interference, could ensure full respect for human rights. Stating that its affirmative vote should not be construed as taking sides in the conflict in El Salvador, the Federal Republic of Germany expressed regret that several points of the text attributed blame to one side only.

In Cuba's opinion, it could not be claimed that a call for the restoration of peace, for the elimination of martial law and for strict respect of civil and political rights constituted interference in internal affairs; the only interference was the action of a hegemonistic super-Power providing the Salvadorian junta with 31 per cent of all military assistance to Latin America. Mexico said the resolution opened the way for whatever democratic solution might emerge and did not prejudge that solution. Saint Lucia supported the resolution on the ground that its call for a negotiated political solution would create an appropriate environment for free elections.

During debate in the Third Committee, a number of speakers called for negotiations between the contending parties to bring about a political settlement that would protect human rights. Canada called on all political groups in the country to seek a political solution through elections, and offered to provide technical assistance and to participate in international monitoring of such elections. Sweden, however, said that a political solution through elections was no

longer a realistic solution; only after a cease-fire and through a negotiated settlement with the participation of all parties would it be possible to control the army and guerrilla forces and organize general elections.

Nicaragua stressed the need to promote a political solution through a global and unconditional dialogue involving all parties. The United Kingdom said the European Community (EC) members favoured a dialogue between the Government and all parties, including the opposition, in preparation for elections to be held as soon as possible in conditions which would ensure an impartial and fair result; they called on all parties involved in the fighting to forsake violence and bring an end to the conflict, as well as to promote and respect the free and fair functioning of the democratic process. Yugoslavia spoke of the need for a political and democratic solution, taking account of all political forces in the country and without external interference.

Commenting on the human rights situation as described in the Special Representative's report, Australia expressed concern about human rights violations perpetrated by armed forces of various political persuasions. Denmark said the pattern of atrocities, murders, abductions and large-scale disappearances described in the report was shocking. Norway said the report had confirmed its view of the situation and would serve as a good basis for future work.

Bulgaria stated that the Salvadorian junta, encouraged by imperialist support, had pursued a policy of mass terror against its own people, massacring tens of thousands of them without trial. Hungary and Poland condemned what they described as the crimes committed against the Salvadorians by the military junta.

Calling for an end to flagrant interference in El Salvador's affairs, the Ukrainian SSR said the United States had not stopped supplying military equipment to that country and had sent military advisers to train units carrying out punitive expeditions and to participate in military operations against Salvadorian patriots. The United States, said Mongolia, was providing military assistance to the junta and supporting the mass violations of human rights. The USSR said the imperialist circles of a certain Power were directly involved in the bloody crimes committed in El Salvador. Given the large-scale outside assistance from a country which sought to prove its own prestige and strength, Czechoslovakia said, the people of El Salvador could not realize their aspirations for a democratic society.

The United States said the El Salvador Government, although it had an imperfect command of its security forces confronting a violent enemy, was committed to reform and social

justice, whereas the insurgents were not interested in a political solution that would permit the people to decide.

During the debate, the Netherlands proposed that the Special Representative be invited to assist the Third Committee in its discussion of his interim report. Following discussion of this proposal, the Chairman announced that it had been withdrawn after a request by Venezuela and others that he decide the question. Having concluded that the proposal would have been adopted if it had been put to the vote, the Chairman had invited the Special Representative to attend but he had declined, stating in a letter that he had taken great care to ensure a climate of mutual confidence and co-operation between himself and all parties in El Salvador.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Special Representative, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/608.

Resolutions and decisions: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 32(XXXVII), 11 Mar.; <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/155, 16 Dec., text following; <sup>(4)</sup>SCDPDM (report, E/CN.4/1512), 10(XXXIV), 9 Sep. Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/147, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 18, 19 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 68-70, 72 (19 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/147  
40-0-14

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) by vote (37-0-14), 5 May (meeting 19); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25): agenda item 7.

#### Special Representative of the Commission on Human Rights on El Salvador

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council took note of resolution 32(XXXVII) of 11 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights, and approved the decision of the Commission to request its Chairman to appoint, after consultations within the Bureau, a Special Representative of the Commission on El Salvador; the Council also requested the Secretary-General to give all necessary assistance to the Special Representative of the Commission.

General Assembly resolution 36/155

69-22-53 (recorded vote) Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) by recorded vote (65-21-54). 3 December (meeting 72); 10-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.62), orally revised: agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Denmark, France, Greece, Ireland, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Sweden, Yugoslavia.

#### Situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador

The General Assembly,  
Recognizing the permanent validity of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

Conscious of its responsibility to promote and guarantee the maintenance of those principles and to contribute to ensuring respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all,

Reiterating once more that all Member States have an obligation to protect human rights and fundamental freedoms and to fulfil in this respect the obligations they have undertaken through the various international instruments in this field,

Recalling its resolution 35/192 of 15 December 1980, in which, among other things, it expressed deep concern at the violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador, especially in view of the death of thousands of persons and the climate of repression and insecurity which prevailed in that country, and deplored the assassinations, disappearances and other serious violations of human rights in El Salvador,

Reiterating the appeal made by the General Assembly in that resolution for the cessation of violence and the re-establishment of full respect for human rights in El Salvador and for Governments of all States to refrain from supplying arms and lending other forms of military assistance in the current circumstances,

Bearing in mind Commission on Human Rights resolution 32(XXXVII) of 11 March 1981, approved by the Economic and Social Council in its decision 1981/147 of 8 May 1981, in which the Commission noted the persistence of the climate of violence and insecurity which prevails in El Salvador,

Endorsing the appeal to the Salvadorian parties involved, made by the Commission on Human Rights in its resolution 32(XXXVII), to arrive at a peaceful settlement and put an end to violence in order to prevent further loss of lives and to alleviate the suffering of the people of El Salvador,

Taking note of resolution 10(XXXIV) of 9 September 1981, adopted by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, in which the Sub-Commission stated that only respect for article 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights will assure to the Salvadorian nation, through the participation of all its political forces, the full exercise of its fundamental rights in establishing a democratically elected government, but also noted that at the present time these conditions do not exist in El Salvador,

Having studied the interim report on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador, prepared by the Special Representative appointed by the Commission on Human Rights, which confirms the seriousness of the situation prevailing in El Salvador and, among other things, provides evidence on the general attitude of passiveness and inactivity of the present Salvadorian authorities with respect to the constant human rights violations in that country,

Noting that the situation in El Salvador, as clearly shown in the interim report of the Special Representative, has its root causes in internal political, economic and social factors,

1. Reiterates its deep concern for the situation prevailing in El Salvador and the suffering of the Salvadorian people;

2. Requests once more the Salvadorian parties involved to arrive at a negotiated political solution in order to establish, in an atmosphere free from intimidation and terror, a democratically elected government;

3. Deeply deplores all acts of violence and all grave violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and regrets in particular the persistence of a situation in which governmental paramilitary organizations and other armed groups continue to act with total contempt for the life, security and tranquillity of the civilian population;

4. Draws the attention of all parties concerned to the fact that the rules of international law, as contained in common article 3 of the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, are applicable to armed conflicts not of an international character and requests the parties involved to apply a minimum standard of protection to the affected population;

5. Reiterates its appeal to all States to abstain from intervening in the internal situation in El Salvador and to suspend all supplies of arms and any type of military support, so as to allow the political forces in that country to restore peace and security;

6. Affirms once more that it is incumbent only on the Salvadorian people to exercise their right to determine freely their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development and to establish the conditions and undertake the changes most adequate to their aspirations as a people and as a nation without external interference Of any kind;

7. Urges the Government of El Salvador to adopt the necessary measures to ensure full respect for the human rights of its population in all their expressions, primarily by creating conditions which could lead to a political solution of the present crisis through the full participation of all representative political forces in that country;

8. Urges the parties concerned to co-operate and not interfere with the activities of the humanitarian organizations which are dedicated to alleviating the suffering of the civilian population in El Salvador;

9. Requests the Commission on Human Rights at its thirty-eighth session thoroughly to examine the situation in El Salvador on the basis of the final report of the Special Representative of the Commission on Human Rights;

10. Decides to maintain under consideration, during its thirty-seventh session, the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador, in order to examine anew this situation in the light of additional elements provided by the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Morocco, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Turkey, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chad, China, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Zaire.

## Guatemala

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.** In response to a March 1980 resolution by the Commission on Human Rights,<sup>(6)</sup> the Secretary-General reported in January 1981 on action taken in regard to the human rights situation in Guatemala.<sup>(2)</sup>

The report included a letter to Guatemala from the Secretary-General, dated 13 June 1980, proposing to appoint a representative to visit the country in pursuance of the Commission's request that he bring its resolution to the Government's attention and report on the results of the contact. Guatemala replied on 12 September that in due course it would indicate dates for the visit but, because of violence by clandestine factions, the dispatch of such a representative would not be appropriate for the time being. Replying on 27 October to an expression of hope by the Commission Chairman that human rights would be fully respected, Guatemala again stated that, for the time being, it could not re-

ceive a representative of the Secretary-General but that arrangements for a visit by the OAS Inter-American Commission on Human Rights would be concluded when adequate security and conditions for the Commission to fulfil its task were guaranteed.

The report also transmitted information on the situation in Guatemala from one Government (Venezuela) and four non-governmental organizations, received in response to a 1980 request by the Secretary-General.

Noting the Secretary-General's report, the Commission on Human Rights, on 11 March 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> requested that he continue his efforts to establish direct contacts with the Government of Guatemala and to collect information from all relevant sources. The Commission requested him to present an interim report to the General Assembly in 1981 and a report to the Commission in 1982. It asked the Government to extend its co-operation and decided to keep the question under review as a priority item.

The resolution was adopted by 28 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

**REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.** As requested by the Commission on Human Rights, the Secretary-General presented to the General Assembly in November an interim report<sup>(1)</sup> giving an account of his efforts to establish contacts with Guatemala. By a letter of 24 August, the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs had proposed that Julio Prado Vallejo (Ecuador), a member of the Human Rights Committee, should act as the contact. Guatemala had responded on 11 September that Mr. Prado Vallejo's appointment was unacceptable, since the contacts must be established through a Secretariat member rather than a member of the Committee established under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,<sup>(4)</sup> to which Guatemala was not a party. At the time of submission, the report stated, representatives of the Secretary-General remained in contact with the Government in their effort to establish direct contacts.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 16 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to establish direct contacts and asked Guatemala to co-operate further. The Assembly took this decision, by a recorded vote of 81 to 18, with 45 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, which approved the text, revised in writing and orally, on 3 December by a recorded vote, requested by Guatemala, of 68 to 18, with 41 abstentions.

The draft was orally revised by its sponsors, Ghana and the Netherlands, to have the Assembly request rather than appeal to Guatemala

to co-operate, and to insert "further" after "co-operate".

Introducing the original text in the Committee, Ghana said that, in establishing his contacts with Guatemala, the Secretary-General should be able to choose a Secretariat official or an international expert. There were strong grounds for believing in Guatemala's willingness to co-operate with the Secretary-General. Introducing the revised version, Ghana remarked that a State should not be a Member of the United Nations without having to meet certain international obligations; one of the Organization's functions was to establish norms requiring international respect.

Guatemala rejected the decision, stating that it was inappropriate in a forum like the Assembly; the only appropriate decision would be a procedural one, not a text including conditions and prejudgments which embodied an intention to condemn. Guatemala also rejected the accusations against it, stating that it considered respect for the human person to be the basic principle of law. An international conspiracy, supported by certain Western and Latin American countries, sought to impose on Guatemala a materialist system and ideology, and the Government had taken steps to deal with the violence fomented by them. It would not tolerate interference in its internal affairs. Guatemala had sent a special representative to the 1981 session of the Commission on Human Rights, but the political interests of some members of that body had prompted them to deny him a hearing and to condemn Guatemala without evidence.

Also voting against the decision, Argentina said it refused to co-operate with those who wanted to make Latin America a battleground for conflicts alien to the region. In Bolivia's view, the resolution was aimed at creating divisions in Latin America in order to facilitate extremist penetration. Costa Rica stated that the decision represented an unjust and isolated accusation of a Latin American country that was not being left in peace to demonstrate its good faith by allowing the Secretary-General's representative to visit. Israel described the decision as unbalanced and unjustifiably selective. The United States said it refused to associate itself with a scenario designed to concentrate attention in human rights matters solely on one part of the world.

Abstaining, Fiji, the Philippines and Solomon Islands objected that the decision referred selectively to a single country. Peru said it betrayed a desire to intervene in internal affairs. Tunisia said it was essentially up to OAS to find solutions to its members' problems.

Though voting in favour, Vanuatu expressed concern that the southern part of the western

hemisphere was being singled out in examining possible human rights violations.

Speaking during the Committee's debate on human rights, Sweden said that, in order to avoid developments similar to those in El Salvador (p. 958), the spiralling violence must be stopped and the political process resumed. The United Kingdom said the EC members were concerned at the high level of violence committed by both sides and urged the Government to encourage peace and reconciliation.

Australia, Canada and others expressed hope that the Guatemalan Government would enable the Secretary-General to carry out his mission. The Netherlands hoped the Secretary-General would convey the concern of Member States to the Guatemalan Government. However, Morocco said it was well known that in cases of alleged human rights violations no intervention was possible without the agreement of the country concerned; it had always been understood that prior agreement should be obtained before a special rapporteur was sent.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/705, <sup>(2)</sup>E/CN.4/1438.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: ("Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 33(XXXVII), 11 Mar.; <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 423). Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>GA, 36/435, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 829.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 68, 70, 72 (19 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/435

81-18-45 (recorded vote) Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) by recorded vote 68-18-41), 3 December (meeting 72): Z-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.91/Rev.1), orally revised; agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Ghana, Netherlands.

#### Situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Guatemala

At its 101 st plenary meeting, on 16 December 1981, the General Assembly, having taken note of the report of the Secretary-General on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Guatemala and of Commission on Human Rights resolution 33(XXXVII) of 11 March 1981 on the human rights situation in Guatemala, decided, on the recommendation of the Third Committee:

(a) To request the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to establish direct contacts with the Government of Guatemala;

(b) To request the Government of Guatemala to co-operate further with the Secretary-General in his efforts to establish these contacts.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone.



Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Gabon, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Pakistan, Paraguay, Turkey, United States, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Chad, China, Democratic Kampuchea, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Japan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Zaire.

#### Iran

By a resolution of 9 September 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> adopted by 19 votes to none, with 5 abstentions, the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities expressed profound concern for the perilous situation facing the Baha'i community in Iran, and urged the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to persuade the Government of Iran to prevent further attacks on the Baha'is and to grant them religious freedom. He was requested to submit information regarding their treatment to the Commission on Human Rights in 1982.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>SCPDPM (report, E/CN.4/1512), 8(XXXIV), 9 Sep.

#### Other situations

On 11 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights decided to take no decision on four proposals submitted in connection with its consideration of human rights violations. This decision was taken by a roll-call vote of 24 to 16 (Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Peru, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay), with 3 abstentions.

The proposals were: a draft resolution by Jordan proposing the appointment of a special representative to investigate reports of human rights violations in the Syrian Arab Republic;<sup>(4)</sup> a draft resolution by the Syrian Arab Republic calling on Jordan to end support for terrorist gangs operating in Syrian territory and proposing the appointment of a special representative to collect information on the activities of those gangs;<sup>(5)</sup> a draft decision by the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States in regard to Andrei Sakharov of the USSR, proposing that the Commission deplore that the situation which had given rise to its 1980 debate on the question<sup>(7)</sup> had not been remedied and that it decide to keep the question under review;<sup>(2)</sup> and a draft resolution by the Byelorussian SSR expressing concern at the fate of the non-white population in the United States and urging United States authorities to put an end to racial discrimination.<sup>(s)</sup>

The Head of State of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, by a letter to the Secretary-General annexed to a transmittal letter of 11 August, asked that political-prisoner status be granted to a group of prisoners in Northern Ireland who were dying as a result of hunger strikes.<sup>(6)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 7(XXXVII), 11 Mar.

Draft decision not acted upon: <sup>(2)</sup>Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom, United States, E/CN.4/L.1609.

Draft resolutions not acted upon: <sup>(3)</sup>Byelorussian SSR, E/CN.4/L.1611; <sup>(4)</sup>Jordan, E/CN.4/L.1607; <sup>(5)</sup>Syrian Arab Republic, E/CN.4/L.1610.

Letter: <sup>(6)</sup>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 11 Aug., A/36/434.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1980, p. 831.

### Other aspects of human rights violations

#### Mass exoduses

A Special Rapporteur appointed under a March 1981 resolution of the Commission on Human Rights submitted a study in December on human rights and mass exoduses.

The Commission acted after receiving a January 1981 report by the Secretary-General, submitted in accordance with a March 1980 Commission resolution<sup>(5)</sup> requesting him to consider establishing contacts with Governments in cases where large-scale exoduses had become a matter of international concern and solidarity, to assess the relationship between that situation and full enjoyment of human rights, and to make recommendations for improving the situation.

In his report,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General gave a brief account of the methods employed by the United Nations to facilitate solutions and alleviate suffering in such situations, through contacts and consultations with the parties, the exercise of good offices and appeals for international assistance. He expressed the view that further investigation or articulation of the nexus between human rights violations and mass exoduses deserved consideration by United Nations organs such as the Commission. In devising approaches or procedures for dealing with mass exoduses, caution was to be exercised in the public disclosure of the precise substance of his contacts with Governments, so as to avoid prejudicing future efforts.

Taking note of the Secretary-General's report, the Commission decided on 11 March<sup>(3)</sup> to appoint for one year a special rapporteur to study the question of human rights and mass exoduses. He was authorized to seek information mainly from United Nations agencies and departments, Governments, and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. He was requested to submit his study to the Commission in 1982, together with conclusions and recommendations.

The appointment was approved by the Economic and Social Council on 8 May<sup>(4)</sup> by 46 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions. The Second (Social) Committee approved the decision, based on a draft by the Commission, on 5 May, by 43 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

In his report,<sup>(2)</sup> the Special Rapporteur, Sadruddin Aga Khan (former United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees), concluded that mass movements had become more commonplace and the principle of the law of asylum had been eroded. In exoduses caused by man-made situations, there was a lack of contact between the authorities of the country of origin and the country of asylum, causing humanitarian operations to develop in a vacuum without relation to the origins of the situation. Timely distribution of aid could help circumscribe the flow of persons; conversely, the availability of assistance exclusively within the receiving country could help precipitate population movements. United Nations organs that dealt with causes and prevention of mass exoduses tended to be compartmentalized and ponderous or hamstrung by political constraints, and did not co-ordinate with assistance agencies.

The Special Rapporteur recommended a series of measures to deal with the problem, including: an updating of refugee, nationality and labour law, and fresh consideration of asylum practice; simultaneous approaches to the country of origin and country of asylum to gain a comprehensive view that would improve planning; reappraisal of developing countries' economic needs in relation to possible causes of exodus; standardization of international aid criteria; relating multilateral to bilateral aid so as to prevent duplication and ensure an integrated approach; introduction of a census mechanism to determine the number of border-crossers requiring assistance; introduction of an early-warning system on potential mass exoduses; and the appointment of a special representative for humanitarian questions to forewarn, monitor and depoliticize situations, carry out functions not assumed by humanitarian agencies and serve as an intermediary between parties.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/CN.4/1440; <sup>(2)</sup>Special Rapporteur, E/CN.4/1503.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 29(XXXVII), 11 Mar. Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1981/145, 8 May, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 830.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 19(27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/145  
46-5-2

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) by vote (43-5-2), 5 May (meeting 19); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda item 7.

#### Human rights and mass exoduses

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council took note of resolution 29(XXXVII) of 11 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights, and approved the Commission's decision to appoint for a period of one year a special rapporteur to study the question of human rights and mass exoduses; the Council also requested the Secretary-General to provide the special rapporteur with all necessary assistance, in particular staff and resources, to carry out his study.

#### Hostages

The Commission on Human Rights, on 11 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> affirmed that the taking of hostages constituted a grave human rights violation, exposing the hostages to privation, hardship, anguish, and danger to life and health. The Commission called on all States to observe fully and unconditionally their international obligations to protect diplomatic and consular personnel and premises and to prevent the taking of hostages, and resolved that it would accord due consideration to violations of human rights through hostage-taking.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 27(XXXVII), 11 Mar.

#### Right to promote observance of human rights

The Commission on Human Rights, on 11 March 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> reiterated the right and responsibility of individuals and organs of society to strive for the promotion and observance of the rights recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights<sup>(2)</sup> and the International Covenants on Human Rights.<sup>(3)</sup> It deplored harsh and punitive treatment of individuals, groups or organs of society as a result of their efforts to enjoy civil and political as well as economic, social and cultural rights, and reaffirmed that their responsibility to promote respect for human rights should be in accordance with the relevant international instruments. The Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was requested to study the subject without omitting the indivisibility and interdependence of the two groups of rights, with a view to considering what further action might be desirable.

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 28(XXXVII), 11 Mar. GA: <sup>(2)</sup>217 A (III), 10 Dec. 1948 (YUN 1948-49, p. 535); <sup>(3)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 419).

#### Procedures for examining human rights violations

In accordance with a procedure established by the Economic and Social Council in 1970 for dealing with communications to the United Nations alleging denial or violation of human rights,<sup>(3)</sup> five-member working groups established respectively by the Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commission on dis-

crimination and minorities met privately prior to the 1981 sessions of both bodies to examine such communications and related material. The procedure called for the Sub-Commission to refer to the Commission communications and government replies which appeared to reveal a consistent pattern of gross and reliably attested violations, and for the Commission to decide whether particular situations should be investigated. All actions under this procedure were to remain confidential until the Commission decided to make recommendations to the Council.

The Commission's working group examined documents referred to it by the Sub-Commission in 1980 and submitted a confidential report which the Commission examined at 12 closed meetings in February and March 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> In addition, the Secretary-General distributed to Commission members confidential lists of communications concerning human rights, replies of Governments and a confidential document of a statistical nature. The Commission took confidential decisions relating to Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, the Central African Republic, Chile, El Salvador, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Japan, Mozambique, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Uganda and Uruguay.

As it had done in previous years, the Commission decided on 6 March to set up a working group of five of its members to meet for one week prior to its 1982 session, to examine situations referred to it by the Sub-Commission as well as situations the Commission had decided to keep under review.<sup>(5)</sup> The Economic and Social Council approved this decision without vote on 8 May 1981,<sup>(6)</sup> following similar approval by the Second (Social) Committee on 5 May.

Prior to the August/September session of the Sub-Commission, its five-member Working Group on Communications held its tenth session from 3 to 14 August and submitted a confidential report containing its findings. After considering the matter at four closed meetings on 4 and 7 September,<sup>(2)</sup> the Sub-Commission transmitted its findings to the Commission in a confidential report. The Sub-Commission rejected a proposal to have the working group take its decisions by consensus instead of majority vote.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION.** In its resolution of 14 December on measures to advance human rights, the General Assembly reiterated that priority should continue to be accorded to the search for solutions to mass and flagrant violations of human rights of peoples and individuals, paying due attention to other human rights violations.<sup>(4)</sup>

During the human rights debate in the Assembly's Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural)

Committee, Canada said the United Nations should design and set up a new procedure to deal rapidly and effectively with all urgent situations involving serious violations of human rights; no State should enjoy any immunity in that regard. France suggested that the Commission conduct a public investigation of alleged human rights violations when the confidential procedure proved fruitless. The United Kingdom, speaking for the European Community members, said they were keenly disappointed by the failure of the United Nations to agree on proposals to remedy the lack of machinery to deal with violations, such as establishment of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (p. 929) or inter-sessional activities by the Commission (p. 926).

Some countries criticized what they described as a selective approach by the United Nations to human rights violations. Argentina deplored what it saw as growing politicization of certain aspects of human rights, with the result that, instead of co-operating, Governments rejected the misrepresentation of problems for political reasons and solutions became more remote. Colombia charged that some countries were using human rights, for which they had little respect at home, as a pretext for stirring up trouble in certain States and destabilizing them; while terrorist violence was increasing, international human rights machinery remained silent. Israel regretted that the United Nations did not concern itself with injustices to all minorities and all groups deprived of their rights but dealt almost exclusively with issues in which the numerical majority were interested and which served the propaganda purposes of countries that were among the most flagrant violators of human rights.

New Zealand said that, while it was sometimes necessary to keep the situation in certain countries under special review, the United Nations should not ignore serious violations elsewhere lest its effectiveness in combating abuses all over the world be weakened. The United States asserted that no aspect of United Nations affairs had been more perverted by politicization than its human rights activities; human rights had become a bludgeon wielded by the strong against the weak, by the majority against the isolated, by blocs against the unorganized.

Australia, though agreeing that the United Nations should be concerned about violations wherever they occurred, stated that the action it took on one situation could not be invalidated on the ground that other comparable or even worse situations had not been considered. In India's view, it was difficult to agree that the international community should not concern itself

with any human rights violations until it was in a position to deal with all such situations. Mexico said that, to argue that certain cases could not be condemned or censured unless all were condemned or censured, would lead to the absurd thesis that no criminal could be apprehended and punished unless all were.

The Netherlands observed that United Nations involvement could favourably affect a national human rights situation in general and the fate of individuals in particular; the Committee should take advantage of the fact that the attention paid to Governments in the Committee was of concern to them.

The Byelorussian SSR believed that human rights violations should be dealt with by organs consisting of representatives of Member States. The German Democratic Republic saw a need to establish unambiguous criteria as to what was meant by systematic and mass violations; and the USSR believed that priority should be given to combating mass and flagrant human rights violations in situations which threatened peace and security and which were the consequence of aggression, fascism, racism and the suppression of national liberation movements and democratic forces.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights, E/1981/25 & Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>SCPDP, E/CN.4/1512.

Resolutions and decisions: Res.: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1503(XLVIII), 27 May 1970 (YUN 1970, p. 530); <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/133, para. 3, 14 Dec. 1981 (p. 929). Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>Commission on Human Rights, 4(XXXVII), 6 Mar.; <sup>(6)</sup>ESC, 1981/150, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 19(27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/150

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May (meeting 19); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25 and Corr. 1); agenda item 7.

Establishment of a working group of the Commission on Human Rights to examine situations referred to the Commission under Economic and Social Council resolution 1503(XLVIII) and those situations of which the Commission is seized

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council approved the decision taken by the Commission on Human Rights, in its decision 4(XXXVII) of 6 March 1981, to set up a working group composed of five of its members to meet for one week prior to its thirty-eighth session to examine such particular situations as might be referred to the Commission by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities at its thirty-fourth session, under Council resolution 1503(XLVIII) of 27 May 1970, and those situations of which the Commission is seized.

## Other human rights questions

Human rights in armed conflicts

In February 1981, the Secretary-General submitted, in accordance with a 1979 General As-

sembly resolution,<sup>(3)</sup> his annual report on States that had ratified or acceded to the two 1977 Protocols<sup>(4)</sup> Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 concerning respect for human rights in armed conflicts.<sup>(1)</sup>

As at 31 December 1981 -according to information submitted in the corresponding report for 1982<sup>(2)</sup>-20 States had ratified or acceded to Protocol I, on protection of victims of international armed conflicts (names of States adhering in 1981 are italicized): Bahamas, Bangladesh, Botswana, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Niger, Norway, Sweden, Tunisia, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia. All of these States except Cyprus and Viet Nam had also adhered to Protocol II, on protection of victims of non-international conflicts.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>A/INF/36/2 & Add.1 & Add.1 Corr.1, <sup>(2)</sup>A/INF/37/2.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 34/51, para. 2, 23 Nov. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 839).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1977, p. 706.

Proposed establishment of a new international humanitarian order

By a resolution of 14 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to seek the views of Governments on a proposal by Jordan for the promotion of a new international humanitarian order, and decided to consider the question in 1982 on the basis of the Secretary-General's report.

The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, which approved the 12-nation draft on 30 November 1981 in like manner.

The proposal on a new international humanitarian order had been submitted by Jordan in a letter of 28 October<sup>(1)</sup> requesting the inclusion of an item on the subject in the agenda of the 1981 Assembly session. Annexed to the letter were a general outline of the concept and historical background on humanitarian law.

Introducing the draft resolution, Jordan said the concept of a new international humanitarian order, proposed by Crown Prince Hassan of Jordan in a statement to the Assembly in September, was based on the urgently felt need to fill gaps in international humanitarian law, in terms of both principles and mechanisms for remedial action. The response to major natural and man-made disasters had been generous but fragmentary, and much remained to be done in regard to both human welfare-including disaster relief and international economic disparities-and human rights. Once a basic frame-

work was established for the new order, its implementation would depend on the improvement of international institutions. To elaborate the idea, Jordan suggested the establishment of a working group of some 20 leading personalities in human rights or experts in international humanitarian law.

In the Committee, Yugoslavia favoured the deletion of the second and third preambular paragraphs (citing the importance of improving a comprehensive international framework relating to humanitarian questions and the possible need to strengthen institutional arrangements and action of governmental and non-governmental bodies) on the ground that they implied that the Committee had already taken a stand on the proposal, which might prejudice the discussion in 1982.

In Australia's view, efforts for missing persons and the elimination of torture were among the more important issues to be addressed in this context. Romania thought that priority should be given to issues requiring concerted action, such as hunger and malnutrition, diseases, illiteracy, education, natural disasters, and guarantees for economic, social and cultural rights; to promoting a new humanism based on the principle that personal happiness was incompatible with exploitation of man by man; and to universal respect for the right to peace. Speaking for the European Community members, the United Kingdom said the proposal seemed to have the laudable goal of consolidating methods and instruments; in view of the extremely complex problems involved, however, Governments would need time to consider it.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Jordan, 28 Oct., A/36/245.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/136, 14 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56, 61, 63, 64, 66 (19-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.97 (14 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/136

Adopted without vote Meeting 97 14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/786) without vote, 30 November (meeting 66): 12-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.65); agenda item 138.

Sponsors: Algeria, Austria, Chile, Djibouti, Ecuador, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Pakistan, Romania, Suriname.

New International humanitarian order

The General Assembly,

Noting with Interest the proposal for the promotion of a new international humanitarian order,

Recognizing the Importance of further Improving a comprehensive international framework which takes fully Into account existing instruments relating to humanitarian questions as well as the need for addressing those aspects which are not yet adequately covered,

Bearing in mind that institutional arrangements and action of governmental and non-governmental bodies might need to be further strengthened to respond effectively in situations requiring humanitarian action,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to seek the views of Governments on the proposal for the promotion of a new International humanitarian order:

2. Decides to consider the question at its thirty-seventh session on the basis of the report of the Secretary-General.

Rights of the child

Draft convention

ACTIVITIES OF THE WORKING GROUP. The Working Group on a draft convention on the rights of the child, established by the Commission on Human Rights, met at Geneva between 26 January and 27 February 1981 to continue work begun in 1979 on the basis of a draft submitted that year by Poland. The Group completed one article that had been partially approved in 1980 and adopted five additional articles, but was unable to complete consideration of the draft for lack of time.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Group, open to all Commission members, was headed by Adam Lopatka (Poland) as Chairman/Rapporteur. As authorized by the Economic and Social Council in May 1980 at the Commission's request,<sup>(4)</sup> the Group met from 26 to 30 January, prior to the Commission's 1981 session. The Commission then decided on 3 February that the work of the Group should continue during its session.

The Working Group adopted paragraph 2 of article 2, and articles 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8. These pertained to: acquisition of the nationality of the State where the child was born if no other nationality was granted; ensuring that the child's best interests would be taken into account, that the child's views would be heard, that protection and care would be afforded and that personnel of child-care institutions were properly supervised; the guarantee of each child's rights without distinction or discrimination; the duty of States parties to ensure those rights through administrative and legislative measures; free expression of the child's opinion; and primary responsibility of parents or guardians for the child's upbringing and development, and provision for assistance from the State, including measures to ensure child-care services and facilities.

ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL. On 10 March,<sup>(2)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights decided to continue in 1982 its work on the draft convention with a view to completing it for transmission to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council. To facilitate completion of the draft convention, the Commission requested the Council to authorize a one-week session of an open-ended working group prior to the Commission's 1982 session.

The Council gave its authorization on 8 May 1981, by a decision<sup>(5)</sup> adopted without vote. The Second (Social) Committee had approved the

text, based on a draft by the Commission, on 5 May in like manner.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 25 November,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly welcomed the Council decision to authorize a working group and requested the Commission to give the highest priority to completion of the draft convention. It decided to include the item in the provisional agenda of its 1982 session.

The Assembly adopted the resolution, without vote, on the recommendation of its Third Committee, which approved the 66-nation draft on 3 November 1981 in the same manner.

Introducing the draft resolution, Poland said it took into account the advanced stage of work and offered the Assembly's encouragement to the Commission. Poland's initiative for a convention had resulted from mounting concern over the fact that children were the first to suffer from poverty, and from the conviction that a convention could enhance the complementarity of national and international efforts and serve as a catalyst for change.

In October, Poland submitted to the Third Committee a working paper on the status of the draft convention, including the articles agreed on by the Commission and the proposed text of 20 additional articles, incorporating revisions to the text previously submitted.<sup>(6)</sup>

In the Committee, many speakers expressed support for the adoption of a draft convention, among them Australia, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea, France, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Norway, the Philippines, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, the USSR, Viet Nam and Zaire. Bulgaria, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR hoped the draft convention would be completed and adopted in 1982. The Council decision to authorize a working group was welcomed by the Byelorussian SSR, Hungary, New Zealand and others.

In Guyana's view, effective protection of the rights of the child meant first of all meeting the child's basic needs, such as sufficient food, adequate medical care, a decent level of living and a proper education; the enjoyment of those rights was inseparable from an improvement in the economic and social conditions of developing countries and the establishment of a new and more just international economic order. Uganda thought that some provisions of the draft convention placed on States responsibilities with vast financial implications, such as that of guaranteeing an education to all children, which developing countries would be unable to implement in the near future.

Argentina thought the distinction between childhood and adolescence should be clearly re-

flected in the convention, and that age of minority should not be included since it was a legal state rather than a stage of psycho-biological development. The Lao People's Democratic Republic said it did not agree with the proposal to delete or rephrase draft article 6 which, in its opinion, fully guaranteed the rights of the child, the responsibility for whom lay essentially with the family. Yemen thought that, in elaborating the convention, special attention should be given to the situation of children in Namibia, South Africa and occupied Palestine.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Working Group, E/CN.4/L.1575.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 26(XXXVII), 10 Mar. <sup>(3)</sup>GA: 36/57, 25 Nov., text following.

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(4)</sup>1980/138, 2 May 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 883); <sup>(5)</sup>1981/144, 8 May 1981, text following.

Working paper: <sup>(6)</sup>Poland; A/C.3/36/6.

Meeting records; ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-17, 19 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.27-36, 38 (22 Oct.-Y Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/144

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May (meeting 19); draft by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25): agenda item 7.

Draft convention on the rights of the child

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council took note of resolution 26(XXXVII) of 10 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights, and decided to authorize a one-week session of an open-ended working group prior to the thirty-eighth session of the Commission to facilitate completion of the work on a draft convention on the rights of the child.

General Assembly resolution 36/57

Adopted without vote Meeting 73 25 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/662) without vote, 3 November (meeting 38): 66-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.14); agenda item 86.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Question of a convention on the rights of the child

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 33/166 of 20 December 1978, 34/4 of 18 October 1979 and 35/131 of 11 December 1980,

Mindful of the vital link between programmes benefiting children and the observance of their rights, and a broader and more comprehensive framework of overall economic and social development in conditions of peace,

Convinced that the fresh and necessary impetus to activities generated by the International Year of the Child should be maintained and that the new perspectives it has created should be followed by appropriate action in the years to come,

Reaffirming the important role that the United Nations Children's Fund has to play in the subject-matter concerned,

Aware of the importance of an international convention on the rights of the child for the protection of children's rights and improvement in their situation,

Having in mind Commission on Human Rights resolutions 20(XXXIV) of 8 March 1978, 19(XXXV) of 14 March 1979, 36(XXXVI) of 12 March 1980 and 26(XXXVII) of 10 March 1981, as well as Economic and Social Council resolutions 1978/18 of 5 May 1978 and 1978/40 of 1 August 1978 and Council decisions 1980/138 of 2 May 1980 and 1981/144 of 8 May 1981.

Noting with appreciation the further progress made in the elaboration of a draft convention on the rights of the child by the Commission on Human Rights prior to and during its thirty-seventh session,

1. Welcomes Economic and Social Council decision 1981/144 by which the Council authorized an open-ended working group of the Commission on Human Rights to meet for a period of one week prior to the thirty-eighth session of the Commission to facilitate completion of the work on the draft convention on the rights of the child;

2. Requests the Commission on Human Rights to give the highest priority to the question of completing the draft convention;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to provide all necessary assistance to the working group in order to ensure its smooth and efficient work;

4. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled 'Question of a convention on the rights of the child'.

#### Exploitation of child labour

**REPORT OF THE SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR.** A report on the exploitation of child labour,<sup>(1)</sup> authorized by the Economic and Social Council in May 1980<sup>(4)</sup> and prepared by a Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, Abdelwahab Bouhdiba (Tunisia), was submitted to the Sub-Commission in 1981.

The report was based on documentation supplied by the United Nations, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), including studies by the Anti-Slavery Society for Protection of Human Rights. The report dealt with economic, social, cultural and psychological aspects of the problem of child labour, affecting an estimated 145 million children, especially in developing countries. It also dealt with activities which fell into the category of slavery and slavery-like practices: the sale of children and pressing them into serfdom, child prostitution and child pornography.

The report contained suggestions for a global campaign strategy against the exploitation of child labour, including: a broad public information campaign; an appeal for national legislation on the minimum age for admission to employment; an international training programme for inspectors specializing in child labour, with the assistance of international organizations; special activities by trade unions; and national or regional research into the forms, conditions, structures and implications of the exploitation of child labour.

The Special Rapporteur stressed the need to make families aware of their responsibilities and of the need to avoid concealing or being unwitting parties to the activities of child exploiters. Also, consideration should be given to the relationship between school, apprenticeship and child labour. He called for action by the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol) and increased pressure on States in the most flagrant types of exploitation, including sale and serfdom, child prostitution and trafficking in pornography, and under-aged maidservants in positions of servitude. Further suggestions included extension of the Sub-Commission's role to support the strategy, organization of a human rights seminar on the subject, joint research and other activities by NGOs, and international assistance to help States with national measures.

**REPORT BY THE WORKING GROUP ON SLAVERY.** In its 1981 report to the Sub-Commission,<sup>(2)</sup> the Working Group on Slavery (p. 913) also dealt with the exploitation of child labour, urging further consideration of reports on child labour in Greece and Jamaica, and on child prostitution, especially in certain Asian countries.

**ACTION BY THE SUB-COMMISSION ON DISCRIMINATION AND MINORITIES.** Endorsing the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Rapporteur, the Sub-Commission, on 10 September,<sup>(3)</sup> by 22 votes to none, decided to transmit his report to the Commission on Human Rights and recommended that it also be transmitted to several specialized agencies and United Nations bodies, as well as to Interpol, for comment. The Sub-Commission requested that the attention of the United Nations University be drawn to the Rapporteur's suggestion that the University undertake a five-year research programme and regional pilot studies on child labour and its circumstances. It recommended that the United Nations Division of Human Rights hold as soon as possible, under its advisory services programme (p. 937), a seminar on human rights violations through the exploitation of child labour. It decided to consider in 1982 the drawing up of a concrete programme of action to combat violations of the human rights of children through the exploitation of child labour, and invited the Special Rapporteur to present recommendations or observations.

The Sub-Commission recommended that the Economic and Social Council authorize the printing and widest possible distribution of the report and that the Commission on Human Rights invite the Sub-Commission to present to the Council, through the Commission, an action programme to combat human rights violations through exploitation of child labour.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Exploitation of child Labour. Final report submitted by Abdelwahab Bouhdiba, Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/CN.4/Sub.2/479/Rev.1), Sales No. E.82.XIV.2.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Working Group on Slavery, E/CN.4/Sub.2/486 & Corr.1.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(3)</sup>SCPDPM (report, E/CN.4/1512), 18(XXXIV), 10 Sep. Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1980/125, 2 May 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 884).

#### Youth and human rights

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.** By a resolution of 12 March 1981 on the role of youth in the promotion and protection of human rights,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights emphasized the important role of young people in the promotion of their country's economic and social development, especially in efforts to overcome such obstacles to development as colonialism and neo-colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid foreign domination and occupation, aggression and threats to national sovereignty, national unity and territorial integrity, and denial of the right of peoples to self-determination and the exercise of full sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources. The Commission called on Member States to encourage and ensure the active participation of youth in the formulation and implementation of development programmes, and decided to consider in 1982 the role of youth in the promotion of social and economic progress.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a resolution of 13 November,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly called on all States, in view of the International Youth Year (IYY) in 1985 (p. 1019), to adopt legislative, administrative and other measures for the implementation and enjoyment by youth of human rights, particularly the right to education and to work, aimed at solving the problem of youth unemployment. It appealed to governmental organizations and NGOs to pay increased attention to securing the basic right of young people to education, vocational training and work. The Assembly requested the Commission on Human Rights and other United Nations bodies and agencies to give continuous attention to the youth unemployment problem, and requested the Advisory Committee for IYY to ensure systematic and continuous attention to the promotion of human rights and their enjoyment by youth.

The resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 136 to none, with 5 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, which approved the 21-nation text on 26 October by a recorded vote, requested by Singapore, of 129 to none, with 11 abstentions. The text had been revised

by the sponsors, twice in writing and once orally, and amended by the Committee.

The text incorporated two amendments by Morocco which were adopted by vote in Committee. One of them affected paragraph 3, by which the Assembly requested that attention be given to the problems of youth unemployment; at the end of this paragraph the amendment, adopted by 80 votes to 30, with 18 abstentions, replaced the phrase "and the securing of its right to work" by "and to resolving them". The other amendment, adopted by 86 votes to 25, with 19 abstentions, inserted the words "whenever possible" in the fourth preambular paragraph, which mentioned the need for action to codify and implement the rights of youth. The amended preambular paragraph was adopted by a recorded vote of 99 to none, with 37 abstentions; the vote was requested by Sweden and the German Democratic Republic asked that it be recorded.

The sponsors had orally revised their draft in the light of other amendments by Morocco. As a result, references to the right to education were inserted in the resolution's title and three places in its text. In addition, as proposed by Sweden in an oral sub-amendment which Morocco had accepted, the words "human rights of youth" were replaced by "enjoyment by youth of human rights". The revised text also incorporated editorial changes suggested orally by Ethiopia and Ghana.

Morocco withdrew several other amendments it had proposed to an earlier version of the text, including a proposal to remove youth unemployment problems from the list of topics for the IYY Advisory Committee. Introducing these amendments, Morocco remarked that the objective of the resolution, though commendable, could not be achieved in the immediate future in view of the difficulties many States had in dealing with unemployment.

Introducing the original draft in the Committee, Czechoslovakia stated that the most critical problem afflicting young people was unemployment. The resolution sought to encourage Governments and international organizations to focus on improving the legal and material status of young people and safeguarding their right to work.

Speaking of an earlier version of the text prior to the incorporation of some of the Moroccan amendments, the United Kingdom remarked, on behalf of the European Community (EC) members, that care should be taken not to accord young people special rights which would make them a privileged group; also, the lack of a definition of the right to work made the text too vague and open to conflicting interpretations. Czechoslovakia responded that the right to work



was provided for in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,<sup>(2)</sup> and could not be omitted from a resolution drawn up on that basis.

Explaining its abstention in the Committee and Assembly votes, the United States expressed regret that the text had been politicized by insertion of the phrase "right to work", the use of which was intended to promote the supposed benefits of a centralized economy, based on compulsion. Abstaining in Committee, Canada voted for the resolution in the Assembly, saying its purposes and aims were valid; however, Canada continued to be against any further codification of the rights of youth or any other group of that kind. A similar point was made by the United Kingdom on behalf of the EC members, which voted for the resolution. Though voting in favour, Sweden, speaking for the five Nordic States, commented that it was unnecessary and misleading to speak of young people's right to work as a separate issue, since the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights embodied everybody's right to work; the problem should be solved not by legislation but by economic policy aimed at full employment and by training programmes.

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25); 39(XXXVII), 12 Mar. GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 419); <sup>(3)</sup>36/29, 13 Nov. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.15-17, 19, 21-26, 27-29 (12-26 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.57 (13 Nov.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/29

136-0-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 57 13 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/637) by recorded vote (129-0-11), 26 October (meeting 29); 21-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.20/Rev.2), amended by Morocco (A/C.3/36/L.30, amendments to fourth preambular paragraph and to operative paragraph 3 only) and Orally revised: agenda item 76.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Equatorial Guinea, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Efforts and measures for securing the implementation and the enjoyment by youth of human rights, particularly the right to education and to work

The General Assembly,

Mindful of the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,

Recalling its resolution 34/151 of 17 December 1979, by which it decided to designate 1985 as International Youth Year: Participation. Development. Peace,

Recognizing the profound importance of the role of youth for the all-round development of each country.

Convinced of the need for further action aimed at the codification and implementation, whenever possible, of the rights of youth with special regard for the right to work, stipulated in article 6 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as one of the fundamental human rights.

Aware of the fact that the unemployment of youth is a hindrance to the full participation of young people in the socio-economic life of their country, limits their ability to participate in the development process and is, furthermore, a source of increased social ills, and in this regard emphasizing the importance of secondary and higher education of youth as well as of its access to appropriate technical, vocational guidance and training programmes,

Considering it necessary that States and also international organizations and their bodies should examine in a more comprehensive, systematic and effective manner ways and means to secure the implementation of human rights and their enjoyment by youth, particularly the right to education and to work, aimed at solving the problem of youth unemployment,

1. Calls upon all States, in view of the forthcoming International Youth Year, to adopt appropriate legislative, administrative and other measures, for the implementation and the enjoyment by youth of human rights, particularly the right to education and to work, aimed at solving the problem of youth unemployment;

2. Appeals to the respective governmental and non-governmental organizations to pay, during the preparation and observance of the International Youth Year, increased attention to the securing and realization of the basic right of young people to education and vocational training and to work;

3. Requests the Economic and Social Council, the Commission for Social Development and the Commission on Human Rights, as well as other relevant bodies of the United Nations and specialized agencies, to give continuous attention to the problems of the unemployment of youth and to resolving them;

4. Requests the Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year to ensure that, in the context of the preparations for the Year, systematic and continuous attention is given to the efforts aimed at the promotion of human rights and their enjoyment by youth, particularly the right to education and vocational training and to work, with a view to resolving the problem of youth unemployment.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Leo People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Fiji, Israel, Japan, Papua New Guinea, United States

#### Human rights, peace and development

WORK OF THE SEMINAR. A Seminar on the Relations that Exist between Human Rights, Peace and Development, organized within the framework of the human rights advisory service programme (p. 937), was held in New York from

3 to 14 August 1981. The decision to convene the Seminar had been taken by the General Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(5)</sup> The Commission on Human Rights, in a resolution of 11 March 1981<sup>(3)</sup> concerned mainly with the right to development (p. 921), requested the Secretary-General to hold the Seminar at United Nations Headquarters in August and established three priority items for it to consider: the relationship between human rights, peace and development; the impact of the arms race in the realization of peace and the right to development; and concrete measures for the full enjoyment of human rights, particularly of peace and the right to development.

The Commission's request was endorsed by the Economic and Social Council on 8 May.<sup>(9)</sup> The Council took this decision by 38 votes to 1, with 12 abstentions, following approval by its Second (Social) Committee on 5 May by the same vote. The 15-nation draft was introduced by Algeria.

The Seminar, attended by representatives of 28 Governments, United Nations and specialized agency officials, and participants from intergovernmental organizations, NGOs and four national liberation movements, adopted by consensus a number of conclusions, which, were included in its report.<sup>(2)</sup> It agreed that human rights, peace and development were interrelated and that the absence of peace or development could not exempt a State from its obligation to ensure respect for human rights. The maintenance of international peace and security for all peoples and individuals was vital for social and economic progress and for the full realization of human rights, and the great resources which would be released by disarmament could contribute in a major way to the development of all States, especially developing countries.

The Seminar recommended that: human rights organs, particularly the Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, should examine practical issues arising from the interrelationship between human rights, peace and development; the United Nations, when dealing with development, should give human rights aspects greater attention, and concerns for human rights should be reflected in the deliberations and in the principles and programme of action of the 1982 special session of the General Assembly on disarmament (p. 27); and the enlightenment of public opinion by information dissemination through the mass media and educational institutions was vital for the promotion and realization of human rights, peace and development.

The Secretary-General, by a note of 25 September,<sup>(1)</sup> informed the General Assembly

that the Seminar had recommended that its report be submitted to the 1981 Assembly session and to several United Nations human rights bodies.

**ACTION BY THE SUB-COMMISSION ON DISCRIMINATION AND MINORITIES.** On 10 September 1981,<sup>(10)</sup> the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities decided to include in the provisional agenda of its 1982 session a new item entitled "The effects of gross violations of human rights on international peace and security".

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** In the preamble of its resolution of 14 December 1981 on measures for the advancement of human rights,<sup>(8)</sup> the General Assembly took note with appreciation of the Seminar's report.

The Assembly, in a resolution of 9 December on strengthening international security, stated that respect for and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms in their civil, political, economic, social and cultural aspects contributed to the strengthening of international peace and security.<sup>(6)</sup>

In its Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States,<sup>(7)</sup> adopted on the same day, the Assembly declared it to be the duty of a State to refrain from exploitation and distortion of human rights issues as a means of interference in the internal affairs of States, of exerting pressure on other States or creating distrust and disorder within and among States or groups of States. It also declared that States had the right and duty to observe, promote and defend all human rights and fundamental freedoms within their territories and to work for the elimination of massive and flagrant violations of the rights of nations and peoples, in particular apartheid and racial discrimination.

Explaining its position on the Declaration, the United States objected to the provision on exploitation and distortion of human rights issues, stating that its confusing and imprecise language could be interpreted as discouraging progress towards internationally recognized standards. Finland said it would have voted against the paragraph, and Greece said it could not subscribe to provisions which appeared to limit human rights. Ireland thought some provisions were inconsistent with the Assembly's 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights.<sup>(4)</sup>

In the Third Committee debate on human rights, several States commented on the results of the Seminar on human rights, peace and development. One important result, said Australia, was the conclusion that it was possible to examine critically the meaning of international human rights standards without detracting from their universality; to acknowledge that there

were universal standards did not mean that those standards should be systematically implemented in the same way and always judged by the same criteria. Bulgaria and the Byelorussian SSR believed that respect for human rights was feasible only in conditions of peace, international security and understanding. The German Democratic Republic suggested that United Nations bodies, particularly the Commission on Human Rights, give maximum priority to an analysis of the disastrous consequences of the arms race for the implementation of human rights. Lesotho endorsed the Seminar's conclusion that human rights, peace and development were interdependent.

The Netherlands said it did not accept the notion that respect for human rights was dependent on the achievement of development; there were rights that could never be derogated from, even in situations of underdevelopment. In New Zealand's opinion, the proposal by the Seminar to place on the Assembly's agenda a new item concerning the world human rights situation deserved careful study.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/482.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Seminar, ST/HR/SER.A/10,

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 36(XXXVII), para. 9 & annex, 11 Mar. GA: <sup>(4)</sup>217 A (III), 10 Dec. 1948 (YUN 1948-49, p. 535); <sup>(5)</sup>35/174, para. 6, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 882); <sup>(6)</sup>36/102, para. 9, 9 Dec. 1981 (p. 145); <sup>(7)</sup>36/103, annex., paras. 2.II (I) & 2.III (c), 9 Dec. (p. 148); <sup>(8)</sup>36/133, 14 Dec. (p. 928).

Decisions: <sup>(9)</sup>ESC: 1981/156, 8 May, text following.

<sup>(10)</sup>SCPDP (report, E/CN.4/1512): 4(XXXIV), 10 Sep.

Financial implications: S-G note, E/1981/C.2/L.17.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12-16, 17, 19 (27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/156

38-1-12

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) by vote (38-1-12). 5 May (meeting 19); 15-nation draft (E/1981/C.2/L.20); agenda item 7.

Sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Burundi, Cuba, Egypt, Ghana, India, Jordan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Senegal, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Seminar on the relations that exist between human rights, peace and development

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council, noting resolution 36(XXXVII) of 11 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights, endorsed the request of the Commission to the Secretary-General to hold at United Nations Headquarters, within the framework of the advisory service programme, the seminar on the relations that exist between human rights, peace and development to be held in August 1981, as decided by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/174 of 15 December 1980, and to give priority in the programme of the seminar to the items mentioned in the annex to resolution 36(XXXVII) of the Commission on Human Rights.

Duty of the individual to the community

STUDY BY THE SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR. At the 1981 session of the Commission on Human Rights, a Special Rapporteur of the Sub-

Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, Erica-Irene A. Daes (Greece), introduced her study on the individual's duties to the community and limitations on human rights and freedoms. <sup>(1)</sup> The study had been requested by the Sub-Commission in 1974.<sup>(6)</sup>

The general purposes of the study, the Special Rapporteur stated, were to contribute to the freedom of the individual under law, to provide guidelines and supply Governments with United Nations standards, to examine and define the duties and responsibilities of the individual to the community, and to indicate the basic judicial and other procedures and remedies against unlawful or arbitrary restrictions on individual rights and freedoms.

The report contained several recommendations. In connection with the duties of the individual to the community, it suggested that the General Assembly recommend to Member States that human rights teaching and education be developed at all levels in school and out-of-school education, and that such teaching should also concern human rights in armed conflicts. It also recommended that the Sub-Commission prepare a draft declaration on the principles governing the responsibilities of the individual in connection with the promotion and observance of human rights, to be submitted to the Commission on Human Rights in 1983.

With regard to limitations on the exercise of certain human rights and freedoms, the Special Rapporteur presented a number of conclusions interpreting the grounds for imposing limitations or restrictions, and recommended that the Sub-Commission elaborate principles and guidelines for United Nations standards. She also recommended the elaboration of standards for the protection of human rights in time of public emergency.

ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL. On 10 March 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the Commission on Human Rights recommended to the Economic and Social Council that the study on the individual's duties to the community and limitations of rights be printed and given the widest possible distribution. The Commission endorsed the Special Rapporteur's recommendation on teaching and education on human rights, and decided to consider in 1982 the question of setting further standards in the field. The Commission adopted this resolution by 28 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

Taking up another recommendation of the Special Rapporteur in her report, the Commission, also on 10 March,<sup>(3)</sup> recommended to the Council that it authorize the Sub-Commission to

appoint Mrs. Daes as Special Rapporteur for a study on the status of the individual and contemporary international law, taking into account doctrines and practices in various legal systems. The Commission requested the Special Rapporteur to submit a preliminary report to the Sub-Commission in 1982 and a final report the following year. The resolution was adopted by 26 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

The Council took the requested action on 8 May 1981.<sup>(5)</sup> The decision, based on drafts by the Commission, was taken without vote, following similar approval by the Second Committee on 5 May.

The Special Rapporteur informed the Sub-Commission in September of the approach she intended to follow for preparation of the new study.<sup>(2)</sup>

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>The Individual's Duties to the Community and the Limitations on Human Rights and Freedoms under Article 29 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: A Contribution to the Freedom of the Individual under Law-Study prepared by Erica-Irene A. Daes, Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/CN.4/Sub.2/432/Rev.2), Sales No. E.82.XIV.1.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>SCPDP.M, E/CN.4/1512.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25), 10 Mar.: <sup>(3)</sup>18(XXXVII), <sup>(4)</sup>19(XXXVII).

Decision: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/142, 8 May, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1974, p. 681.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.9, 12, 17, 19(27 Apr.-5 May); plenary, E/1981/SR.18 (8 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/142

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/46) without vote, 5 May (meeting 19); drafts by Commission on Human Rights (E/1981/25); agenda item 7.

The individual's duties to the community and the limitations on human rights and freedoms under article 29 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

a contribution to the freedom of the individual under law  
At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council:

(a) Took note of resolution 18(XXXVII) of 10 March 1981 of the Commission on Human Rights and decided to authorize the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to appoint Mrs. Erica-Irene A. Daes as Special Rapporteur with the mandate of undertaking a study on the status of the individual and contemporary international law, in accordance with the terms of Commission resolution 18(XXXVII), and to request the Secretary-General to give the Special Rapporteur all the assistance she might require in her work;

(b) Took note of resolution 19(XXXVII) of 10 March 1981 of the commission on Human Rights, and decided that the study prepared by Mrs. Erica-Irene A. Daes, entitled "Study on the individual's duties to the community and the limitations on human rights and freedoms under article 29 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: a contribution to the freedom of the individual under law", should be printed and given the widest possible distribution, including distribution in Arabic.

Human rights and science and technology

ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS. By a resolution of 12 March 1981,<sup>(3)</sup>

the Commission on Human Rights stressed the importance of implementing the General Assembly's 1975 Declaration on the Use of Scientific and Technological Progress in the Interests of Peace and for the Benefit of Mankind.<sup>(4)</sup> It instructed the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities to study the use of the results of scientific and technological progress for the realization of the rights to work and to development, and decided to examine the study in 1983.

The resolution was adopted by 28 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions.

CONSIDERATION BY THE SUB-COMMISSION ON DISCRIMINATION AND MINORITIES. This topic was considered in September 1981 by the Sub-Commission on discrimination and minorities, which reviewed an ongoing study of guidelines for the protection of persons detained on grounds of mental illness (p. 906) and heard a statement outlining the content of a continuing study on guidelines for computerized personal files, particularly as they affected the privacy of the individual.<sup>(2)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 25 November,<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly stressed the importance of implementing the Declaration on scientific and technological progress. It called on States to use the achievements of science and technology in order to promote peaceful social, economic and cultural development; requested United Nations agencies and organizations to take account of the provisions of the Declaration in their programmes and activities; and invited them as well as Member States to submit information on its implementation. The Assembly requested the Commission on Human Rights to give special attention to implementation of the Declaration.

The Assembly took note of a September 1981 report by the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> which it had requested in December 1980,<sup>(5)</sup> containing information submitted by 13 Governments on implementation of the Declaration.

The resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 119 to none, with 24 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, where, on 3 November, the 25-nation draft was approved by 116 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.

The approved text incorporated oral revisions by the sponsors. The main change, taking account of a suggestion by Somalia affecting paragraph 2, had the Assembly call on States to use scientific and technological achievements to "promote peaceful social, economic and cultural development and progress", rather than to "ensure the right to work and right to development".

In another resolution adopted in connection with this topic, the Assembly requested the

Commission on Human Rights to continue consideration of the protection of persons detained on grounds of mental ill-health.<sup>(7)</sup>

Introducing the resolution on human rights and science and technology, the Byelorussian SSR held it essential to prevent the results of scientific and technological progress from being used to the detriment of human rights.

Explaining the abstentions of the European Community (EC) members in the vote, the United Kingdom said that, as in their view the 1975 Declaration did not sufficiently guarantee individual human rights, they had reservations about the validity of the request that the Commission on Human Rights give special attention to its implementation.

Speaking during the Committee debate, Argentina hoped the communications media would promote the ideas contained in the Declaration. Colombia stated that countries with scientific and technological know-how should not be preoccupied with opportunism and a concern for short-term commercial gain; developing countries must have access to all scientific knowledge, not only to the portion others judged good for them. Cuba said the Committee should condemn the misuse of science and technology of the kind that had been directed against Cuba by the United States.

Liberia believed that deterioration of the environment and violations of such individual rights as the right to life and the right to a good standard of living were the most serious issues which would arise in connection with scientific and technological progress during the next decade. Malawi considered the question of human rights and scientific and technological developments to be of immediate importance for national development. Mali thought the question should be studied in the light of the ethics of each people. Morocco suggested that, following completion of the studies already requested from the Secretary-General, the Assembly might recommend exhaustive studies on the topic and consider drafting specific instruments to protect the individual, as well as to protect peoples against the threat of weapons of mass destruction. Zimbabwe stated that technological advances must be used to better the lives of peoples, not push them to the brink of extinction; the major arms-producing countries must be persuaded that their efforts should be directed to development.

The Byelorussian SSR, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and others expressed the conviction that the strengthening of peace and international security and the curbing of the arms race were among the essential prerequisites for the application of the results of scientific and technological progress to development. The

German Democratic Republic called for a closer examination of the impact of scientific and technical development, which in capitalist countries had led to intensified exploitation and growing unemployment, on the right to work and the conditions of work. Romania stressed the need for scientists throughout the world to wage an unremitting struggle to ensure that the fruits of their labour contributed to building a better and more just world and not to war and discord. The Ukrainian SSR stated that it used science and technology only in the interest of society and to encourage democracy, not as a means of interfering in the private lives of citizens. The USSR described steps it was taking to ensure that science and technology were placed at the service of all members of Soviet society.

Stating that inadequate scientific and technological development limited the effective enjoyment of human rights, France said it had reservations on a number of past United Nations resolutions because they had not taken full account of two aspects: the need to define uses contrary to human rights and to determine what measures were conducive to accelerating scientific and technological progress in all countries. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, said the benefits from science and technology could not be dissociated from the abuses to which they gave rise, nor could their prospect of a world free from hunger and want be dissociated from the threat they posed to human rights; Governments had the obligation to protect their people from the abuses, whether they were modern weapons threatening human survival or the misuse of psychiatry by authorities to imprison in mental hospitals sane individuals who disagreed with the established regime.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/429 & Add.1.2: <sup>(2)</sup>SCPDPM. E/CN.4/1512.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 38(XXXVII), 12 Mar. GA: <sup>(4)</sup>3384(XXX), 10 Nov. 1975 (YUN 1975, p. 631); <sup>(5)</sup>35/130 A, para. 4, 11 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 878); <sup>(6)</sup>36/56 A, 25 Nov. 1981, text following; <sup>(7)</sup>36/56 B, 25 Nov. (p. 907). Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.27-36, 37, 38 (22 Oct.-3 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/56 A

119-0-24 (recorded vote) Meeting 73 25 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/661) by vote (116-0-25), 3 November (meeting 38); 25-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.31), Orally revised, taking account of oral amendments by Somalia: agenda item 85.

Sponsors: Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Viet Nam.

#### The General Assembly,

Noting that scientific and technological progress is one of the important factors in the development of human society,

Reaffirming that scientific and technological progress is a necessary prerequisite for accelerating social and economic development in all countries.

Noting once again the great importance of the Declaration on the Use of Scientific and Technological Progress in the Interests of Peace and for the Benefit of Mankind, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 3384(XXX) of 10 November 1975,

Considering that implementation of the said Declaration will contribute to the strengthening of international peace and the security of peoples, and to their economic and social development as well as to international co-operation in the field of human rights.

Seriously concerned that the results of scientific and technological progress could be used for the arms race to the detriment of international peace and security and social progress, human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the dignity of the human person,

Convinced that, in the era of modern scientific and technological progress, the resources of mankind and the activities of scientists should be used for the peaceful economic, social and cultural development of all countries and for raising the living standards of peoples,

Recognizing that the establishment of the new international economic order calls in particular for an important contribution to be made by science and technology to economic and social progress,

Bearing in mind that the exchange and transfer of scientific and technological knowledge is one of the basic ways to accelerate the social and economic development of the developing countries,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on human rights and scientific and technological developments,

1. Stresses the importance of the implementation by all States of the provisions and principles contained in the Declaration on the Use of Scientific and Technological Progress in the Interests of Peace and for the Benefit of Mankind in order to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms under conditions of scientific and technological progress;

2. Calls upon all States to make every effort to use the achievements of science and technology in order to promote peaceful social, economic and cultural development and progress;

3. Requests the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to take into account in their programmes and activities the provisions of the Declaration;

4. Invites those Member States, specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system that have not yet done so to submit their information in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/130 A of 11 December 1980;

5. Requests the Commission on Human Rights to give special attention, in its consideration of the item entitled "Human rights and scientific and technological developments", to the question of the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Human rights and scientific and technological developments".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kam-

puchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

#### Publication

On 25 November 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to instruct the United Nations Department of Public Information to prepare in United Nations working languages a booklet outlining the main points of studies he had prepared on human rights and scientific and technological developments.

The Assembly took this decision, without vote, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, which similarly approved the draft, submitted by France, on 3 November. It incorporated an oral revision by the sponsor specifying that the booklet should be prepared "using the available resources".

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/413, 25 Nov., text following.

Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.3/36/L.40.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.27-36, 37, 38 (22 Oct.-3 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

#### General Assembly decision 36/413

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/661) without vote, 3 November (meeting 38); draft by France (A/C.3/36/L.35), orally revised: agenda item 85.

#### Human rights and scientific and technological developments

At its 73rd plenary meeting, on 25 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, decided to request the Secretary-General to instruct the Department of Public Information to prepare, using the available resources, in the various working languages of the United Nations so as to give it the widest possible publicity, a booklet outlining the main points of the studies on human rights and scientific and technological developments which had been prepared by the Secretary-General in pursuance of Assembly resolution 2450(XXIII) of 19 December 1968 and other relevant resolutions of the Assembly and had been submitted to the Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights.

## Chapter XIX

## Women

Efforts for the advancement of women were highlighted in 1981 by the entry into force in September of the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, a fact welcomed with great satisfaction by the General Assembly.<sup>(17)</sup> At year's end, the Convention had been signed by 87 States, and ratified or acceded to by 32 States.

Also in 1981, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare a multisectoral and interdisciplinary survey on women's role in development.<sup>(5)</sup> It considered but deferred action on a draft Declaration on the Participation of Women in the Struggle for the Strengthening of International Peace and for the Solution of Other Vital National and International Problems (p. 990).

In connection with the United Nations Decade for Women (1976-1985), the Economic and Social Council<sup>(2)</sup> stressed the need for urgent implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the Decade, and the Assembly<sup>(6)</sup> called on Governments to continue taking measures aimed at ensuring women's equal participation in the development process (p. 985). At the same time, the Assembly requested the Commission on the Status of Women to give priority consideration in 1982 to the question of preparations for the 1985 World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women, and to submit proposals to the Assembly (p. 985).

Among a series of guidelines given to competent bodies within the United Nations system, the Assembly defined the role of its Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee and the Commission on the Status of Women with regard to questions on women's role in development;<sup>(7)</sup> decided that the Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women should continue its activities beyond the Decade (p. 982); and requested the Secretary-General to report in 1984 on the implications of relocating the Fund within the Secretariat's Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs, at Vienna, Austria.<sup>(9)</sup> The Economic and Social Council, for its part, wished that prompt and effective co-operation would be instituted between the Centre's Branch for the Advancement of Women, the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women

(INSTRAW), the Statistical Office and the Commission on the Status of Women;<sup>(1)</sup> and invited all United Nations organizations not to perpetuate the idea that women constituted a marginal category relating only to social welfare.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Assembly also pronounced on the question of equal rights to work, when it invited Governments in host countries to consider granting working permits for spouses accompanying members of diplomatic missions or consular posts and staff members of international organizations.<sup>(10)</sup>

Work of INSTRAW in 1981 focused on the development of organizational and administrative procedures (p. 996). The agreement between the United Nations and the Dominican Republic concerning establishment of INSTRAW at Santo Domingo was signed in March (p. 998), and Dunja Pastizzi-Ferencic of Yugoslavia assumed her duties as the Institute's Director in June (p. 997).

Sharing the hope expressed by the Council<sup>(3)</sup> that INSTRAW would start functioning shortly, the Assembly urged all Governments to consider making financial contributions or extending co-operation to it.<sup>(8)</sup>

All Assembly action was taken in December, while the Council adopted its resolutions relating to women in May.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(1)</sup>1981/11 (p. 993), <sup>(2)</sup>1981/12 (p. 981), <sup>(3)</sup>1981/13 (p. 996), <sup>(4)</sup>1981/26 (p. 987), 6 May. GA: <sup>(5)</sup>36/74, 4 Dec. (p. 989); <sup>(6)</sup>36/126 (p. 982), <sup>(7)</sup>36/127 (p. 990). <sup>(8)</sup>36/128 (p. 997). <sup>(9)</sup>36/129 (p. 984), <sup>(10)</sup>36/130 (p. 994), <sup>(11)</sup>36/131 (p. 995), 14 Dec.

## UN Decade for Women (1976-1985)

Implementation of the  
Programme for 1981-1985

In 1981, both the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly dealt with implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women, adopted by the 1980 World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace.<sup>(5)</sup> The Council acted after consideration of proposals by the Secretary-General for Programme implementation. Information on Programme implementation was also contained in a report on preparations for the 1985 World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women (p. 985), submitted by the Secretary-General to the Assembly in October."

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** The Economic and Social Council, by a resolution of 6 May adopted by a recorded vote of 47 to 1, with 5 abstentions,<sup>(3)</sup> reaffirmed the importance and need for urgent implementation of the Programme of Action. The Council recognized the role of resident co-ordinators in Programme implementation, reaffirmed the importance of strengthening the role of the regional commissions and invited relevant United Nations bodies to inform the Council of action taken to integrate their activities into the global effort to implement the Programme. In addition, the Council requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Assembly later in the year a report containing concrete proposals and specific measures to ensure its urgent and full implementation.

Venezuela introduced the text on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries and orally revised it to indicate that the resident co-ordinators not only could help ensure but, indeed, should ensure co-ordination of activities. The Council's Second (Social) Committee approved the draft on 29 April by a recorded vote of 45 to 1, with 5 abstentions.

In a 13 April report to the Council on Programme implementation proposals,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General noted the suggestions made at the March meeting of the Consultative Committee on Substantive Questions of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, including the establishment of interorganizational working groups in the four regional commissions in developing regions. At the national level, designation of resident representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as co-ordinators and team-leaders was considered helpful in maintaining co-operation among all United Nations organizations.

In addition, the Secretary-General informed the Council of activities undertaken by the Branch for the Advancement of Women, of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs (CSDHA), which served as the focal point of the Decade for Women, and noted that a programme of monitoring, review and research had been prepared to look into relationships between women's advancement and various determining factors.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** Welcoming the entry into force in 1981 of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (p. 994), the General Assembly affirmed on 14 December<sup>(4)</sup> that the implementation of the Programme of Action and recommendations made at the 1980 World Conference should result in the complete integration of women into the development process (p. 986) and in the effective

realization of the objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women.

The Assembly called on Governments to continue taking measures aimed at full implementation of the Programme, and urged United Nations organizations to devote resources and attention to Programme implementation and the regional commissions to report to the Economic and Social Council in 1982 on the evolution of women in their development programmes. It requested the Council to consider Programme implementation and the Commission on the Status of Women to submit in 1982 proposals for the preparations for the 1985 World Conference (p. 985). It emphasized the role of CSDHA as the focal point in the United Nations system for Programme implementation; stressed the need for close and continued co-operation between the United Nations system and the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (p. 996); and took note with satisfaction of the effective contribution by the Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women (p. 983) to the Programme's implementation.

The resolution was adopted without vote, following its approval in the same manner by the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee on 24 November.

The text was introduced by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 and was subsequently orally revised to incorporate some amendments suggested by France, such as deleting a request that the regional commissions submit reports on the subject every two years.

In explanation of positions, continued reservations on the Programme of Action, particularly its paragraph 5 containing a reference to Zionism as a form of racism, were expressed by Australia, Austria, Japan, New Zealand, Norway (for the Nordic countries), Portugal, the United Kingdom (on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Community) and the United States. Spain also reiterated the reservations it had expressed at the 1980 Conference, and Canada hoped the adoption of the text would help overcome the divisiveness that had arisen at that Conference as a result of the introduction of extraneous elements. Israel dissociated itself from the consensus on this and other resolutions based on the Programme of Action, which contained a call for the elimination of Zionism.

Support for the Programme was expressed during the Committee debate by a number of countries, including Afghanistan, Cape Verde, the Congo, the German Democratic Republic, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Oman, Poland, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and Zimbabwe.



The German Democratic Republic said the Programme provided effective machinery to ensure women's equality in all spheres of life. The Byelorussian SSR stated that implementation of the Programme's objectives depended on the nature and extent of national efforts, while the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya called for Programme implementation by international organizations and specialized agencies. Egypt thought that the Secretariat should have taken further steps to draw attention to the need to implement the Programme.

The Netherlands said it was endeavouring to formulate a national action programme based on the Programme, and New Zealand explained that, although it could not formally vote in favour of the Programme of Action, it had taken specific steps to implement a national programme. The importance of national action within the framework of the Programme was reaffirmed by several other States, including Belgium, Bolivia, the USSR and Yugoslavia.

Speaking for the Nordic countries, Denmark stated that only very slow progress had been made during the first half of the Decade and that determined political efforts were necessary if the Programme was to be implemented satisfactorily. Portugal and the United Kingdom thought that, despite some unacceptable elements, the Programme contained realistic proposals.

Reservations to the Programme were made by Chile. The United States declared it would continue to participate in activities beneficial to women and in efforts to attain the objectives of the Decade; however, propaganda must be left behind and attention must be given to the real problems of women which were the need for better food, better health facilities and care, education, and less arduous work.

Several countries attached importance to the provisions of the Programme linking the struggle for international peace and security with the struggle for women's equality (p. 990), among them Bulgaria, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Uganda and the USSR.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/564 & Corr.1, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1981/32.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/12, 6 May, text following;

<sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/126, 14 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 890.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-8, 10, 12 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.41, 44-48, 50, 51, 53, 59, 60 (5-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.97 (14 Dec.).

Statement: NGOs, E/1981/NGO/2.

Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Woman  
The Economic and Social Council,

Reaffirming General Assembly resolution 35/136 of 11 December 1980, in which the Assembly endorsed the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women, as adopted at the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/78 of 5 December 1980, in which the Assembly called upon all regional commissions and other organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to make every effort to implement the recommendations and resolutions of the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women related to the integration of women in the development process,

Recognizing the need for women's active participation in the achievement of a just and lasting peace and social progress, the establishment of the new international economic order, complete respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and the integration of women into the development process so that the equality of men and women may be affirmed and their situation improved,

Reaffirming that the realization of equal rights for women at all levels and in all areas of life would contribute to the struggle for the elimination of colonialism, neo-colonialism, all forms of racism and racial discrimination and apartheid,

Emphasizing the need for urgent and full implementation of the special measures of assistance to women called for in the Programme of Action,

1. Reaffirms the importance of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women and stresses the need for its urgent and full implementation at the international, regional and national levels for the further promotion of the objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women;

2. Takes note of the proposals for the implementation of the Programme of Action contained in the report of the Secretary-General;

3. Recognizes that the resident co-ordinators of the operational activities for development of the United Nations should ensure co-ordination among the organizations of the United Nations system for the implementation of the Programme of Action;

4. Reaffirms the importance of strengthening and enhancing the role of the regional commissions, which should be kept informed of the progress achieved and actions taken at the global level by the United Nations system. In order to facilitate necessary follow-up at the regional level;

5. Takes note with interest of the system of co-ordination at the national level being developed by the Economic Commission for Africa;

6. Invites relevant specialized agencies, regional commissions and other United Nations organizations to provide information to the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982 on the follow-up action taken by them with a view to integrating their activities into the global effort to implement the Programme of Action;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to make available to the Commission on the Status of Women at its twenty-ninth session the information referred to in paragraph 6 above;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session a report containing concrete proposals and specific measures to ensure urgent and full implementation of the Programme of Action, including the special measures of assistance called for therein.

Recorded vote in Economic and Social Council as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, China, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Thailand,

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/12

47-1-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/51) by recorded vote (45-1-5), 29 April (meeting 12); draft by Venezuela, for Group of 77 (E/1981/C.2/L.10), orally revised; agenda item 9.

Turkey, USSR, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, United Kingdom.

General Assembly resolution 36/126

Adopted without vote Meeting 97 14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/789) without vote, 24 November (meeting 60): draft by Algeria, for Grout of 77 (A/C.3/36/L.47), orally revised, incorporating amendments by France (A/C.3/36/L.57, paras. 1,2 and 4-6): agenda item 88 (a).

#### United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/136 of 11 December 1980, in which it endorsed the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women, and decided to convene in 1985, at the conclusion of the Decade, a World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women,

Bearing in mind its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362 (S-VII) of 16 September 1975, on development and International economic co-operation,

Emphasizing the importance attached in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade to the need to improve the status of women and ensure their full participation in the development process as agents and beneficiaries of development,

Taking note of chapter XXV, on the role of women in development, of the New Delhi Declaration, adopted by the conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981,

Emphasizing that the recommendations made in the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the Decade and in other relevant decisions and resolutions adopted by the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women should immediately be translated into concrete action by States, the organizations of the United Nations system and inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations,

Welcoming the entry into force on 3 September 1981 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the growing number of States that have ratified it,

Convinced that the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women must be given the assistance needed to enable it to begin to function as early as possible in the host country,

Noting that the review and appraisal of the progress made by Governments in implementing the Programme of Action will be carried out by the Commission on the Status of Women every two years, beginning with the Commission's twenty-ninth session,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women,

1. Affirms that the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women and of the relevant recommendations, resolutions and decisions adopted by the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women should result in the complete integration of women into the development process and in the effective realization of the objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace;

2. Calls upon Governments to continue taking the measures necessary for achieving substantial progress in the implementation of the relevant recommendations of the Programme of Action with a view to ensuring equal participation by women as agents and beneficiaries in all sectors and at all levels of the development process;

3. Calls upon the organizations of the United Nations system, including the regional commissions, to reserve adequate resources for, and pay increased attention to, the implementation of the Programme of Action, particularly as regards the dissemination of information of the participation of women;

4. Urges the regional commissions to report in full to the Economic and Social Council, at its first regular session of 1982, on the evolution of the situation of women in all the sectors of their development programmes, in order to strengthen and reorient the programmes and reporting methods of those commissions, so as to reflect more adequately the regional concerns of women;

5. Requests the Economic and Social Council, at its first regular session of 1982, to consider the implementation of the Programme of Action, giving high priority in this regard to the report of the Commission on the Status of Women;

6. Emphasizes the role of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs of the Secretariat as the focal point for the organizations of the United Nations system with regard to the implementation of the Programme of Action, in order to achieve the goals and objectives of the Decade, and requests the Secretary-General to give the Centre the assistance required to enable it to carry out its mandate;

7. Requests the Commission on the Status of Women at its twenty-ninth session, to be held in February 1982, to give priority to the question of the preparations for the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women, to be held in 1985, which will mark the end of the Decade, with a view to submitting to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, through the Economic and Social Council, specific proposals on that question;

8. Stresses the need for close and continued co-operation between the United Nations system and the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women and requests the Secretary-General to take all necessary measures to allow the Institute to carry out its mandate;

9. Takes note with satisfaction of the effective contribution made by the Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women to the implementation of the Programme of Action;

10. Invites the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly, at its thirty-seventh session, a report on the steps taken to implement the present resolution;

11. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace".

#### Voluntary Fund for the Decade

In 1981, \$3.4 million in funding was approved for 68 new and five ongoing projects under the Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women, of which 56 were at the country level and 17 at the regional and subregional levels. Of all country projects financed from the Fund, 59 per cent were located in least developed, land-locked and island developing countries:

Rural and poor urban women, many of them heads of families, continued to be the Fund's major beneficiaries and there was a noticeable increase in 1981 in projects dealing with women in urban slums who worked in large-scale industries. Intended to give women more equitable access to the resources and benefits of the development process, the Fund continued to assist innovative and experimental activities which

could later be financed from other sources: energy projects originally sponsored by the Fund, for instance, attracted several million dollars from other funds in 1981.<sup>(4)</sup>

The \$2.1 million pledged at the 1981 United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities (p. 426) was considered insufficient to meet the multiplying demands on the Fund. Lack of resources affected the Fund's operations at a time when women's critical role in the fight against poverty had begun to be recognized and the Fund's activities were demonstrating that women could contribute more productively to development and participate more equitably in its benefits.

Information on developments and activities of the Fund in 1981, an outline of its financial situation and needs, and a summary of the recommendations made by the Consultative Committee on the Fund at its ninth (16-20 March) and tenth (31 August-4 September) sessions in New York, were contained in a November report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup>

Concerning the Fund's future beyond the United Nations Decade for Women ending in 1985, the Consultative Committee noted that an overwhelming majority of responses from Member States and organs of the United Nations system were in favour of continuation, for reasons of the Fund's catalytic, innovative and co-ordinating roles as well as absence of other more immediate or permanent resources.<sup>(3)</sup> The Committee considered it desirable that an affirmative decision be taken following the 1985 World Conference (p. 985).

In its 14 December resolution on the United Nations Decade for Women,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly took note with satisfaction of the effective contribution made by the Fund to the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the Decade. In a separate action, taken without vote on the same day,<sup>(6)</sup> the Assembly underlined the importance of the Fund's contributions towards realization of the goals of the Decade; decided that the Fund should continue its activities beyond the Decade; urged Member States to increase their contributions; and stressed the Fund's interrelationship with the Advancement of Women Branch of CSDHA (p. 985).

The draft was approved without vote in the Third Committee on 19 November, when it was introduced by the Netherlands, also on behalf of the Bahamas, Morocco, New Zealand, Oman, Samoa, Senegal and Somalia. It was presented as a compromise text incorporating the views contained in another draft which was co-sponsored, and later withdrawn, by India, Jamaica and Nigeria.<sup>(1)</sup> That draft, rather than noting the interrelationship, stressed the need for integration of the Fund's activities within CSDHA and emphasized

the importance of those activities' responding to the priorities in the Programme of Action.

Introducing the revised draft, the Netherlands said that, while there were divergent views on the Fund's future, there was clear support for its activities.

Appreciation and support for the Fund's activities, in particular projects in rural areas and for the least developed, land-locked and island developing countries, was expressed during the Committee debate by a number of speakers, among them Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Chile, Egypt, France, Japan, Malawi, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, Uganda, the United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe. Morocco noted with satisfaction that the Fund had financed 220 projects with contributions from 70 Member States, and New Zealand said the Fund had done much to increase the direct participation of women in development projects (p. 985). Sri Lanka welcomed in particular the emphasis on support to employment-generating activity. Nepal said the Fund's resources should be more closely geared to the needs of the poorest women in low-income countries, while Italy felt that the Fund should be not only a source of direct support for innovative and experimental activities benefiting rural and poor urban women, but also a catalyst encouraging major agencies and funds to consider women's needs in their development assistance programmes. Algeria considered that the Fund should enable the implementation of projects normally not included in national programming. Japan urged that efforts be made to involve more countries in the Fund's Consultative Committee.

Extension of the Fund beyond the end of the Decade was favoured by the majority of speakers, among them Belgium, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guyana, India, Morocco, Nepal, Suriname and Zimbabwe. The United Kingdom, on the other hand, said it would welcome more time to consider the matter, and Australia felt that the Fund should be retained at the end of 1985 but as a special fund within UNDP. The Netherlands hoped that, by the end of the Decade, United Nations agencies would have integrated the Fund's activities in their regular programmes. Yugoslavia was convinced that CSDHA would succeed in finding the most propitious way of ensuring continuation of the Fund's activities.

Several countries, including Benin, Sierra Leone and Uganda, expressed concern at the shortage of the Fund's resources and appealed for generous contributions.

The following table shows the status, as at 31 December 1981, of contributions and pledges made to the Fund.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE VOLUNTARY FUND FOR THE  
UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN, 1981 AND 1982  
(as at 31 December 1981; In US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment	1982 pledge
Algeria	5,000	-
Australia	-	174,419
Austria	21,000	21,000
Barbados	1,000	-
Belgium	130,582	-
Bolivia	10,101	-
Brazil	10,000	-
Chile	5,000	5,000
China	50,000	-
Democratic Yemen	3,646	1,323
Denmark	-	37,241
Finland	116,360	112,360
France	16,949	35,398
Greece	3,500	-
Honduras	3,000	1,000
Iceland	2,000	1,000
India	15,000	6,000
Indonesia	-	20,000
Iraq	-	2,000
Italy	126,840	254,237
Lesotho	-	500
Luxembourg	7,485	-
Madagascar	-	883
Maldives	1,000	-
Mexico	5,073	5,195
Netherlands	128,070	-
New Zealand	8,286	-
Nigeria	9,058	-
Norway	290,670	672,269
Pakistan	10,101	10,101
Philippines	5,000	6,000
Qatar	5,000	5,000
Republic of Korea	-	2,000
Samoa	300	-
Sao Tome and Principe	500	-
Senegal	-	1,000
Spain	-	60,000
Sweden	100,000	100,000
Switzerland	50,000	-
Syrian Arab Republic	500	-
Thailand	2,000	-
Togo	1,807	-
Trinidad and Tobago	-	1,008
Turkey	125	-
United Republic of Cameroon	-	2,209
United Republic of Tanzania	2,442	2,442
United States	1,000,000	-
Zimbabwe	-	5,000
Total	2,147,395	1,544,585

Draft resolution withdrawn <sup>(1)</sup>India, Jamaica, Nigeria, A/C.3/36/L.49.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/646, <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/647 & Corr.1, <sup>(4)</sup>DP/1982/22.

Resolutions: GA. 14 Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>36/126, para. 9 (p. 982); <sup>(6)</sup>36/129, text following.

Meeting Records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.41, 44-48, 50, 51, 57(5-19 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.97(14Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/129

Adopted without vote Meeting 97 14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/789) Without vote, 19 November (meeting 57); 8-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.52/Rev.1); agenda item 88 (b).

Sponsors: Bahamas, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Oman, Samoa, Senegal, Somalia.

#### Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women The General Assembly.

Recalling its resolution 3520(XXX) of 15 December 1975, by which it proclaimed the period from 1976 to 1985 United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace,

Recalling its decision of 15 December 1975 to extend the activities of the Voluntary Fund for the International Women's Year so as to cover the period of the Decade,

Recalling its resolution 31/133 of 16 December 1976, containing the criteria and arrangements for the management of the Fund,

Recalling its resolution 32/138 of 16 December 1977,

Recalling also its resolution 34/156 of 17 December 1979, in which it expressed the desire to see the activities developed by the Fund continued beyond the United Nations Decade for Women and decided to review at its thirty-sixth session the decision regarding the location of the Fund in New York,

Recalling further Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/3 of 16 April 1980,

Bearing in mind its resolution 35/136 of 11 December 1980, in which it endorsed the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women,

Conscious that the Fund is intended to supplement, through financial and technical support, the activities for implementing the goals for the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace,

Noting with appreciation the effective management and continuing expansion of the Fund's activities and the co-operation extended by the relevant organs of the United Nations, including the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund and the regional commissions,

Reaffirming the role of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs of the Secretariat as the focal point for inter-agency co-operation towards the implementation of the Programme of Action,

Noting with appreciation the support given by the Fund to projects in the developing countries,

/Voting also with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General on the future of the Fund,

1. Notes with satisfaction the decisions of the Consultative Committee on the Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women during its ninth and tenth sessions;

2. Expresses its appreciation for the voluntary contributions pledged by Member States and urges them to contribute or increase their contributions to the Fund;

3. Decides that the Fund should continue its activities beyond the United Nations Decade for Women;

4. Stresses the importance of the contributions of the Fund towards the realization of the goals and objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women;

5. Stresses also the interrelationship of the Voluntary Fund with the Advancement of Women Branch of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs, of the Secretariat;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to invite the views of Member States on how best the Fund can continue its activities beyond the Decade and to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session;

7. Requests also the Secretary-General, taking into account the views expressed by Member States on this matter, to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session a report on the substantive and financial implications of, and his proposals for the timing and modalities for, a relocation of the Fund within the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs of the Secretariat in order to enable Member States to take a decision in the matter.

#### Location of the Fund

The Secretary-General noted in his November 1981 report<sup>(1)</sup> that the question of the Fund's location had elicited responses from 24 Member States, of which 12 considered that the Fund should remain in New York, 11 favoured its location at Vienna, Austria, and one wished to

make no comment. He recalled that while the Fund's managing body, CSDHA, had moved to Vienna in 1979, the Fund itself remained administratively located in New York. In view of the fact that the Fund's activities were essential for achieving the goals of the Decade and integral to the continuing programme for the advancement of women, with which CSDHA was charged, the Secretary-General considered it logical and desirable that the Fund's operation be fully integrated within CSDHA at Vienna.

The General Assembly, in a resolution of 14 December,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to submit in 1984 a report on the substantive and financial implications of, and his proposals for the timing and modalities for, a relocation of the Fund within CSDHA in order to enable Member States to decide on the matter.

During the debate in the Assembly's Third Committee, several countries, including Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Jamaica, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Suriname, spoke for relocation of the Fund to Vienna, while others, such as Australia, Guyana, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States, thought it should remain in New York.

Nigeria expressed regret that a final decision had not been reached and Pakistan urged a quick decision. Malawi, on the other hand, said the proposal to relocate the Fund must be carefully assessed with regard to the Fund's effectiveness, and Ethiopia felt that a change of location required stronger justification than had been presented. Sri Lanka considered it preferable to await the results of the deliberations of the Fund's Consultative Committee, rather than attempt to resolve the question in 1981. In Egypt's view, the decision should be based on practical considerations and should ensure that the Fund's activities were not adversely affected.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/647.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/129, para. 7, 14 Dec. (p. 984).

#### 1985 World Conference

The World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women, to be convened in 1985 at the conclusion of the Decade, was to review achievements and consider a strategy for future United Nations activities. The decision to hold the Conference was taken by the General Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(2)</sup>

In an October 1981 report,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General indicated that the Secretariat was giving preliminary consideration to the Conference's preparation and a report would be submitted to the Commission on the Status of Women in 1982. Preliminary arrangements were also

being made to ensure that the procedures for undertaking the 1982-1983 round of monitoring, review and appraisal of implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the Decade (p. 979) and other international instruments for the advancement of women were adapted to the need to provide the Conference with up-to-date information.

In its 14 December resolution on the Decade,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Commission on the Status of Women, at its February 1982 session, to give priority consideration to the question of preparations for the 1985 World Conference and to submit specific proposals to the Assembly at its 1982 session, through the Economic and Social Council.

Speaking during the Third Committee's debate on women, Argentina expressed the hope that, in preparing for the Conference, the Commission would take into account the need to strengthen those activities in which the least progress had been achieved. Nepal said preparatory measures should be intensified on all levels, and Yugoslavia held it necessary to make new efforts for co-ordination within the United Nations system in preparing for the Conference. Stating that the political elements introduced at the 1980 World Conference had prevented a consensus on the Programme of Action and relevant resolutions, Chile stressed the importance of careful preparations for the 1985 Conference.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/564 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/136, 11 Dec. 1980, para. 17 (YUN 1980, p. 906); <sup>(3)</sup>36/126, para. 7, 14 Dec. 1981 (p. 982).

## Women and society

### Women in development

Calls for greater recognition of women's right to participate in development, both as agents and as beneficiaries, were issued in many international forums during 1981.

Making that call to all United Nations organizations, the Economic and Social Council, in a 6 May resolution adopted without vote, also invited them not to perpetuate the widely accepted idea that women constituted a marginal category relating only to social welfare.<sup>(6)</sup> The text was approved likewise on 29 April by the Council's Second (Social) Committee, where it was introduced by France, also on behalf of Belgium and Poland, and was orally revised by the sponsors on the basis of consultations to replace "commonly" with "widely".

Information contributed by various United Nations organs and agencies was submitted by the Secretary-General in a 16 September note to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> concerning their assessment of women's involvement in financial and

technical support activities and evaluation of the impact of those activities on women.

The Executive Director of the United Nations Children's Fund observed that low governmental priorities for women's concerns and the ad hoc nature of women's projects seemed to indicate that many policy-makers viewed programmes for women as a drain on the national budget rather than as productive investments or even as cost-effective welfare expenditures. Governments needed to be made aware of women's multiple roles as integral to the successful implementation of national policies and overall economic development.<sup>(4)</sup>

Echoing that sentiment, the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries, meeting in New York from 1 to 8 June, invited Governments and United Nations organizations to promote complete integration of women in the technical co-operation process.<sup>(10)</sup>

The Industrial Development Board of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) on 30 May<sup>(3)</sup> recognized that the integration of women should be seen as an intrinsic element in UNIDO activities; considered that the impact of UNIDO efforts to increase the participation of women in the development process must be greatest in the developing countries themselves; and requested the secretariat to focus on activities aimed at generating employment for women in their home countries.

The UNIDO Executive Director, in a report submitted through the Secretary-General to the General Assembly in September,<sup>(5)</sup> discussed relevant activities of the organization, including a Seminar on the Role of Women in the Development of Industrial Branches Traditionally Employing Female Labour, scheduled for October at Sofia, Bulgaria. However, due to increased financial and staff constraints, UNIDO indicated its inability to carry out proposed new activities for women, except those for which extrabudgetary resources might be made available. The Assembly took note of the report on 4 December without vote,<sup>(11)</sup> as did its Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 20 November when it approved the text as orally proposed by its Chairman. By the same decision, the Assembly took note of the reports of the Secretary-General on the role of United Nations agencies and organizations in facilitating the integration of women in rural development (p. 987) and on the implementation of the resolution on women, science and technology, adopted by the 1979 United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development (p. 992).

By a note verbale of 9 September to the Secretary-General, Cuba transmitted the Final

Document adopted at the meeting of High-level Experts of Non-Aligned and Other Developing Countries Concerned with the Role of 'Women in Development, held at Havana, Cuba, From 25 to 27 May.<sup>(2)</sup> It contained a programme of action aimed at contributing to women's total liberation from domination, subordination and socio-political inequality, enabling them to possess true human dignity and lead independent and creative lives.

The Assembly, in its 14 December resolution on the United Nations Decade for Women,<sup>(8)</sup> affirmed that the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the Decade and of the relevant resolutions and decisions adopted by the 1980 World Conference should result in the complete integration of women into the development process, and called on Governments to continue taking measures to ensure women's equal participation as agents and beneficiaries in all sectors and at all levels of that process. The Assembly urged the regional commissions to report to the Economic and Social Council in 1982 on the evolution of women in their development programmes so that programmes and reporting methods could be adjusted to reflect more adequately women's regional concerns.

In related action, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare a multisectoral and interdisciplinary survey on women's role in development,<sup>(7)</sup> and further defined the role of its Third Committee and the Commission on the Status of Women in relation to questions on women's role in development.<sup>(9)</sup>

During discussions in the Assembly's Second and Third Committees, many speakers, including Bolivia, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Chad, China, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Grenada, Guyana, Italy, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen and Yugoslavia, underlined the importance of women's participation in the development process. Uganda said the integration of women in development had to be viewed in the light of the new international economic order, while Morocco held it premature to call on women to contribute to the establishment of such an order. Mexico considered the full implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the Decade (p. 979) as a key element for the total integration of women in the development process.

France said that, while the international community should focus its efforts on poor countries, women's role in economic life should also be promoted in industrialized countries; it asserted that some of the United Nations measures to

involve women in development had been left in abeyance because of the lack of resources and staff.

Italy believed that many United Nations organizations and programmes were increasingly committed to involving women in their financial and technical support activities. Denmark, speaking for the Nordic countries in the Third Committee, thought that only very slow progress had been made during the first half of the Decade and, in many cases, the situation of women had worsened; solutions to the social and economic problems affecting women must be integrated in the planning and implementation of regular programmes and activities, not only in those specifically designed for women. A similar opinion was expressed in the Second Committee by Finland, also on behalf of the Nordic States.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/485.

Note verbale: <sup>(2)</sup>Cuba, 9 Sep., annexing report of high-level experts, A/36/490.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(4)</sup>UNICEF Executive Director, E/ICEF/690; <sup>(5)</sup>UNIDO Executive Director, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/470.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: <sup>(6)</sup>ESC: 1981/26, 6 May, text following GA: <sup>(7)</sup>36/74, 4 Dec. (p. 989); <sup>(8)</sup>36/126 (p. 982), <sup>(9)</sup>36/127 (p. 990), 14 Dec.

Decisions: <sup>(10)</sup>Committee on TCDC (report, A/36/39): 2/2, 7 June. <sup>(11)</sup>GA: 36/422, 4 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-8, 9, 12 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 42 (24 Sep.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.84 (4 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/26

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote, 29 April (meeting 12): J-nation draft (E/1981/C.2/L.4), orally revised; agenda item 10.

Sponsors: Belgium, France, Poland.

#### Women and development

The Economic and Social Council,

Having taken cognizance of the report of the Commission for Social Development on its twenty-seventh session,

Recalling the contents of the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations.

Conscious that women, like men, are an integral part of the population of the world,

Aware that women, like men, participate in the economic, social and cultural development of their country, although too frequently in a subordinate capacity.

1. Invites all the organizations of the United Nations system to refrain from perpetuating the widely accepted idea that women constitute a marginal category relating only to social welfare;

2. Calls upon all the organizations of the United Nations System to emphasize the right of women to participate, as agents and as beneficiaries, in all aspects of economic and social development.

General Assembly decision 36/422

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.11) without vote. 20 November (meeting 42): oral proposal by Chairman (paras. (a) -(c) as a whole); agenda item 69 (I).

#### Effective mobilization and Integration of women in development

At Its 84th plenary meeting, on 4 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee, took note of the following documents:

(a) Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization on the Integration of women in development:

(b) Report of the Secretary-General on the role of United Nations agencies and organizations in assisting Governments to facilitate the integration of women in rural development;

(c) Report of the Secretary-General on the Implementation of resolution 2, entitled "Women, science and technology", adopted by the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development.

#### Rural areas

As requested by the General Assembly in a December 1980 resolution,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General reported in October 1981 on a wide range of activities undertaken by United Nations agencies and organizations to assist Governments in facilitating the integration of women in rural development,<sup>(1)</sup> including those relating to equality of legal status; access to rural services; women's organization and participation; educational and employment opportunities; problems resulting from migration from rural to urban areas; training; impact of agro-business on women's traditional work; and women's participation in the co-operative movement and access to land, credit and marketing facilities (p. 399).

Within the United Nations Secretariat, the integrated reporting system on the status of women, for instance, was anticipated to enable clearer identification of the special problems of women in rural development, and a study which was expected to be completed during the year included a comprehensive survey of rural women workers with 'special reference to labour legislation and maternity protection.

On 4 December, the Assembly took note of the Secretary-General's report.<sup>(3)</sup>

In the Third Committee debate on women, France said discrimination against women would not disappear until the poorest women and women in rural areas had access to the same general opportunities as other women.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/475.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 35/78, para. 9, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 922). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/422, para. (b), 4 Dec. 1981 (p. 987).

#### Survey on women in development

In response to a General Assembly call of December 1980 for preparation of a comprehensive outline for an interdisciplinary and multisectoral world survey on women's role in overall development,<sup>(4)</sup> the Secretary-General proposed in an October 1981 report to the Assembly<sup>(2)</sup> that the survey be prepared by the Centre for Social

Development and Humanitarian Affairs as part of its regular work programme, and that the final draft be submitted by the end of 1983, with the anticipated publication date in mid-1984.

It was further proposed that the survey comprise two parts, the first focusing on women in rural/urban sectors and studying the implications of women's limited participation in production and politics, and the second being organized from the viewpoint of the individual life cycle, with particular attention to health, education and employment.

Acting without vote, the Assembly recommended on 4 December 1981<sup>(5)</sup> that the survey should analyse the role of women in relation to key developmental issues as envisaged in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,<sup>(3)</sup> focusing in particular on trade, agriculture, industry, energy, money and finance, and science and technology. The Assembly recommended that the survey should include an assessment of benefits women derived from their participation in development, and should cover ways and means of improving women's role as agents and beneficiaries of development (p. 985) as well as the potential impact of such improvements on the achievement of overall development goals. Further, it invited the Secretary-General to give due attention to the achievement of goals of self-reliance and to economic and technical co-operation among developing countries; to prepare the survey with contributions from all United Nations organs and organizations, including the regional commissions and the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women; and to submit a progress report in 1982 and the survey in its final form in 1984.

The revised text was approved by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 20 November, also without vote, after the USSR withdrew its proposal<sup>(1)</sup> for an additional preambular paragraph dealing with the provisions of the report of the 1980 World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women and the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. As a result of consultations, the preamble of the final text included a general reference to relevant documents adopted at the World Conference.

In explanation of positions, Poland, speaking on behalf of the Eastern European States, asserted that the survey should aim at guaranteeing the equality of women and their participation in the struggle against all forms of racism and foreign domination (p. 990). While joining the consensus, the United States reiterated its objection

to those provisions of the Programme of Action adopted at the World Conference which were not connected with the real problems of 'women. Israel joined the consensus on the understanding that the third preambular paragraph mentioning provisions of documents adopted at the Conference referred exclusively to the agreed measures concerning the integration of women in development; it remained opposed to certain ill-advised politicizing provisions of the Programme of Action.

Introducing the original draft on behalf of the 14 sponsors, Egypt said it was designed to put the survey on the right course; the outline as proposed by the Secretary-General was incoherent, particularly in the first part, and reflected the traditional and stereotypical approaches adopted in earlier surveys. Egypt in particular objected to the proposal for emphasizing the rural and urban sectors rather than the different sectors of the economy; the situation of women in the rural world had already been studied on many occasions and, with regard to part two of the outline, the survey should rather deal with economic aspects than be organized from the viewpoint of the individual life cycle of women. Also, the preparation of the survey should not be entrusted to one particular department but should be dealt with by all specialized agencies dealing with economic development.

Ecuador expressed regret that the multidisciplinary and multisectoral approach had been abandoned and emphasis had been placed on the social aspect which had already been considered at the World Conference. It was useless to duplicate such work or the work done by the Third Committee; what was needed was a survey reflecting the reality of the situation of women in various sectors of the economy.

Meanwhile in the Third Committee, Italy expressed agreement with the structure and content of the proposed outline of the survey, in particular with the necessity of identifying the causes of the ineffectiveness and distortion of the role of women in the development process, of studying the existing relationships between women as individuals and the social environment, and the salient issues of women at all ages. Morocco wondered to what extent it would be possible for the Commission on the Status of Women to participate in the preparation of the survey, and France thought the Commission should be consulted during its elaboration.

Australia hoped that the results of such meetings as the Expert Group Meeting on Women and the International Development Strategy, scheduled for December 1981, would be taken into account in the preparation of the survey.



Amendment withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>USSR, A/C.2/36/L.81.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/590.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503); <sup>(4)</sup>35/78, para. 10, 5 Dec. 1980 (ibid., p. 922); <sup>(5)</sup>36/74, 4 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28, 29-32, 41, 42 (24 Sep.-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.84 (4 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/74

Adopted without vote Meeting 84 4 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.11) without vote, 20 November (meeting 42); 14-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.26/Rev.2); agenda item 69 (I).

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Chad, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Guinea, India, Mali, Netherlands, Peru, Singapore.

Comprehensive outline of a world survey  
on the role of women in development

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling also its resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980, the annex to which contains the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recalling further the provisions concerning the participation of women in development contained in the documents adopted at the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace,

Recalling its resolution 35/78 of 5 December 1980 on the effective mobilization and integration of women in development, in which it, *inter alia*, called for the preparation of a comprehensive and detailed outline for an interdisciplinary and multisectoral world survey on the role of women in overall development,

Bearing in mind the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, in particular the special provisions relating to the integration of women in overall development with a view to securing women's equal participation both as agents and as beneficiaries in all sectors and at all levels of the development process,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on a comprehensive outline of a world survey on the role of women in development,

1. Emphasizes the need for a multisectoral and interdisciplinary survey on the role of women in development;

2. Recommends that the survey should analyse the role of women in relation to key developmental issues as envisaged in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, focusing in particular on trade, agriculture, industry, energy, money and finance, and science and technology;

3. Further recommends that, in its analysis, the survey should cover:

(a) The present role of women as active agents of development in each sector;

(b) An assessment of the benefits accruing to women as a result of their participation in development, namely, income, conditions of work, and decision-making;

(c) Ways and means of improving women's role as agents and beneficiaries of development at the national, regional and international levels;

(d) The potential impact of such improvements on the achievement of overall development goals;

4. Invites the Secretary-General, in preparing the survey, to give due attention to the problems and requirements of women in every region and to the contribution of women to the achievement of goals of self-reliance and to economic and technical co-operation among developing countries;

5. Calls upon the Secretary-General to include in the survey an overview analysing interrelationships among key developmental issues with regard to women's current and future roles in development with a view to providing a basis for future action for women's effective mobilization and integration in development;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare the survey in close collaboration and co-operation with the appropriate organizations of the United Nations system and with contributions from all organs and organizations concerned of the United Nations system, including the regional commissions and the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women, as well as national institutions having expertise on this subject;

7. further requests the Secretary-General to submit a progress report on the preparation of the survey to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session and to submit the survey in its final form to the Assembly at its thirty-ninth session.

Role of the Third Committee and  
the Commission on the Status of Women

On the recommendation of its Third Committee, the General Assembly, by a resolution adopted without vote on 14 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended that documents on the integration of women in development be made available to the Third Committee and that the Assembly's General Committee be informed of this wish. The Assembly expressed the desire that the Third Committee be seized of the world survey on the role of women in development (p. 987) and requested that the Commission on the Status of Women be consulted in its preparation. In addition, the Assembly requested the Commission to give special attention at its 1982 session to questions on women's participation in development.

The Committee approved the text without vote on 19 November after agreeing to incorporate a number of oral amendments by Canada and Egypt. Canada's proposals dealt with the preambular paragraphs, making them more general in nature, while the Egyptian proposal specifically requested transmittal of documents to the Third Committee rather than allocating the item and relevant documents to both the Second and Third Committees. Further, on the basis of an Egyptian proposal, a new operative paragraph was inserted to define the role of the Third Committee in the world survey.

Introducing the text, also on behalf of Chad, Italy, the Ivory Coast, the Philippines and Romania, France considered it sometimes useful that questions involving a number of aspects be studied in different committees and that there should be communication and a transmittal of documents between them; such joint consideration was already practised in a number of national parliaments and the approach suggested in the draft would enable the Assembly to consider development as a whole rather than dividing it into compartments.

Speaking during the debate on women in the Third Committee, Jamaica expressed the view that the time had come for rationalizing the way the Assembly dealt with women's issues; currently, the Third and Second Committees each dealt with different aspects on the basis of different documents.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/127, 14 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.41, 44-48, 50, 51, 53, 57 (5-19 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.97 (14 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/127

Adopted without vote Meeting 97 14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/789) without vote, 19 November (meeting 57); B-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.50), orally amended by Canada and by Egypt and orally revised; agenda item 88.

Sponsors: Chad, France, Italy, Ivory Coast, Philippines, Romania.

Consideration within the United Nations of questions concerning the role of women in development

The General Assembly.

Recalling the objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace,

Recalling further its resolution 35/78 of 5 December 1980 in which it emphasized the need to integrate the objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women into the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Having taken cognizance of the report prepared by the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations, established pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 1979/45 of 11 May 1979, and, in particular, of paragraphs 80 to 82 of the report,

Having also taken cognizance of the report of the Secretary-General, which contains a comprehensive outline of a world survey on the role of women in development,

1. Recommends, in the light of paragraphs 80 to 82 of the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations, that documents concerning the Integration of women in development should be made available to the Third Committee under the relevant agenda item;

2. Expresses the desire that the recommendation in paragraph 1 above should be brought to the attention of the General Committee of the General Assembly;

3. Expresses also the desire that the Third Committee should be seized of the world survey on the role of women in development, whose comprehensive outline is contained in the report of the Secretary-General;

4. Requests the Commission on the Status of Women to give special attention at its twenty-ninth session, to be held in February 1982, to questions pertaining to the participation of women in development, under its agenda item 3 concerning the Implementation of the World Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Objectives of the International Women's Year;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the Commission on the Status of Women is consulted in the preparation of the world survey on the role of women in development requested by the General Assembly in paragraph 10 of its resolution 35/78 and, to the extent possible, regarding any survey or proposed action concerning women.

#### Women and peace

##### Draft Declaration

In 1981, the General Assembly again deferred action on a draft Declaration on women and peace, an idea which first emerged in 1977.<sup>(8)</sup> Ex-

pressing appreciation of the interest shown and the discussions held on the draft Declaration on the Participation of Women in the Struggle for the Strengthening of International Peace and for the Solution of Other Vital National and International Problems, and realizing that neither the debate nor the examination of proposals could be concluded in 1981 due to lack of time, the Assembly, in a 14 December decision adopted without vote,<sup>(10)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to present a report based on further comments from Member States, with a view to ensuring an early adoption of the draft Declaration at the Assembly's 1982 session.

The text, as orally proposed by Ethiopia on behalf of the sponsors of the draft Declaration, was approved without vote by the Third Committee on 3 December.

Explaining its position on the decision, the German Democratic Republic asserted that it did not feel proper procedure had been followed in dealing with the draft. The United Kingdom reiterated the view that the draft Declaration should be referred first to the Commission on the Status of Women.

For its consideration, the Assembly had before it a report plus addendum submitted by the Secretary-General,<sup>(7)</sup> containing the views of 25 Governments on the draft Declaration, as received until 3 November 1981 in response to its December 1980 call,<sup>(9)</sup> as well as two documents, transmitted by a note verbale of 20 October from Czechoslovakia<sup>(6)</sup> - an "Appeal to Women of the World", calling for a stop to the arms race, and a declaration entitled "Equality, National Independence, Peace" - both adopted by the World Congress of Women, held at Prague, Czechoslovakia, from 8 to 13 October, with participants from 132 countries and 234 national and 90 international organizations.

Introducing the 30-nation draft Declaration,<sup>(3)</sup> the German Democratic Republic stated that it aimed at creating, with women's participation, the conditions necessary for guaranteeing such social rights as the maintenance of peace and the elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid. The draft was originally entitled "Draft Declaration on the Participation of Women in the Struggle for the Strengthening of International Peace and Security and Against Colonialism, Apartheid All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Foreign Aggression, Occupation and All Forms of Foreign Domination".

The text, consisting of a preamble and three operative parts, incorporated several written and oral amendments by a number of countries, including an oral proposal by Singapore to insert the words "intervention and" in the phrase "foreign aggression" throughout the text. Amend-

ments by Australia and New Zealand dealt mainly with the incorporation of phrases on the elimination of sexism and discrimination against women,<sup>(4)</sup> and Morocco's amendments concerned insertion or rewording of phrases, including a reference to respect for national sovereignty.<sup>(5)</sup> By making a series of oral amendments, including insertion of reference to foreign intervention and domination as well as new forms of colonialism, Pakistan withdrew the amendments it had originally submitted in writing.<sup>(1)</sup>

The sponsors, however, categorically rejected a series of amendments proposed by the United States,<sup>(2)</sup> calling them a manoeuvre to create confusion, delay adoption of the text and divert it from its main purpose. The United States remarked that its amendments were intended to highlight the draft's inadequacies, incompleteness and selective approach to women's rights. The proposed amendments suggested insertion, throughout the text, of denunciation of, among others, threats or use of force, arbitrary arrest and detention, totalitarianism, chemical and biological warfare, systematic denial of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and suppression of peaceful political dissent.

In the preamble of the text as presented and revised by the sponsors, the Assembly would have expressed serious concern at the continuing arms race and colonial racist oppression, emphasized the need for a just restructuring of international economic relations and welcomed women's contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security. Member States would have been invited to put into action the principles contained in the operative part of the Declaration.

Article 1 on women's rights would have recommended encouragement of equal participation of women in the political and economic affairs of society, including, as suggested by Australia and New Zealand,<sup>(4)</sup> the decision-making processes.

By article 2, States would have been encouraged to create the necessary prerequisites for women's participation in the struggle for disarmament, through freedom of speech and assembly, as proposed by Australia and New Zealand; the resources released as a result of disarmament were to be used for economic and social development in the developing countries, with special attention to the advancement of women and to the protection of mother and child.

Under article 3, all obstacles to achieving world-wide peace and the happiness and welfare of women were to be eliminated. Among the list of obstacles, proposals by Australia and New Zealand for inclusion of reference to sex discrimination and human rights violations were ac-

cepted, whereas those for the suppression of peaceful political dissent were not.

Article 4 would have had all forms of oppression and inhuman treatment of women considered contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and recognized as a matter of concern to the international community, as suggested by Australia and New Zealand, rather than as crimes against humanity and gross violations of human rights as originally phrased. Comprehensive solidarity and assistance would be rendered to those women who were victims of foreign aggression and racism and who were compelled to live under most adverse conditions.

By article 5, the full sovereign right of every State to establish an economic, social and political order of its own choice free from foreign intervention was to be ensured with a view to safeguarding international peace and creating the socio-economic conditions for women's development.

In part II of the draft Declaration, the Assembly would have called on all States to ensure implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women (p. 979) and adopt programmes for the achievement of the goals of the Declaration, including exchange of experience, ensuring women freedom of thought and expression, and provision of effective legal remedies against violation of their fundamental rights. While a number of amendments, or their essence, by Australia, Morocco and New Zealand were incorporated in part II, a proposal by Australia and New Zealand, for insertion of a paragraph calling for States' dedication to the elimination of all exploitative and dependent relations, including those between women and men, was not accepted by the draft's sponsors.

Under part III, the Assembly and other United Nations bodies would have been called on to review regularly the progress made in promoting the equality of women in respect of their participation in the struggle for peace and for the solution of other vital national and international problems.

In the Third Committee debate, while a number of States, including Afghanistan, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the Gambia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Sierra Leone, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and Viet Nam, urged adoption of the draft Declaration without delay, the wisdom of the negotiating and drafting procedures used as well as the contents of the text were questioned by many others.

Portugal and the United States asserted that the draft was based on closed bilateral negotia-

tions rather than on multilateral consultations and debate as befitting an international instrument. Belgium, the United Kingdom and the United States questioned the validity of unilateral and selective acceptance or rejection of amendments, as practised by the sponsors, as if the draft were a resolution rather than a declaration.

Observing that no competent body had discussed or endorsed the draft Declaration before its submission to the Third Committee, Australia, Belgium, Pakistan, the United Kingdom (speaking for the member countries of the European Community (EC)) and the United States asserted that the draft should be referred to the Commission on the Status of Women, while Ghana suggested that the Assembly should establish a small joint committee consisting of representatives of the Third Committee and the Sixth (Legal) Committee. Several other countries, including Canada, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal, Singapore and Spain, also deemed it advisable not to act with haste on the text before detailed consideration took place in a suitable forum. Belgium, Denmark, Ghana, the Netherlands and Pakistan also urged postponement of action on the draft.

Doubts were expressed by Belgium, Canada, Ghana, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom about the ideological aspects of the text, its validity as well as its relevance to the question of women. Still others, such as Australia, Morocco, New Zealand, Pakistan and the United States, spoke of omissions and a selective approach to the real problems facing women.

Belgium and the United Kingdom, the latter for the EC members, considered that the text, rather than referring to women's rights, contained didactic and paternalistic expressions and highly debatable assertions; they expressed concern that the draft might perpetuate sex discrimination by implying that women could not claim rights which were not specifically acknowledged as theirs. As political considerations and goals applied equally to both sexes, Ireland proposed replacing the word "women" with more general terms such as "individuals and peoples" in a number of articles.

The need for a declaration in general was questioned by several speakers, such as Canada, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United States. In addition, noting the absence of declarations granting particular rights to particular social groups, the United Kingdom feared the possible consequences of creating a precedent by adopting the draft.

Most Eastern European countries, as well as Cuba, Sierra Leone and Viet Nam, regarded the Declaration as a substantive contribution to-

wards achieving the goals of the Decade for women. Support for the draft was also expressed by others, among them Benin, the Congo and Suriname.

Amendments: <sup>(1)</sup>Pakistan, A/C.3/36/L.84 (withdrawn);

<sup>(2)</sup>United States, A/C.3/36/L.86 (not acted upon).

Draft resolution deferred: <sup>(3)</sup>Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe, A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2 (incorporating some amendments by <sup>(4)</sup>Australia and New Zealand, A/C.3/36/L.85; and amendments by <sup>(5)</sup>Morocco, A/C.3/36/L.76).

Note verbale: <sup>(6)</sup>Czechoslovakia, 20 Oct., A/36/620.

Report: <sup>(7)</sup>S-G, A/36/476 & Add. 1.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(8)</sup>GA: 32/142, para. 5, 16 Dec. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 756).

Decisions: GA: <sup>(9)</sup>35/429, 11 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 921); <sup>(10)</sup>36/428, 14 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.41, 44-48, 50, 51, 53, 58-60, 64, 68, 71, 72 (5 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.97 (14 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/428

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/789) without vote, 3 December (meeting 71); draft orally proposed by Ethiopia; agenda item 88 (c).

Draft Declaration on the Participation of Women in the Struggle for the Strengthening of International Peace and for the Solution of Other Vital National and International Problems

At its 97th plenary meeting, on 14 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, appreciating the interest shown in the draft Declaration on the Participation of Women in the Struggle for the Strengthening of International Peace and for the Solution of Other Vital National and International Problems by a large number of Member States and the extensive discussions held on the subject in the Third Committee during the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth sessions of the Assembly and realizing that, in view of lack of time, the Committee had been unable to conclude these discussions and examine fully all the proposals before it, decided to request the Secretary-General to seek further comments from Member States and to submit a report based on their comments as well as on the proposals submitted so far, with a view to ensuring the early adoption of the draft Declaration during the thirty-seventh session of the Assembly.

Women and science and technology

As requested by the General Assembly in 1979,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General reported in October 1981<sup>(1)</sup> on the implementation of the resolution adopted by the 1979 United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development<sup>(6)</sup> by which States were invited to facilitate women's participation in the decision-making process related to science and technology and their equal access to training and careers in the field.

Among relevant United Nations activities, the Secretary-General indicated in his report-

which was taken note of by the Assembly on 4 December<sup>(5)</sup> that data were collected through the integrated reporting system on women, established in 1979,<sup>(2)</sup> and that a newly established data bank on the advancement of women possessed information classified by geographical, functional and organizational categories.

In a resolution of 5 June 1981 on its work programme (p. 752), the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development invited its Advisory Committee to give due regard in its deliberations to the effective implementation of the 1979 Conference resolution on women and science and technology.<sup>(4)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/591.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>33/186, 29 Jan. 1979 (YUN 1978, p. 763); <sup>(3)</sup>34/204, 19 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 903).

Decisions: <sup>(4)</sup>Committee on Science and Technology (report, A/36/37): 3(III), sect. IV, para. 6, 5 June 1981.

<sup>(5)</sup>GA: 36/422, para. (c), 4 Dec. (p. 987).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1979, p. 640.

#### Social indicators on women

Recognizing the importance of a systematic analysis of the global situation of women, the Economic and Social Council, by a resolution adopted without vote on 6 May 1981, expressed the wish that prompt and effective co-operation be instituted between the Advancement of Women Branch of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs, the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) (p. 996), the Statistical Office and the Commission on the Status of Women, particularly during the second half of the United Nations Decade for Women.<sup>(1)</sup>

Introducing the draft in the Council's Second (Social) Committee, France said social indicators should be developed for measuring the progress made in promoting the advancement of women. Prior to the Committee action on the text, France orally revised the fourth preambular paragraph by adding a phrase specifying that the work of standardizing terms of reference and harmonizing data collection should be submitted to the Commission on the Status of Women. It also orally revised the operative paragraph to include the Commission in the co-operation originally called for between the Advancement of Women Branch and INSTRAW. On 29 April, the Committee approved without vote the text as orally revised.

In addition, prior to the Council's adoption of the resolution, France orally amended the fourth preambular and the operative paragraphs to include mention of the Statistical Office.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/11.6 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-8, 9, 12 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/11

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/51) without vote, 29 April (meeting 12); draft by France (E/1981/C.2/L.5), orally revised: orally amended In Council by France; agenda Item 9.

#### Social Indicators applicable to studies on women

The Economic and Social Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General containing proposals for the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women,

Recalling resolution 38 of 30 July 1980 of the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace,

Recognizing the importance of a systematic analysis of the situation of women in the world,

Noting that the work of standardizing terms of reference and harmonizing the collection of data, in the organizations of the United Nations system, should be undertaken promptly by the Advancement of Women Branch of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs. In co-operation with the Statistical Office, and submitted to the Commission on the Status of Women at its twenty-ninth session,

Noting further that the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women, the establishment of which has extended the scope of research on the status of women, can provide valuable assistance to the aforementioned Branch, in particular in the preparation of sets of social indicators,

Expresses the wish that prompt and effective co-operation may be instituted between the Advancement of Women Branch, the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women, the Statistical Office and the Commission on the Status of Women, whose role must continue to be fundamental, particularly during the second half of the United Nations Decade for Women.

#### Employment of spouses of

diplomats and international civil servants

Recalling its previous recommendations on the need to create conditions conducive to the enjoyment of equal rights to work, the General Assembly on 14 December 1981 invited Governments in host countries to consider granting, when appropriate and to the extent possible, working permits for spouses accompanying members of diplomatic missions or consular posts and staff members of international organizations.<sup>(1)</sup> In the preamble, the Assembly also expressed concern over the continued under-representation of women in the professional staffs of international organizations and occasional discrimination against them at the time of recruitment.

The Assembly adopted the resolution without vote, following the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee's approval of the text on 27 November in like manner. The fourth preambular paragraph, as orally amended by Morocco to add the reference to discrimination in recruitment, was approved in Committee by a vote of 46 to none, with 60 abstentions. After introducing the draft, Sweden had proposed to delete that paragraph altogether; it also orally introduced some changes of wording in the other

preambular paragraphs and revised the operative paragraph, which in the original would have had the Assembly invite Governments to consider favourably working permit applications.

In explanation of positions, Brazil, Chile, Ethiopia and Turkey understood that the granting of working permits would be in conformity with the national legislation of the host State. Belgium would have preferred consideration of the matter in a more appropriate body than the Third Committee, and said granting permits to one particular group might give rise to discrimination between foreigners on the labour market as well as legal problems. Canada joined the consensus on the understanding that the measures referred to would be based on reciprocity. Morocco continued to have reservations on the text as it considered that the operative part should have invited Governments to ensure more effective and greater participation of women in the political decision-making process; also, a paragraph should have been added inviting the Secretary-General and agency heads to recruit women.

Introducing the 23-nation text, Sweden observed that the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations<sup>(2)</sup> and the 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations<sup>(3)</sup> had not excluded the possibility that family members of diplomats might work in the receiving State. Asserting that the question should be solved bilaterally, the USSR considered that the text conflicted with existing regulations under international law, and Pakistan feared it would create difficulties for developing countries. Cyprus and Ethiopia also shared Pakistan's view, and Nigeria questioned the competence of the Third Committee to deal with the serious legal implications of the text.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/130, 14 Dec., text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(2)</sup>1961, p. 512; <sup>(3)</sup>1963, p. 510.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.41, 44-48, 50, 51, 53, 57, 60, 63 (5-27 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.97 (14 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/130

Adopted without vote Meeting 97 14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/789) without vote, 27 November (meeting 63); 23-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.53), orally revised, and orally amended by Morocco; agenda item 88.

Sponsors: Australia, Barbados, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Iceland, Jamaica, Jordan, Lesotho, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, United States, Venezuela,

Equal rights to work

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 34/155 of 17 December 1979, in which it called upon Governments to take steps to ensure the effective participation of women in the decision-making process with respect to foreign policy and international economic and political co-operation, including steps to ensure that

they have equal access to diplomatic functions and that they are represented in the United Nations and other international organizations,

Recalling also its resolutions 33/184 of 29 January 1979 and 34/159 of 17 December 1979, in which it recommended that States should envisage in their policies all appropriate measures to create necessary conditions which will enable women to participate in work on an equal footing with men,

Noting that in some countries legal and administrative regulations hamper the possibilities of accompanying spouses of members of diplomatic missions or consular posts and of staff members of intergovernmental organizations to work,

Concerned that women continue to be under-represented in the professional staffs of international organizations, including the United Nations and the specialized agencies, and are not always exempt from discrimination when they are recruited,

Invites Governments in host countries to consider granting, when appropriate and to the extent possible, working permits for spouses accompanying members of diplomatic missions or consular posts and staff members of intergovernmental organizations.

Convention on discrimination against women

The 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women<sup>(2)</sup> entered into force on 3 September 1981, on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit with the Secretary-General of the twentieth instrument of ratification or accession, as stipulated under article 27. The Convention also called for the election, six months after its entry into force, of 18 members of a Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women; however, if at that time 35 instruments of ratification or accession had been deposited, the Committee would comprise 23 members. The reservations made by States at the time of ratification were annexed to the Secretary-General's report on the status of the Convention.<sup>(1)</sup>

By a resolution of 14 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly welcomed with great satisfaction the entry into force of the Convention, invited States that had not done so to become parties to it and requested the Secretary-General to report in 1982 on its status.

The resolution was adopted without vote, following its similar approval by the Third Committee on 23 November. Introducing the 24-nation text, Sweden said the Convention was a major step towards achievement of equal rights for women, and the draft reflected the satisfaction with the instrument.

Explaining its position, Colombia welcomed the fact that the draft had been adopted by consensus. Despite joining in the consensus, Morocco expressed reservations, as did Iraq.

During the debate, the Convention's entry into force was welcomed by a number of speakers, among them Argentina, Chile, the Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Hungary, Italy, Nepal, Nigeria, Portugal and Zaire. Support for the Convention was also expressed by others, such

as Cape Verde, Grenada, Jamaica, Japan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan and Yugoslavia.

Several countries, including the Comoros, the Congo and India, urged adherence by more Member States. Hungary and Japan trusted that the Convention would soon be a truly universal instrument.

Many speakers, among them Australia and Papua New Guinea, regarded the Convention as a serious instrument with practical implications. New Zealand and Suriname thought it was a solid basis for enhancement of the participation of women in many aspects of life, while Bolivia, the Byelorussian SSR, the Syrian Arab Republic, the USSR and others considered it an important achievement of the United Nations Decade for Women. The German Democratic Republic said the Convention benefited women in all countries, especially those where women's participation in political, economic, social and cultural affairs had not been comprehensively guaranteed. Bulgaria and Denmark, the latter speaking for the Nordic countries, regarded the Convention as a major step towards achieving equal rights for women, and France believed that it brought discrimination against women to the attention of decision-makers and the public at large.

Declaring its support of the goals and objectives of the Convention, Pakistan stated that some provisions must be considered in accordance with its religious belief and its legislation based on the Islamic Sharia. Belgium said it planned to introduce a number of modifications in its domestic legislation with a view to ratifying the Convention without, or with a minimum of, reservations. Yugoslavia stated that ratification would not necessitate adjustments or additions to its national legislation which, in some areas, went even further.

As at 31 December, the following 87 States had signed the Convention (including 6 during 1981, indicated in *italics*):

Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka,

Sweden, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

At year's end, the Convention had been ratified or acceded to by the following 32 States (including 21 during 1981, indicated in *italics*):

Barbados, Bhutan, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, China, Cuba, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Uruguay.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/295 & Add.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>34/180, annex, 18 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 895); <sup>(3)</sup>36/131, 14 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.41, 44-48, 50, 51, 53, 58 (5-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.97 (14 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/131

Adopted without vote Meeting 97 14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/724) without vote, 23 November (meeting 58); 24-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.54); agenda item 89.

Sponsors: Bulgaria, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Sweden, USSR, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

#### Status of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

The General Assembly,

Considering that one of the purposes of the United Nations, as stated in Articles 1 and 55 of the Charter, is to promote universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms without distinction of any kind, including any distinction as to sex,

Affirming that women and men should, on the basis of equality, participate and contribute to the social, economic and political processes of development and should share equally in improved conditions of life,

Recalling Its resolution 34/180 of 18 December 1979, by which it adopted the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women,

Recalling also its resolution 35/140 of 11 December 1980, Having taken note of the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the Convention,

1. Notes with appreciation that a significant number of Member States have already ratified or acceded to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;

2. Welcomes with great satisfaction the fact that, as a result, the Convention entered into force on 3 September 1981;

3. Notes further that an important number of Member States have signed the Convention;

4. Invites all States that have not yet done so to become parties to the Convention by ratifying or acceding to it;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report on the status of the Convention.

## Institute for the advancement of women

### Activities of the Institute

During 1981, work of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW), which it had been decided to establish in 1976,<sup>(4)</sup> focused on the development of organizational and administrative procedures aimed at ensuring its readiness to engage in substantive programmes at the earliest possible time. The agreement between the United Nations and the Dominican Republic concerning the arrangements for the establishment of INSTRAW headquarters at Santo Domingo was signed in New York on 31 March 1981 and was later proved by that country's National Congress (p. 998). The Institute's Director assumed her duties in June (p. 997) and participated in a United Nations technical mission to the Dominican Republic in July for consultations.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Institute's expenditure for 1981 was estimated at \$127,656, making a total of \$344,817 for the 1980-1981 biennium. On the basis of tentative estimates as at the end of 1981, the unencumbered balance of the United Nations Trust Fund for INSTRAW amounted to \$2,474,510, of which \$507,846 represented unpaid pledges. In addition, \$337,742 was pledged by Member States at the 1981 United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities, held at United Nations Headquarters in November (p. 997)<sup>(3)</sup>

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** By a resolution of 6 May, the Economic and Social Council expressed the hope that INSTRAW would start functioning shortly and requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Council at its first regular session of 1982 a report on the organization, programme and activities of the Institute.<sup>(5)</sup>

The resolution was adopted without vote, following its similar approval on 29 April by the Council's Second (Social) Committee, where it was introduced by Venezuela on behalf of the Group of 77 and orally revised to satisfy the concern originally expressed by France in its withdrawn draft<sup>(1)</sup> with regard to the interruption of the Institute's work for the preceding six months.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** Underlining the importance of the Institute's contributions to the advancement of women, the General Assembly, by a resolution of 14 December,<sup>(6)</sup> stressed the urgency of assuring its prompt establishment in the host country, reiterated the guidelines agreed on by the Economic and Social Council in 1976 regarding INSTRAW activities,<sup>(4)</sup> and requested United Nations organs and bodies to

co-operate fully with the Institute. At the same time, Governments were urged to consider making financial contributions or extending co-operation (p. 997).

The Assembly adopted the text without vote, after similar approval by the Third Committee on 19 November. Introducing the 28-nation draft, Argentina said the sponsors wished to make clear the current state of progress in establishing INSTRAW, which had encountered some difficulties and for which funds, appeared to be insufficient. The text was orally revised by the sponsors to add a reference to the importance of INSTRAW contributions to the work of all United Nations bodies concerned with women's advancement.

During the Committee debate on women, a number of States, including Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea, Ethiopia, Nigeria and Pakistan, welcomed the establishment of INSTRAW. Several countries, among them Algeria, Australia and Japan, expressed hope that it would soon be in full operation. Chile, Democratic Kampuchea and others thought it could make a valuable contribution to the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women (p. 979). Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Pakistan and Yugoslavia were of the opinion that INSTRAW could play a useful part in promoting the participation of women in development. Malawi expected it to offer opportunities for practical and action-oriented research, and Jamaica wanted it to investigate women's integration into the major United Nations development programmes. Argentina and Chile called for the co-operation of INSTRAW with United Nations organizations and regional centres.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>France, E/1981/C.2/L.6.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>INSTRAW Board of Trustees, E/1982/11; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, E/1982/33.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(4)</sup>1998(LX), 12 May 1976 (YUN 1976, p. 620); <sup>(5)</sup>1981/13, 6 May 1981, text following. <sup>(6)</sup>GA: 36/128, 14 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR/3-8, 9, 10, 12 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.41, 44-48, 50, 51, 53, 57(5-19 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.97 (14 Dec.).

### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/13

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981  
Approved by Second Committee E/1981/51) without vote, 29 April (meeting 12); draft by Venezuela. for Group of 77 E/1981/C.2/L.11), orally revised; agenda item 9.

#### International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Woman

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 31/135 of 16 December 1976. In which the Assembly approved the establishment of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women,

Recalling, in particular, General Assembly resolution 35/134 of 11 December 1980, In which, inter alia. the Assembly urged the Secretary-General to appoint the Director of the



International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women and expressed the desire that the necessary consultations concerning the agreement with the Government of the Dominican Republic Would be expeditiously concluded,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women,

1. Expresses its satisfaction at the conclusion of the agreement between the Government of the Dominican Republic and the United Nations concerning the installation at Santo Domingo of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women;

2. Welcomes the appointment of the Director of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women;

3. Expresses its hope that the Institute will start functioning shortly;

4. Expresses also its hope that a date will be set for a meeting of the Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women during the first quarter of 1982;

5. Calls upon all Member States to contribute or increase their contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women, both financially and in kind;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982 a report on the organization, programme and activities of the Institute.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/128

Adopted without vote Meeting 97 14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/789) without vote, 19 November (meeting 57); 28-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.51), orally revised; agenda item 88.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaïre, Zambia.

#### International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 31/135 of 16 December 1976, in which it approved the establishment of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women,

Further recalling Economic and Social resolution 1981/13 of 6 May 1981, in which the Council, inter alia, took note of the progress made towards the full establishment of the Institute,

Convinced that the Institute can, with adequate resources, make a valuable contribution to the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women, as well as to realizing the objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

1. Insists on the urgency of assuring the prompt establishment of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women in the host country;

2. Reiterates the guidelines set out in Economic and Social Council resolution 1998(LX) of 12 May 1976 regarding the activities of the Institute, in particular the need for close collaboration with the regional centres and institutes which have similar objectives;

3. Underlines the importance of the contributions of the Institute to the work of all United Nations bodies, agencies and institutions involved with the advancement of women, in particular the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs of the Secretariat;

4. Urges all Governments to consider contributing financially to the United Nations Trust Fund for the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women or co-operating in other ways with the Institute in

order to assure its regular and effective financing so that it can plan the expansion of its programmes;

5. Requests the regional commission, the specialized agencies and other organs and bodies in the United Nations system to co-operate fully with the Institute in their respective fields of competence.

#### Appointment of the Director

Following consultations with Member States and taking into account the views of the Institute's Board of Trustees on suitable candidates, the Secretary-General approved the appointment of Dunja Pastizzi-Ferencic of Yugoslavia as Director of INSTRAW.<sup>(1)</sup> The Economic and Social Council welcomed the appointment in its resolution on INSTRAW of 6 May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> and the Director took up her duties in June.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/33.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/13, para. 2, 6 May (see above).

#### Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees of INSTRAW did not meet in 1981 despite its original intention to do so in January or February. No firm date had been set for the 1981 meeting in view of the impending appointment of the Director (see above). Consultations on the date and venue of the Board's session were to be conducted between its President and the Director upon the latter's appointment, and the postponement of the session was expected to enable the Director to prepare, among other things, a proposed revised work programme for INSTRAW covering the balance of the 1980-1981 biennium (p. 996).<sup>(1)</sup>

The Economic and Social Council, in its 6 May resolution on INSTRAW,<sup>(2)</sup> expressed the hope that the Board of Trustees would meet during the first quarter of 1982.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/33.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/13, para. 4, 6 May (see above).

#### Contributions to the Institute

For 1981, a total of \$334,913 was pledged by 14 Member States to the United Nations Trust Fund for INSTRAW, of which \$205,074 had been collected from 10 States by 31 December; at that date, pledges for 1982 amounted to \$350,879 (see table on next page). As estimated by the Secretary-General,<sup>(\*)</sup> the unencumbered balance of the Trust Fund stood at \$2,474,510, including unpaid pledges totalling \$507,846.

A call for contributions to the Trust Fund, both financially and in kind, was made by the Economic and Social Council on 6 May <sup>(2)</sup> and repeated on 14 December by the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> which hoped that INSTRAW would thus be assured of regular and effective financing so that it could plan the expansion of its programmes.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1982/33.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/13, para. 5, 6 May (see above);

<sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/128, para. 4, 14 Dec. (see above).

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING  
INSTITUTE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN, 1981 AND 1982  
(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment	1982 pledge
Austria	11,800	11,800
Bolivia	5,051	
Brazil	3,000	3,000
Chile	3,000	
Denmark		50,000
France	67,797	106,195
Japan	100,000	
Mexico	5,627	5,758
Nigeria	3,623	
Norway		168,067
Pakistan	5,051	5,051
Trinidad and Tobago		1,008
Turkey	125	
Total	205,074	350,879

#### Location of the Institute

Consultations initiated in 1979<sup>(4)</sup> with the Dominican Republic led to the signing in New York on 31 March 1981 of the agreement be-

tween the United Nations and the host country concerning arrangements for the establishment of INSTRAW headquarters at Santo Domingo.

The Economic and Social Council, in its 6 May resolution on INSTRAW,<sup>(3)</sup> expressed satisfaction at the conclusion of the agreement. A draft by France, later withdrawn, would have had the Council also express gratitude to the host Government.<sup>(1)</sup>

In July, a United Nations technical mission, with the participation of the Institute's Director, visited the host country for consultations on matters relating to implementation of the agreement. By a note verbale of 3 November, the Dominican Republic informed the Secretary-General that its National Congress had on 18 August approved the agreement and its annex<sup>(\*)</sup>.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>France, E/1981/C.2/L.6.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, E/1982/33.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/13, para. 1, 6 May (p. 997).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1979, p. 901.

## Chapter XX

# Children, youth and aging persons

Throughout 1981, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) co-operated in programmes in 111 countries with a total child population (aged 0-15) of 1.3 billion, providing support in basic maternal and child health care, water supply, child nutrition, social services and education (p. 999).

The lead agency responsibilities of UNICEF in the Kampuchean relief operations were terminated on 31 December, ending the most critical phase of a massive international effort that had provided some \$634 million in food, medical and other relief assistance to Kampucheans since October 1979.

The UNICEF Executive Board met in New York three times in 1981: from 11 to 22 May for its regular session;<sup>(3)</sup> for a special session on 22 and 23 January, on emergency relief assistance;<sup>(1)</sup> and for another special session from 22 to 24 October, to consider financial questions.<sup>(2)</sup> In the course of the year, the Board approved a total of \$97.5 million in emergency relief, to assist 14 African countries, for the period 1981-1983 (p. 1001). It also accepted an offer by Denmark of new rent-free facilities for an integrated supply centre at Copenhagen, which set into motion a plan for the reorganization of the Fund's Supply Division for optimum efficiency and cost-effectiveness (p. 1011).

New funding arrangements went into effect in 1981, involving sponsorship of UNICEF-assisted

projects by such inter-State institutions as the newly established Arab Gulf Programme for United Nations Development Organizations (p. 1009), and institutional loans to Governments for activities implemented by UNICEF.

The General Assembly, in December, reaffirmed the Fund's role as the lead agency in the United Nations system for co-ordinating the follow-up activities of the International Year of the Child (1979), invited Governments to pay their contributions early and appealed for an increase in contributions, if possible on a multiyear basis.<sup>(15)</sup> A similar appeal was made by the Economic and Social Council in July.<sup>(8)</sup>

The Assembly, also in December, decided to take up in 1982 the question of the draft Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to the Protection and Welfare of Children, with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally.<sup>(14)</sup> The Council had requested in May that the question be considered at the 1981 Assembly session.<sup>(5)</sup>

In November, the Assembly endorsed the Specific Programme of Measures and Activities for the International Youth Year (1985): Participation, Development, Peace;<sup>(12)</sup> and adopted additional guidelines for the improvement of the channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations.<sup>(10)</sup>

The Council, in May, requested the Secretary-General to continue analysing the views and

suggestions of the United Nations system on the question of youth<sup>(7)</sup> and to submit his report on youth to the Assembly at its 1981 session.<sup>(4)</sup> The Assembly, by another November resolution, invited Member States to develop sports activities and physical education within the context of continuing education, and recommended the promotion of indigenous forms of sport as well as a reduction of cost and infrastructure requirements so as to make them accessible to all.<sup>(9)</sup>

Accepting the offer of Austria to host the World Assembly on Aging, the General Assembly decided, also in November, that it be held at Vienna from 26 July to 6 August 1982, and called for generous voluntary contributions to the Fund for the World Assembly.<sup>(13)</sup> In May, the Economic and Social Council called on Member States, the United Nations system and non-governmental organizations to participate fully in the World Assembly and in its preparatory work.<sup>(6)</sup>

By another November resolution, the Assembly recommended that Governments continue to give attention to the question of aging in the formulation of national development policies and programmes, and invited Member States to consider designating a "Day for the Aging".<sup>(11)</sup>

Reports: UNICEF Board, <sup>(1)</sup>E/ICEF/680, <sup>(2)</sup>E/ICEF/687, <sup>(3)</sup>E/1981/48.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(4)</sup>1981/16 (p. 1015), <sup>(5)</sup>1981/18 (p. 1013), <sup>(6)</sup>1981/23 (p. 1026), <sup>(7)</sup>1981/25 (p. 1016), 6 May; <sup>(8)</sup>1981/56, 22 July (p. 1000). GA: <sup>(9)</sup>36/16 (p. 1019), <sup>(10)</sup>36/17 (p. 1017), <sup>(11)</sup>36/20 (p. 1023), 9 Nov.; <sup>(12)</sup>36/28 (p. 1021), <sup>(13)</sup>36/30 (p. 1026), 13 Nov.; <sup>(14)</sup>36/167, 16 Dec. (p. 1013); <sup>(15)</sup>36/197, 17 Dec. (p. 1000).

## Children

### United Nations Children's Fund

In 1981, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) was co-operating in programmes in 111 countries with a total child population, aged between 0 and 15, of approximately 1.3 billion. Support was given to basic maternal and child health services in 103 countries, and to water supply, child nutrition, social services and education in 80 to 90 countries. The average expenditure per child was 23 cents, compared to 26 cents in 1980.

Excluding emergency relief, the percentage breakdowns of expenditure by main category of programme were: 27 for basic child health, 25 for water supply and sanitation, 13 for formal education, 12 for general services, 10 for social welfare services for children, 8 for child nutrition, 4 for non-formal education and 1 for family planning.<sup>(2)</sup>

At its regular session in New York, from 11 to 22 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNICEF Executive Board approved programme commitments for multiyear implementation, totalling \$351 million for services benefiting children in over 50 countries. Seven eighths of this total, or \$307 million, was given firm approval. The remainder (\$44 million) was given contingent approval to the extent that contributions received during the year exceeded \$264 million. However, the 1981 income did not reach the level to put the contingent approval into effect.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/ICEF/48; <sup>(2)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/690.

### Programme policy decisions

UNICEF EXECUTIVE BOARD CONSIDERATION. At its regular session (New York, 11-22 May 1981)<sup>(3)</sup> and at its special session (New York, 22-24 October),<sup>(2)</sup> the UNICEF Executive Board recognized the challenge to the ongoing work of the Fund by the deteriorating global circumstances on the one hand, and by the mandates of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade<sup>(5)</sup> for accelerated progress towards social, child-oriented goals on the other. There was general agreement that the primary focus of UNICEF was programme delivery and that it should continue to emphasize its field-oriented operational character and the basic services strategy.

The Board recognized the need for continuing growth of programmes, reaffirmed and further clarified its policy on UNICEF involvement in emergency relief, and decided to review its policy concerning co-ordination of humanitarian relief activities in the United Nations system.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. Reaffirming the principles and guidelines for the programme activities of UNICEF, particularly its field- and action-oriented approach, the Economic and Social Council, by a resolution adopted without vote on 22 July,<sup>(4)</sup> took note of the Board's decisions and conclusions, and appealed to Governments to increase their contributions to the Fund. The text, introduced by Norway on behalf of 11 countries, was approved without vote on 17 July by the Council's Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 17 December,<sup>(@)</sup> the General Assembly commended UNICEF for its policies and activities, reaffirmed the Fund's role as the United Nations lead agency for co-ordinating the follow-up activities of the International Year of the Child (1979), and urged organizations within and outside the United Nations system to enhance their co-operation with UNICEF for maximizing the effectiveness of services for the benefit of children

and mothers in developing countries. The Assembly also commended the Fund's efforts to enlarge its income so as to respond better to the needs of developing countries, invited those Governments that made pledges to make early payment of their contributions and appealed to all Governments to increase their contributions, if possible on a multiyear basis (p. 1008).

The resolution, adopted without vote, was approved by the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee in like manner on 20 November. It was submitted by a Committee Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations and contained minor stylistic changes to the original submitted by 19 nations.<sup>(1)</sup>

Explaining its position in the Committee, the United Republic of Cameroon expressed regret over the discrepancy between the volume of resources provided for in resolutions and those actually received by UNICEF; it was unpardonable that the arms race claimed enormous sums, while millions of children in the developing countries died for lack of essential services.

During the debate, a number of speakers, including Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Mauritania, the Sudan and Yugoslavia, expressed their appreciation of UNICEF assistance to developing countries. Several States, among them Canada, Italy and Yugoslavia, stressed that UNICEF assistance should remain field-oriented. In Indonesia's opinion, the Fund should give more determined support to assisting developing countries to achieve the minimum goals identified in the International Development Strategy, which included the reduction of infant mortality and mass illiteracy and the provision of primary health care. The USSR said UNICEF should pay special attention to assisting children in the countries struggling against colonialism.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Bangladesh, Bhutan, Canada, Ecuador, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Italy, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Senegal, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, A/C.2/36/L.71.

Report: UNICEF Board, <sup>(2)</sup>E/ICEF/687, <sup>(3)</sup>E/1981/48.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC: 1981/56, 22 July, text following. GA: <sup>(5)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503);

<sup>(6)</sup>36/197, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.9, 10-12, 16 (13-17 July); plenary, E-1981/SR.39 (22 July). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3, 33-39, 41, 42 (24 Sep. & 9-20 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 17 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/56

Adopted without vote Meeting 39 22 July 1981

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/102) without vote, 17 July (meeting 16); 11-nation draft (E/1981/C.3/L.13); agenda item 17.

Sponsors: Canada, Finland, France, Ghana, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Norway, Pakistan, Senegal, Sweden, Yugoslavia.

#### United Nations Children's Fund

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/79 of 5 December 1980 and Council resolution 1980/62 of 25 July 1980,

Having considered the decisions and conclusions of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund adopted at its session held in New York from 11 to 22 May 1981,

Reaffirming the principles and guidelines for the programme activities of the Fund, in particular its field-oriented and action-oriented approach, as laid down by the Executive Board,

Fully aware of the important responsibilities entrusted to the Fund in helping Governments to implement the goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Noting with appreciation the full and careful consideration given to those matters by the Executive Board,

1. Takes note of the decisions and conclusions of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund, as adopted at its session held in May 1981;

2. Appeals to all Governments, especially those that are not contributing at a level commensurate with their capacity, to increase their voluntary contributions to the Fund, if possible on a multiyear basis.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/197

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/812) without vote, 20 November (meeting 421); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.92), based on informal consultations on 19-nation draft (A/C.2/36/L.71); agenda item 70 (h).

#### United Nations Children's Fund

The General Assembly,

Taking note of Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/56 of 22 July 1981,

Having considered the report of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund on its session held at United Nations Headquarters from 11 to 22 May 1981.

Reaffirming the principles and guidelines for the programme activities of the United Nations Children's Fund laid down by the Executive Board, in particular the field-oriented and action-oriented approach of the Fund and the maintenance of a low ratio of administration to programme costs,

Acutely aware that the present global economic situation adversely affects the ability of developing countries to implement plans for the extension of basic services to children and mothers, which requires the most effective use of available resources to advance the well-being of children,

Concerned that the situation regarding the income of organizations of the United Nations system depending on voluntary contributions, including the United Nations Children's Fund, has recently been adversely affected by a number of unfavourable factors,

Bearing in mind that the programmes of co-operation of the United Nations Children's Fund are contributing to the realization of the relevant goals and objectives of the international Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

1. Commends the policies and activities of the United Nations Children's Fund;

2. Endorses Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/56;

3. Reaffirms the role of the United Nations Children's Fund as the lead agency in the United Nations system responsible for co-ordinating the follow-up activities of the International Year of the Child related to the goals and objectives concerning children set forth in the international Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;

4. Commends the Executive Director and the secretariat of the United Nations Children's Fund for their efforts to enlarge the income of the Fund so that it may respond more effectively to the needs of developing countries in support of their programmes to enlarge basic services for the benefit of children and mothers;

5. Urges all organizations concerned in supporting the activities of the United Nations Children's Fund, including the

national committees for the Fund and the co-operating non-governmental organizations, as well as other organizations of the United Nations system, to enlarge and enhance their co-operation with the Fund in order to maximize the effectiveness of such co-operation in the interests of children and mothers in developing countries;

6. Expresses its appreciation to Governments that have responded to the needs of the United Nations Children's Fund and expresses the hope that more Member States will follow their example;

7. Invites all Governments that make pledges of voluntary contributions to make payment thereof as early as possible so that the United Nations Children's Fund may proceed with the implementation of its programmes without undue delay while maintaining an adequate level of operating capital;

8. Appeals to all Governments to increase their contributions, if possible on a multiyear basis, so that the United Nations Children's Fund may, in the present global economic situation, be able to augment its co-operation with developing countries and respond to the urgent needs of the children in those countries.

#### Medium-term plan for 1980-1984

The medium-term plan for 1980-1984, submitted to the UNICEF Executive Board in April 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> defined as the two main goals of UNICEF work the reduction of infant and child mortality and the improvement of child development through promotion of primary health care, clean water, sanitation, nutrition, education and improved status of women in society. While programme trends were similar to those of the previous year, more emphasis was placed on child nutrition, community involvement in water and sanitation programmes, services benefiting children through women's activities, and services for the prevention and rehabilitation of childhood disability.

The UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance, at its special session in New York on 22 and 23 October 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> considered the financial plan for 1980-1984, as well as budget estimates for 1982-1983 (p. 1007), and agreed to a series of proposals made by the Executive Director on income projections (p. 1006) and staffing and management (p. 1010). Recognizing that the low-income projections accepted in the revised financial plan would result in a smaller-than-planned increase over 1981 levels in the real value of programme co-operation, the Committee decided that reductions from planned growth levels should be made so as to minimize disruptions and protect the effectiveness of UNICEF programmes.

Medium-term plan: <sup>(1)</sup>E/ICEF/L.1423.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on Administration and Finance, E/ICEF/AB/L.236.

#### UNICEF programmes by region

In 1981, UNICEF programme expenditure was broadly maintained in all geographical regions, with slight growth in Africa and the Americas. Most of the nominal reductions in expenditure in

East Asia and Pakistan resulted from the drop in expenditure for Kampuchean relief. The tables on the following pages show expenditure and commitments for 1981, and commitments and "notings" (awaiting funding) approved by the Executive Board in 1981 for regional and interregional projects. Data on commitments and programme expenditure were contained in the reports of the Board on its special session in January<sup>(1)</sup> and its regular session in May,<sup>(2)</sup> and in a report of the Executive Director highlighting 1981 activities.<sup>(3)</sup>

Reports: UNICEF Board, <sup>(1)</sup>E/ICEF/680, <sup>(2)</sup>1981/48; <sup>(3)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/690.

#### Africa

In 1981, UNICEF assistance in Africa dealt with basic education, social statistics, monitoring and evaluation, family welfare and the young child, appropriate technology and transport management. Between March and September, UNICEF implemented an emergency feeding programme for 250,000 people in the famine-stricken Karamoja region of Uganda, and followed it up with a supplementary feeding and nutritional surveillance project to monitor recurring problems. It also implemented in Somalia an emergency project funded by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (p. 1046). Measures were taken to improve the regional office's capacity to respond promptly to emergencies.

Emergency relief activities. At its special session in January 1981, the UNICEF Executive Board<sup>(2)</sup> approved, on the request of the Executive Director,<sup>(1)</sup> commitments of \$10.7 million from general resources to increase immediate assistance to Angola, the Central African Republic, Chad, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somalia, the Sudan, Uganda and Zimbabwe, where drought, internal strife and the influx of refugees had produced special situations requiring urgent attention. New "notings" for specific-purpose contributions totalling \$19.8 million were also approved for three of these countries.

Receiving a report from the Executive Director that the problems those countries faced continued to grow more severe,<sup>(5)</sup> the Board approved, at its regular session in May, additional assistance totalling \$27.2 million for the nine countries as well as for Mali, Mauritania, Senegal, the Upper Volta and Zaïre.<sup>(3)</sup> "Noted" projects amounting to \$17 million were also approved for eight of the countries. In all, \$97.5 million in emergency commitments and "notings" was approved in 1981 for the period 1981-1983.

Linked to long-term development objectives whenever possible, assistance was provided

(continued on p. 1003)

**1981 EXPENDITURE AND MULTIYEAR COMMITMENTS BY COUNTRY AND REGION**  
(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollars)

COUNTRY	Expenditure	Approved new commitments	COUNTRY	Expenditure	Approved new Commitments
<b>Africa</b>			<b>Americas (cont.)</b>		
Algeria	256,970	109,602	Mexico	647,718	1,285,000
Angola	2,541,220	5,764,269*	Nicaragua	836,078	1,282,748
Benin	842,755	1,000,000	Panama	130,680	—
Botswana	178,731	—	Paraguay	435,605	132,282
Burundi	737,140	500,000	Peru	1,435,653	434,895
Cape Verde	140,740	285,943	St. Kitts – Nevis– Anguilla	29,759	5,254
Central African Republic	771,768	2,574,759	Saint Lucia	105,626	—
Chad	1,032,830	4,845,696	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	99,587	—
Comoros	211,527	170,024	Suriname	3,500	—
Congo	35,533	175,000	Regional projects	1,554,076	1,425,961
Djibouti	568,732	1,564,000			
Equatorial Guinea	342,334	21,582	Subtotal	12,450,062	6,826,117
Ethiopia	9,442,764	7,471,968			
Gabon	932	—	<b>East Asia and Pakistan</b>		
Gambia	142,941	88,728*	Bangladesh	12,328,804	1,277,095
Ghana	1,066,847	700,000	Burma	5,339,856	7,899,981
Guinea	850,264	—	China	2,474,729	42,000
Guinea-Bissau	494,545	1,422	Democratic Kampuchea	1,107,501	4,863,032
Ivory coast	188,323	726,619	Indonesia	13,107,390	1,000,000
Kenya	1,238,401	6,275,000	Kampuchean relief	27,233,439	16,418,442
Lesotho	326,529	1,226,622	Lao People's		
Liberia	570,098	525,000	Democratic Republic	1,432,838	9,700
Madagascar	1,001,453	3,157,833	Malaysia	447,888	(7,268)
Malawi	995,599	2,906,000	Pacific Island Territories	334,419	85,601
Mali	2,035,411	1,040,183*	Pakistan	9,950,829	59,040,040
Mauritania	408,987	805,800	Papua New Guinea	93,116	292,608
Mauritius	280,518	141,311	Philippines	3,199,148	—
Morocco	934,942	7,374,430	Republic of Korea	601,921	—
Mozambique	1,067,676	4,050,728*	Thailand	2,826,583	866,030
Niger	1,029,844	—	Viet Nam	3,932,254	16
Nigeria	3,238,436	8,925,000	Regional projects	254,349	—
Rwanda	1,299,440	926,029			
Sao Tome and Principe	74,046	256,253	Subtotal	84,665,066	91,787,278
Senegal	673,591	807,583			
Seychelles	84,412	—	<b>South Central Asia</b>		
Sierra Leone	459,559	45,290	Afghanistan	1,451,702	—
Somalia	5,620,053	8,348,519	Bhutan	858,887	2,149,249
Swaziland	109,604	2,500*	India	33,229,545	105,744,783
Togo	193,231	656,000	Maldives	310,319	20,744
Tunisia	222,824	52,984	Mongolia	19,075	—
Uganda	3,871,233	12,441,594	Nepal	3,878,926	5,392,945
United Republic of Cameroon	579,147	1,722,000	Sri Lanka	3,681,595	1,183,422
United Republic of Tanzania	3,342,420	502,296			
Upper Volta	1,943,517	817,000	Subtotal	43,430,049	114,491,123
Zaire	1,511,460	3,568,000			
Zambia	425,285	1,344,086*	<b>Eastern Mediterranean</b>		
Zimbabwe	2,007,984	5,374,526	Democratic Yemen	339,422	1,523,400
Regional projects	895,661	3,182,580	Egypt	1,920,388	3,930,810
			Iran	10,057	10,057*
Subtotal	56,068,258	102,454,758	Jordan	438,160	292,357
<b>Americas</b>			Lebanon	843,168	6,957
Antigua	47,691	—	Lebanon rehabilitation	3,498,573	8,191,075*
Barbados	20,048	—	Sudan	7,919,120	27,960,866
Belize	27,055	—	Syrian Arab Republic	418,696	51,583
Bolivia	438,034	1,312,000	Yemen	1,405,688	7,034,770
Brazil	993,189	—	Regional projects	708,193	525,000
Chile	136,274	151,750			
Colombia	1,809,582	—	Subtotal	17,501,464	49,526,875
Costa Rica	83,183	—			
Cuba	148,482	13,044	<b>Europe</b>		
Dominica	54,367	14,750	Italy	115,039	39
Dominican Republic	431,380	—	Turkey	345,793	(116,567)
E c u a d o r	736,584	117,480	Yugoslavia	(1,028)	—
El Salvador	245,781	—			
Grenada	32,497	9,583	Subtotal	459,804	(116,528)
Guatemala	636,752	38,897			
Guyana	212,445	544,000	<b>International</b>		
Haiti	755,466	—		3,677,760	18,250,263
Honduras	246,470	—			
Jamaica	136,502	58,474	Total	218,252,463	383,219,906

Includes allocation for emergency relief.

NOTE: Totals and subtotals differ from the sum of the figures due to rounding.

## COMMITMENTS AND "NOTINGS" APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD IN 1981 FOR REGIONAL AND INTERREGIONAL PROJECTS

(in US dollars)

(continued from p. 1001)

## REGION

## Africa

African Training and Research Centre for Women of the Economic Commission for Africa	1981-1983	798,000	-
Ecole nationale des assistants et éducateurs sociaux	1981-1983	157,000	-
Pan African Institute for Development (IPD)	1981-1984	1,181,000	-
Project for training in communication for basic services, Eastern and South Central Africa	1981-1984	525,000	-
Support technology for basic services in the Eastern African Region	1981-1984	597,000	-
Schistosomiasis control, Swaziland and Ghana	1981-1984	-	2,000,000
Subtotal		3,258,000	2,000,000

## Americas

Prevention and early detection of handicaps among children in Central America and Panama	1981-1983	-	550,000
Early childhood stimulation in the Americas	1981-1983	262,000	-
Promotion and development of women in Latin America and the Caribbean	1981-1982	883,000	-
Child feeding in Central America	1981-1983	-	500,000
Subtotal		1,145,000	1,050,000

## Asia

No regional projects considered in 1981.

## Eastern Mediterranean

Training scheme in drinking water programmes at the Wad-el-Maghboul Institute, Sudan	1981-1983	525,000	-
Subtotal		525,000	-

## Interregional

Emergency reserve	1982	2,376,500	-
Maurice Pate Memorial Award	1981	15,973	-
Interregional Fund for Programme Preparation (IFP)	1982-1983	7,993,800	-
International Children's Centre (ICC)	1982	218,000	-
Commitment for additional support to various programme fields	1982-1983	7,650,000	-
Subtotal		18,254,273	-
Total		23,182,273	3,050,000

mainly for health services, water supply, education, training for women and supplementary feeding.<sup>(4)</sup>

Recommendations: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/677 & Corr. 1,2.

Reports: UNICEF Board. <sup>(2)</sup>E/ICEF/680, <sup>(3)</sup>E/1981/48; UNICEF Director, <sup>(4)</sup>E/ICEF/L.1450, <sup>(5)</sup>E/ICEF/P/L.2094.

## Asia and the Pacific

In 1981, UNICEF committed substantial resources in South Central Asia to promote consistent delivery of basic services to women and children in deprived areas, paying special attention to encourage popular participation in project design, implementation and evaluation. In addition to identifying constraints to the implementation of UNICEF-assisted primary health care services, the Fund explored ways of improving supplementary feeding programmes and collaborated with the World Health Organization in preparing a public information campaign for effective infant-feeding practices. A quarter of UNICEF expenditures in the region was devoted to water supply programmes.

In East Asia, progress was made in integrated country-level planning and technical co-operation among developing countries. Country programmes reflected increased attention to young child development, local-level planning and the needs of the urban poor, who comprised 25 to 50 per cent of the region's swelling urban population.

At the May session of the UNICEF Executive Board, views were expressed that the Fund's lead agency role in the United Nations programme of humanitarian assistance for Kampuchians (p. 494) should end on 31 December. Following consultations with Governments, its lead agency responsibilities were terminated on that date, ending the most critical phase of a massive international effort that had provided some \$634 million in food, medical and other relief assistance since October 1979.

## Eastern Mediterranean

New funding arrangements for the Eastern Mediterranean region went into effect in 1981, involving sponsorship of UNICEF-assisted projects by inter-State institutions, such as the Arab Gulf Programme for United Nations Development Organizations, and institutional loans to Governments for activities implemented by UNICEF, such as the \$25-million loan by the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development to seven countries for UNICEF projects in the development of drinking water policies. In 1981, the Fund of the Organization of Petroleum

Exporting Countries contributed \$3 million for UNICEF programmes.

During the year, UNICEF completed 47 out of 205 reconstruction projects in southern Lebanon, for which \$47 million had been allocated by Arab Governments for joint activities of the Fund and Lebanon's Council for Reconstruction and Development for the repair and re-equipment of schools and hospitals and the provision of emergency water services (p. 528).

Regional trends showed an increase in assistance for water projects and reduced expenditures for nutrition and social services, resulting in part from the integration of these sectors into other programmes.

New UNICEF offices were opened in Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Oman and Yemen.

#### Latin America and the Caribbean

In accordance with the Regional Programme of Action adopted by the Economic Commission for Latin America in 1981 (p. 661), UNICEF in 1981 encouraged national efforts to combine specific solutions to community problems with comprehensive solutions benefiting larger groups.

A preliminary examination of primary health care services in the Americas pointed to the need for improved co-ordination between Governments and organizations such as UNICEF and the World Health Organization. For the consideration of the Executive Board, a regional programme was prepared on technical and para-professional training in the provision of clean water and basic sanitation. In addition, UNICEF promoted breast-feeding, continued its efforts to develop simplified technologies for food production, encouraged school involvement in community development and supported experiments in pre-school education.

#### Interregional programmes

In 1981, the UNICEF Executive Board approved \$7.8 million for the Interregional Fund for Programme Preparation for 1982-1983, and \$7 million for additional support to selected countries in primary health care, water and sanitation, and maternal and child nutrition.

The Interregional Fund supported preparatory work leading to policy and programme formulation, assessment of activities and information exchange between countries and regions.

#### UNICEF programmes by sector

As in the previous three years, the Fund's largest share of expenditures in 1981 was devoted to child health (see below), with water supply and sanitation a close second. Other major programmes dealt with nutrition (p. 1005), social welfare services and education (p. 1006).

Support for basic services—basic maternal and child health, water supply and sanitation, and support for education—were found in virtually every country programme. Of UNICEF country programmes, 80 per cent included applied nutrition and non-formal education. <sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/690.

#### Health services

In 1981, UNICEF expenditures on health programmes in 107 countries were more than \$47 million. Including related co-operation in the fields of water supply, sanitation and child nutrition, expenditures exceeded \$100 million. <sup>(2)</sup>

At its regular session in May, the UNICEF Executive Board <sup>(1)</sup> welcomed the co-operative efforts of the Fund and the World Health Organization (WHO) in comprehensive national approaches to primary health care (PHC), and approved the strengthening of support for PHC components, such as the expanded programme of immunization (p. 1005), diarrhoeal diseases control (see below) and the supply of essential drugs (p. 804). The Board also noted the discussions of the UNICEF/WHO Joint Committee on Health Policy on programmes concerned with immunization, leprosy and schistosomiasis (p. 1005), childhood disability (see below) and other health questions.

Reports: UNICEF Board, <sup>(1)</sup>E/1981/48, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1982/17.

**Diarrhoeal diseases.** The Executive Board noted in May 1981 <sup>(1)</sup> that under the global programme for diarrhoeal diseases control, initiated in 1978, 70 countries were planning national programmes as part of PHC. In addition to the provision of oral rehydration salts, emphasis was placed on the importance of preventive measures such as safe water and a clean environment.

At the invitation of WHO, UNICEF became a sponsor of the global programme. The new arrangement would supplement the Fund's co-operation with countries in providing oral rehydration salts and improving capacity for their production.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/1981/48.

**Disability prevention.** World-wide, it was estimated that one child in every 10 was born with or acquired an impairment, and that four out of five of those impaired children were in developing countries, often beyond the reach of even the most basic rehabilitation services.

In addition to its traditional assistance to disabled children—general child health and nutrition programmes, immunization and blindness prevention—UNICEF continued in 1981 to explore a new approach which recognized that the disruption of the normal process of child development could produce a more serious handicap



than the impairment itself. The Fund therefore supported the incorporation of early detection as well as rehabilitation measures into existing community-based health, child welfare and education services.

Throughout the year, UNICEF maintained close contact with the secretariat of the International Year of Disabled Persons (1981) (IYDP) (p. 795) and made its staff available to assist IYDP national committees, develop the IYDP Trust Fund (p. 796) and analyse projects to be financed by the Fund. It also produced information material for the Year and co-sponsored the IYDP coin programme.

Other UNICEF-supported activities in 1981 included surveys on the prevalence of childhood disabilities, preparation of a field manual for communities, and the design of less costly rehabilitation devices adapted to local needs. UNICEF began a three-year programme, agreed upon in November 1980 with Rehabilitation International, to assist projects for the prevention of childhood impairment and disabilities and the expansion of services for disabled children.

**Immunization.** The expanded programme on immunization, first endorsed by the World Health Assembly in 1974,<sup>(1)</sup> had grown by 1981 to include over 100 developing countries, and an estimated \$15 million was contributed to the programme annually by UNICEF, the United Nations Development Programme, the World Health Organization (WHO) and bilateral agencies. In addition to providing vaccines, the programme contributed to the development of management training and the improvement of equipment and methodologies.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(1)</sup>1974, p. 974.

**Leprosy.** While the number of estimated leprosy cases remained stationary at about 11 million world-wide, significant reductions were reported in 1981 in several countries of Africa and Asia where leprosy control programmes had been implemented with the support of UNICEF and WHO. The latest estimated number of patients registered for treatment was 3.6 million.

Infection with leprosy was acquired in childhood, and a wide network of health units was needed because of the chronic nature and diffuse distribution of the disease. However, mobile and static clinics were often the only means of providing services at the periphery. Progress continued to be made in research, particularly towards the development of vaccine.

**Schistosomiasis.** Schistosomiasis, one of the most complex parasitic infections, affected an estimated 200 million people in 1981, with an additional 500 million, in particular children, exposed to the risk of infection. As a result of

advances in research and drug development, the strategy for schistosomiasis control had shifted from attempted eradication of the snail host to drug treatment of the human population.

#### Nutrition

In 1981, UNICEF expenditures on child nutrition amounted to \$14 million. Activities to improve the nutritional status of children and mothers included promotion of food and nutrition policies and preparation of national plans, and efforts to control specific deficiency diseases. In selected cases, food supplements as well as vitamins and mineral supplements were provided to vulnerable mothers and children.<sup>(1)</sup> In addition, nutrition components were included in programmes on health, water supply and sanitation, education, social welfare services and emergency relief. A joint five-year work plan was developed between UNICEF and the World Health Organization (WHO) on improvement of nutrition through the primary health care approach.<sup>(2,3)</sup>

Reports: UNICEF Board, <sup>(1)</sup>E/1981/48, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1982/17; <sup>(3)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/690.

**Infant feeding.** Greatly strengthened by the adoption by the World Health Assembly in May 1981 of the International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes (p. 1419), national and regional activities to promote breast-feeding and improve weaning practices were extended, often with UNICEF co-operation.<sup>(3)</sup> At least 35 countries adopted or were taking steps to adopt national codes.

The promotion of breast-feeding and the improvement of infant-feeding practices constituted a major component of the UNICEF/WHO five-year programme on nutrition.<sup>(1)</sup>

At its May session,<sup>(2)</sup> the UNICEF Executive Board endorsed a programme involving increased and more systematic UNICEF participation in such activities as surveillance of breast-feeding trends, orientation and training of health workers, preparation of information material for mothers, revision of health service practices, improvement of maternal nutrition and more widespread measures to combat infant malnutrition, emphasis on social support systems, and implementation of the Code of Marketing.

Studies undertaken in 1981 reported a continuing decline in breast-feeding and inadequate weaning practices in several countries. In addition to promoting breast-feeding and advocating improved weaning practices in country programmes, UNICEF established at headquarters a Task Force on Infant and Young Child Feeding to monitor progress in the field.

Reports: UNICEF Board, <sup>(1)</sup>E/ICEF/L.1441, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1981/48; <sup>(3)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/690.

## Education

In developing countries in 1981, only three or four children out of every 10 completed primary education, and the proportion of women among illiterates continued to grow.

UNICEF expenditures on primary and formal education reached \$11 million in 1981, assistance which continued to be increasingly integrated with programmes of non-formal education, particularly for women and girls, in such areas as health education, child care, nutrition and income-earning skills. In 1981, approved commitments for formal education rose by \$5 million over 1980 to \$29.1 million, and commitments for non-formal education rose from \$6.1 million to \$29.9 million. The increased emphasis on non-formal education reflected efforts at reaching large numbers of out-of-school children through non-formal approaches.<sup>(1,2)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/1982/17; <sup>(2)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/690.

## Child welfare in urban areas

Support by UNICEF to child welfare in low-income urban areas increased substantially in 1981, in anticipation of the increase in number, from the current estimated figure of 370 million to 666 million by the year 2000, of children under 15 living in such areas in the developing countries. Urban programmes supported by UNICEF operated in 43 countries, and field offices in 24 more countries had identified possibilities for collaborative urban efforts. Such programmes emphasized women's activities, pre-school and day-care programmes and early child development for children under six years of age, as well as primary health care and nutrition.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/1982/17.

## UNICEF finances

UNICEF income in 1981 of \$268 million, excluding \$23 million contributed for Kampuchean relief operations, represented a net increase of 10 per cent over 1980 in real terms, while its expenditures of \$265 million (excluding Kampuchean relief) represented an increase of 6 per cent. However, programme growth was hampered by the adverse world economic situation and commitments for all UNICEF country programmes were reduced by 12.5 per cent after the Board's May session. Further reductions following the Board's special session in October affected those countries which were considered most able to effect reductions.<sup>(4)</sup> At the same time, major efforts were made for fund-raising and many donors increased their contributions to general resources at the United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities in November (p. 426).

In May, the UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance again considered a proposal submitted in 1980 by the Fund's Executive Director that he be granted authority to negotiate stand-by lines of credit with international banks as an overdraft arrangement.<sup>(3)</sup> The proposal failed to generate support, and the Board concluded that the Fund's current liquidity policy was adequate. <sup>(1)</sup> In October, in connection with the financial plan approved for 1980-1984 (p. 1007), the Board adopted a principle calling for the restoration, over a three-year period, of a liquidity provision covering one month's general resources cash needs in order to safeguard the Fund's programme delivery and financial integrity.<sup>(2)</sup>

Reports: UNICEF Board, <sup>(1)</sup>E/1981/48, <sup>(2)</sup>E/ICEF/687;

<sup>(3)</sup>UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance, E/ICEF/AB/L.230/Rev.1 & Rev.1/Corr.1;

<sup>(4)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/690.

## Budgets

Revised administrative and programme support budgets for 1981. The UNICEF Executive Board, on the recommendation of its Committee on Administration and Finance,<sup>(3)</sup> approved in May 1981 revised budget estimates for the year, comprising \$30.2 million gross (\$26.6 million net) for administrative services and \$48.6 million gross (\$39.7 million net) for programme support.<sup>(2)</sup>

This represented an increase of 6.6 per cent over the amount initially approved by the Board in 1980 for administrative services during 1981 (\$28.4 million) and an increase of 7.0 per cent over those for programme support (\$45.4 million), a total increase of \$5.1 million. About half of the increase resulted from inflation affecting salary scales and other costs, and the remainder related to unforeseen requirements and to the proposed establishment of eight new field offices.

The approved budget estimates for 1981 were \$2 million less than those submitted by the Executive Director, who had estimated a total of \$30.7 million gross for administrative services and \$50.2 million for programme support. <sup>(1)</sup> It was agreed that, of the \$2 million reduction, \$419,000 related to items which would more appropriately be considered as part of the 1982-1983 budget estimates (p. 1007). The approved figures showed an increase over the 1980 level-\$24.4 million for administrative services and \$40.3 million for programme support.

Speaking in the General Assembly's Second (Economic- and Financial) Committee, Canada said the ratio of administrative to programme costs must remain as low as possible. The Byelorussian SSR called for more energetic action to reduce administrative costs.

Recommendations: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/AB/L.224.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/1981/48; <sup>(3)</sup>UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance, E/ICEF/AB/L.230/Rev.1.

Budget for 1982-1983. Following the recommendations of its Committee on Administration and Finance,<sup>(7)</sup> the Executive Board approved, in October 1981, 1982-1983 budget estimates for UNICEF totalling \$171 million gross, presented for the first time in a biennial format and grouping activities under four parts—\$13.6 million for policy-making, \$21.8 million for external relations, \$44 million for administration and \$91.6 million for programme development.<sup>(5)</sup>

The estimates had undergone a series of revisions since the Board first acted in May,<sup>(6)</sup> when it requested the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) to review the estimates submitted by the Executive Director. These totalled \$214 million, including \$17.2 million for policy-making, \$26.7 million for external relations, \$54.2 million for administration and \$115.7 million for programme development. <sup>(1)</sup> The initial estimates also included a proposed increase of 384 posts.

In its report of 9 September, ACABQ recommended expenditure reductions in the amount of \$11.8 million, resulting in a net addition of 290 posts and budget estimates of \$202 million.<sup>(4)</sup> After examining the Executive Director's revised proposals<sup>(2)</sup> and new estimates totalling \$181.8 million,<sup>(3)</sup> followed by further revised estimates based on the 1980-1981 budget of 1,862 posts with a net addition of 30 field posts, the Board approved \$43 million less than the initial estimates.

It also approved in October, on the recommendation of the Committee on Administration and Finance, income estimates of \$28.2 million, consisting of \$17.8 million in income from staff assessment, \$6 million in other income and \$4.4 million in government contributions to local costs. This reflected a decrease from the initial income projection of \$31.4 million, including \$21.1 million from staff assessment. <sup>(1)</sup> ACABQ had recommended a reduction of \$1.4 million, while reductions of \$1.3 million resulted from the deferment of budget expenditures and \$1 million from fluctuations in exchange rates.

The consensus reached by the Board on the 1982-1983 budget was welcomed by Denmark, speaking in the General Assembly's Second Committee for the Nordic countries.

Budget estimates: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/AB/L.225, vol. I.

proposals: UNICEF Director, <sup>(2)</sup>E/ICEF/AB/L.234, E/ICEF/AB/L.235.

Reports: <sup>(4)</sup>ACABQ E/ICEF/AB/L.231; UNICEF Board, <sup>(5)</sup>E/ICEF/687, <sup>(6)</sup>E/1981/48; <sup>(7)</sup>UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance, E/ICEF/AB/L.236.

Financial plan for 1980-1984

The UNICEF financial plan for 1980-1984, set out in the medium-term work plan (p. 1001) issued in April 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> projected a 1981 income of \$470 million, 50 per cent higher than projections made in 1980, in anticipation of additional contributions from various sources. Income projections for other years were: \$540 million for 1982, \$620 million for 1983 and \$710 million for 1984. However, due to uncertainties over the timing of new contributions, the Executive Director presented to the Executive Board in May<sup>(4)</sup> income projections for the period that reflected reductions of some \$50 million per year.

In response to the Board's concern that the original income projections were not sufficiently secure to meet the commitments proposed for 1982-1984, the Executive Director circulated a revised general-resources plan showing income of \$264 million for 1981, or \$55 million less than the original estimates.

On the recommendation of its Committee on Administration and Finance,<sup>(5)</sup> the Board gave firm approval to seven eighths, or \$307 million, of the 1981 programme commitments, based on the lower-income projection; approval of the remaining one eighth, or \$44 million, was contingent on receipt of income exceeding \$264 million.

Reviewing proposals of the Executive Director for a revised rolling financial plan for 1980-1984,<sup>(2)</sup> in which general resources income estimates for 1981 had been reduced to \$218 million, the Committee in October considered that the lower-income version of projections might still be too high and that a more cautious approach was called for in financial planning.<sup>(6)</sup>

The Board, at its special session in October,<sup>(3)</sup> agreed that the Fund's primary focus should be on programme delivery and accepted the low-income projection as a framework until June 1982 for the financial plan and decision-making on programming. On the recommendation of the Committee on Administration and Finance, the Board decided that reductions from planned growth levels should be allocated so as to minimize the disruption and protect the effectiveness of programmes.

Denmark, speaking in the General Assembly's Second Committee on behalf of the Nordic countries, welcomed the revised financial plan, and Australia said it was confident that the decisions taken by the Board in October would provide a sound basis for planning. Japan believed it was important for UNICEF to plan its future activities on the basis of realistic financial prospects and said the Board, at its October session, had had the difficult task of reconciling the need to expand activities with that of consolidating the financial

and administrative basis at a time of global economic constraints.

Yugoslavia, on the other hand, deplored the fact that the Board had revised its financial plan on the basis of a low-income projection; if the financial situation did not improve, the rate of real increase in UNICEF assistance would be 1 per cent annually for 1982 and 1983, which was in contradiction with the increased needs of developing countries.

Medium-term plan: <sup>(1)</sup>E/ICEF/L.1423.

Proposals: <sup>(2)</sup> UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/AB/L.233 & Corr.1.

Reports: UNICEF Board, <sup>(3)</sup>E/ICEF/687, <sup>(4)</sup>E/1981/48; UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance, <sup>(5)</sup>E/ICEF/AB/L.230/Rev.1 & Rev.1/Corr.1, <sup>(6)</sup>E/ICEF/AB/L.236.

#### Accounts

Accounts for 1979. On the recommendation of its Committee on Administration and Finance <sup>(2)</sup> the UNICEF Executive Board, in May 1981, <sup>(1)</sup> noted the observations of the Board of Auditors and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) on the Fund's 1979 financial report and that of the Greeting Card Operation (GCO) on its 1978/1979 season (p. 1011). It also noted the Executive Director's comments and actions in response to those observations, <sup>(3)</sup> including measures taken to strengthen administrative control of travel costs.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/1981/48; <sup>(2)</sup>UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance, E/ICEF/AB/L.230/Rev.1; <sup>(3)</sup>UNICEF Director observations, E/ICEF/AB/L.222.

Accounts for 1980. Executive Board, following the recommendation of its Committee on Administration and Finance, <sup>(4)</sup> noted in May 1981 <sup>(3)</sup> the financial reports of UNICEF for 1980 and of GCO on its 1979/1980 season (p. 1011). The Board of Auditors made a series of recommendations on the Fund's accounts plan and on personnel questions at the UNICEF Packing and Assembly Centre (UNIPAC) at Copenhagen, Denmark. <sup>(2)</sup>

In its September report to the General Assembly, ACABQ noted the Auditors' comments and the UNICEF response thereto; called for an expeditious review of the accounts plan, as recommended by the Auditors; and agreed with the Fund on the current non-feasibility of UNIPAC itself hiring manual workers instead of using the services of a local firm. <sup>(1)</sup>

By a 30 November resolution, the Assembly accepted the 1980 financial report and the audit opinion of the Board of Auditors, concurred with the ACABQ observations and requested the Executive Director to take remedial action required by the Auditors. <sup>(5)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/480; <sup>(2)</sup>Board of Auditors, and financial statements, A/36/5/Add.2; <sup>(3)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/1981/48; <sup>(4)</sup>UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance, E/ICEF/AB/L.230/Rev.1. Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>GA, 36/65, 30 Nov. (p. 1302).

#### Contributions

The Executive Board noted at its May 1981 session that 72 per cent of 1980 UNICEF income came directly from Governments as regular and specific-purpose contributions and another 15 per cent from private sources other than GCO. <sup>(2)</sup>

At its special session in October, <sup>(1)</sup> the Board urged donors to make special contributions to general resources, take up additional "noted" projects, adopt projects as a short-term exceptional measure, and pay as much of their contributions as possible by 30 April, especially in 1982, 1983 and 1984 while the general resource liquidity was being restored (p. 1006).

On 17 December 1981, <sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly invited all contributing Governments to make early payment of their pledges to UNICEF and appealed for increased contributions, if possible on a multiyear basis, to enable the Fund to augment its co-operation. The Assembly also endorsed an Economic and Social Council resolution of 22 July, which contained an appeal for increased contributions to UNICEF.

The contributions received or pledged in 1981—to UNICEF's general resources, supplementary funds and the Kampuchean relief operations—totalled \$261,391,165, including a deduction of \$186,396 in adjustments to prior years' income. Of this amount, \$222,307,637 came from Governments and intergovernmental agencies, \$35,949,299 from non-governmental sources and \$3,320,623 from the United Nations system (see table on next page).

Concern at the downward trend in contributions and at the lack of adequate resources was expressed by several speakers in the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, among them Bhutan and Italy. Ethiopia said the financial support actually provided to UNICEF was a sad contrast to the professions of support for it. Bangladesh and others appealed to developed countries to make adequate resources available. Yugoslavia appreciated the efforts of the Executive Director to raise special contributions to the general resources of UNICEF. Poland stated that the permanent shortage of its currency in UNICEF seemed to be the best proof that contributions in national currencies could be used; in the opinion of the Byelorussian SSR, the experience of UNICEF showed that the supposed difficulties created by contributions in national currencies had been groundlessly exaggerated and the great possibilities to be found in the

socialist countries for providing assistance to developing countries had not been exploited to the full.

Reports: UNICEF Board, <sup>(1)</sup>E/ICEF/687, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1981/48.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/56, para. 2, 22 July (p. 1000);

<sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/197, paras. 7 & 8, 17 Dec. (p. 1001).

Arab Gulf Programme for UN Development Organizations. In early 1981, consultations between Prince Talal bin Abdul Aziz al Saud of Saudi Arabia and leaders of the Gulf Arab States resulted in the establishment of an Arab Gulf Programme for United Nations Development

Organizations, to provide support for UNICEF, the United Nations Development Programme and other United Nations organizations concerned with human resources development. The Programme, initially known as the Arab Gulf Development Foundation for the United Nations, pledged \$22 million to UNICEF for 1981.

In January<sup>(1)</sup> and May,<sup>(2)</sup> the UNICEF Executive Board, which had followed up on the Programme's development through a progress report of the Executive Director,<sup>(3)</sup> expressed appreciation to Prince Talal for his efforts.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNICEF  
(INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS FOR KAMPUCHEAN RELIEF)  
(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country or territory	Paid or pledged in 1981	Country or territory	paid or pledged in 1981	Country or territory	paid or pledged in 1981
Afghanistan	30,000	Hong Kong	6,913	St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla	750
Algeria	113,130	Hungary	16,926	Saint Lucia	2,587
Antigua	299	Iceland	18,426	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1,500
Argentina	103,407	India	1,976,471	San Marino	2,521
Australia	3,147,210	Indonesia	654,890	Saudi Arabia	1,000,000
Austria	764,427	Iran	342,784	Seychelles	1,000
Bahamas	2,962	Iraq	122,034	Singapore	11,389
Bahrain	7,500	Ireland	482,145	Somalia	19,262
Bangladesh	4,056	Israel	45,000	Spain	228,000
Belgium	1,255,000	Italy	9,182,460	Sri Lanka	10,922
Benin	10,601	Ivory Coast	93,103	Sudan	35,000
Bhutan	2,000	Jamaica	15,169	Swaziland	6,952
Bolivia	16,000	Japan	9,871,247	Sweden	27,934,253
Botswana	11,175	Jordan	29,762	Switzerland	5,812,632
Brazil	85,000	Kenya	24,762	Syria <sup>1</sup> Arab Republic	25,641
British Virgin Islands	299	Kuwait	200,000	Thailand	292,871
Brunei	18,320	Lao People's Democratic Republic	5,000	Trinidad and Tobago	10,365
Bulgaria	58,685	Lebanon	8,212,658	Tunisia	84,485
Burma	256,888	Lesotho	2,055	Turkey	162,231
Byelorussian SSR	79,337	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	75,000	Ukrainian SSR	158,674
Canada	9,337,715	Liechtenstein	2,000	USSR	880,435
Chile	220,000	Luxembourg	33,268	United Arab Emirates	823,900
China	212,500	Madagascar	10,601	United Kingdom	11,827,525
Colombia	359,066	Malawi	4,264	United Republic of Cameroon	85,797
Congo	16,519	Malaysia	389,951	United Republic of Tanzania	33,939
Cuba	93,139	Maldives	3,000	United States	42,351,820
Czechoslovakia	85,179	Malta	5,229	Venezuela	200,000
Democratic Yemen	5,060	Mauritania	2,000	Viet Nam	5,000
Denmark	5,825,480	Mauritius	4,019	Yemen	50,869
Djibouti	2,000	Mexico	286,481	Yugoslavia	235,000
Dominica	999	Monaco	23,911	Zaire	102,000
Dominican Republic	10,000	Mongolia	3,500	Zambia	44,637
Ecuador	37,520	Montserrat	200		
Egypt	72,110	Morocco	100,000	Subtotal	193,803,184*
Ethiopia	49,647	Nepal	8,824		
Fiji	2,000	Netherlands	16,345,382	Intergovernmental agencies	
Finland	2,370,501	New Zealand	660,436	European Community	6,504,453
France	1,774,509	Nigeria	242,558	Arab Gulf Programme for UN Development Organizations	22,000,000**
Gambia	5,325	Norway	17,236,653		
German Democratic Republic	133,333	Oman	50,000	Subtotal	28,504,453*
Germany, Federal Republic of	6,402,563	Pakistan	159,343	Non-governmental sources	35,949,299
Ghana	9,600	Panama	22,000	United Nations system	3,320,623
Greece	120,000	Paraguay	7,000	Adjustments to prior years' income	(186,396)
Grenada	3,748	Peru	120,000		
Guatemala	30,600	Philippines	516,234	Total	261,391,165*
Guinea-Bissau	395	Poland	209,211		
Guyana	4,480	Portugal	15,000		
Haiti	7,500	Qatar	200,000		
Holy See	1,000	Republic of Korea	128,000		
Honduras	20,000	Romania	12,500		
		Rwanda	4,077		

\*May differ from the sum of individual contributions because of rounding.

\*\*The total pledge for 1981 amounted to \$25,000,000; at year's end, an allocation of \$3,000,000 of that pledge was still under finalization.

The Programme's Administration Committee held its first meeting in April, attended by representatives of all its members: Bahrain, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.

In October, the Committee considered UNICEF-assisted projects totalling \$25 million for the period covering September 1981 to September 1982, approved 10 of those projects totalling \$10.2 million and set a target of \$50 million for private contributions over the same period. Contributions to the Programme from its member States totalled \$91 million in 1981, of which \$69 million was pledged by Saudi Arabia.

Reports: UNICEF Board: <sup>(1)</sup>E/ICEF/680, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1981/48; <sup>(3)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/676.

#### Organizational questions

##### Administration and management

At its special session held in New York from 22 to 24 October 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the UNICEF Executive Board took note of the recommendations and conclusions of its Committee on Administration and Finance, which also met in New York, on 22 and 23 October,<sup>(2)</sup> and approved the creation of 30 posts over the staffing level of 1,862 posts for 1980-1981, primarily for the new field offices to be established in Beijing, China, and Salisbury, Zimbabwe, and in support of decentralization, field programme delivery and accountability. The Board also authorized 17 net upgradings to accommodate the proposed reclassification of posts, and the conversion of 11 posts at the UNICEF Packing and Assembly Centre at Copenhagen, Denmark (p. 1012), from the national officer to the international professional category.

The Executive Director agreed to submit to the 1982 Board session a report on his administration of the staffing guidelines approved by the Board in 1981. In addition, the Board agreed to include in the agenda of its 1982 session an item on resources, administrative efficiency and programme delivery.

In 1981, UNICEF became the first United Nations entity to meet the 25 per cent target set by the General Assembly in 1978 for the recruitment of women in the Professional category.<sup>(3)</sup>

During the debate in the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee, France said that, in view of the low increase of resources and in order to preserve the Fund's excellent reputation, the creation of new posts, particularly at high levels, would have to be done very cautiously and gradually. The Byelorussian SSR said UNICEF should seek to achieve a better balance in recruiting experts from various countries, especially the socialist countries.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/ICEF/687; <sup>(2)</sup>UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance, E/ICEF/AB/L.236.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 33/143, sect. III, para. 1, 20 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 989).

##### Relations with NGOs

An increasing number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were interested and involved in UNICEF work at the local, national and regional levels.

The Chairman of the NGO Committee on UNICEF, which included 116 international organizations world-wide, informed the UNICEF Executive Board at its regular session in May 1981<sup>(1)</sup> of the two symposia organized by the Committee early in the year, on childhood disability prevention and on breast-feeding promotion strategies.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/1981/48.

National committees. In 1981, the income channelled from UNICEF national committees from fund-raising; including greeting card sales (p. 1011), amounted to \$48 million, or 17 per cent of UNICEF total income.<sup>(2)</sup>

At the May session of the UNICEF Executive Board,<sup>(1)</sup> a number of representatives suggested that the UNICEF secretariat should give greater support to the national committees for the expansion of their work in new, more substantive fields. It was noted that, in addition to their traditional advocacy and fund-raising roles, the committees had become increasingly involved in information-sharing and development education, and served as focal points for the follow-up of the 1979 International Year of the Child.

Efforts to strengthen UNICEF relations with the national committees included a collective study tour to the field by a group of committees, implementation of a new system of 'twinning' between donor and recipient countries, and the holding of an information workshop for national committees, at Bienne/Twannberg, Switzerland, in November.

The role of the national committees was emphasized by Canada during the debate in the General Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/1981/48; <sup>(2)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/690.

##### Public information

The advocacy and fund-raising efforts of the UNICEF Special Envoy, Prince Talal bin Abdul Aziz al Saud of Saudi Arabia (p. 1009), stimulated extensive media coverage and helped raise special funds in a number of industrialized countries as well as in the Gulf Arab States. In addition, the UNICEF Goodwill Ambassadors, Danny

Kaye, Liv Ullmann and Peter Ustinov, contributed to raising public consciousness on behalf of children and mothers affected in emergency situations.

Information activities of UNICEF in 1981 included support for the international campaign for the promotion of breast-feeding, the International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes (p. 1005), the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation (1981-1990) (p. 684) and the International of Disabled Persons (1981) (p. 795). Support was provided for media visits to the field. Development education as a facet of information work received priority in many national committees.

The Executive Director's report on The State of the World's Children 1981-1982 was given expanded distribution, translated into 18 languages, and received extensive media coverage. Advocacy material produced during the year included 25 television co-productions and 10 films, one of them nominated in the United States for an Academy Award.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/690.

#### Greeting Card Operation

During the 1980 Greeting Card Operation (GCO) season (1 May 1980-30 April 1981), 117 million cards (4 million more than the 1979 season), 478,000 calendars, 347,000 packs of stationery and other related items were sold in 132 countries, generating record gross proceeds of \$47.2 million (an increase of 4.9 per cent over the previous season) and bringing in a record net income of \$18.4 million (\$1.3 million more than in 1979, but \$4.2 million less than estimated) to UNICEF general resources.<sup>(3)</sup> Operational expenditures of \$19.5 million were 12 per cent higher than the previous year but 2 per cent less than projected.<sup>(1)</sup>

At a meeting of the Committee on Administration and Finance in May,<sup>(2)</sup> the Senior Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF explained that the reported net income of the 1980 season was \$5 million lower than the approved estimates, due to a lower-than-expected sales volume (\$3 million) and to exchange rate fluctuations (\$2 million).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Board of Auditors, and financial statements, A/37/5/Add.2; <sup>(2)</sup>UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance, E/ICEF/AB/L.230/Rev.1; <sup>(3)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/690.

Budget for 1981/1982. On the recommendation of the Committee on Administration and Finance,<sup>(3)</sup> the UNICEF Executive Board approved in May 1981<sup>(2)</sup> budget estimates for the 1981 GCO season (1 May 1981-30 April 1982) as submitted by the Executive Director.<sup>(1)</sup> The budget included \$23.4 million (gross) for operational

costs and a projected gross income of \$49.7 million (or \$26.3 million net). The Board also authorized the Executive Director to advance up to \$7.2 million against 1982 expenditure estimates and to spend additional amounts under specified conditions.

Budget estimates: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/AB/L.226. Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/1981/48; <sup>(3)</sup>UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance, E/ICEF/AB/L.230/Rev.1.

Accounts for 1978/1979 and 1979/1980. At its May 1981 session, the UNICEF Executive Board,<sup>(5)</sup> on the recommendation of its Committee on Administration and Finance,<sup>(6)</sup> took note of the financial report for the 1979 GCO season (1 May 1979-30 April 1980), the observations of the Board of Auditors<sup>(2)</sup> and of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) on the financial report for the 1978 season (1 May 1978-30 April 1979), and the UNICEF Executive Director's response, submitted to the Committee on Administration and Finance in January 1981.<sup>(3)</sup>

Expressing concern over the expenditures for the maintenance of GCO sales offices in some countries, the Board of Auditors recommended a review of the arrangements and indicated that the administration agreed with that recommendation. The Executive Director noted that the development of an effective sales, distribution and marketing system necessitated high initial costs which should be viewed as an investment, and that as sales increased the ratio of income to expenses would improve.

At the May 1981 session of the Committee on Administration and Finance, several representatives emphasized that maximum profits should be made by minimizing the operating and administrative costs.

In their observations on the 1979 GCO season,<sup>(4)</sup> the Auditors made a series of recommendations on various aspects of management, including unrecorded obligations, procurement practices and over-production of cards. Examining those recommendations, ACABQ, in its September 1981 report to the General Assembly, <sup>(1)</sup> recommended that over-production be minimized, and noted UNICEF efforts to improve sales forecasting and sales of unsold cards.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/480. Board of Auditors, and financial statements: <sup>(2)</sup>A/35/5/Add.2, and <sup>(3)</sup>UNICEF Director observations, E/ICEF/AB/L.222; <sup>(4)</sup>A/36/5/Add.2. <sup>(5)</sup>UNICEF Board, E/1981/48. <sup>(6)</sup>UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance, E/ICEF/AB/L.230/Rev.1.

#### Supply operations

During 1981, supplies requested by UNICEF programmes totalled \$147 million and supplies valued at \$138 million were ordered.<sup>(1)</sup> By year's

end, orders were pending for supplies totalling \$55 million. The total volume of supply purchases in over 80 developing countries amounted to \$27 million and supplies worth \$38 million were packed at the UNICEF Packing and Assembly Centre at Copenhagen, Denmark.

Emergency supply assistance decreased to \$14 million from the 1980 figure of \$34 million, due mainly to the improved situation in Kampuchea, which continued to receive the largest emergency supply assistance, valued at \$10 million.

At the May 1981 session of the Executive Board, the Executive Director accepted Denmark's offer of new rent-free facilities for an integrated supply centre at Copenhagen. At that session, the Board also initiated plans for reorganization of the UNICEF Supply Division to consolidate supply operations for optimum efficiency and cost-effectiveness.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF, E/ICEF/692.

Budget of Packing and Assembly Centre. On the recommendation of its Committee on Administration and Finance,<sup>(5)</sup> the Executive Board,<sup>(4)</sup> in May 1981, approved revised budget estimates for 1981 for the UNICEF Packing and Assembly Centre (UNIPAC) at Copenhagen, except for a change of category of some posts from national officer to international professional. The revised estimates amounting to \$6.3 million, or \$0.5 million less than the original projections, had been submitted in April by the Executive Director, together with budget estimates for 1982-1983.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Board, also in May, referred the 1982-1983 estimates to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which, in its September report,<sup>(2)</sup> recommended approval of the estimates, but considered it unjustified to change the category of some UNIPAC posts. The change had been proposed in view of a 1980 decision of the International Civil Service Commission on national officers (permitting employment of national professionals only for functions at field offices which required local experience and could not be carried out as effectively by international professionals).

Following the Committee's recommendation, the Board, at its special session in October,<sup>(3)</sup> approved UNIPAC budget estimates of \$15 million for 1982-1983 (an increase of \$2.9 million over the combined 1980 expenditures and revised 1981 estimates). The Board, however, agreed to the proposed conversion of 11 posts from the national officer to the international professional category.

Recommendations: <sup>(1)</sup>UNICEF Director, E/ICEF/AB/L.228 & Corr.1.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ACABQ, E/ICEF/AB/L.231; UNICEF Board, <sup>(3)</sup>E/ICEF/687, <sup>(4)</sup>E/1981/48; <sup>(5)</sup>UNICEF Committee on Administration and Finance, E/ICEF/AB/L.230/Rev. I.

Increase in membership of the Executive Board

As agreed by the Executive Board in 1980, the Board Chairman held informal consultations aimed at reaching consensus on a recommendation to the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly relating to enlargement of the Board's membership, including number, criteria and composition. There was general agreement that such enlargement should be modest and should meet the criteria established by the Assembly in 1956<sup>(3)</sup> with respect to geographical distribution and the representation of the major contributing and recipient countries.

In May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the Board did not reach a consensus on the question, and requested its new Chairman to continue consultations in order to reach a decision at the Board's special session in October or at the next (1982) regular session. In October, the Chairman reported that consultations continued.<sup>(1)</sup>

Speaking in the Assembly's Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on behalf of the Nordic countries, Denmark expressed regret that no agreement had been reached; Australia hoped for an early settlement of the matter.

Reports: UNICEF Board, <sup>(1)</sup>E/ICEF/687, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1981/48.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 1038(XI), 7 Dec. 1956 (YUN 1956, p. 263).

Increase in membership of the Committee on Administration and Finance. Following up on an agreement reached at its regular session in May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> that the Committee on Administration and Finance be enlarged to become a committee of the whole, the Executive Board, at its special session in October,<sup>(1)</sup> revised rule 18 of its rules of procedure. Rules 60 and 61, concerning observers at meetings of the Board and its committees of the whole, were also revised, as proposed by the United Nations Office of the Legal Counsel.

Reports: UNICEF Board, <sup>(1)</sup>E/ICEF/687, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1981/48.

#### Draft declaration on adoption and foster placement

In 1981, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council took up consideration of a draft declaration on adoption and foster placement, first submitted in 1979.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. On the recommendation of its Second (Social) Committee, the Economic and Social Council, by a resolution adopted without vote on 6 May, requested the General Assembly to consider in 1981 the draft declaration on social and legal principles relating to adoption and foster placement of children nationally and internationally.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Committee approved the text without vote on 29 April. The resolution was based on a



draft approved by the Commission for Social Development (p. 770) on 16 February.<sup>(2)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. The Secretary-General, by a note of 28 September to the Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> recalled that the draft declaration had been prepared by a group of experts convened by him in response to a 1975 Economic and Social Council resolution,<sup>(3)</sup> that the text had been submitted to the Council in 1979<sup>(7)</sup> and that the Assembly had taken no action on the matter in 1979 or in 1980. The Council had noted in 1979 the wish of the Commission for Social Development that, in the event the declaration was adopted, a group of experts should draft guidelines for the use of Governments in implementing its principles.<sup>(4)</sup>

Acting without vote on 16 December 1981, the Assembly decided to include in its provisional agenda for 1982 an item on the draft Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to the Protection and Welfare of Children, with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally, with a view to its possible allocation to the Sixth (Legal) Committee.<sup>(6)</sup> The Assembly also decided that appropriate measures should be taken in 1982 to finalize the draft Declaration so that further action, as proposed by the Council in 1979, could proceed.

The draft Declaration, the text of which was annexed to the resolution, equated the best child welfare with good family welfare; emphasized the importance of children's rights to security, affection and continuing care; and asserted that foster family care should be a planned, temporary service leading to such forms of permanency as restoration of the child to the biological family or adoption. The text also contained a series of provisions on adoption.

Introducing the draft resolution in the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, Sweden said the item could well be discussed in the Sixth Committee because it entailed clear legal aspects and because the workload of that Committee offered better prospects for an early and thorough discussion; the question of how the Sixth Committee could deal with the matter was left open.

When the sponsor later proposed deletion, on the basis of informal consultations, of the reference to allocating the question to the Sixth Committee, Morocco asked for a vote on the retention of that phrase. After accepting a compromise amendment by Ethiopia, for inclusion of a reference to possible allocation of the question to the Sixth Committee, the Third Committee approved without vote on 30 November the text as a whole. Explaining their position, Iraq and Morocco asserted that the legislation of various

Moslem countries was incompatible with some of the provisions of the draft Declaration, and Iraq stated it could not accept intercountry adoption.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.3/36/3.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission for Social Development, E/1981/26. Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(3)</sup>1925(LVIII), 6 May 1975 (YUN 1975, p. 684); <sup>(4)</sup>1979/28, 9 May 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 769); <sup>(5)</sup>1981/18, 6 May 1981, text following. <sup>(6)</sup>GA: 36/167, 16 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1979, p. 765.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-8, 11 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-63, 64, 66 (19-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/18

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote. 29 April (meeting 11); draft by Commission for Social Development (E/1981/26); agenda item 10.

#### Draft declaration on social and legal principles relating to adoption and foster placement of children nationally and internationally

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolution 1979/28 of 9 May 1979, in which it submitted the draft declaration on social and legal principles relating to adoption and foster placement of children nationally and internationally to the General Assembly for preliminary consideration at its thirty-fourth session,

Bearing in mind the report of the Secretary-General on views of Member States on the text of the draft declaration,

Convinced that adoption of the draft declaration will promote the well-being of children with special needs,

Requests the General Assembly to consider at its thirty-sixth session the draft declaration on social and legal principles relating to adoption and foster placement of children nationally and internationally so that the further action proposed in Economic and Social Council resolution 1979/28 may proceed.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/167

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote. 30 November (meeting 66); draft by Sweden (A/C.3/36/L.75), orally revised and orally amended by Morocco, sub-amended by Ethiopia; agenda item 12.

#### Draft Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to the Protection and Welfare of Children, with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally

The General Assembly,

Recalling Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/18 of 6 May 1981 entitled "Draft declaration on social and legal principles relating to adoption and foster placement of children nationally and internationally", by which the Council requested the General Assembly to consider at its thirty-sixth session the draft Declaration annexed to that resolution so that the further action proposed in Council resolution 1979/28 of 9 May 1979 may proceed,

Bearing in mind the report of the Secretary-General on views of Member States on the text of the draft Declaration,

Convinced that adoption of the draft Declaration will promote the well-being of children with special needs,

1. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item entitled "Draft Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to the Protection and Welfare of Children, with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally" with a view to the possible allocation of the item to the Sixth Committee;

2. Decides, in order that the further action proposed in Economic and Social Council resolution 1979/28 may proceed, that appropriate measures should be taken at Its thirty-seventh session to finalize the draft Declaration.

#### ANNEX

Draft Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to the Protection and Welfare of Children, with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally

##### A. General family and child welfare

1. It is in the best interest of every nation to give a high priority to family and child welfare as it plans for the use and further development of national resources.

2. It is recognized that the best child welfare is good family welfare.

3. It is affirmed that the first priority for a child is to be cared for by the biological parents. Other family members should be the first alternative if the biological parents cannot provide care for the child.

4. When biological family care is unavailable or inappropriate, substitute family care should be considered.

5. It must be recognized that there are parents who cannot bring up their own children and that the children's rights to security, affection and continuing care should be of greatest importance.

6. Providers of service should have professional social work training in family and child welfare.

##### B. Foster placement

7. Every child has a right to a family. Children who cannot remain in their biological family should be placed in a foster family or adoption in preference to Institutions, unless the child's particular needs can best be met in a specialized facility.

8. Children for whom institutional care was formerly regarded as the only option should be placed with families, both foster and adoptive.

9. Provision should be made for regulation of placement of children outside of their biological family.

10. Foster family care should be a planned, temporary service as a bridge to permanency for a child, which includes but is not limited to restoration to the biological family or adoption.

11. Planning for the child in foster family care must involve the biological family, foster family and child, if appropriate, under the auspices of a competent authorized agency.

##### C. Adoption

12. The primary purpose of adoption is to provide a permanent family for a child who cannot be cared for by his/her biological family.

13. Adoption procedures should be flexible enough to meet the child's needs in various situations.

14. In considering possible adoption placements, those responsible for the child should select the most appropriate environment for the particular child concerned.

15. Sufficient time and adequate counselling should be given to the biological parents to enable them to reach a decision on their child's future, recognizing that it is in the child's best interest to reach this decision as early as possible.

16. Legislation and services should ensure that the child becomes an integral part of the adoptive family.

17. The need of adult adoptees to know about their background should be recognized.

18. There should be recognition, in the law, of traditional adoption within the family, to ensure the protection of the children and to assist the family by counselling.

19. Governments should determine the adequacy of their national services for children and recognize those children whose needs are not being met by existing services. For some of these children, intercountry adoption may be considered as a suitable means of providing them with a family.

20. When intercountry adoption is considered, policy and legislation should be established to protect the children concerned.

21. In each country, placements should be made through authorized agencies competent to deal with intercountry adoption services and providing the same safeguards and standards as are applied in national adoptions.

22. Proxy adoptions are not acceptable, in consideration of the child's legal and social safety.

23. No adoption plan should be considered before it has been established that the child is legally free for adoption and the pertinent documents necessary to complete the adoption are available. All necessary consents must be in a form which is legally valid in both countries. It must be definitely established that the child will be able to immigrate into the country of the prospective adopters and can subsequently obtain their nationality.

24. In intercountry adoption, legal validation of the adoption should be assured in the countries involved.

25. The child should at all times have a name, a nationality and a legal guardian.

## Youth

### Youth and development

Youth in the 1980s would face a concrete structural crisis of chronic economic uncertainty and even deprivation, the Secretary-General warned in his January 1981 report on youth in the contemporary world,<sup>(2)</sup> prepared in response to a 1979 Economic and Social Council request<sup>(3)</sup> and considered by the Commission for Social Development at its February 1981 session.<sup>(1)</sup> The report pointed to a possible deterioration of the situation, particularly of youth in developing countries, which centred on illiteracy, lack of educational opportunities, unemployment, underemployment and the flight of rural youth to the cities. The effective integration and active participation of young people in society would most likely reduce the possibility of social dysfunction, lessen the probability of war and augment the possibility of development, peace and stability.

The Secretary-General also discussed major trends and activities of Member States in the field of youth and noted that considerable efforts were being made to provide youth with opportunities for productive work in the various socio-economic sectors.

Participation of youth in United Nations development activities was discussed in a March report of the Secretary-General to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) (p. 1016).

On the recommendation of its Second Committee, the Economic and Social Council, acting without vote on 6 May<sup>(4)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to submit his report to the 1981 General Assembly session and to take into account relevant views expressed in the Commission for Social Development in preparing the

documentation for the Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year (1985) (p. 1019). It also decided to include in the agenda of the Commission's next (1983) session the question of youth in the contemporary world.

The draft resolution, approved by the Commission on 16 February, asked that all relevant documentation be submitted to the Assembly. When the Second Committee ascertained that the only documentation considered by the Commission had been the Secretary-General's report, it approved an oral amendment by Ireland to reflect that fact. The amended draft was approved by the Committee without vote on 29 April.

The importance of youth participation in development was emphasized by a number of speakers in the Assembly's Third Committee, among them China, the Congo, Fiji, Guinea, Indonesia, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, Nicaragua, the Niger, Poland, Sierra Leone, Togo, the USSR, the Upper Volta, Yemen and Zambia. Guinea called for young people to receive priority in development plans and Zambia attached great importance to the participation of youth in decision-making and other development-related areas. Chile, China, Denmark and others believed that youth should be given a chance to participate, in particular in activities aimed at establishing a new international economic order. Indonesia warned that social dysfunction would result if youth were denied the chance to participate in development and to realize their potential.

Finland, on the other hand, said the participation of youth in development should be considered an integral part of general participation. Nicaragua agreed that the aim of youth participation in development should not be merely to resolve their own problems but to co-ordinate their efforts with other groups in society.

To integrate youth successfully into development, many countries, including the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Fiji, France, Indonesia, Mauritania, New Zealand, Norway, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, the United States, Venezuela and Zambia, stressed the need to combat problems affecting young people, in particular youth unemployment. Norway called for effective measures by United Nations bodies to deal with youth unemployment and Fiji urged the United Nations to recommend national and local action. National programmes against youth unemployment were considered necessary by a number of States, among them the Byelorussian SSR, Mauritania, New Zealand, the USSR and Venezuela.

The youth unemployment problem was highlighted in an Assembly resolution of 13 November on youth and human rights (p. 972).

Reports: (1) Commission for Social Development, E/1981/26; (2) S-G, E/CN.5/587.

Resolutions: ESC: (3) 1979/16, para. 5, 9 May 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 987); <sup>(4)</sup> 1981/16, 6 May 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-8, 11 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

#### **Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/16**

Adopted without vote      Meeting 14      6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote, 29 April (meeting 11); draft by Commission for Social Development (E/1981/26), orally amended by Ireland; agenda item 10.

#### **Youth in the contemporary world**

The Economic and Social Council,

Noting with great interest the importance attached by the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies to the concerns of youth,

Recalling its resolution 1979/16 of 9 May 1979, as well as General Assembly resolutions 35/126 of 11 December 1980 on the International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace and 35/139 of 11 December 1980 on channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations,

Noting with satisfaction that the Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples continues to provide a useful basis and incentive for further action in the field of youth, at the national, regional, interregional and international levels,

Conv/need that the preservation and strengthening of international peace and security are prerequisites for a secure and happy future for the youth of all countries,

Recognizing the importance of integrating young people in the overall life of society and of taking fully into account their special needs when formulating national plans and programmes,

Emphasizing the need for increasing the quantity and quality of opportunities for young people for their active and productive participation in the general development of society,

Reaffirming the necessity to intensify and consolidate the efforts of the United Nations so as to give effect to a co-ordinated and practical approach to youth programmes of all the United Nations agencies involved, as well as to strengthen co-operation with non-governmental organizations of youth or directly dealing with youth,

Noting the views on the question of youth in the contemporary world expressed in the report of the Secretary-General and in the report of the Commission for Social Development on its twenty-seventh session,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General on youth in the contemporary world, prepared for the Commission for Social Development;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to bring that report to the attention of the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session;

3. Further requests the Secretary-General to take into account the views expressed on youth in the Commission for Social Development in the preparation of the documentation to be submitted to the Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace;

4. Decides to include the item entitled "Youth in the contemporary world" in the agenda of the twenty-eighth session of the Commission for Social Development and that the Commission should consider under this item the second report on the situation of youth to be submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1979/16.

#### **UN activities**

Activities of the United Nations system related or directed to youth—defined by the Organi-

zation as those between the ages 15 and 24—were primarily field activities, 84 per cent of which were designed to provide them with services and 13 per cent to encourage their participation in development (p. 1014). Training was the main focus of some 87 per cent of field activities; other areas included institution-building, improvement of the situation of young workers, rural and underprivileged youth, and transfer of technological knowledge to youth.

Those activities, as described to the Commission for Social Development in a January 1981 report of the Secretary-General,<sup>(4)</sup> included assistance by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) for the training of youth leaders; technical advisory services by the International Labour Organisation on employment-oriented youth schemes; rural youth programmes by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; youth involvement, under the World Health Organization, in promotion of primary health care; and projects by the United Nations Volunteers programme (p. 460) and by the regional commissions for the promotion of youth's role in economic and social development activities.

The Secretary-General, in a March report to the General Assembly on co-ordination of youth activities,<sup>(2)</sup> pointed to the importance of enhanced co-operation between the United Nations system and youth and student non-governmental organizations (p. 1017).

In his March report to CPC on a cross-organizational programme analysis of youth activities of the United Nations system,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General noted the need for a more coherent and integrated approach through project evaluation and agreed system-wide objectives, for the development of indicators on youth participation and for an increased focus on a number of substantive areas such as employment, rural youth and juvenile delinquency in urban areas.

Apart from those areas, CPC, at its May/June session,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended that future United Nations activities should also focus on the handicapped, refugees, equal opportunities for young women, education for peace, and participation, particularly at local levels, of youth in development. The main thrust of activities should be national rather than regional or global.

The Committee urged that programme formulation should have built-in evaluation indicators; it disagreed with the Secretary-General's suggestion for dispatching joint advisory missions, and concluded that more important than a set of system-wide objectives was for each organiza-

tion, within its mandate, to have its own clear objectives and programmes.

By a resolution adopted without vote on 6 May,<sup>(5)</sup> the Economic and Social Council decided to consider at its second regular session of 1981 the question of the co-ordination of United Nations activities in the field of youth, in the light of the cross-organizational programme analysis and the comments and recommendations of CPC (p. 1076). The Council also requested the Secretary-General to continue, in the context of the 1985 International Youth Year (p. 1019), to analyse the views and suggestions of United Nations bodies and organizations on the question of youth and to report to the Council at its first regular session of 1982. The 14-nation text was introduced by Indonesia in the Council's Second Committee, where it was approved without vote on 29 April.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>CPC, A/36/38; S-G, <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/135, <sup>(3)</sup>E/AC.51/1981/2, <sup>(4)</sup>E/CN.5/587.

Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/25, 6 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-8, 9, 12 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/25

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote, 29 April (meeting 12); 14-nation draft (E/1981/C.2/L.1); agenda item 10.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Senegal, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

#### Co-ordination and information In the field of youth

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolutions 1979/27 of 9 May 1979 and 1980/25 of 2 May 1980 on co-ordination and information in the field of youth,

Recalling also General Assembly resolution 34/151 of 17 December 1979, by which the Assembly decided to designate 1985 as International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace,

Noting that the Advisory Committee for the international Youth Year has held its first session at which, in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 35/126 of 11 December 1980, it formulated a programme of measures and activities to be adopted and undertaken prior to and during the International Youth Year,

Considering that it is necessary to intensify and improve the co-ordination of the activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies relating to youth, so as to contribute fully to the proper preparation and celebration of the International Youth Year,

Convinced of the importance of giving widespread publicity to the activities of the United Nations in the field of youth and of increasing the dissemination of information about youth, especially in the context of the preparations for the International Youth Year,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on co-ordination and information in the field of youth,

Recalling that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination decided to undertake at its twenty-first session a cross-organizational programme analysis of the youth activities of the United Nations system,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to continue, in the light of the objectives and goals of the International Youth Year, to analyse the views, observations and suggestions of the specialized agencies and United Nations bodies on the situation, needs and aspirations of youth in the contemporary world and to report to the Council at its first regular session of 1982;

2. Decides to consider, at its second regular session of 1981, in the context of the discussion of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, the question of the co-ordination of United Nations activities in the field of youth. In the light of the cross-organizational programme analysis of the youth activities of the United Nations system and the comments and recommendations of the Committee.

#### Strengthening channels of communication between youth and the United Nations

In a September 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> submitted in accordance with a December 1980 Assembly request,<sup>(6)</sup> the Secretary-General reviewed progress by the United Nations system in implementation of 1977 guidelines for the improvement of channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations,<sup>(5)</sup> and proposed additional guidelines, including the establishment of national and regional co-ordinating committees for the International Youth Year (1985) (p. 1019).

The strengthening of co-operation between the United Nations and youth was also discussed in three other 1981 reports by the Secretary-General on: youth in the contemporary world,<sup>(4)</sup> submitted in January to the Commission for Social Development (p. 1014); a cross-organizational programme analysis of youth activities of the United Nations system,<sup>(3)</sup> presented to CPC in March (p. 1016); and co-ordination and information in the field of youth,<sup>(1)</sup> submitted to the Assembly in March.

Acting without vote on 9 November,<sup>(7)</sup> the Assembly adopted the additional guidelines; requested Member States, specialized agencies and other intergovernmental organizations to implement both the 1977 and 1981 guidelines, in co-operation with youth organizations; and asked the Secretary-General to report in 1982 on their implementation.

Annexed to the resolution, the additional guidelines-for national, regional and international action-invited Governments to consider the expansion of advisory services on youth activities provided by the United Nations, urged the regional commissions to promote integration and participation of youth in development (p. 1014), and called for the expansion of United Nations youth internships and the strengthening of the relationship with the Geneva informal meetings of international non-governmental youth organizations.

The 40-nation text, introduced in the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee by Egypt, was orally revised by the sponsors to include mention, in the preamble and in the guidelines, of the contribution that could be made by UNESCO to the improvement of channels of communication with youth. The Commit-

tee approved the text, as revised, on 23 October without vote.

During the Committee debate, a number of speakers, including the Congo, Denmark, Finland, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, Romania and Venezuela, stressed the importance of strengthening channels of communication between youth and the United Nations. The Netherlands expressed the hope that the Assembly would recognize the informal meetings at Geneva as a main channel of communication between the United Nations and youth organizations.

Finland thought that one way of improving communication and representation between the United Nations and youth organizations was to enable those organizations to participate more actively in the work of the regional commissions. The Netherlands welcomed the opportunity for youth representatives to participate in the work of the Assembly. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Mauritania stressed the need to increase the number of young persons participating as interns or in the work of the United Nations system.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/135, <sup>(2)</sup>A/3.6/427, <sup>(3)</sup>E/AC.51/1981/2, <sup>(4)</sup>E/CN.5/587.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(5)</sup>32/135, annex, 16 Dec. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 801); <sup>(6)</sup>35/139, 11 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1016); <sup>(7)</sup>36/17.9 Nov. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.15-17, 19, 21, 23-26, 27, 28 (12-23 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.49 (9 Nov.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/17

Adopted without vote Meeting 49 9 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/635) without vote, 23 October (meeting 28); 40-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.21), orally revised; agenda item 77 (b).

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Romania, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 32/135 of 16 December 1977, in which it adopted guidelines for the improvement of the channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations,

Recalling its resolution 35/139 of 11 December 1980, in which it requested the Secretary-General, taking into account the views expressed by Governments, to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, for adoption, proposals for additional guidelines, consistent with the guidelines already adopted in its resolution 32/135 and on the basis of the draft additional guidelines contained in the annex to its resolution 34/163 of 17 December 1979, as well as the suggestions of the Secretary-General in his reports to the Assembly at its thirty-third, thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth sessions,

Recalling also Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/25 of 2 May 1980 concerning co-ordination and information in the field of youth,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General of 10 September 1981,

Noting with appreciation that the report of the Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year contains useful proposals for the improvement of channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations,

Convinced of the need to improve the efforts of the United Nations and the specialized agencies with regard to the participation of youth in achieving the objectives of the Charter of the United Nations,

Equally convinced of the valuable contributions that youth can make in promoting co-operation among States and in implementing the new international economic order and the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Taking note also of the valuable contribution that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization can make in the improvement of channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations,

Bearing in mind the importance of the existence of channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations for the proper information of youth and youth organizations and their effective participation in the United Nations and the specialized agencies at the national, regional and international levels,

Convinced that the existence and the proper functioning of channels of communication between the United Nations and youth organizations form a basic prerequisite of the successful preparation, celebration and follow-up of the International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace,

1. Adopts the additional guidelines for the improvement of the channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations set forth in the annex to the present resolution;

2. Requests Member States, specialized agencies and other intergovernmental organizations to implement these additional guidelines, together with the guidelines adopted in General Assembly resolution 32/135, in co-operation with youth organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council and with other youth organizations concerned;

3. Requests the Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year to promote the implementation of the additional guidelines, together with the guidelines adopted in resolution 32/135, during the preparation for and celebration of the International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace;

4. Requests the Secretary-General, on the basis of the reports of Member States, specialized agencies and other intergovernmental organizations as well as non-governmental youth organizations, to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

#### ANNEX

Additional guidelines for the improvement of the channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations

##### A. National

1. Attention should be given to the expansion of advisory services on youth activities provided by the United Nations to Governments at their request.

2. Governments should consider the inclusion of youth representatives in their national delegations to the General Assembly and other relevant United Nations meetings.

##### B. Regional

3. The regional commissions should review their relationships with regional non-governmental youth organizations in order to facilitate co-operation with and among such organizations.

4. The regional commissions should pay special attention to the question of the active participation of youth in the process of development and should consider the need to co-operate closely with the international programmes of the In-

ternational Labour Organization, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization for the provision of services for and by youth with regard to employment.

5. In the context of paragraph 4 above, the executive secretaries of the regional commissions, within their mandates, should consider the promotion and co-ordination within their respective regions of all activities regarding the integration and participation of youth in development.

6. The regional commissions should consider the possibility of organizing regional workshops on questions relating to youth.

7. The regional commissions should, with the assistance of regional liaison officers, strengthen their co-operation with youth organizations.

##### C. International

8. The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination should continue arrangements for the promotion and co-ordination of activities in the field of youth and the integration of those activities into the overall programmes of social and economic development. This could be done by, inter alia, regularly including the item concerning youth in its agenda or convening ad hoc inter-agency meetings on youth, or both.

9. The practice of providing internships for youth should be expanded in order to give a broad section of young people from all regions of the world the opportunity of being acquainted with the United Nations and thereby learning of its activities. Those internships should not be confined to United Nations Headquarters.

10. The Joint United Nations Information Committee should take into account the views of youth organizations representative of all regions of the world on all phases of production of United Nations publications of interest to youth and ensure the broadest possible circulation of such publications.

11. The Secretary-General should continue to strengthen and promote the relationship with, and assistance to, the Geneva informal meetings of international non-governmental youth organizations as an important channel of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations.

#### Physical education and sports exchanges

The contribution of physical education and sports to human development and international understanding, as well as the relevant activities of Member States and UNESCO, were discussed in the Secretary-General's report of 9 September 1981 to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> submitted in accordance with a 1978 Assembly resolution.<sup>(2)</sup> The Secretary-General recommended that Member States be encouraged to develop physical education and sports activities to reach all sectors of society, especially the out-of-school youth and the rural population, and to promote indigenous forms of sport or adapt other forms through the use of local materials.

Taking note of the report, the Assembly, on 9 November, invited Member States to develop sports activities and physical education within the context of continuing education, and recommended the promotion of indigenous forms of sport as well as reduction of cost and infrastructure requirements so as to make sports accessible to all.<sup>(3)</sup>

The resolution was adopted unanimously, following its approval by the Third Committee on

23 October in like manner. Introducing the text on behalf of 17 nations, Argentina asserted that one of the aims of the draft was to foster indigenous forms of sports with a view to preserving the cultural identity of countries.

During the Committee debate, several speakers, among them the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, the USSR and Venezuela, stressed the importance of physical education of youth and of sports contacts among young people. The Ukrainian SSR expressed regret that the Secretary-General's report did not mention any examples of sports exchanges, not even the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow. Denmark was pleased that the International Youth Year (see below) would provide an opportunity to promote physical education and sports exchanges and that the Secretary-General gave priority to programmes designed to implement a policy of sports for all. Particular interest in sports activities during the International Youth Year was also expressed by Honduras.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/409.

Resolutions: GA: (2)33/8, 3 Nov. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 798); <sup>(3)</sup>36/16, 9 Nov. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.15-17, 19, 21, 23-26, 27, 28 (12-23 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.49 (9 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/16

Adopted unanimously Meeting 49 9 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/635) unanimously, 23 October (meeting 28); 17-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.23); agenda item 77 (a).

Sponsors: Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Guyana, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Physical education and sports exchanges among young people  
The General Assembly,

Recalling the Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples, proclaimed in its resolution 2037(XX) of 7 December 1965,

Recalling also its resolution 33/8 of 3 November 1978, in which it requested the Secretary-General to submit to it at its thirty-sixth session a report on the activities undertaken by Member States, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, regional organization and other interested organizations and programmes of the United Nations system in the field of physical education and sports, particularly among young people,

Taking into account the activities carried out by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization with a view to promoting physical education and sports in school curricula and their importance in furthering universal understanding and friendship,

Convinced of the importance of physical education and sports exchanges in promoting peace, mutual understanding, co-operation and the development of friendly relations among peoples,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 33/8;

2. Takes note also of the replies of Member States to the request addressed by the Secretary-General in accordance with resolution 33/8;

3. Invites Member States to develop sports activities and physical education within the context of continuing education and, in particular, to give priority to programmes developed in

the framework of a "sports for all" policy so as to reach all sectors of the population, especially young people who are not in school and the rural population;

4. Recommends that, in preparing programmes, special attention should be given to the promotion of indigenous forms of sport and physical training as well as to the adaptation of other forms of sport, especially through the use of local materials, and to the reduction of their cost and infrastructure requirements, so as to enable the largest possible number of persons to participate in these sports.

Preparations for the  
International Youth Year (1985)

Considering it necessary to disseminate among youth the ideals of peace, respect for human rights (p. 972) and dedication to the objectives of progress and development, the General Assembly endorsed in 1981 the Specific Programme of Measures and Activities for the International Youth Year (1985): Participation, Development, Peace.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Programme was prepared by the 24-member Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year at its first session, held at Vienna, Austria, from 30 March to 7 April.<sup>(3)</sup> Aimed at promoting policies relating to youth as an integral part of social and economic development (p. 1014), the Programme laid out the basic approach to the implementation of the objectives of the Year; established a timetable and guidelines for national, regional and international action; and discussed the role of non-governmental youth organizations. The Advisory Committee also made a proposal regarding the convening of its next session and took note of a list of regional and international meetings on youth, transmitted by the Secretariat.

Preparations for the Year were also discussed at an ad hoc inter-agency meeting, held at Vienna on 26 and 27 March,<sup>(2)</sup> where representatives of United Nations agencies and departments agreed that objectives and programme priorities of their activities should respond to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. The meeting also proposed convening an inter-agency technical working group for effective co-ordination of activities and the establishment of a voluntary fund for the promotion of the Year.

By its resolution endorsing the Programme, adopted without vote on 13 November, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to transmit the Programme to all concerned to ensure its early implementation, and to convene the second session of the Advisory Committee during the latter half of 1982. It also reiterated its appeals for timely and generous voluntary contributions to supplement funds provided for the Programme under the regular United Nations budget.

The Assembly's Third Committee approved the text without vote on 23 October. Australia

suggested that, in connection with the Programme, the Advisory Committee might be asked to consider the celebration of a day on which the youth of the entire world would symbolically plant trees.

Explaining its position in the Assembly, the United States said it had joined in the consensus on the understanding that the Secretary-General would take all steps necessary to absorb the cost of the Year's activities within available resources; the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, however, had advised that the adoption of the resolution would make additional funds necessary. On those grounds, the United States would have abstained had there been a vote, in spite of its general support for the goals of the Year. Concern that every effort be made to reduce costs was voiced by Canada.

In the Third Committee, the USSR declared that it had agreed to the approval of the draft on the understanding that no additional regular-budget funds would be required.

Introducing the text on behalf of 82 countries, Romania stated that it reflected the importance of young people's direct participation in shaping the future and of their role in solving the major problems of the world; while all the specialized agencies were invited to exert the necessary efforts, UNESCO, being particularly concerned with the problems of young people and because of its experience and knowledge, could make an essential contribution to the preparation and celebration of the Year. The sponsors stressed the need to make the best possible use of existing resources to cover the expenditures related to the Programme for the Year.

The majority of speakers in the Committee, among them Afghanistan, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, the Niger, Norway, Qatar, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, the Upper Volta, Uruguay and Venezuela, reaffirmed their support for the Year. The Programme for the Year was endorsed by many countries, including Bangladesh, Barbados, the Byelorussian SSR, Chile, Hungary, Indonesia, Jamaica, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, the Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Suriname, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda and Zambia. The USSR felt the Programme was on the whole useful, but needlessly exaggerated the role of the Secretariat's Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs.

Democratic Yemen, Japan and the Ukrainian SSR thought the Programme should be continuously reviewed and revised in the light of Member States' experience. New Zealand felt that States should not be expected to endorse the Programme before having had an opportunity to examine it carefully and before specific measures were undertaken as part of the preparations for the Year. Uganda expressed support for the elaboration of specific programmes for rural and urban youth and young women, but cautioned that such programmes should not result in offering unequal opportunities for certain groups.

Several speakers, such as the Bahamas, Chile, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Rwanda and the Ukrainian SSR, agreed with the Advisory Committee that the major thrust of the activities for the Year should be at the national and local levels, with international activities being primarily supportive. Barbados, however, considered regional activities more important than national ones, particularly in the Caribbean. Nepal said the establishment of national committees should follow the formation of a regional committee, which should meet as soon as possible to find ways of assisting Programme implementation. Sri Lanka felt that regional meetings could play a catalytic role in creating an increased awareness of the objectives of the Year. The Congo believed that the success of the Year depended to a large extent on regional organizations and called for an international conference. Zambia said the solution to youth problems, which were similar in many parts of the world, required international co-operation and should not be left to Governments alone.

The United Kingdom suggested that, in so far as possible, young people should determine the theme and activities of the Year through voluntary and non-governmental organizations, thus ensuring that the Year did not become excessively politicized. Finland said young people should participate in the preparation and activities of the Year, and Sierra Leone said youth themselves should decide on the plans of action for the Year. Greece said it would concentrate on the participation of youth in the formulation and execution of decisions, and the Federal Republic of Germany stressed the need for their involvement in policy-making and Programme implementation to ensure that the Year had a lasting impact.

As part of the activities of the Year, Afghanistan and Democratic Yemen favoured the idea of a charter of rights and duties of youth. Japan and the Netherlands opposed its elaboration; New Zealand considered preparation of an international instrument unnecessary.



By a note verbale of 12 October, Romania informed the Secretary-General of the establishment on 19 September of a Romanian National Committee for the International Youth Year.<sup>(1)</sup>

Note verbale: <sup>(1)</sup>Romania, 12 Oct., A/C.3/36/9.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Inter-agency consultations, ACC/1981/20; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G and Advisory Committee, A/36/215 & Add.1.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/28, 13 Nov., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/675; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/34 & Corr.1.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.15-17, 19,21-26,27,28(12-23 Oct.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.39(12 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.57 (13 Nov.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/28

Adopted without vote Meeting 57 13 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/637) without vote, 23 October (meeting 28); 82-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.15); agenda item 76.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace  
The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 34/151 of 17 December 1979 and 35/126 of 11 December 1980, by which it decided to designate and observe 1985 as International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace,

Recalling a/so its decision 35/318 of 11 December 1980 on the appointment of the members of the Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year,

Recognizing the profound importance of the direct participation of youth in shaping the future of mankind and the valuable contribution that youth can make in the implementation of the new international economic order based on equity and justice.

Considering it necessary to disseminate among youth the ideals of peace, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, human solidarity and dedication to the objectives of progress and development,

Convinced of the imperative need to harness the energies, enthusiasms and creative abilities of youth to the tasks of nation-building, the struggle for self-determination and national independence, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and against foreign domination and occupation, for the economic, social and cultural advancement of peoples, the implementation of the new international economic order, the preservation of world peace and the promotion of international co-operation and understanding,

Emphasizing again that the United Nations should give more attention to the role of young people in the world of today and to their demands for the world of tomorrow,

Recalling the topicality of assessing the needs and aspirations of youth, and reaffirming the importance of current and projected United Nations activities designed to increase the opportunities for youth and for its active participation in national development activities,

Believing that it is urgently desirable to consolidate the efforts of all States in carrying out specific programmes concerning youth and to improve the activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in the field of youth, including youth exchanges in the cultural, sporting and other fields,

Reaffirming the necessity for better co-ordination of efforts in dealing with specific problems confronting young people and in examining the manner in which those problems are being treated by the specialized agencies and by various United Nations bodies.

Convinced that the preparation and observance in 1985 of the International Youth Year under the motto "Participation, Development, Peace" will offer a useful and significant opportunity for drawing attention to the situation and specific needs and aspirations of youth, for increasing co-operation at all levels in dealing with youth issues, for undertaking concerted action programmes in favour of youth and for involving young people in the study and resolution of major national, regional and international problems,

Confident that the International Youth Year will serve to mobilize efforts at the local, national, regional and international levels in order to promote the best educational, professional and living conditions for young people, to ensure their active participation in the overall development of society and to encourage the preparation of new national and local policies and programmes in accordance with each country's experience, conditions and priorities,

Recognizing that the preparation and observance of the International Youth Year will contribute to the reaffirmation of the goals of the new international economic order and to the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Recalling a/so in this connection its decision 35/424 of 5 December 1980 and Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/67 of 25 July 1980 on the question of guidelines for international years and anniversaries,

Aware that, for the International Youth Year to be successful and to maximize its impact and practical efficiency, adequate preparation and the widespread support of Governments, all specialized agencies, international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and the public will be required,

Noting with great satisfaction the interest of Member States, various United Nations bodies and specialized agencies, as well as youth organizations, in the decision to designate and observe 1985 as International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace,

Taking note of the report of the Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year on its first session, held at Vienna from 30 March to 7 April 1981,

1. Endorses the Specific Programme of Measures and Activities to be undertaken prior to and during the International Youth Year, as adopted by the Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year and contained in the report of the Secretary-General, bearing in mind that continued review and revision of the Programme should be carried out in the coming years;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the Specific Programme of Measures and Activities to all States, United Nations bodies, specialized agencies and regional commissions as well as to the international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations concerned with a view to its early implementation;

3. Invites all States, all United Nations bodies, specialized agencies, regional commissions and the international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations concerned, as well as youth organizations, to exert all possible efforts for the implementation of the Specific Programme of Measures and Activities, in accordance with their experience, conditions and priorities;

4. Stresses the importance of active and direct participation of youth organizations in the activities organized at the local, national, regional and international levels for the preparation and observance of the International Youth Year;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to take the necessary measures to ensure the proper co-ordination of the implementation and follow-up of the Specific Programme of Measures and Activities, including the provision of information;

6. Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with Governments of Member States, specialized agencies and all the international bodies and organizations concerned, to prepare for submission to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, through the Advisory Committee, a progress report on the implementation of the Specific Programme of Measures and Activities;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to convene the second session of the Advisory Committee during the second half of 1982, prior to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, to provide it with all necessary assistance and to submit to it a progress report on the implementation of the Specific Programme of Measures and Activities;

8. Invites the Advisory Committee to pay particular attention to the implementation of the Specific Programme of Measures and Activities and, to this end, to submit adequate recommendations to the General Assembly;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to take concrete measures, through all the communications media at his disposal, to give widespread publicity to the activities of the United Nations system in the field of youth and to increase the dissemination of information on youth;

10. Further requests the Secretary-General to take all necessary measures in order to enable the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs of the Secretariat to perform its tasks and responsibilities for the adequate preparation and observance of the international Youth Year;

11. Again appeals to all States, to international governmental and non-governmental organizations and to the public to make in due time generous voluntary contributions to supplement funds provided under the regular budget of the United Nations for the costs of the Specific Programme of Measures and Activities and requests the Secretary-General to take all appropriate measures for obtaining such voluntary contributions;

12. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace" and to grant it high priority.

## Aging persons

### Social welfare of aging persons

By a resolution of 9 November 1981 relating to the elderly and the aged,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly recommended that Governments continue to give attention to the question of aging, particularly in the formulation of national development policies and programmes in accordance with their national priorities. It invited Member States to consider designating a 'Day for the Aging', appealed to them to make voluntary contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for the World Assembly on Aging (p. 1024), and invited the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) to continue providing financial support, particularly for the implementation of the plan of action that would result from the 1982 World Assembly.

The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to use the Trust Fund to encourage further interest in the field of aging among developing countries, to report in 1982 on the status of the Fund and on

Fund-financed project activities, and to strengthen activities such as monitoring and researching the implications of aging populations.

The 32-nation draft was introduced in the Third Committee by Malta, which orally revised it to have the Assembly: invite, rather than call upon, UNFPA to continue providing financial support; and request the Secretary-General to use the Trust Fund to encourage further interest in the field of aging among developing countries, rather than to meet their needs. The Committee approved the text, as revised, on 26 October without vote.

Speaking in the Committee, Greece stressed the importance of viewing the situation of the aged as a new category of human rights and endorsed the distinction made by France between the aged, who were dependent on others, and the elderly, who could contribute to society. In Kenya's view, action to solve the problems of the aged should reflect the needs of the particular regions and societies. The creation of a fund to improve the condition of the elderly was considered important by the Dominican Republic; the organization entrusted with administering that fund could protect their rights by promoting the adoption of special legislation and by providing economic and technical assistance to developing countries.

In preparation for the World Assembly, a Panel of Experts on Aging met at Vienna from 9 to 13 November, with the participation of 15 international experts as well as representatives of the International Labour Organisation, the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Population Division and the European Centre for Social Welfare, Training and Research.<sup>(1)</sup> The Panel declared that aging, an achievement of the twentieth century, should be transformed into a social asset by restructuring existing social institutions and services as well as national policies, which originally evolved in response to a very different age pyramid. The Panel maintained that the issues of aging should be discussed broadly rather than within the narrow framework of charitable or welfare dimensions, and that the prevailing myths and stereotypes about old age needed to be dispelled and replaced by the positive aspects of an aging society. Research was needed to understand better the phenomenon and problems of aging and to anticipate population trends so as to assist Governments in designing their development and population policies.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Panel of Experts on Aging, A/AC.208/7.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/20, 9 Nov., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.15-17, 19, 21-26, 27, 28, 29 (12-26 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.49 (9 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/20

Adopted without vote Meeting 48 9 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/638) without vote. 26 October (meeting 29); 32-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.28), orally revised; agenda item 80.

Sponsors: Bolivia, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Mali, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Romania, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

#### Question of the elderly and the aged

The General Assembly,

Recalling Its resolution 34/153 of 17 December 1979 on the question of the elderly and the aged,

Recalling also its resolution 33/52 of 14 December 1978, In which It decided to convene a World Assembly on Aging in 1982 to launch an international programme of action on aging.

Considering that the international programme of action on aging should respond to the socio-economic implications of the aging of populations and to the specific needs of older persons, and should pay due regard to the special situation of developing countries, In particular of the least developed countries.

Convinced that the objectives of an international plan of action on aging must be adapted to the alms of the new international economic order and the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,

Noting with satisfaction the preparatory work for the World Assembly on Aging, and the leading role being played by the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs of the Secretariat In the work of the United Nations In the field of aging.

Aware of the need for the continuing role of the Commission for Social Development and other appropriate United Nations bodies in the monitoring and evaluation of the international plan of action that would result from the World Assembly on Aging.

Appreciating the efforts of the specialized agencies and regional commissions and of the non-governmental organizations concerned In the promotion of awareness of the situation of the aging.

Recognizing the important role of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities In furthering solutions to the problems of the elderly and the aged,

Noting that a United Nations Trust Fund for the World Assembly on Aging has been established by the Secretary-General In pursuance of General Assembly resolution 35/129 of 11 December 1980,

Taking note with appreciation of the progress report of the Secretary-General on the question of the elderly and the aged.

1. Recommends that Governments should continue to give attention to the question of aging, particularly In the formulation of national development policies and programmes in accordance with their national priorities;

2. Invites Member States to consider designating In their respective countries a "Day for the Aging" devoted to activities by, and on behalf of, the elderly and the aged and to report their views and comments to the Secretary-General;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session the views and comments received from Member States pursuant to the invitation contained in paragraph 2 above;

4. Appeals to Member States to make voluntary contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for the World Assembly on Aging;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to use the Trust Fund to encourage further interest In the field of aging among developing countries, particularly the least developed among them, within the context of the World Assembly on Aging;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the status of the

Trust Fund and to include In his report an account of project activities financed by the Fund;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to strengthen, within the limits of existing resources and voluntary contributions, activities in the field of aging In co-operation with the organizations concerned, and In particular:

(a) To assist Governments, at their request, In the formulation and implementation of policies and programmes for the elderly;

(b) To continue to monitor and research the implications of aging populations, especially in developing countries;

(c) To promote technical co-operation among developing countries In the exchange of information and technology In this field;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at Its thirty-seventh session on the Implementation of paragraph 7 above and also to report any views received from Member States on the problems of the elderly and the aged;

9. Invites the United Nations Fund for Population Activities to continue to provide financial support In the field of aging, particularly for the implementation of the plan of action that would result from the World Assembly on Aging;

10. Decides to include In the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the Item entitled "Question of the elderly and the aged".

#### UN activities

In accordance with a 1979 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General, in a report of 13 January 1981 on national and international activities relating to the question of the elderly and the aged,<sup>(2)</sup> informed the Economic and Social Council and the Assembly that United Nations specialized agencies and regional commissions carried out their activities in co-operation with the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs (CSDHA), designated as the office responsible for the 1982 World Assembly on Aging (p. 1024). International non-governmental organizations (NGOs), including the two United Nations NGO Committees on Aging in New York and Vienna, actively campaigned for the cause of the elderly and for the World Assembly.

The report indicated that CSDHA was conducting two studies during 1980-1981, one assessing the situation of the elderly from the perspective of current aging population trends and the other identifying regional variations in the conditions and needs of the aging. In addition, CSDHA was expected to be involved in the implementation of an international plan of action, anticipated to emerge from the World Assembly.

The second Ad Hoc Inter-agency Meeting on Aging, held at Vienna from 27 to 29 April 1981, reviewed the preparatory activities of the United Nations system for the World Assembly, including the status of documentation being prepared by the specialized agencies.<sup>(1)</sup>

Speaking in the General Assembly's Third Committee, Uganda said new international programmes should focus on the welfare of the elderly and the aged world-wide and, in the case of

the developing countries, should emphasize the provision of such necessities as agricultural equipment, building materials and adequate water supplies. In the framework of the preparation of an international action plan for the World Assembly, Romania proposed to create under the auspices of WHO regional training centres for personnel specializing in gerontology and geriatrics and to encourage in-depth studies on demographic trends.

Expressing hope for increased UNFPA commitment to activities for the elderly, Malta said the United Nations programme on aging assumed a vital role in view of the potential impact, on the developing countries, of the prospect that the aging would comprise nearly 10 per cent of the world population by the year 2000. Chile considered it important that programmes for the elderly be institutionalized within the United Nations, and the Byelorussian SSR called for a wider exchange of information on the problems of the elderly.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Inter-agency Meeting on Aging, ACC/1981/21; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G.A/36/70.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 34/153, para. 6, 17 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 988).

#### Preparations for the 1982 World Assembly on Aging

The official preparatory work for the 1982 World Assembly on Aging commenced on 1 January 1981, amid a wide range of related activities already under way throughout the world. The decision to convene the conference had been taken by the General Assembly in 1978.<sup>(9)</sup>

In his January 1981 report on questions of the elderly and the aged (p. 1023), the Secretary-General informed the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly that several Member States had convened national or regional meetings or were considering establishing national committees on aging, as suggested in his 1980 draft programme for the World Assembly.<sup>(5)</sup> From 19 to 23 October 1981, one of the four regional meetings on aging in the developing world, organized in preparation for the World Assembly with UNFPA assistance, took place at Manila, Philippines.<sup>(7)</sup> A draft international plan of action on aging, prepared by CSDHA, was revised and approved in April by the Ad Hoc Inter-agency Meeting on Aging.

The Economic and Social Council called in May for the full participation of Member States, United Nations agencies, regional commissions and NGOs in preparations for the World Assembly.

On the recommendation of the Advisory Committee for the World Assembly, which held its first session in August, the General Assembly, in

November, accepted an offer by Austria to host the conference. Also in November, the Panel of Experts on Aging (p. 1022) suggested that World Assembly participants be given a package of documents dealing with demographic considerations, developmental aspects of aging and humanitarian issues.<sup>(4)</sup>

As at 31 December 1981, the United Nations Trust Fund for the World Assembly on Aging, established in response to a December 1980 General Assembly request,<sup>(11)</sup> had received contributions of \$5,000 each from Norway and Sweden, and \$361,000 from the United States.

INTER-AGENCY MEETING. The second Ad Hoc Inter-agency Meeting on Aging, held at Vienna from 27 to 29 April 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> endorsed the draft outline of an international plan of action prepared by CSDHA for the consideration of the Advisory Committee for the World Assembly, and agreed that CSDHA should prepare a draft declaration on the rights of the aging, to serve as an instrument for developing appropriate policies and programmes.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. By a resolution adopted without vote on 6 May,<sup>(8)</sup> the Economic and Social Council called on Member States, United Nations bodies and NGOs to participate fully in the World Assembly and in its preparatory work, and appealed to Member States to consider contributing to the Fund for the World Assembly. The Council requested the Secretary-General to convene two sessions in 1981 of the Advisory Committee for the World Assembly and to report to the General Assembly in 1983 on actions to implement the recommendations adopted at the conference.

Based on a draft approved by the Commission for Social Development on 17 February 1981, the text was orally amended in the Council's Second (Social) Committee by the USSR to omit a request that the decisions of the World Assembly be taken into account in planning the United Nations programme budget for 1982-1983. The Committee approved the text without vote on 29 April.

WORK OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE. The Advisory Committee for the World Assembly, at its first session held at Vienna from 17 to 21 August, recommended that the General Assembly accept Austria's offer to host the conference, which was conveyed by a letter of 6 May to the Secretary-General, who transmitted it to the Assembly in July.<sup>(2)</sup> Austria expressed the belief that holding the conference at Vienna would facilitate the preparatory work, as the relevant Secretariat units were based there.

The Advisory Committee also recommended that the General Assembly schedule two days of pre-conference organizational meetings, approve

the holding of three simultaneous meetings throughout the World Assembly and allow for two additional Advisory Committee sessions in 1982. In addition to examining the draft international plan of action on aging, the Committee agreed that the provisional agenda for the World Assembly needed further consideration and that the desirability of a draft declaration on the rights of the aging should be discussed at a later session, when a preliminary draft of such a document was submitted by the Secretariat.

Transmitting the report of the Advisory Committee to the General Assembly, the Secretary-General, in a report of 8 October,<sup>(6)</sup> stated that 14 Member States had established national committees or similar bodies for the World Assembly, that preparations were under way for the convening of regional intergovernmental meetings, and that international NGOs had decided to hold a World Forum at Vienna from 29 March to 2 April 1982 under the theme "The Social and Economic Integration and Participation of the Aging".

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. Welcoming the Austrian offer, the General Assembly, acting without vote on 13 November 1981,<sup>(13)</sup> decided that the World Assembly would be held at Vienna from 26 July to 6 August 1982. To the extent of the availability of funds, the Assembly authorized the convening of two days of pre-conference organizational meetings at Vienna, approved the holding of three simultaneous meetings for the duration of the conference and requested the Secretary-General to convene at Vienna two sessions of the Advisory Committee, in February and May 1982, to finalize preparations and documentation. The General Assembly called for generous contributions to the Fund for the World Assembly and invited UNFPA to continue providing financial support to the conference preparatory work.

An appeal for contributions to the Fund was also made in an Assembly resolution of 9 November, as was a request to the Secretary-General to use the Fund to encourage further interest in the field of aging among developing countries, within the context of the World Assembly.<sup>(12)</sup>

Introducing the draft resolution on the conference in the Assembly's Third Committee also on behalf of Austria, the Dominican Republic, France, Japan, Malta and Nicaragua, the United States said international co-operation was needed in the search for solutions to the problems of the aging. The text was orally revised by the United States to have the financial conditions also apply to the holding of pre-conference meetings. The Committee approved the draft, as revised, on 26 October without vote.

Explaining its position in the Committee, the USSR said it had agreed to the approval of the text on the understanding that no additional regular-budget funds would be required for its implementation.

Another draft, circulated by France and subsequently withdrawn, would have had the General Assembly emphasize the need to distinguish between elderly people living in a state of dependence and those capable of making a contribution to the community, and have the World Assembly highlight that contribution.<sup>(1)</sup>

Support for the holding of the World Assembly was reaffirmed by the majority of speakers in the Third Committee, among them the Byelorussian SSR, Israel, Japan, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Romania, Suriname, Uganda, the USSR, the United Kingdom and Uruguay.

A number of countries, including Japan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mauritania, Nepal and Papua New Guinea, expressed approval of the preparations for the World Assembly by the Advisory Committee and of the proposed draft plan of action.

Many States, such as Hungary, Japan, Liberia, Nepal, New Zealand, Sierra Leone, the USSR and the United Kingdom, felt the main stress should be put on national activities. The United States urged Member States to promote private and public activities on a national level.

Papua New Guinea, on the other hand, believed that international efforts were required in order to arrive at appropriate solutions. In Chile's view, the holding of regional meetings was one of the best ways to prepare for the World Assembly, and Nepal emphasized the role of the regional commissions and international NGOs in the preparations.

The Syrian Arab Republic hoped that the plan of action would cover all the requirements of aging persons, while taking into consideration their capacities. Suriname said the plan's objectives should be geared to those of the new international economic order and the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.<sup>(10)</sup> Romania felt the plan should offer the elderly and the aged a chance to contribute to national development, while the Byelorussian SSR and Hungary believed it should reflect the need for strengthening international peace and security. The United States said Member States must be urged to contribute practical proposals for the plan of action. New Zealand expressed the hope that the skills of NGOs would be utilized in the formulation and implementation of the plan.

France, Hungary, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and others supported the Advisory

Committee's proposal that the World Assembly should emphasize the humanitarian and developmental aspects of policies for aging persons. Romania and the USSR considered it one of the basic tasks of the World Assembly to provide for an exchange of information and experience, and France thought the conference should make it possible to ensure the use, for the benefit of all, of the untapped source of wealth which women constituted.

The United States expressed concern that plans for the World Assembly were behind schedule and that only one of the two preparatory sessions planned for 1981 had been held. The holding of two further Advisory Committee sessions was also supported by others, such as Hungary and New Zealand.

The establishment of the Fund for the World Assembly was welcomed by several countries, including Malta, which cautioned that its finances should be managed carefully, particularly at the preparatory stage. Nepal and others appealed for contributions to the Fund.

The Byelorussian SSR said the World Assembly and its related activities should not have additional financial or administrative implications for the United Nations regular budget.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>France, A/C.3/36/L.19.

Letter: <sup>(2)</sup>Austria, 6 May, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/357.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>Inter-agency Meeting on Aging, ACC/1981/21; <sup>(4)</sup>Panel of Experts on Aging, A/AC.208/7; <sup>(5)</sup>S-G, A/36/70; <sup>(6)</sup>S-G and Advisory Committee, A/36/472; <sup>(7)</sup>World Assembly on Aging, A/CONF.113/26.

Resolutions: <sup>(8)</sup>ESC: 1981/23, 6 May, text following. GA: <sup>(9)</sup>33/52, 14 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 799); <sup>(10)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503); <sup>(11)</sup>35/129, 11 Dec. 1980 (ibid, 1019); <sup>(12)</sup>36/20, paras. 4 & 5, 9 Nov. 1981 (p. 1023); <sup>(13)</sup>36/30, 13 Nov., text following.

Financial implications and revised budget estimates (r): ACABQ report, A/36/7/Add.12; 5th Committee report, A/36/676; S-G statements, A/C.3/36/L.25 & Rev.1, A/C.5/36/35; S-G report (r), A/C.5/36/36 & Corr.1.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.3-8, 11 (16-29 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.15-17, 19, 21-26, 27, 28, 29 (12-26 Oct.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.39 (12 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.57 (13 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/23

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/57) without vote, 29 April (meeting 11); draft by Commission for Social Development (E/1981/26), orally amended by USSR: agenda item 10.

World Assembly on Aging

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 33/52 of 14 December 1978, by which the Assembly decided to organize in 1982 a World Assembly on Aging as a forum to launch an international action programme aimed at guaranteeing economic and social security to older persons, as well as an opportunity to investigate the impact of the aging of population structures on society,

Reaffirming General Assembly resolution 35/129 of 11 December 1980 concerning the World Assembly on Aging,

Convinced that the World Assembly on Aging is a significant international event through which a long-term pro-

gramme of concrete and effective action on aging can be launched,

Re-emphasizing the important role of the Advisory Committee for the World Assembly on Aging,

Taking note of the establishment of the voluntary fund for the World Assembly on Aging,

Taking note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General concerning the preparatory work for the World Assembly on Aging,

Recognizing the role of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs in the preparation of the World Assembly on Aging,

1. Calls upon Member States, specialized agencies, regional commissions and non-governmental organizations to participate fully in the preparatory work for the World Assembly on Aging and in the Assembly itself;

2. Appeals to Member States to consider making contributions to the voluntary fund for the World Assembly on Aging;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to take all necessary measures to ensure that the Advisory Committee for the World Assembly on Aging shall meet twice in 1981;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, through the Economic and Social Council and the Commission for Social Development, on further actions to implement the recommendations adopted at the World Assembly on Aging.

General Assembly resolution 36/30

Adopted without vote Meeting 57 13 November 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/639) without vote. 26 October (meeting 29); 7-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.18/Rev.1), orally revised; agenda item 84.

Sponsors: Austria, Dominican Republic, France, Japan, Malta, Nicaragua, United States.

World Assembly on Aging

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 33/52 of 14 December 1978, in which it decided to convene a World Assembly on Aging in 1982, and 35/129 of 11 December 1980,

Bearing in mind that the number of older people in the world, in both the developed and developing countries, will increase dramatically during the next two decades,

Recognizing that the aging are a valuable human resource as much in the economic and social fields as in the transmission of the cultural heritage,

Emphasizing the great importance of the World Assembly on Aging in addressing the broad spectrum of questions concerning the aging and in helping to formulate policies to deal with these questions,

Taking note with appreciation of the report of the Advisory Committee for the World Assembly on Aging on its first session, held at Vienna from 17 to 21 August 1981,

1. Welcomes the offer of the Government of Austria to act as host to the World Assembly on Aging;

2. Decides that the World Assembly on Aging will be held at Vienna from 26 July to 6 August 1982;

3. Decides further that, subject to the conditions in paragraph 8 below, two days of pre-conference meetings should be held at Vienna immediately before the World Assembly on Aging in order to reach agreement on all procedural and organizational matters to be dealt with on the opening day of the Assembly;

4. Approves, subject to the conditions in paragraph 8 below, the holding of three simultaneous meetings—plenary meetings and meetings of two Main Committees—for the whole duration of the World Assembly on Aging;

5. Requests the Secretary-General, subject to the conditions in paragraph 8 below, to convene at Vienna two sessions of the Advisory Committee for the World Assembly on Aging, if possible from 1 to 5 February and from 3 to 7 May 1982, in order to finalize the preparations and documentation for the Assembly;

6. Urges those countries in a position to do so to make generous voluntary contributions to the Fund for the World Assembly on Aging;

7. Invites the United Nations Fund for Population Activities to continue to provide financial support to the preparatory work for the World Assembly on Aging;

8. Notes that paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 above will be implemented only to the extent that they can be financed by econo-

mies within the direct and apportioned resources requested by the Secretary-General in section 4 B of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1 1982-1983, or by voluntary contributions which may be or may become available from the Fund for the World Assembly on Aging.

## Chapter XXI

# Refugees

Continued preoccupation with the plight of the growing world-wide population of refugees and displaced persons was reflected in a number of actions taken by major United Nations organs in 1981, requesting the international community and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to provide both immediate and long-term assistance.

In 1981, UNHCR received the Nobel Peace Prize for the second time, and the accompanying cash award helped establish a Trust Fund for Handicapped Refugees. Other UNHCR contributions to the 1981 International Year of Disabled Persons (p. 795) included an August appeal to a number of countries to accept a large number of disabled refugees.

Total UNHCR programme expenditures in over 60 countries dropped from the 1980 level of almost \$500 million to \$474 million in 1981. More than one fifth of this amount was used to provide basic needs to over 2 million Afghan refugees in Pakistan. International attention focused on the situation of refugees in Africa, estimated to number some 5 million, when the ministerial-level International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (ICARA)

(Geneva, 9 and 10 April) drew pledges of contributions in cash and kind amounting to some \$567 million (p. 1039).

In South-East Asia, over 230,000 Indo-Chinese refugees still awaited a durable solution despite the overall caseload reduction due to massive resettlement. Refugees in Latin America numbered 280,000, and the tense and volatile refugee situation in Central America called for increased UNHCR presence and action. Europe had an estimated refugee population of 589,200 at year's end. In addition to its ongoing humanitarian activities, UNHCR assisted a number of countries in Africa and in South-East Asia in their programmes of voluntary repatriation or departure.

The activities of UNHCR from 1 April 1980 to 31 March 1981<sup>(1)</sup> and in the remainder of 1982<sup>(2)</sup> were described in annual reports of the High Commissioner to the General Assembly.

At its October session, the Executive Commit-

tee of the High Commissioner's Programme<sup>(3)</sup> expressed concern over the increasing number of refugees in northern Latin America, Pakistan, Iran, Angola and Zaire; noted with approval the High Commissioner's regional approach in the Horn of Africa and the Sudan; reaffirmed the importance of international protection and non-refoulement; called for burden-sharing; and urged Governments to seek removal of the root causes of large-scale movements (p. 1050).

In one of a series of December resolutions, the General Assembly urged UNHCR to provide humanitarian assistance to the vastly increased numbers of refugees, and called on the international community to share the burden of assisting refugees and displaced persons, taking into account the economic and demographic absorptive capacity of the countries concerned.<sup>(8)</sup>

Noting with concern the continuing massive flows of refugees (p. 965) and their implications for international peace and security, the Assembly established a 17-member Group of Governmental Experts on International Co-operation to Avert New Flows of Refugees to undertake a comprehensive review of the problem, with a view to developing recommendations and reporting to the Assembly in 1982.<sup>(9)</sup>

In four resolutions, the Assembly called for continued international and UNHCR assistance to meet the needs of refugees or displaced persons in Djibouti,<sup>(11)</sup> Ethiopia,<sup>(13)</sup> Somalia<sup>(10)</sup> and in the Sudan.<sup>(12)</sup> In May, the Economic and Social Council called for international assistance to Djibouti,<sup>(4)</sup> Ethiopia<sup>(6)</sup> and Somalia<sup>(5)</sup>.

The Assembly invited the three ICARA sponsors to ensure that the funds pledged at the Conference were channelled to priority projects, and requested the Secretary-General to keep the African refugee situation under close scrutiny so as to facilitate Assembly consideration of the need to convene a follow-up conference in 1983.<sup>(7)</sup>

On the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the High Commissioner, to complete the current joint review of the financing of UNHCR administrative costs with a view to establishing a proper basis for their financing.<sup>(14)</sup>

Reports: UNHCR, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/12, <sup>(2)</sup>A/37/12; <sup>(3)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/Add.1.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(4)</sup>1981/4, 4 May (p. 1043); <sup>(5)</sup>1981/31 (p. 1048), <sup>(6)</sup>1981/32 (p. 1045), 6 May. GA: <sup>(7)</sup>36/124 (p. 1041), <sup>(8)</sup>36/125 (p. 1031), 14 Dec.; <sup>(9)</sup>36/148 (p. 1053), <sup>(10)</sup>36/153 (p. 1048), <sup>(11)</sup>36/156 (p. 1043) <sup>(12)</sup>36/158 (p. 1050) <sup>(13)</sup>36/161 (p. 1046), 16 Dec.; <sup>(14)</sup>36/235, sect. XIII, 18 Dec. (p. 1037).

Publication: UNHCR (information tabloid), Nos. 1-6.

## UN High Commissioner for Refugees

### UNHCR activities

In 1981, UNHCR saw a relentless progression in the magnitude and complexity of the refugee problem, which required intensive and sustained efforts to provide for both immediate needs and long-term solutions.<sup>(\*)</sup>

Of some \$474 million spent during the year on refugee assistance in over 60 countries, <sup>(2)</sup>\$109.5 million went towards provision of basic needs to over 2 million Afghan refugees in Pakistan. UNHCR assisted a number of countries in Africa and in South-East Asia in their programmes of voluntary repatriation or departure, in addition to its ongoing humanitarian assistance activities. In South-East Asia, over 230,000 Indo-Chinese refugees still awaited a durable solution, despite the departure of 120,000 persons primarily to North America and Europe, which raised the total resettlement figure since 1977 to over 700,000. In Central America, the refugee situation remained tense and volatile, requiring increased UNHCR presence and action. New outflows of refugees in Europe called for UNHCR involvement on that continent on a slightly larger scale than usual, and the High Commissioner continued to act as Co-ordinator of United Nations Humanitarian Assistance for Cyprus (p. 1033).

As part of its contribution to the International Year of Disabled Persons (p. 795), UNHCR took steps to identify physically and mentally disabled refugees on a systematic basis, and launched in August a special appeal to a number of countries to give particular consideration to accepting a large number of disabled refugees.

The efforts of UNHCR were recognized by its receipt in December of the Nobel Peace Prize for the second time in history, and the 1 million Swedish kronor (\$184,162) attached to the Prize was used to establish a Trust Fund for Handicapped Refugees.

Introducing his annual report in the General Assembly's Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee on 16 November, High Commissioner Poul Hartling said refugee protec-

tion continued to demand a sustained and alert response at all times. He reported achievement of durable solutions and stressed that, while the international community must continue to give priority to the root causes of the refugee problem, it should do so in the appropriate forums, leaving the humanitarian character of UNHCR unscathed. In addition to co-sponsoring ICARA (p. 1039), other accomplishments of UNHCR during the year included a consultation meeting (Geneva, 20-22 May) with 130 non-governmental organizations to enhance co-operation; completion of a provisional version of a Handbook for Emergencies, designed to improve the UNHCR emergency capacity by ensuring the use of experience gained in crises; and introduction of a project management system for project planning, financial monitoring and programme evaluation.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION.** At its 1981 (thirty-second) session, held at Geneva from 12 to 21 October, the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme<sup>(3)</sup> adopted a series of decisions. Among them, it expressed concern over the increasing number of refugees in northern Latin America, Pakistan, Iran, Angola and Zaire; noted with approval the High Commissioner's regional approach in the Horn of Africa and the Sudan in dealing with the refugee problems in that area; and urged him to continue providing urgent humanitarian assistance to those refugees. It also urged the international community to continue its support to UNHCR assistance programmes, commended the High Commissioner for promoting the search for durable solutions, reaffirmed the purely humanitarian character of the High Commissioner's activities for the benefit of refugees and displaced persons of concern to UNHCR, and urged co-ordination of emergency humanitarian assistance activities among UNHCR and other United Nations bodies.

In addition to endorsing the recommendations of its Sub-Committee of the Whole on International Protection (p. 1054), the Executive Committee adopted a number of decisions concerning staffing, managerial, organizational and budgetary matters, and generally endorsed the High Commissioner's staffing proposals for 1981-1982 and his recommendations on strengthening the senior management level (p. 1038). These decisions were based on recommendations of the newly established Sub-Committee on Administrative and Financial Matters, whose terms of reference were fixed by the Committee in October.

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** On 23 July 1981, the Economic and Social Council, on an oral proposal by its President, decided without vote to transmit, without debate, the



UNHCR annual report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth (1981) session.<sup>(5)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution adopted without vote on 14 December,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly called on the international community to share the burden of assisting refugees and displaced persons, taking into account the economic and demographic absorptive capacity of the countries concerned; noted with concern the serious humanitarian problems resulting from armed attacks on refugee camps and settlements of concern to UNHCR; and urged Governments to join in greater international efforts for suppression of piracy on the high seas and to make generous contributions to UNHCR.

It urged the High Commissioner to provide humanitarian assistance to the vastly increased numbers of refugees in various regions, reaffirmed his leading responsibility in emergency refugee situations, commended him for his efforts on behalf of disabled refugees on the occasion of the International Year of Disabled Persons, urged him to explore arrangements to facilitate the disembarkation and resettlement of asylum seekers rescued at sea, and requested his continued participation in the ICARA follow-up.

The Assembly also took note of the High Commissioner's proposals on strengthening management and welcomed his intention to seek the assistance of the Secretariat's Administrative Management Service in undertaking a review of UNHCR managerial methods and organizational structure (p. 1038).

The Assembly's Third Committee had approved without vote on 24 November the 32-nation text, introduced by Norway. Before approval, the text was orally revised by the sponsors to add the phrase "taking into account the economic and demographic absorptive capacity of the host countries" in paragraph 3 on burden-sharing; Ethiopia further amended this phrase to replace "host countries" with "countries concerned". By other revisions, the Assembly urged Governments, in paragraph 6, "to join in greater international efforts in the suppression" of piracy on the high seas, rather than to co-operate in repression of piracy; and urged the High Commissioner, in paragraph 13, to explore arrangements to facilitate not only the disembarkation but also the "resettlement" of asylum seekers rescued at sea.

In the Committee's debate on the High Commissioner's report, a number of speakers estimated the world refugee population at between 10 and 12 million, and Finland said more than 10 million people were of UNHCR concern.

UNHCR efforts for humanitarian assistance were commended by many, among them Austria, China, Denmark, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Finland,

the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Pakistan, Spain, Turkey and Viet Nam. Malaysia and the United States urged sustained international support of UNHCR activities, Zaire called for concerted global action, and Lebanon and Yugoslavia termed the refugee problem universal.

Yugoslavia commended as timely and useful the UNHCR contribution to the objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women (1976-1985) and the International Year of Disabled Persons (1981).

Belgium believed the High Commissioner should encourage States to help refugees acquire new nationalities, as had been done by the United Republic of Tanzania, and endeavour to persuade States which had made their accession to the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees (p. 1055) subject to reservations, to withdraw them progressively.

The idea of international responsibility and burden-sharing in refugee assistance was voiced by many, including Australia, Egypt, the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan; Canada, Denmark and France, in particular, called for greater and fairer burden-sharing. Argentina observed that entire regions were taking no part in the solution of the problem, and Chile regretted that some countries were not contributing adequately to UNHCR activities. For Pakistan, the nations that had refused to assist refugees by removing the root causes of the problems or through international humanitarian efforts had forfeited their right to talk of their commitment to the Charter of the United Nations.

While Italy expressed concern about the decrease in the UNHCR budget for 1981-1982, Pakistan urged the international community to provide the Office with adequate financial and material resources. Sierra Leone appealed to countries which tended to earmark their contributions to leave it up to the High Commissioner to decide on the funds' best use. France said it was important to provide the donor Governments with regular and detailed information on budgetary matters.

Many expressed support for the proposed review of managerial and operational methods of UNHCR, among them Australia, Canada, Denmark, the Sudan and Turkey. The Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland and New Zealand supported the High Commissioner's proposal to strengthen management. The Sudan considered the expansion of administrative capacity necessary and welcomed the staffing proposal. Lebanon supported the new recruitment policy for achieving the widest geographical representation. Canada and Denmark welcomed the estab-

lishment of the Sub-Committee on Administrative and Financial Matters (p. 1035), and Finland urged that body to concentrate on those matters and not depend solely on its 1981 operational experiences which, it said, were exceptional in many ways.

For France, what was needed to co-ordinate the humanitarian activities of the United Nations was not the creation of a new body but the establishment of flexible mechanisms at the international level and on the scene to deal with emergency situations.

Several speakers, including Argentina, the Central African Republic, Oman, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Somalia and the United States, spoke of the burden borne by the asylum countries. China expressed sympathy and respect, and Ireland commended those countries.

In view of that burden, the Netherlands believed that material assistance to refugees should be integrated into the ongoing structural development programmes of the host countries. Agreeing with Lebanon that the UNHCR programme had expanded to cover not only emergency material relief but also quasi-developmental or socio-economic assistance components, Italy said that necessitated a programme examination and consideration of the possibility of entrusting to others within the United Nations system the task of seeking the most appropriate solutions. Ethiopia asserted that, while special consideration was sometimes necessary as regards the burden borne by some asylum countries, UNHCR should be critical in its approach so as not to perpetuate the problem; the growing tendency towards formulating approaches to assistance programmes for refugees on the basis of misplaced emphasis should be reversed, by obtaining accurate data through UNHCR machinery.

For Chad, it was the countries of origin that deserved assistance.

Liberia noted with interest that a working group of the Organization of African Unity and UNHCR, established in 1980, was conducting an examination of questions relating to the legal protection of refugees in Africa. Belgium, which saw a need for a proper international law on refugees, wondered whether giving the term "refugee" a broader meaning in Africa than in the rest of the world was a good legal practice and whether it might not be preferable for the concordance of the definitions of the term to be studied by a group of legal experts. Mexico asserted that the concepts applicable to persons seeking asylum, to refugees or to displaced persons were often confused or loosely used. For Australia, the search for lasting solutions must focus primarily on the problem of genuine refugees and not on

those who might more accurately be described as migrants. Argentina considered it important to ensure that the aid provided did not become an incentive for people to leave their countries for purely economic reasons. Afghanistan and Viet Nam spoke of abuse and misuse of humanitarian aid given for refugees, and opposed aiding those who conducted political and subversive activities.

Denmark, Liberia and Sierra Leone considered that international assistance should be aimed at providing subsistence for the refugees and helping them achieve economic self-sufficiency.

Along with Belgium, which considered international protection of refugees as one of the essential tasks of the international community, New Zealand supported the High Commissioner's efforts to ensure refugees' physical safety; Chile and Denmark welcomed the decision to convene a working group to study the problems arising from the rescue, disembarkation and resettlement of "boat people".

The Federal Republic of Germany welcomed the close contacts between UNHCR and Member States as well as the improvement in the Executive Committee's consultative machinery, while Cyprus welcomed active UNHCR collaboration with other United Nations agencies and inter-governmental organizations. Noting the central co-ordinating role the High Commissioner played in emergency refugee situations, Australia urged others in the United Nations system to co-operate. Denmark was pleased with the close co-operation between UNHCR and other humanitarian organizations. Australia commended voluntary groups which provided humanitarian assistance.

While reaffirming the humanitarian and non-political mandate of UNHCR, many, including Australia, Canada, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Nigeria, stressed the need for the international community to explore the root causes of the refugee question (p. 1050). China also pointed to the need for humanitarian assistance as well as a political solution. Thailand considered it essential to continue seeking durable political solutions.

Voluntary repatriation was considered by Bangladesh as the most effective solution to the refugee problem, by Belgium as durable though not perfect, and by Zaire as ideal. Denmark noted the success of voluntary repatriation programmes, while Japan welcomed programmes of orderly departure and repatriation. Supporting voluntary repatriation as the best solution, New Zealand none the less recognized the principle of burden-sharing where that solution was not

feasible. For Lebanon, permanent settlement and local integration of refugees were unacceptable measures that put the right of repatriation in jeopardy. Lebanon therefore had reservations regarding reference in the High Commissioner's report to local integration and resettlement possibilities, and provision of assistance to that end, for the refugees in that country.

Reports: UNHCR, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/12, <sup>(2)</sup>A/37/12; <sup>(3)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/Add.1.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/125, 14 Dec., text following. Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/186, 23 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR.40 (23 July). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.50, 52-55, 60 (16-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.97 (14 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/186

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by Council President.

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

At its 40th plenary meeting, on 23 July 1981, the Council decided to transmit, without debate, the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session.

General Assembly resolution 36/125

Adopted without vote Meeting 97 14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/725) without vote, 24 November (meeting 60); 32-nation draft, A/C.3/36/L.58/Rev.1, orally amended by Ethiopia and orally revised; agenda item 83 (a).

Sponsors: Australia, Austria, Barbados, Botswana, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of Ghana, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Portugal, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand.

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees  
The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on the activities of his Office, as well as the report of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the High Commissioner on the work of its thirty-second session, and having heard the High Commissioner's statement.

Recalling its resolutions 35/41 A and B and 35/42 of 25 November 1980,

Expressing deep concern at the persistence and gravity of the problems of refugees and displaced persons in the world, particularly in different parts of Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe,

Noting with great appreciation the positive responses of Governments to the problems of refugees and displaced persons of concern to the Office of the High Commissioner through offers of asylum, voluntary repatriation, resettlement, rehabilitation and financial contributions, as well as the generous support given to the Office of the High Commissioner in its humanitarian task,

Reaffirming the eminently humanitarian and non-political character of the activity of the Office of the High Commissioner,

Extending its Congratulations to the Office of the High Commissioner for the award of the 1981 Nobel Peace Prize in recognition of its work for refugees,

Considering the continuing and urgent need for a substantial International effort to promote durable solutions to the problems of refugees and displaced persons of concern to the Office of the High Commissioner through voluntary repatriation or return and resettlement, drawing particular attention to women and children refugees, and disabled and elderly refugees,

Noting with satisfaction that a growing number of States have acceded to the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees,

Noting with great concern that, despite an increasingly broad understanding of the principles of international protection, refugees still encounter serious difficulties in many parts of the world in obtaining asylum and that they are exposed to the threat of refoulement, arbitrary detention and physical violence,

Deploring, in particular, the instances of military attacks on refugee camps in southern Africa and elsewhere and physical attacks on asylum seekers at sea,

Drawing attention, to the problem of refugees rescued at sea and the difficulties encountered for their disembarkation, involving threats of refoulement,

We/coming the success achieved by the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa, held at Geneva on 9 and 10 April 1981, as a first step in arousing world-wide interest and support for refugees in Africa,

1. Commends the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and his staff for the manner in which they have continued to discharge their responsibilities for protecting and assisting refugees and displaced persons of concern to his Office;

2. Takes due note of the proposals made by the High Commissioner and generally endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Programme of the High Commissioner to strengthen the management of his Office on the basis of the principles and guidelines of the General Assembly, and welcomes his intention to seek the assistance of the Administrative Management Service of the Secretariat in undertaking expeditiously a review of the managerial methods and organizational structure of his Office, as recommended by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;

3. Calls upon the international community to share the burden of assisting refugees and displaced persons the world over, taking into account the economic and demographic absorptive capacity of the countries concerned;

4. Reaffirms the fundamental nature of the High Commissioner's function to provide international protection to refugees and the importance of promoting durable and speedy solutions, in consultation and agreement with the countries concerned, through voluntary repatriation or return and subsequent assistance in rehabilitation and, whenever appropriate, integration in countries of asylum or resettlement in other countries of refugees and displaced persons of concern to the Office of the High Commissioner;

5. Urges Governments to intensify their support for activities which the High Commissioner is carrying out in accordance with his mandate and relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, especially by:

(a) Facilitating the High Commissioner's efforts in the field of international protection, in particular by scrupulously observing the principle of asylum and non-refoulement and by protecting asylum seekers in situations of large-scale influx, as endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Programme of the High Commissioner at its thirty-second session;

(b) Supporting his efforts to promote, in co-operation with Governments, United Nations bodies and non-governmental organizations, durable and speedy solutions to the problems of refugees and displaced persons of concern to the Office;

6. Urges Governments to join in greater international efforts in the suppression of piracy on the high seas, in accordance with their international obligations, and to take appropriate action to protect asylum seekers from acts of violence at sea;

7. Notes with great concern the serious humanitarian problems resulting from armed attacks on refugee camps and settlements which are the concern of the High Commissioner, and the need for special measures to protect and ensure the safety of such refugees;

8. We/comes the measures taken to implement the recommendations on the subject of assistance to women refugees

and displaced women of concern to the High Commissioner in the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women, endorsed in General Assembly resolution 35/136 of 11 December 1960;

9. Commends the High Commissioner for his special efforts on behalf of disabled refugees on the occasion of the International Year of Disabled Persons;

10. Requests the High Commissioner to continue participating in the follow-up of the international Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa and urges the international community to maintain the momentum gained by the Conference in providing assistance to refugees in Africa commensurate with the growing number of African refugees;

11. Urges the High Commissioner to provide humanitarian assistance to meet the needs of the vastly increased numbers of refugees in various regions of Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe;

12. Stresses the importance of maintaining the relief efforts and the resettlement momentum for boat and land cases in South-East Asia, including the Programme of Orderly Departure, and urges all Governments to provide opportunities for durable solutions to these refugees;

13. Urges the High Commissioner further to explore the elaboration of arrangements in order to facilitate the disembarkation and resettlement of asylum seekers rescued at sea;

14. Reaffirms the High Commissioner's leading responsibility in emergency situations regarding refugees and displaced persons of concern to his Office as well as his responsibility in the co-ordination of assistance in those situations and commends him for the considerable progress made in the elaboration of adequate procedures to meet emergency situations, in co-ordination with the relevant bodies of the United Nations system;

15. Requests the High Commissioner, while carrying out his responsibilities, to co-ordinate and co-operate closely with other organizations within and outside the United Nations system for greatest efficiency of relief in the case of major emergencies;

16. Urges all Governments in a position to do so to contribute generously in order to provide the High Commissioner with the necessary means to attain the objectives of his humanitarian programme.

#### Assistance to refugees

Africa. In 1981, African countries remained the haven for some 5 million refugees and displaced persons. In the Horn of Africa and the Sudan, the situation was aggravated by natural disasters in Somalia (p. 1046), limited possibilities for durable solutions in Djibouti (p. 1042) and large numbers of new refugee arrivals in the Sudan (p. 1049). The commencement in June 1981 of a programme of voluntary repatriation to Chad, arranged by UNHCR at the request of the Secretary-General, and a July proclamation of amnesty by the Government of Chad drew an immediate response, as demonstrated by a decline in the number of Chadian refugees in the United Republic of Cameroon from 110,000 in 1980 to 25,000 in 1981: Of a total of 150,000 returnees, some 66,000 were assisted by UNHCR.

The 1981 UNHCR expenditures in Africa totalled over \$111 million under General Programmes and \$55 million under Special Programmes. Of this amount, over \$97 million was spent to promote local settlement of refugees.

The ministerial-level ICARA (Geneva, 9 and 10 April) drew pledges of contributions in cash and kind amounting to some \$566.6 million (p. 1039).

In October, the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme<sup>(1)</sup> welcomed the successful conclusion of the United Nations humanitarian assistance programme, co-ordinated by UNHCR, for the initial settlement and rehabilitation of returnees and displaced persons in Zimbabwe. Almost all the 111 refugees remaining in Zimbabwe at year's end were South Africans.

The following countries were known to host refugees and displaced persons (breakdown by origin of the 1981 refugee population, where available, is given in parentheses): Algeria (150,000 Sahrawis, 2,000 others of various origin); Angola (70,000 Namibians, 18,000 Zairians, 5,000 South Africans); Botswana. (1,300 Angolans, South Africans and Namibians); Burundi (234,600); Djibouti (31,600, mostly Ethiopians); Egypt (5,500); Kenya (3,400, mainly Ethiopians and Rwandese, in addition to a resumed influx of Ugandans); Lesotho (11,500, mostly South African students); Morocco (500, mostly elderly Europeans, the rest being African and Latin American students); Mozambique (about 100, mostly South Africans); Rwanda (18,000, mostly from Burundi); Senegal (some 4,000 of various origin); Sudan (419,000 Ethiopians, 110,000 Ugandans, 16,000 Chadians, 5,000 Zairians); Swaziland (5,600 South Africans); Tunisia (some 200, mostly Europeans); Uganda (80,000 Rwandese, 32,000 Zairians, 1,000 Ethiopians and Sudanese); and Zambia (29,100 Angolans, 4,700 Zairians, 4,300 Namibians, 2,200 South Africans, 200 others).

In Angola, programme modification was necessitated by repeated armed attacks into the territory. In Ethiopia (p. 1044), around 5,500 of the 11,000 predominantly Sudanese refugees no longer required UNHCR assistance. In Nigeria, UNHCR was requested to provide an emergency programme starting in March to assist the refugees from Chad, which comprised the majority of the refugee population there of 105,000. In the face of several emergencies including drought, flooding, epidemics and malnutrition, the UNHCR programme in Somalia first emphasized relief assistance for an estimated refugee population of 700,000, followed by income-generating and self-help projects.

The refugee population increased by 8,000 to 164,000 in the United Republic of Tanzania, as a result of a legal study which established the refugee status for 9,000 (previously estimated at 4,000) Zairians settled there and owing also to new arrivals, mainly from Burundi. The direct

responsibility of the High Commissioner for the Special Programme of Immediate Humanitarian Assistance in Uganda, launched in 1979, ended in March 1981; the Programme was subsequently administered by a special representative of the Secretary-General (p. 520). The continued influx of refugees from Uganda brought the refugee population in Zaire to 365,000 (215,000 Angolans, 115,000 Ugandans, 22,000 Rwandese, 11,000 from Burundi, 1,800 Zambia; emergency relief was necessary for a new influx of Ugandans at mid-year.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/Add.1.

Asia and the Pacific. Total UNHCR obligations amounting to \$250.8 million were recorded in 1981 for refugee assistance in Asia and the Pacific, where the number of Afghan refugees increased and the Indo-Chinese refugees continued to seek asylum.

In Pakistan, the number of Afghan refugees was estimated to have grown from 1,400,000 to over 2,375,000 in the course of the year, and the High Commissioner issued an appeal to the international community on 1 June for increased contributions. A rapid increase of Afghan asylum seekers at the end of 1980 led UNHCR to reopen an office in India, where the caseload involved 3,507 refugees, including 2,685 Afghans and 720 Iranians.

In South-East Asia, 99,000 Indo-Chinese refugees arrived in 1981 in countries of first asylum-75,000 by sea, as in the previous year, and 24,000 by land, half the 1980 figure. Although the departure of 120,000 persons primarily to North America and Europe raised the total resettlement figure since 1977 to over 700,000, more than 230,000 Indo-Chinese refugees still awaited a durable solution.

During the year, China received an additional 2,000 Vietnamese refugees, the number of Vietnamese "boat people" in Hong Kong decreased to 13,542, and Japan had a caseload balance of 1,798, after 1,026 arrivals and 1,181 departures for resettlement. In Indonesia, 7,395 refugees from Indo-China left for resettlement in third countries, arrivals totalled 9,328, and the first-asylum caseload of 6,191 awaited solution. A decline in Malaysia's refugee population to 9,845 Vietnamese and some 2,600 other Indo-Chinese, after the arrival of 23,113 "boat people" and resettlement of 25,652, made it possible to close a field camp and two transit centres.

In the Philippines, Indo-Chinese arrivals by boat doubled from the previous year to 8,353, 5,402 departed for resettlement in third countries and 6,628 persons awaited a durable solution. The 5,381 refugees arriving in Singapore in 1981 amounted to slightly over half the number in the

previous year; 5,967 persons departed, 539 Vietnamese refugees awaited resettlement and an additional 21,569 Indo-Chinese refugees arrived in transit for resettlement.

Due to fewer arrivals (42,792) and continued departures for resettlement (101,961), Thailand's refugee population of concern to UNHCR-composed mainly of Kampuchean and Lao-decreased from 261,334 in 1980 to 192,998 in 1981. After the closing of six camps, there remained three holding centres and one camp for Kampucheans, eight camps for Lao and one camp for Vietnamese, as well as one resettlement processing centre and three transit centres.

UNHCR assistance in the Lao People's Democratic Republic was directed to the remaining 3,500 Kampuchean refugees and repatriates from Thailand. The estimated number of Kampuchean refugees in Viet Nam decreased by 3,000 to 30,000, and 9,815 people-more than double the 1980 figure- left the country under the Orderly Departure Programme.

In Oceania, Australia accepted 13,485 refugees and displaced persons from South-East Asia, including 11,983 "boat people", and New Zealand accepted 607 Indo-Chinese refugees, including 155 "boat people". The UNHCR branch office actively promoted accession to the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees (p. 1055).

Western Asia had an estimated refugee population of 70,000, excluding Afghan refugees in Iran. The 3,200 refugees in Lebanon received UNHCR assistance geared towards self-sufficiency and supplementary aid.

At its October session, the UNHCR Executive Committee<sup>(2)</sup> noted with concern the continuing increase in the refugee arrivals in Asia, aside from South-East Asia, and recognized the importance of assistance programmes corresponding to the needs of the respective situations.

In a letter dated 30 October,<sup>(1)</sup> Viet Nam transmitted to the Secretary-General a press release issued on 9 October by its Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs concerning the agreement reached between him and the High Commissioner, during their talks at Geneva from 5 to 9 October, on increasing the number and rate of legal departures and on resettling the Kampuchean refugees currently in Viet Nam.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Viet Nam 30 Oct., A/36/640.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/Add.1.

Europe. The number of refugees in Europe at the end of 1981 stood at 589,200, and the total expenditures in the region, excluding Cyprus, amounted to \$8.8 million. There was a substantial increase in the number of Poles requesting asylum: nearly 30,000 Poles entered Austria,

where \$2 million was made available from the UNHCR Emergency Fund at the Government's request. The High Commissioner asked 24 countries to increase resettlement opportunities so as to lighten Austria's burden.

In addition to admitting Indo-Chinese refugees under established quotas, additional places were made available for handicapped refugees in the context of the 1981 International Year of Disabled Persons (p. 795). The local integration of 7,500 displaced persons from Africa continued in Portugal through UNHCR assistance, and the 20,500 Latin Americans in Spain continued to receive legal and other assistance.

At the request of the Secretary-General, the High Commissioner continued to act as Co-ordinator of United Nations Humanitarian Assistance for Cyprus (p. 346), providing medical, training and material assistance to those displaced as a result of the events of 1974. Total obligations in 1981 amounted to some \$12.7 million, including \$3.5 million for the construction of a hospital at Lanarca.

Latin America. Assistance totalling \$18.9 million, including \$9.9 million for emergency relief, was provided to refugees in Latin America, whose number reached 280,000 by the end of 1981.

In northern Latin America, where Salvadorians comprised 90 per cent of the estimated refugee population of 200,000, expenditures towards resettlement and local integration increased from \$350,000 in 1980 to \$3.3 million in 1981. While the number of asylum seekers from Guatemala and Nicaragua increased, smaller numbers arrived from the Caribbean and South America, mainly in Costa Rica.

Elsewhere, the overall refugee population in Argentina was estimated at 26,500, of whom 20,000 were from Europe, 5,000 from Latin America and 1,500 from Indo-China. The refugee population in Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay was 28,500, mostly of European origin, but the number of Latin American refugees was on the increase. In the course of the year, 710 Latin American refugees, mostly in Brazil and Chile, left for countries of permanent settlement.

In Peru, the new arrivals from other Latin American countries more than offset the departure of over 200 refugees for third countries and, at year's end, 730 Latin American refugees and 750 elderly Europeans remained in the country. Refugees of UNHCR concern in Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Suriname and Venezuela included 11,000 Europeans and 8,500 Latin Americans.

The Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme, at its October session at Geneva, expressed concern at the increasingly serious situation of refugees in Central America and called on Governments to continue co-

operating fully with UNHCR in extending international protection and material assistance to the refugees in that region.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/Add.1.

#### Resettlement of refugees

UNHCR spent some \$13.5 million in 1981 on resettlement activities, mostly for the transportation of refugees arranged by the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration (ICM). A tripartite agreement between ICM, the International Council of Voluntary Agencies and UNHCR was concluded in 1981 to set up an International Refugee Integration Resource Centre (IRIRC), to facilitate the sharing of resource materials, data and information on resettlement and integration.<sup>(1)</sup>

Many refugees in Africa, primarily from the Horn and from the south, were placed in urban centres which had no resources to absorb them. In Europe, a large number of asylum seekers arriving in Western Europe sought resettlement elsewhere, and some 34,000 asylum seekers were officially registered in Austria alone. The vast majority of Central American refugees had been allowed to settle locally, while refugees in Argentina and Brazil along with smaller numbers in Peru awaited resettlement. During the year, 1,550 persons were resettled from Latin America to 24 countries.

In South-East Asia, 120,000 Indo-Chinese departed from various camps, leaving behind some 45,000 "boat people" in countries of temporary asylum. Some 90,000 land cases, mostly Lao, and 97,000 Kampuchean remained in camps and holding centres in Thailand awaiting durable solutions. Discussions were held to accelerate departures of Vietnamese under the Orderly Departure Programme (p. 1033), and nearly 10,000 persons left Viet Nam in 1981 for 30 countries of resettlement. In addition, some 1,400 Kampuchean refugees left Viet Nam for resettlement in 16 countries.

The UNHCR Executive Committee, in an October decision on resettlement,<sup>(2)</sup> urged Governments to be liberal in accepting refugees, particularly of special cases; commended Governments for accepting refugees rescued at sea by ships flying their flag; commended the High Commissioner for promoting the Orderly Departure Programme; and noted with appreciation the agreement reached on establishing IRIRC.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNHCR, A/36/12; <sup>(2)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/Add.1.

#### Financial and administrative aspects

##### Expenditures

In 1981, expenditure for UNHCR programmes, including expenditure for programme support

and administration, dropped from the 1980 level of almost \$500 million to \$474.3 million.<sup>(1)</sup> Of this amount, \$319 million was spent for General Programmes and some \$155 million for Special Programmes and other trust funds. For the year's expenditure by country or area and by main types of assistance activities, see table on p. 1036.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNHCR, A/37/12.

### Income

Total UNHCR income in 1981 amounted to \$506,778,000—including \$346,881,000 for General Programmes and \$159,483,000 for Special Programmes.<sup>(1)</sup>

Income for voluntary funds under the Special Programmes category included \$28.5 million for the Trust Fund for Kampucheans, \$12.8 million for the Cyprus operation, \$10.3 million for repatriation and rehabilitation of Chadians, \$9.5 million for the Refugee Education Account, \$9.1 million for processing centres in South-East Asia, \$7.9 million for assistance to returnees to Ethiopia, \$4.1 million for language training in South-East Asia, \$3.8 million for the Trust Fund for Kampuchean Returnees, \$2.4 million for the Special Fund for Durable Solutions, \$1.7 million for the Orderly Departure Programme for Viet Nam, and \$1.3 million for the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.

The Executive Committee, by an October decision<sup>(2)</sup> on the status of contributions and the overall financial requirements for 1981-1982, reaffirmed the need for more equitable and widespread financial support within the international community for UNHCR programmes, and invited donors to at least maintain a proportionate level of contribution in relation to the increased programme and budget requirements.

Some \$120 million was pledged to the 1982 UNHCR programme at a 20 November 1981 meeting, in New York, of the Ad Hoc Committee of the General Assembly for the Announcement of Voluntary Contributions to UNHCR.

By a 14 December resolution on the work of the High Commissioner, the Assembly urged Governments to contribute generously so as to provide the High Commissioner with the means to attain the objectives of his humanitarian programme.<sup>(3)</sup>

Contributions paid or pledged to the UNHCR assistance programmes for 1981 and 1982 are listed in the table on p. 1037.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Board of Auditors, A/37/5/Add.5; <sup>(2)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/Add.1.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/125, para. 16, 14 Dec. (p.1032).

Meeting record: Committee of General Assembly for voluntary contributions to UNHCR, A/AC.212/SR.1 (20 Nov.).

### Administrative expenses

The Board of Auditors, in examining the financial statements of the UNHCR-administered voluntary funds for the year ended 31 December 1980 (p. 1038), noted that over the years voluntary funds had assumed an ever-increasing share of the administrative costs of UNHCR, despite the stipulation in the UNHCR statute that the administrative expenditures relating to the functioning of that Office should be borne by the regular budget of the United Nations.

The UNHCR Executive Committee, at Geneva in October 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> urged the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General to pursue an equitable apportionment of the administrative costs of UNHCR. It also formally established the Subcommittee on Administrative and Financial Matters to assist in the managerial, financial and administrative aspects of its work.

By a resolution of 18 December, on the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the High Commissioner, to complete by the 1982 Assembly session the current joint review of the financing of the administrative costs of UNHCR with a view to establishing a proper basis for their financing. This action was taken by a recorded vote of 126 to 9. The text was recommended by the Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee on 15 December as sponsored by Lebanon and approved by 81 votes to 7.

In explanation of vote, the USSR questioned the appropriateness of the Fifth Committee's taking action on a question whose substance had been discussed in the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee; it voted negatively because the Fifth Committee had rejected its request for deferring consideration of the item until 1982. Japan supported the call for completion of the joint review, on the understanding that the text did not prejudice the outcome of that review. Panama supported the decision as it attached importance to UNHCR work, and the United Republic of Tanzania considered the text appropriate for Fifth Committee action.

Introducing the text, Lebanon said the review, to be completed on the recommendation of the UNHCR Executive Committee, had taken longer than expected; the draft called for completion of that review so that the Fifth Committee could reach agreement on the funding of additional administrative costs, bearing in mind the universal responsibility of the international community and the essentially non-political, humanitarian vocation of UNHCR.

Support for the review's completion was voiced by Austria, Chile, India, Morocco, Paki-

(continued on p. 1037)

UNHCR EXPENDITURE IN 1981 BY COUNTRY OR AREA'  
(in thousands of US dollars)

Country or area	Local Settlement	Resettlement	Voluntary repatriation	Relief" and other assistance	Total
<b>AFRICA</b>					
Algeria	1,657.3	—	—	248.5	1,905.8
Angola	4,313.2	11.7	5.0	342.6	4,672.5
Botswana	1,672.4	3.7	15.9	89.8	1,781.8
Burundi	1,943.8	1.7	—	3.3	1,948.8
Djibouti	4,350.1	3.2	—	101.2	4,454.5
Egypt	1,741.1	71.8	0.6	226.3	2,039.8
Ethiopia	1,086.7	110.8	5,992.8	79.5	7,269.8
Kenya	1,369.0	29.9	15.0	598.3	2,012.2
Lesotho	1,286.7	32.4	—	281.0	1,600.1
Nigeria	799.0	—	320.0	1,019.9	2,138.9
Rwanda	306.2	0.2	5.0	1.0	312.4
Senegal	530.0	0.9	—	244.0	774.9
Somalia	12,633.2	1.1	—	35,110.9	47,745.2
Sudan	13,386.6	127.0	82.1	4,967.4	18,563.1
Swaziland	1,873.4	13.5	—	102.7	1,989.6
Uganda	850.3	6.7	2.4	853.4	1,712.8
United Republic of Cameroon	10,851.5	—	135.0	—	10,986.5
United Republic of Tanzania	6,677.5	11.4	10.0	89.9	6,788.8
Zaire	18,247.6	4.8	156.1	2,455.7	20,864.2
Zambia	2,720.3	—	1.6	55.9	2,777.8
Other	9,180.0	12.9	6,671.9	213.3	16,078.1
Follow-up on ICARA recommendations	—	—	—	669.0	669.0
Subtotal	97,475.9	443.7	13,413.4	47,753.6	159,086.6
<b>AMERICAS</b>					
Argentina	1,257.8	89.9	29.2	1,090.4	2,467.3
Other southern Latin America	755.5	282.7	5.1	607.5	1,650.8
Peru	476.4	50.0	2.4	29.4	558.2
Other north-western South America	421.2	0.3	0.4	97.9	519.8
Northern Latin America	3,326.7	124.6	83.9	8,126.2	11,661.4
North America	22.3	3.3	10.1	3.4	39.1
Subtotal	6,259.9	550.8	131.1	9,954.8	16,896.6
<b>ASIA</b>					
China	9,492.6	5.7	—	4.4	9,502.7
Hong Kong	581.6	2,286.5	—	5,042.0	7,910.1
Indonesia	1,326.5	1,313.4	1.0	8,549.3	11,190.2
Leo People's Democratic Republic	1,978.1	—	—	394.7	2,372.8
Lebanon	225.2	3.0	—	15.2	243.4
Malaysia	2,797.3	702.6	1.4	6,873.4	10,374.7
Pakistan	38.3	18.9	1.5	108,673.1	108,731.8
Philippines	2,493.1	604.6	—	10,236.9	13,334.6
Thailand	2,893.7	5,513.6	—	52,030.1	60,437.4
Viet Nam	6,973.8	2,276.4	—	—	9,250.2
Western Asia	169.0	54.9	—	27.0	250.9
Other	2,068.0	1,586.4	25.1	8,366.4	12,045.9
Subtotal	31,037.2	14,366.0	29.0	200,212.5	245,644.7
<b>EUROPE</b>					
Austria	2,192.9	15.8	—	23.2	2,231.9
Cyprus	11,900.1	—	—	573.3	12,473.4
France	239.9	39.6	8.9	17.0	305.4
Germany, Federal Republic of	79.4	70.6	—	84.8	234.8
Greece	135.9	30.4	0.1	70.0	236.4
Italy	102.8	66.4	7.6	345.8	522.6
Portugal	699.7	0.6	4.0	231.3	935.6
Spain	1,045.0	37.1	6.7	364.6	1,453.4
Turkey	50.1	68.9	—	5.3	124.3
United Kingdom	—	2.3	46.6	170.9	219.8
Yugoslavia	111.2	42.2	2.2	700.0	855.6
Other	371.0	42.1	47.1	141.3	601.5
Subtotal	16,928.0	416.0	123.2	2,727.5	20,194.7
<b>OCEANIA</b>					
Australia	—	5.3	1.3	0.2	6.8
GLOBAL AND REGIONAL	201.6	194.6	50.8	838.2	1,285.2
Total	151,902.6	15,976.4	13,748.8	261,486.8	443,114.6

'Not including expenditure for programme support and administration.

"Including donations in kind, e.g. food.



(continued from p. 1035)

stan and Sweden, the last on behalf of the Nordic countries. In addition, Algeria observed that there would be ample time in 1982 to go into the substance; India saw no need to postpone action, as the text simply requested the Secretary-General to meet a deadline.

A number of countries, including Austria, Chile, India, Lebanon and the Sudan, expressed concern over the financing of administrative costs from voluntary funds and asked that the United Nations regular budget meet a substantial portion of those costs. Chad agreed with Lebanon that the policy of budgetary restraint should not hinder the activities of an organ which faced ever-increasing responsibilities. Pakistan considered it important to determine an appropriate allocation of UNHCR administra-

tive costs between the United Nations regular budget and voluntary funds.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/ADD.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/235, sect. XIII, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.8, 10, 12-35, 37-39, 41-47, 62, 64, 65, 74, 76 (8 Oct.-15 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section XIII  
126-9 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) by vote (81-7), 15 December (meeting 76); draft by Lebanon (A/C.5/36/L.35); agenda Item 100.

Administrative costs of the Office of the United Nations  
High Commissioner for Refugees

[The General Assembly...]

Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to complete the current joint review of the financing of the administrative

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND PLEDGES TO THE UNHCR ASSISTANCE PROGRAMMES FOR 1981 AND 1982

(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country	1981 payment or pledge	1982 pledge	Country	1981 payment or pledge	1982 pledge
Algeria	40,000	50,000	Monaco	1,020	870
Argentina	49,700	—	Morocco	9,859	—
Australia	33,013,953	7,505,643	Netherlands	8,982,564	4,520,000
Austria	103,101	100,000	New Zealand	298,098	—
Bahamas	4,454	—	Nicaragua	—	1,000
Bahrain	50,000	—	Nigeria	3,075,873	—
Bangladesh	2,918	—	Norway	11,133,004	6,506,849
Belgium	3,018,582	572,916	Oman	6,000	6,000
Benin	—	2,000	Pakistan	44,444	—
Botswana	1,224	—	Panama	500	1,000
Brazil	15,000	15,000	Philippines	9,333	—
Burma	10,000	—	Portugal	15,000	100,000
Canada	13,025,075	3,898,305	Qatar	1,010,000	35,000
Chile	35,000	20,000	Republic of Korea	30,000	10,000
China	1,995,902	200,000	San Marino	2,950	—
Colombia	11,646	15,000	Sao Tome and Principe	500	—
Costa Rica	—	2,000	Saudi Arabia	31,010,000	—
Cyprus	4,260	—	Senegal	6,000	3,000
Denmark	8,862,075	3,527,027	Singapore	30,000	—
Djibouti	2,000	2,000	Spain	80,000	—
Finland	1,459,462	568,182	Suds"	3,333	3,333
France	1,937,440	1,095,652	Swaziland	1,875	—
Germany, Federal Republic of	19,010,131	—	Swede"	19,586,487	8,960,573
Ghana	70,000	—	Switzerland	4,751,842	1,944,444
Greece	100,000	80,000	Syrian Arab Republic	11,000	—
Guyana	391	—	Thailand	20,000	10,000
Holy See	2,500	2,500	Trinidad and Tobago	2,073	—
Honduras	1,000	—	Tunisia	3,970	4,500
Iceland	42,900	43,300	Turkey	19,543	11,000
India	11,299	—	Uganda	12,195	2,500
Indonesia	24,000	4,000	United Kingdom	16,696,267	—
Iraq	11,822	—	United Republic of Cameroon	—	4,514
Ireland	472,219	—	United Republic of Tanzania	16,970	—
Israel	15,000	15,000	United States	138,749,107	80,000,000
Italy	3,300,319	—	Uruguay	2,000	—
Jamaica	550	—	Venezuela	20,000	20,000
Japan	52,220,840	—	Viet Nam	1,000	1,000
Jordan	10,000	10,000	Yugoslavia	30,000	30,000
Kenya	694	—	Zambia	4,396	—
Kuwait	2,040,000	40,000	Zimbabwe	5,000	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	6,000	6,000			
Lebanon	10,000	10,000	Subtotal	376,942,785	120,021,157
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	50,000	—			
Liechtenstein	34,056	—	Intergovernmental organizations	51,912,299	—
Luxembourg	121,871	8,464			
Madagascar	1,767	—	United Nations system	651,152	—
Malawi	6,182	—			
Malaysia	1,500	1,500	NGOs and others	14,652,000	—
Malta	1,039	1,085			
Mexico	52,710	50,000	Total	444,158,236	120,021,157

costs of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees with a view to establishing a proper basis for the financing of those costs, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at Its thirty-seventh-session;

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR.

#### Accounts for voluntary funds

The financial statements on the UNHCR-administered voluntary funds, examined by the Board of Auditors,<sup>(2)</sup> indicated that the funds' income for the year ended 31 December 1980 amounted to \$466,238,000 and their expenditures totalled \$496,956,000.

Meeting with the Board in June 1981, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ)<sup>(1)</sup> noted the Board's recommendation that the responsibility for control of administrative expenditure be transferred from the Finance Division of the United Nations Office at Geneva to UNHCR in order to rectify the unsatisfactory situation arising from the current arrangement, under which the UNHCR Budget and Management Section rarely dealt with follow-up on payments and supporting documentation while the United Nations counterpart was not sufficiently involved with the evolution of the projects and the problems of the UNHCR field offices.

In response to queries, the Secretariat informed ACABQ that, in view of the importance of keeping separate the programme and financial responsibilities, the action proposed by the Board would adversely affect the responsibility of the Office of Financial Services for regular budget accounts; and that discussions were under way with UNHCR staff regarding proper financial procedures and controls as well as provision of management information as required to UNHCR.

By a resolution of 30 November on the reports of the Board of Auditors,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assem-

bly accepted the 1980 financial statements on UNHCR voluntary funds along with the audit opinions of the Board, concurred with the comments made by ACABQ, and requested the Board and ACABQ to give greater attention to areas regarding which they had made observations. The Assembly also requested the High Commissioner to take remedial action where required.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/480; <sup>(2)</sup>Board of Auditors and financial statements, A/36/5/Add.5.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/65, 30 Nov. (p. 1302).

#### Administration and management

In a note of 27 August 1981 to the UNHCR Executive Committee,<sup>(1)</sup> the High Commissioner proposed a series of measures aimed at strengthening the management of UNHCR, including decentralization of responsibility and authority within its Geneva headquarters and to 86 field offices, strengthening the programme implementation and evaluation, and reinforcing the mechanism for consultation and operational co-operation with other humanitarian assistance organizations.

The Executive Committee,<sup>(2)</sup> in October, generally endorsed the High Commissioner's staffing proposals for 1981 and 1982, stressed the importance of delegating authority as a means of strengthening UNHCR, and welcomed his intention to have its managerial methods and organizational structure reviewed by the Secretariat's Administrative Management Service. The Committee believed that the review should include consideration of steps to facilitate decision-making, possibilities for improving programme delivery through redeployment of existing staff, and administrative costs and their implications for the United Nations regular budget.

By a resolution of 14 December on the report of UNHCR,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly noted the proposals by the High Commissioner to strengthen UNHCR management on the basis of the Assembly's principles and guidelines, and welcomed his intention to seek the assistance of the Administrative Management Service in undertaking expeditiously a review of the managerial methods and organizational structure of his Office, as recommended by ACABQ.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>UNHCR, A/AC.96/594/Add.1 & Add.1/Corr.1.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/Add.1.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/125, para. 2, 14 Dec. (p. 1031).

#### Public information

The International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (p. 1039) and the 1981 Nobel Peace Prize awarded to UNHCR provided major focal points for the public information activities of UNHCR in 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> In connection with the Conference, a special report entitled "Africa's Refugees and UNHCR" was issued as a follow-up

and two itinerant journalists' seminars visited refugee camps in Africa. The announcement of the Nobel award resulted in hundreds of media interviews, production of special radio programmes and world-wide distribution of a television film, "Road to Survival", covering the Office's 30-year history.

Increased demand for UNHCR publications, which included the fortnightly Refugee Update, led to the introduction of a computerized distribution system. The photo library provided 50,000 photographs, double the 1980 figure, to media, schools and non-governmental organizations. Among the documentary films produced were "Zimbabwe: From Swords to Ploughshares" and "Refugees: A Historical View".

The Executive Committee,<sup>(2)</sup> in October 1981, reaffirmed the importance of effective public information in increasing global awareness of refugee situations and urged the High Commissioner to continue his efforts in that regard.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNHCR, A/37/12; <sup>(2)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/Add.1.

## Assistance to refugees in Africa

### International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa

CONFERENCE ACTIVITIES. Contributions in cash and kind amounting to \$566.6 million (see table on p. 1042) were pledged by 46 countries and the European Community (EC) at the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (ICARA),<sup>(2)</sup> which met at Geneva on 9 and 10 April 1981. Of this amount, unspecified pledges totalled \$451.9 million, those for ongoing United Nations programmes amounted to \$66.9 million and indications of bilateral assistance totalled \$41.1 million.

The ministerial-level Conference was convened by the Secretary-General, in response to a 1980 General Assembly request,<sup>(6)</sup> in close cooperation with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the High Commissioner. Attended by 99 of the 131 States invited and by over 120 non-governmental organizations (NGOs), it focused on the plight of both the refugees and the countries of asylum, and reconfirmed the central role of OAU in pursuing basic remedies, as well as the need for international agencies to give priority to African refugee problems.

The Secretary-General, acting as ICARA President, informed the gathering on 9 April that Africa hosted more than half the world's refugee

population; the number of refugees there had risen from 750,000 in 1970 to 5 million in 1980, mostly in the last two years. Eighty per cent of them were sheltered in 18 African countries, the majority of which were among the least developed in the world. The less publicized but much larger part of the refugee burden—its effect on the economy—was disproportionate to the resources available to those countries. While the priority was to meet the refugees' immediate life-sustaining needs, resettlement programmes required full support so as not to perpetuate the problem.

To mobilize support for ICARA, representatives of the Secretary-General, OAU and UNHCR held several joint meetings at Geneva with regional groups, and missions were dispatched to donor countries. A document on assistance measures proposed by Governments and calling for some \$893 million was assembled by the Conference secretariat.

Following the Conference, an ICARA Steering Committee, comprising representatives of the sponsoring organizations, was established to implement the Conference's conclusions, including examination of projects for funding from pledges.<sup>(3)</sup> The Committee, advised by a technical working group composed of representatives of OAU, the Economic Commission for Africa and UNHCR, referred a first selection of projects worth \$38 million to the African Governments concerned for final consideration and, on 22 December, UNHCR on behalf of the Committee transmitted to all Conference participants a summary of selected projects requiring funding on a priority basis.

COMMUNICATION. In a letter dated 14 April to the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information of South Africa denied allegations made at ICARA that refugees were fleeing inhuman living conditions and persecution in Namibia and South Africa. He stated further that, while South Africa's requests for UNHCR assistance to Angolan refugees in Namibia had been ignored for political expediency, a considerable portion of the funds dispensed by UNHCR and the United Nations Development Programme went to programmes executed by or benefiting the African National Congress of South Africa, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and the South West Africa People's Organization in promoting their political aims through violence and terror. Stating that it had been prevented from participating in ICARA by its organizers, South Africa requested that its letter form part of the ICARA documentation as well as that of the General Assembly.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. Acting without vote on 6 May, the Economic

and Social Council, on an oral proposal by its President, took note of the oral report on ICARA proceedings made on behalf of the Secretary-General on 24 April by the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes.<sup>(9)</sup>

In a 22 July resolution on assistance to colonial countries,<sup>(5)</sup> the Council expressed appreciation to Governments and organizations for their pledges at ICARA and called for generous contributions to the funds earmarked for assistance to refugees in Africa, particularly those displaced as a result of the policy imposed by the racist minority regime of South Africa in Namibia and South Africa.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION.** Noting the success of the Conference, the UNHCR Executive Committee, in October, thanked the High Commissioner for his efforts in convening ICARA, urged the international community to maintain the momentum in assisting African refugees and noted the wish expressed by delegations for a follow-up conference.<sup>(4)</sup>

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** By a 14 December resolution<sup>(8)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly commended the three ICARA sponsors and invited them to continue their co-operation to ensure the channelling of Conference funds to priority projects. The Assembly called on pertinent development-oriented bodies of the United Nations system to envisage co-ordinated actions aimed at harmonizing assistance programmes in affected countries so that the potentialities of refugees or returnees might constitute an advantage rather than a burden on national development. The Secretary-General was asked to keep the African refugee situation under close scrutiny and provide the Council in 1982 with up-to-date information, in order to facilitate Assembly consideration of the need to convene an international follow-up conference in 1983.

In a resolution of 9 December<sup>(7)</sup> on co-operation between the United Nations and OAU, the Assembly called on all Member States and regional and international organizations, particularly those of the United Nations system, as well as NGOs to increase substantially their aid to refugees in Africa.

The resolution on ICARA was approved by the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee without vote on 24 November. Introducing the text on behalf of the African Group, Benin said some amendments proposed by donor countries had been incorporated.

Many countries in the Committee debate considered ICARA a success, among them Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Democratic Kampuchea, the United Kingdom (for the EC members), the

United States and Yugoslavia. The Congo said ICARA had made clear that it was time to act before it was too late. Argentina, France and Japan said ICARA had given the international community a chance to express solidarity.

The Central African Republic, Egypt, Finland, Ireland, the Sudan and the United Kingdom, the last for the EC countries, said ICARA had helped to raise the consciousness of the magnitude of the refugee problem in Africa. Sharing that view, New Zealand believed it had generated support for the efforts of the African countries directly affected. The United States said ICARA had made the international community aware of the efforts of the African nations in providing asylum and sharing their resources with the refugees to the maximum extent. Australia spoke of burden-sharing, and Liberia said ICARA had highlighted the need for concerted international action to provide the refugees with subsistence and to help them become self-supporting.

Lebanon, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Sudan and Yugoslavia called for maintaining the momentum created at the Conference, and the United Kingdom (for the EC countries) said the funds pledged should thus be deployed efficiently and responsibly through existing multilateral and national channels. The Sudan said the international community should review by 1983 the progress achieved and decide on further measures that might be needed at that time. Lebanon suggested that consideration be given to the possibility of convening a follow-up conference in 1983.

For the Sudan, ICARA had succeeded in providing reasonable financial and material assistance to the refugees. Somalia believed the amount pledged could go a long way towards assisting asylum countries and hoped that the funds' allocation would be commensurate with the magnitude of the refugee problem in those countries. The Central African Republic and Lebanon said ICARA had contributed to assisting both the refugees and the countries of asylum.

Chad, which was unable to attend the Conference, thanked the international community for its generous contribution and said ICARA should have focused its attention on assisting the countries of origin in order to facilitate the return of the refugees. The Conference objectives had been only partially met, according to Zaire, which asserted that international assistance continued to be insufficient in relation to the accumulated obligations and additional burden which the presence of refugees implied for the economies of the asylum States.

Sierra Leone was disappointed at the lack of response from States which had called themselves friends of Africa. In a similar vein, the

United Kingdom, for the EC countries, expressed regret that one group of countries was conspicuously absent at ICARA.

Canada commended UNHCR for the pivotal role it had played in the planning, organization and execution of ICARA.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>South Africa, 14 Apr., A/36/203.

Reports: S-G, <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/316, <sup>(3)</sup>E/1982/76; <sup>(4)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/Add.1.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/54, para. 8, 22 July (p. 1102). GA: <sup>(6)</sup>35/42, para. 4, 25 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 945); <sup>(7)</sup>36/80, para. 18, 9 Dec. 1981 (p. 231); <sup>(8)</sup>36/124, 14 Dec., text following.

Decision: <sup>(9)</sup>ESC: 1981/133, 6 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR.8, 9, 10, 15 (24 Apr.-6 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.50, 52-55, 59 (16-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.97(14 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/133

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by Council President; agenda item 4.

#### International Conference on Assistance to Refugees In Africa

At its 15th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council took note of the oral report under agenda item 4 made on behalf of the Secretary-General at its 8th meeting on 24 April 1981 on the proceedings of the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa, held at Geneva on 9 and 10 April 1981.

General Assembly resolution 36/124

Adopted without vote Meeting 97 14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/725) without vote, 24 November (meeting 59); draft by Benin, for African Group (A/C.3/36/L.56/Rev.1); agenda item 83 (b).

#### International Conference on Assistance to Refugees In Africa

The General Assembly,

Recalling Its resolution 35/42 of 25 November 1980 relating to the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa, held at Geneva on 9 and 10 April 1981,

Taking note of resolution CM/Res.868(XXXVII) regarding the Conference and Its follow-up, adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-seventh ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 15 to 26 June 1981,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the Conference and the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on the activities of his Office,

Gravely concerned at the growing number of refugees on the African continent, who now constitute over half the population of refugees in the world,

Regretting that, In spite of the efforts made, the assistance provided to the growing number of African refugees is still very inadequate,

Aware of the economic and social burden imposed on African countries of asylum by the growing influx of refugees and its consequences for their development and of the heavy sacrifices made by them, despite their limited resources, to alleviate the plight of those refugees,

Recognizing, therefore, the need of the countries of asylum for adequate human, technical and financial assistance to enable them properly to shoulder their increased responsibilities and assume the additional burden which the presence of refugees represents for their economies,

Recognizing further the need to assist similarly the countries of origin in the voluntary repatriation and resettlement of returnees, as set out in the procedures of the Office of the

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees,

Convinced that the attendance of high-ranking officials and representatives of ninety-nine countries and over one hundred twenty non-governmental organizations at the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees In Africa bears evidence to the fact that the Conference drew international public attention to the situation and needs of African refugees.

1. Commends the initiative taken by the three sponsors of the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa-the Organization of African Unity, the United Nations and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees-to maintain their close co-operation properly to define the follow-up actions that will be called for, and invites them to continue and develop their tripartite consultations and co-operation at all appropriate levels, so that the Conference funds are channelled to priority projects and put to the best use;

2. Reiterates its congratulations to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his efforts towards the preparation of the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa in close consultation with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, as well as for his personal concern for African refugee problems and for the very able manner in which he presided over the Conference, thus bringing it to a successful end;

3. Expresses its appreciation and gratitude to all donor countries and to the international community at large for their very positive response to the appeal for assistance to African refugees and for their contribution to the assistance to refugees in Africa;

4. Urges the International community to continue to support the annual programmes of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and of other United Nations agencies co-operating with that Office on behalf of refugees in Africa;

5. Calls upon the pertinent development-oriented organizations and agencies of the United Nations system to envisage, at the stages of conception and implementation, all concerted efforts and co-ordinated actions aimed at harmonizing assistance programmes in the countries of asylum as well as in the countries of origin during the repatriation process, and current or future development programmes, so that the potentialities of refugees or returnees may constitute an advantage rather than a burden on national development;

6. Requests the Secretary-General, in close co-operation with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to keep the African refugee situation under close and constant scrutiny and to submit to the Economic and Social Council, at its second regular session of 1982, a report containing up-to-date information on the condition of refugees in the countries concerned in order to facilitate consideration by the General Assembly, at its thirty-seventh session, of the necessity of convening an international conference in 1983 to review the status of contributions and commitments made at the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa, and to assess the needs and measures for further assistance for refugees and returnees in implementation of programmes for their relief, rehabilitation and resettlement;

7. Invites governmental bodies of specialized agencies, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to consider, within their sphere of competence, various ways and means to increase substantially assistance to African refugees and returnees;

8. Requests the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, in close co-operation with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, to keep under constant review the situation of refugees in Africa in order to ensure maximum international assistance on a global basis;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

CONTRIBUTIONS ANNOUNCED AT ICARA  
(cash or kind, In US dollar equivalent)

Algeria	300,000
Argentina	500,000
Australia	11,627,906
Belgium	2,492,754
Canada	18,823,529
Chins	1,000,000
Cyprus	3,000
Democratic Kampuchea	1,000
Denmark	9,090,909
Egypt	1,000,000
Finland	2,962,963
France	2,474,747
Germany, Federal Republic of	42,857,143
Ghana	50,000
Iceland	10,000
India	10,000
Indonesia	20,000
Italy	17,000,000
Japan	33,000,000
Lesotho	2,597
Luxembourg	17,390
Malawi	5,882
Malaysia	30,000
Netherlands	9,698,276
New Zealand	186,916
Nigeria	3,000,000
Norway	3,055,555
Pakistan	44,000
Philippines	10,000
Republic of Korea	20,000
Saudi Arabia	30,000,000
Sierra Leone	100,000
Singapore	10,000
Spain	1,000,000
Sweden	6,493,509
Switzerland	2,356,020
Syrian Arab Republic	10,000
Thailand	10,000
Trinidad and Tobago	2,083
Tunisia	15,000
United Arab Emirates	2,000,000
United Kingdom	13,863,636
United Republic of Tanzania	12,500
United States	283,400,000
Upper Volta	4,032
Yugoslavia	78,125
European Community	68,000,000
Total	566,649,472

#### Assistance to refugees in Djibouti

REPORT OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER. In the annex to an April 1981 report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> UNHCR stated that, of the \$7 million allocated for the year for intensified assistance to the refugees in Djibouti, \$1 million was designated for supplementary food and commodities transport and \$500,000 for domestic utensils, clothing and blankets. Further funds were earmarked for construction of housing and storage facilities, procurement of medical supplies and an extension of educational and training facilities. The staffing of the UNHCR branch office had been increased.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. The Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes orally informed the Economic and Social Council on 24 April that the UNHCR programme was being supplemented by contributions from the World Food Programme and

voluntary organizations, and that Djibouti, drought-stricken for a number of years (p. 491) and a recent victim of devastating floods.. was in need of additional international relief assistance (p. 507).

Calling for international support, the representative of Djibouti told the Council that the need to cope with the continuous influx of refugees and the prolonged drought and devastating floods had placed heavy demands on the country's meagre resources and paralysed its social and economic infrastructure.

The number of refugees in Djibouti was estimated at 45,000 in May.

The Council, on 4 May,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the High Commissioner to ensure adequate assistance to refugees in Djibouti and to maintain contact with Member States and organizations concerned to mobilize assistance to the Government to cope with the refugee situation, which had been complicated by the recent floods. The 23-nation draft, introduced by Bangladesh, was adopted without vote.

The Council remained seized of the problem and, on an oral proposal of its President, took note in a decision adopted without vote on 20 July<sup>(4)</sup> of the High Commissioner's 14 July oral report on efforts being made to help the refugees, mostly of semi-nomadic background, attain some self-sufficiency.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution adopted without vote on 16 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly requested UNHCR to continue ensuring that adequate assistance programmes were organized for the refugees in Djibouti, and to maintain close contact with Member States and organizations concerned to mobilize assistance for the Government to cope effectively with the refugee situation aggravated by the debilitating effects of the drought. The Assembly also called on Member States, the United Nations system and other organizations for continued support to the Government of Djibouti to cope with the needs of the refugee population and other victims of the drought.

The Third Committee, which approved without vote the 45-nation text on 30 November, heard on 19 November an oral report by the High Commissioner. Introducing the resolution, Zaire called it purely humanitarian, and added that the international community was duty-bound to provide assistance at a level commensurate with the urgency and importance of the problem.

In the Committee debate, Djibouti said the presence of some 50,000 to 55,000 refugees, constituting more than 15 per cent of the country's total population, was overburdening the infrastructure. Four years of prolonged drought had resulted in the loss of 40 per cent of its livestock,

thus threatening about 130,000 nomads with famine. The Government had established 17 temporary camps to accommodate the displaced nomadic population.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/214.

Resolutions and decision: Res: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/4, 4 May, text following; <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/156, 16 Dec., text following. Dec.:

<sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1981/169, 20 July, text following.

Financial implications: S-G statement, E/1981/L.31.

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR.8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 35, 38 (24 Apr.-4 May & 14, 20 July). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56, 57, 58, 60-63, 64, 66 (19-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/4

Adopted without vote Meeting 13 4 May 1981

23-nation draft (E/1981/L.21); agenda item 4.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Djibouti, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, Indonesia, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Morocco, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Humanitarian assistance to refugees in Djibouti

The Economic and Social Council,

Having heard the statement of the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes on the needs of the refugees and the devastating effects of the recent floods in Djibouti,

Taking note with satisfaction of the report of the Secretary-General on humanitarian assistance to refugees in Djibouti, to which is annexed the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on assistance to refugees in Djibouti,

Recalling its resolutions 1980/11 of 28 April 1980 and 1980/44 of 23 July 1980 and General Assembly resolution 35/182 of 15 December 1980.

Deeply concerned about the continued food shortage in Djibouti, which has been aggravated by the devastating effects of the severe drought and the heavy floods that have left over one third of the already destitute population homeless,

Appreciating the determined efforts of the Government of Djibouti to cope with the ever-increasing number of the refugees, the devastating effects of the severe drought and the recent torrential rains and floods that have left over one third of the country's population homeless,

Aware of the consequences of the social and economic burden placed on the Government and people of Djibouti as a result of the influx of refugees and the subsequent impact on the national development and infrastructure of the country,

Noting with appreciation the continued efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to keep the refugee situation in Djibouti under constant review,

Noting a/s/o with appreciation the concern and the continued efforts of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Development Programme, the World Health Organization, the World Food Programme and the governmental and non-governmental organizations that have worked closely with the Government of Djibouti on the relief and rehabilitation programmes for the refugees and the people affected by the recent floods in Djibouti,

1. Appreciates the action taken by the Secretary-General in reporting on the refugee situation in Djibouti;

2. Endorses the report of the Secretary-General on humanitarian assistance to refugees in Djibouti and the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees annexed thereto;

3. Takes note with appreciation of the oral report of the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes on the needs of the refugees and the devastating effects of the recent floods on the population in Djibouti;

4. Appreciates the efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to keep the refugee situation in Djibouti under constant review and invites him to continue his humanitarian assistance to the refugees in Djibouti;

5. Requests the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue to ensure that adequate assistance programmes are organized for the refugees and to maintain close contacts with Member States and the governmental and non-governmental organizations concerned to mobilize adequate assistance to the Government of Djibouti to cope effectively with the refugee situation, which has now been complicated by the recent floods that have severely affected the urban and rural refugee population in that country;

6. Appeals to all Member States, United Nations organs, specialized agencies and governmental and non-governmental organizations to continue their support for the efforts of the Government of Djibouti to provide for the needs of the refugees and the people affected by the devastating floods in that country;

7. Requests the Secretary-General, in collaboration with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to review the current refugee situation in Djibouti and to submit an updated report, including an assessment of the needs of the people affected by the severe floods in Djibouti, to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session;

8. Decides to consider at its second regular session of 1981, and to bring to the attention of the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, the progress achieved in the implementation of the present resolution.

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/169

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by Council President: agenda item 4.

Humanitarian assistance to refugees

At its 38th plenary meeting, on 20 July 1981, the Council took note of the oral report made by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on behalf of the Secretary-General on humanitarian assistance to the refugees in Djibouti and on assistance to student refugees in southern Africa.

General Assembly resolution 36/156

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, 30 November (meeting 66); 45-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.63); agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, France, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Indonesia, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire, Zambia.

Humanitarian assistance to refugees in Djibouti

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/182 of 15 December 1980 on humanitarian assistance to refugees in Djibouti,

Recalling also Economic and Social Council resolutions 1980/11 of 28 April 1980, 1980/44 of 23 July 1980 and 1981/4 of 4 May 1981 on assistance to the refugees in Djibouti,

Having heard the statement of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees,

Taking note with satisfaction of the report of the Secretary-General on humanitarian assistance to refugees in Djibouti and the report of the High Commissioner annexed thereto,

Deeply concerned about the persistence of the food shortage in the country, which has been aggravated by the devastating effects of the prolonged drought,

Aware of the determined efforts made by the Government of Djibouti to cope with the refugee situation, despite the impact of the devastating effects of the prolonged drought,

Aware a/s/o of the consequences of the social and economic burden placed on the Government and people of Djibouti as a

result of the influx of refugees and the subsequent impact on the national development and Infrastructure of the country.

Noting with satisfaction the concern and continued efforts of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Health Organization, the World Food Programme and the intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, which have worked closely with the Government of Djibouti in the relief and rehabilitation programme for the refugees and drought-stricken population in Djibouti,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General on humanitarian assistance to refugees in Djibouti and that of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees annexed thereto;

2. Appreciates the efforts made by the High Commissioner to keep the refugee situation under constant review and invites him to continue his humanitarian assistance to the refugees in Djibouti;

3. Requests the High Commissioner to continue to ensure that adequate assistance programmes are organized for the refugees and to maintain close contact with Member States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations concerned to mobilize the necessary assistance to the Government of Djibouti to cope effectively with the refugee situation aggravated by the debilitating effects of the drought;

4. Calls upon all Member States, the organizations of the United Nations system, the specialized agencies and the intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to continue to support the efforts made by the Government of Djibouti to cope with the needs of the refugee population and other victims of the drought;

5. Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the High Commissioner, to review the present situation of refugees in Djibouti and to report to the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982 and to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the progress achieved with regard to the refugee situation in Djibouti.

#### Assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. The Commissioner for Relief and Rehabilitation of Ethiopia told the Economic and Social Council on 24 April 1981 that persistent drought and other calamities in his country practically nullified the efforts made by the Government and the international community. The food situation was rapidly deteriorating and the United Nations Co-ordinating Committee for Relief and Rehabilitation in Ethiopia had recommended immediate assistance of \$215,439,000 and food aid amounting to 224,000 metric tons of grain and edible oil. However, the Secretary-General's appeal for aid had met with disappointing results. The Commissioner called for global assistance to resolve the plight of displaced persons in Africa, numbering four times more than refugees, and avert the worsening of the situation.

On behalf of the Secretary-General, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes informed the Council that the displaced persons, estimated by the Ethiopian Government to number 2.4 million, suffered from disease and a scarcity of food and water. An

inter-agency mission to Ethiopia had calculated that 870,000 tons of food assistance would be required over a three-and-a-half year period. With funds provided by UNHCR, the Government would implement a project for five reception centres to assist in the repatriation and resettlement of voluntary returnees.

The United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator noted the findings of the United Nations Co-ordinating Committee that about 1.5 million people in Ethiopia desperately needed help and that the estimated 1981 national food deficit of 350,000 tons was likely to affect over 1 million people.

On 6 May, the Council reiterated its appeal to the international community for prompt and generous assistance to the displaced persons in Ethiopia.<sup>(2)</sup>

The adoption without vote of the 16-nation draft, introduced by Zimbabwe, followed the Council's decision, by 23 votes to 13, with 14 abstentions, to agree to a motion by Morocco not to act on a series of amendments by Somalia<sup>(1)</sup> to this resolution and on amendments proposed by Ethiopia to a resolution on assistance to refugees in Somalia (p. 1046).

Somalia had proposed rewording the second preambular paragraph so that the statement by the Ethiopian Commissioner would be characterized as that dealing with "the question of displaced persons of Ethiopia" rather than referring to the grave situation and the difficulties encountered. The words "with regret" would have been deleted from the fifth preambular paragraph where the response to the Secretary-General's appeal was noted, and the sixth preambular paragraph, noting the extreme difficulties encountered by the Government of Ethiopia in providing relief, would have been replaced by a new paragraph noting "the extreme difficulties encountered by displaced persons in Ethiopia while victims of both the oppressive policies of the Government of Ethiopia and of natural disasters".

Somalia's proposed amendment to operative paragraph 2 would have had the Council describe the international appeal as for the provision of relief to the displaced persons, rather than for assistance to the Government in its relief and rehabilitation effort. The basis for an appeal for assistance, in paragraph 4, would have been confined to "the appeal of the Secretary-General dated 11 November 1980", and a new paragraph would have called on all concerned to ensure that any assistance given was used solely for the purpose of providing relief to the displaced persons. In paragraph 5, the word "certified" would have been inserted to qualify the voluntary returnees for whom the humanitarian assistance was requested.



In the Council's debate, Bangladesh said that natural and man-made disasters threatened more than 5.1 million people in Ethiopia, of whom as many as 1.5 million faced certain starvation unless supplementary rations were made available for the coming 18 months. The German Democratic Republic and Yugoslavia saw Ethiopia as struggling to surmount the problems resulting from its colonial heritage. The USSR said it shared Ethiopia's concern that assistance to that country was being sabotaged by some United Nations organizations and agencies, whose heads practised discrimination against a sovereign State, thus demonstrating the imperialist Powers' efforts to use the Organization for disruption of Ethiopia's economic development.

Ethiopia and Somalia exchanged a series of charges as to the cause of the refugee problem in the region, Ethiopia said that one State sought to describe part of the territory of a neighbouring State as an integral part of its own; that the refugee problem had been created solely by the war of aggression waged by Somalia against Ethiopia since 1978; and that, if Somalia was right in referring to refugees from western Somalia, then they were displaced persons and not refugees. Somalia considered the root cause of exodus to have been the official policy of the Ethiopian regime since 1977, and charged that Ethiopia continued to plead for assistance for its so-called displaced persons, while busy squandering its meagre resources on acquisition of arms.

The Council's decision not to act on the proposed amendments but to adopt the text as originally submitted was criticized by some, among them Algeria, Ethiopia and Zambia, as creating a dangerous precedent with serious implications of denying delegations the right to submit amendments. The German Democratic Republic said the Council should not make a wholesale rejection of amendments, and the Sudan did not participate in the decision because it believed in consultations as the only way to settle differences.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. The High Commissioner informed the Third Committee on 19 November of assistance measures developed in Ethiopia for refugees returning from neighbouring countries.

By a 16 December resolution adopted without vote,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly endorsed the appeals of the Secretary-General and the Council for assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia and requested the High Commissioner to continue his efforts to mobilize humanitarian assistance for the relief and rehabilitation of the voluntary returnees.

The revised 34-nation draft, introduced by Zaire, was approved without vote on 30 November by the Third Committee. The approved text

incorporated an oral revision by the sponsors adding to paragraph 1 the phrase "concerning assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia" after the endorsement of previous appeals.

Amendments not considered: <sup>(1)</sup>Somalia, E/1981/L.30 & Corr.1 & Add.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/32, 6 May, text following; <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/161, 16 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR. 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 (24 Apr.-6 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56, 57, 58, 60-63, 64, 66 (19-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/32

Adopted without vote Meeting 15 6 May 1981

16-nation draft (E/1981/L.22); agenda item 4.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Burundi, Cuba, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Kenya, Nepal, Pakistan, Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/183 of 15 December 1980, in which the Assembly called for international assistance to alleviate the plight of displaced persons in Ethiopia,

Having heard the statement by the Commissioner for Relief and Rehabilitation of Ethiopia on 24 April 1981, outlining the grave situation of displaced persons and the difficulties encountered by his Government in providing relief and rehabilitation to millions of displaced persons in Ethiopia,

Having also heard the oral report of the representative of the Secretary-General on assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia, presented pursuant to General Assembly resolution 35/183,

Taking note of the appeal of the Secretary-General in his note verbale of 11 November 1980,

Noting with regret that the response to the appeal of the Secretary-General for providing generous assistance to alleviate the sufferings of displaced persons in Ethiopia has been inadequate.

Noting further the extreme difficulties encountered by the Government of Ethiopia in providing relief and rehabilitation to several millions of its citizens who are victims of both man-made and natural disasters, as well as to the voluntary returnees,

Recognizing the need for urgent and continued humanitarian assistance to save the lives and alleviate the plight of displaced persons in Ethiopia,

1. Takes note of the oral report presented by the representative of the Secretary-General on assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia;

2. Reaffirms its appeal and that of the Secretary-General to Member States, Intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and voluntary agencies to assist the Government of Ethiopia in its effort to provide relief and rehabilitation to the displaced persons in that country;

3. Notes with appreciation the assistance thus far provided through the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

4. Appeals once more to all Member States, governmental and non-governmental organizations, specialized agencies, other organizations of the United Nations system and voluntary agencies to provide prompt and generous assistance to the displaced persons in Ethiopia on the basis of the recommendations made in the report of the inter-agency mission to Ethiopia annexed to the report of the Secretary-General on assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia;

5. Requests the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue their efforts to mobilize humanitarian assistance for the relief and rehabilitation of displaced persons and voluntary returnees;

6. Further requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session and to the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982 on the progress achieved in the implementation of the present resolution.

General Assembly resolution 36/161

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, 30 November (meeting 66); 34-nation draft A/C.3/36/L.69/Rev.1). orally revised; agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Sierra Leone, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/91 of 5 December 1980 and Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/54 of 24 July 1980,

Having heard the statement of the representative of the Secretary-General and of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia, prepared pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/8 of 28 April 1980,

Taking note also of the appeal of the Secretary-General in his note verbale of 11 November 1980,

Deeply concerned that the appeals of the Secretary-General, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly have yet to meet adequate response,

1. Endorses once again the appeals of the Secretary-General and the Economic and Social Council concerning assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia:

2. Requests the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue his efforts to mobilize humanitarian assistance for the relief and rehabilitation of the large number of voluntary returnees:

3. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982 and to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the progress achieved in the implementation of the present resolution.

Assistance to refugees in Somalia

REVIEW MISSION REPORT. In response to a December 1980 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(5)</sup> a United Nations mission, led by the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes, visited Somalia from 11 to 18 January 1981 to review the refugee situation.

Its findings, annexed to a report of 26 March by the Secretary-General,<sup>(2)</sup> pointed to the needs of the refugees whose number equalled nearly a quarter of the country's entire population. Over 1 million refugees were found in 30 camps and seven transit centres, in addition to an estimated 800,000 mostly nomadic people living elsewhere. Their composition was about 60 per cent children, 30 per cent women and 10 per cent men. Despite improved food delivery and increased food stocks, malnutrition persisted, potable water and medicines were in short supply, and

other necessities such as tents, clothing, tools and domestic fuel were scarce.

The mission called for increased international assistance to the camps, totalling \$234.6 million for 1981, and recommended several expert studies, including those concerning the provision of domestic fuels to the camps, the bulk handling of relief supplies, and the animal health problem created by the influx of cattle into Somalia. Further, the mission recommended some \$171 million in additional multiyear assistance to develop Somalia's economic and social infrastructure to service the refugees.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. By a resolution adopted without vote on 6 May,<sup>(4)</sup> the Economic and Social Council strongly endorsed the Secretary-General's appeal for assistance and urged the international community to help Somalia strengthen its social and economic infrastructure so that essential services and facilities could be expanded. The Council commended the Secretary-General for promoting international action to assist the Somali Government in providing relief aid to the refugees, noted with appreciation the measures taken by the Government, and requested the High Commissioner to bring to the attention of the Assembly all pertinent changes and developments in the refugee situation since the January visit of the review mission.

The adoption without vote of the 27-nation draft, introduced by Zaire as an apolitical and purely humanitarian measure, followed the Council's decision, by 23 votes to 13, with 14 abstentions, to agree to a motion by Morocco not to act on amendments proposed by Ethiopia<sup>(1)</sup> to this resolution and on amendments proposed by Somalia to a resolution on assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia (p. 1044).

Ethiopia had proposed deleting, in the fourth preambular paragraph, a phrase describing the nature of the review mission's report; deleting, in the fifth preambular paragraph, the date of the Secretary-General's appeal for aid; and replacing, in the sixth preambular paragraph, recognition of the heavy burden placed on the Government of Somalia with recognition of the refugees' need for generous international assistance.

In operative paragraph 1, Ethiopia had proposed replacing the word "strongly" by "once more" in the endorsement of the Secretary-General's appeal; in paragraph 2, the Secretary-General would have been commended for "assisting the Government of Somalia in securing relief aid for the refugees" instead of for promoting international action to assist the Government in providing relief. In paragraph 5, the Council would have taken note of the mission's report, rather than endorse its findings and recommendations. Paragraph 6, whereby the Council took

note with appreciation of the measures the Government was taking to provide services to the refugees, would have been replaced with a paragraph simply noting the measures taken. In paragraph 8, assistance to strengthen Somalia's social and economic infrastructure would have been qualified as "necessary for the provision of relief aid for the refugees", and the reference to expanding and strengthening essential services would have been deleted.

Further, Ethiopia had proposed insertion of a new paragraph, which would have had the Council call on all concerned to ensure that the international assistance provided would be used for the sole purpose of providing relief and rehabilitation for the refugees. Paragraphs 9 and 10, providing for updated information on the refugee situation, would have been replaced by a paragraph requesting the Secretary-General to report to the Assembly at its 1981 session, and the High Commissioner to report to the Council at its first regular session of 1982, on the progress achieved in implementing the resolution.

Subsequently, Ethiopia orally proposed replacing its amendment to paragraph 6 with a paragraph which would have had the Council deplore "the expansionist policy of the Government of Somalia, which is the root cause of the refugee problem in the whole of Africa". Ethiopia expressed readiness to withdraw the oral proposal if Somalia withdrew its amendment to the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft on assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia (p. 1044), containing a reference to "the oppressive policies of the Government of Ethiopia".

Morocco regretted that the drafts had been subjected to political demagoguery and confrontation, and appealed to Ethiopia and Somalia to forget their differences in the name of compassion for the refugees and withdraw their amendments.

Zaire said the text's sponsors could not accept the Ethiopian amendments, most of which were unjustified and unnecessary. The fourth and sixth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 2 and 8 were part of a unanimously adopted 1980 Assembly resolution,<sup>(5)</sup> and no alteration was justified. Ethiopia's proposal to replace the word "strongly" with "once more" in paragraph 1 was inappropriate as the Council was considering the appeal of 11 March for the first time, and the gravity of the situation called for a strong endorsement; rejecting in paragraph 6 the simple gesture of commending the Government of Somalia ran counter to the humanitarian spirit and traditions of the Council; and the sponsors could not accept replacing paragraphs 9 and 10 with a single paragraph of different intent.

Zambia, a sponsor of the original text, hoped the Council would adopt it unamended.

During the debate, Somalia said the unprecedented magnitude of the refugee situation in that country had seriously depleted its national resources and food reserves, and it feared that the heavy demands made on the ecological system had serious environmental implications. Bangladesh said the situation needed immediate attention and that all possible assistance should be provided on an emergency basis.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In October, the Secretary-General transmitted to the Assembly the information supplied by UNHCR on the refugee situation since the mission's January visit.<sup>(3)</sup>

UNHCR reported that the exceptionally early and heavy rains following a drought had resulted in flooding that threatened the refugee camps; emergency measures for water supply had been followed by the provision of relief transport. In March, the camps were serviced by 150 international and 180 local medical personnel, new health centres were under construction, and a well-drilling project was started to secure an average of 20 litres of potable water per refugee per day. A comprehensive transport and distribution system was implemented in April, agricultural projects for self-reliance were extended in all camps, surveys were undertaken to identify new projects, a reforestation scheme was being planned, and experimentation with solar energy for cooking was being pursued. A committee set up by the Somali Government in August began a camp-by-camp headcount of refugees to establish precise figures for assistance needs.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. The High Commissioner told the Third Committee on 19 November that the UNHCR programme in Somalia consisted largely of humanitarian assistance for relief purposes, while attention was also being paid to the development of self-reliance schemes in agriculture.

By a resolution adopted without vote on 16 December,<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the High Commissioner, to dispatch a mission to Somalia early in 1982 to review the overall needs of the refugees, including those aspects relating to their settlement and rehabilitation. The Assembly also appealed to Member States, international organizations and voluntary agencies for maximum material, financial and technical assistance to the Government of Somalia in its efforts to assist the refugees.

The Third Committee had approved without vote on 30 November the 51-nation draft, which Zaire, in introducing it, called purely humanitarian.

Amendments not considered: <sup>(1)</sup>Ethiopia, E/1981/L.29 & Corr.1.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/136; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G and UNHCR, A/36/136/Add.1 & Add.1/Corr.1.

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC: 1981/31, 6 May, text following. GA: <sup>(5)</sup>35/180, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 948); <sup>(6)</sup>36/153, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: S-G statement, E/1981/L.31.

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR.8-10, 11, 13, 15 (24 Apr.-6 May). GA: 3rd Committee. A/C.3/36/SR.56, 57, 58, 60-63, 64, 66 (19-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/31

Adopted without vote Meeting 15 6 May 1981  
27-nation draft (E/1981/L.18), orally revised; agenda Item 4.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Burundi, Djibouti, Egypt, Ghana, Indonesia, Italy, Jordan, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Assistance to refugees in Somalia

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 34/61 of 29 November 1979 on the situation of African refugees, by which the Assembly requested the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to make every effort to mobilize additional resources to meet the needs of refugees in Africa,

Recalling its resolutions 1980/9 of 28 April 1980 and 1980/53 of 24 July 1980,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/180 of 15 December 1980, in which the Assembly, inter alia:

(a) Endorsed the appeal of the Economic and Social Council to all Member States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and all voluntary agencies to increase further their assistance to the Government of Somalia and to the various refugee programmes sponsored by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees so as to ensure the adequate and continuous provision of emergency relief and humanitarian assistance to refugees in Somalia,

(b) Requested the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the High Commissioner, to dispatch a mission to Somalia to make a comprehensive review of the refugee situation in that country in the light of developments since the report of the United Nations inter-agency mission, which visited Somalia from 10 to 16 December 1979,

(c) Further requested the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the High Commissioner, to arrange for the report of the review mission to be circulated as soon as issued, so that the international community might have an updated report on the condition of the refugees in Somalia and an assessment of their overall needs, including measures for strengthening the social and economic infrastructure of the country,

Taking note of the report of the United Nations review mission, which visited Somalia from 11 to 18 January 1981, providing up-to-date information on the condition of the growing refugee population in Somalia and an assessment of their overall needs,

Noting the appeal issued by the Secretary-General on 11 March 1981 for urgent international assistance to help the Government of Somalia to provide the necessary care and attention to the refugees,

Recognizing the heavy burden placed on the Government of Somalia in caring for the refugees and the need for international assistance to share that burden,

1. Strongly endorses the appeal of the Secretary-General for urgent assistance to the refugees in Somalia;

2. Commends the Secretary-General for taking steps to promote continued and concerted international action to assist the Government of Somalia to provide relief aid for the refugees;

3. Expresses its deep appreciation for the prompt response, generous donations and support of the United Nations refugee programmes in Somalia by various Member States, international organizations and voluntary agencies;

4. Expresses its appreciation also for the efforts undertaken by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, as well as by the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization and other international organizations, to provide humanitarian assistance;

5. Takes note of the findings and recommendations of the United Nations review mission;

6. Takes note with appreciation of the measures which the Government of Somalia is taking to provide shelter, food and other services to the refugees in Somalia;

7. Requests the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue their efforts to mobilize humanitarian assistance for the relief and rehabilitation of the refugees;

8. Urges Member States, the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank and other intergovernmental and financial institutions to assist Somalia in strengthening its social and economic infrastructure so that essential services and facilities can be strengthened and expanded;

9. Further requests the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to arrange for all pertinent changes and developments in the refugee situation in Somalia since the visit of the United Nations review mission in January 1981 to be brought to the attention of the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session so that the report of the review mission can be updated;

10. Further requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to submit to the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982 an updated report on the condition and needs of the refugees.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/153

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, November (meeting 66); 51 -nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.59/Rev.1); agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire, Zambia.

#### Assistance to refugees in Somalia

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/180 of 15 December 1980 on the question of assistance to refugees in Somalia,

Recalling further Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/31 of 6 May 1981,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the review mission to Somalia and the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on the conditions of the refugees in Somalia and containing an assessment of their overall needs,

Having heard the statement of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees,

Deeply concerned at the need to continue to provide assistance to the refugees in Somalia,

1. Takes note of the reports of the Secretary-General and of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on the situation of refugees in Somalia;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner for their continued efforts to mobilize international assistance on behalf of the refugees in Somalia;

3. Takes note with satisfaction of the assistance rendered to refugees in Somalia by various Member States, the Office

of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the World Food Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund and other concerned intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations;

4. Appeals to Member States, international organizations and voluntary agencies to render maximum material, financial and technical assistance to the Government of Somalia in its efforts to provide all necessary assistance to the refugees;

5. Requests the Secretary-General, In co-operation with the High Commissioner, to dispatch a mission to Somalia early in 1982 to make a comprehensive review of the overall needs of the refugees, including those aspects relating to their settlement and rehabilitation;

6. Also requests the Secretary-General, In co-operation with the High Commissioner, to submit the report of the proposed review mission on the refugee situation in Somalia to the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982;

7. Further requests the Secretary-General, In co-operation with the High Commissioner, to submit a report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the progress achieved in the implementation of the present resolution.

#### Assistance to refugees in the Sudan

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In a 22 April 1981 report<sup>(1)</sup> to the General Assembly, prepared in co-operation with UNHCR, the Secretary-General noted that, of the seven technical feasibility missions recommended by a June 1980 inter-agency mission to the Sudan,<sup>(5)</sup> those organized by UNHCR concerning the planning for new settlements, the development of integrated housing programmes, and planning and project design for agricultural programmes for refugee zones had been completed. The mission on a health-delivery system for refugees in the Sudan was to be undertaken by the World Health Organization (WHO) in late April, and the remaining three missions-relating to education, training, and planning for social development and welfare services-were to be conducted in November by the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), in co-operation with United Nations agencies.

Based on the recommendations of a combined mission, which dealt with regional development for new settlements and project design for agricultural programmes in refugee zones, UNHCR took steps in 1981 to establish three new settlements and a water-supply system, create an agricultural extension service and order equipment for water supply and agriculture. Recommendations made by a mission on integrated housing programmes were under discussion between the Sudanese authorities and UNHCR.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. Acting without vote on a 27-nation draft introduced by Indonesia, the Economic and Social Council took note; on 4 May,<sup>(2)</sup> of the Secretary-General's report, on the situation of refugees in the Sudan and requested him to arrange for the completion of all technical follow-up missions

and to report thereon to the Council at its second regular session of 1981 and to the Assembly later in the year.

Accordingly, the Joint Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes orally reported to the Council on 14 July, on behalf of the Secretary-General. He noted that the WHO mission conducted in April and May had recommended a programme worth \$9 million to strengthen the Government's already over-stretched health services, along with a proposal that a similar programme be considered also for the southern region, where the number of refugees had been increasing. As regards the missions on education, vocational training and social services, ECA had carried out the field work in June and July and the reports were under preparation for submission to the Government.

On 20 July, the Council took note of the oral report of the Joint Co-ordinator.<sup>(4)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 19 November, the High Commissioner reported to the Third Committee that much progress had been achieved in the Sudan in terms of durable solutions and that some 100,000 refugees had been settled in the country.

By a 16 December resolution adopted without vote,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly appealed to Member States, international organizations and voluntary agencies to render the maximum possible financial, material and technical assistance to the Government of Sudan in its efforts to help the refugees. The Assembly also requested the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the relevant agencies, to arrange for the completion of the remaining technical follow-up missions.

The 39-nation text, introduced by Zaire as purely humanitarian in character, was approved by the Third Committee on 30 November, also without vote.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/216 & Add.1.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/5, 4 May, text following; <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/158, 16 Dec., text following. Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1981/168, para. (b), 20 July (p. 497).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 937.

Financial implications: S-G statement, E/1981/L.31.

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR.8-10, 12, 13 (24 Apr.-4 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56, 57, 58, 60-63, 64, 66 (19-30 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/5

Adopted	without vote	Meeting	13	4	May	1981
27-nation draft (E/1981/L.24); agenda item 4.						

Sponsors: Algeria, Bangladesh, Canada, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Situation of refugees in the Sudan

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolutions 1980/10 of 28 April 1980 and 1980/45 of 23 July 1980,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 35/181 of 15 December 1980, by which the Assembly requested the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to send, as a matter of urgency, follow-up missions to the Sudan,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the situation of refugees in the Sudan and the report annexed thereto, prepared in co-operation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, which describes the steps taken to implement General Assembly resolution 35/181 and contains the findings of the sectoral follow-up missions that have thus far been completed;

2. Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the relevant agencies, to arrange for the completion of all technical follow-up missions, and to report thereon to the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1981 and to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session.

General Assembly resolution 36/158

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote. 30 November (meeting 66); 39-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.66); agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Canada, Cape Verde, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia.

#### Situation of refugees in the Sudan

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/181 of 15 December 1980 on the situation of refugees in the Sudan,

Recalling further Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/5 of 4 May 1981,

Having heard the statement delivered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees before the Third Committee on 16 November 1981,

Taking note of the ever-increasing number of refugees arriving in the Sudan,

Appreciating the measures which the Government of the Sudan, a least developed country, is taking in order to provide shelter, food and other services to the growing number of refugees in the Sudan,

Recognizing the heavy burden placed on the Government of the Sudan in caring for the growing number of refugees and the need for adequate international assistance to continue its efforts to render assistance to the refugees,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General containing the findings of the sectoral follow-up missions which have so far been completed;

2. Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the relevant agencies, to arrange for the completion of the remaining technical follow-up missions;

3. Expresses its appreciation to the donor Governments, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for their valuable assistance rendered to refugees in the Sudan;

4. Appeals to all Member States, international organizations and voluntary agencies to render the maximum possible financial, material and technical assistance to the Government of the Sudan in its efforts to provide all necessary service to the refugees;

5. Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the High Commissioner, to submit a comprehensive report to the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982 as well as to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the progress achieved in the implementation of the present resolution.

## International co-operation to avert new flows of refugees

Expressing grave concern about the continuing massive flows of refugees and their implications for international peace and security, the General Assembly, by a resolution adopted without vote on 16 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> established a 17-member group of governmental experts to undertake a comprehensive review of the problem in all its aspects, with a view to developing recommendations on means of international co-operation.

The Assembly requested the Group of Governmental Experts on International Co-operation to Avert New Flows of Refugees, in preparing a report in time for Assembly deliberation in 1982, to pay due regard to the existing international instruments, norms and principles, including the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign States; to the right of refugees to return to their homelands or otherwise receive adequate compensation; and to the importance of reaching general agreement whenever that had significance for the outcome of its work.

The experts, upon nomination by Member States, were to be appointed by the Secretary-General after consultation with the regional groups and with due regard to equitable geographical distribution. Each nominating State, as a rule, would bear the expenses for its appointed expert.

For the Assembly's consideration of this item, the Secretary-General had transmitted to it the views and suggestions<sup>(1)</sup> of 26 States and six United Nations organs, submitted in response to a 1980 Assembly request.<sup>(3)</sup>

Human rights aspects of mass exoduses were also the subject of a report prepared for the Commission on Human Rights (p. 965).

The resolution, as orally revised, had been approved without vote by the Special Political Committee on 30 November. Introducing the 37-nation text, Senegal said that the latest estimated number of refugees, excluding those considered as temporarily settled, was over 12.6 million. In Africa, which harboured more than half that number, one person in every 75 was a refugee; of the 10 States having the greatest number of refugees in proportion to the local population, six were African. If nothing was done, the 1980s would become the "refugee decade". In addition to the human suffering, the refugee flows threatened the order and stability of the countries of asylum and the entire region.

Senegal saw the 1980 initiative by the Federal Republic of Germany for Assembly considera-

tion of the question<sup>(5)</sup> as having helped enlarge the earlier concept of the refugee problem. The current resolution aimed at opening the way for a far-reaching discussion on measures of a preventive and political nature and at enlarging the degree of consensus obtained in 1980. The sponsors envisaged the proposed group of governmental experts, representing all regional groups, as being based in New York and conducting its work by consensus, without affecting the current distribution of functions and responsibilities within the United Nations system.

On behalf of the sponsors, Senegal orally revised paragraph 3, on the right of refugees not wishing to return to their homelands to receive adequate compensation, by adding a phrase indicating recognition of that right in previous Assembly resolutions. It also revised paragraph 4 by inserting the words "as a rule" to qualify the financial responsibility of the nominating States. Senegal subsequently revised paragraph 5 to ensure that the Group would pay due regard to, rather than merely keep in mind, the principle of non-intervention.

Although no vote was taken, explanations of position were made by 11 States, including Ethiopia, Guinea, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar and Viet Nam, which indicated they would have abstained.

The Lao People's Democratic Republic considered that paragraph 3 on refugees' rights could have been better worded to avoid misunderstanding. For Viet Nam, the text, though improved, remained unbalanced and ambiguous. Guinea considered that the text failed to reflect the cause of refugee flows, and feared the future international co-operation based on the text, especially on the fifth preambular paragraph, would prove superficial.

Caution against a proliferation of organs was sounded by Brazil and Cuba. Madagascar and the USSR called for non-duplication of the work of existing United Nations organs. Brazil also felt that the Group's mandate was not specific enough. Madagascar believed that what was needed was the establishment of a new international economic order and the elimination of apartheid and colonialism.

Cuba supported the resolution in so far as it was not an instrument for demographic protection, cold war or interference in the internal affairs of States. The USSR also opposed using the refugee question for political or propaganda purposes, and called for due regard to such principles as the inadmissibility of interference in the internal affairs of States by other States or by the United Nations.

Israel supported the text on the understanding that, where there was an anomalous relationship,

including a state of war, between countries concerned in refugee flows, the right to return and the question of compensation would form part of the comprehensive settlement and peace agreement negotiations between those States.

Cyprus requested that the resolution be regarded as covering both refugees and displaced persons. Somalia pointed out, however, that the text made no mention of displaced persons and that the statement by Cyprus reflected the position of that delegation only.

In the Committee debate, the United Kingdom, a sponsor, stated that the reference to colonialism in the fifth preambular paragraph was unrelated to the United Kingdom's relations with its few remaining dependent Territories.

The 1980 initiative of the Federal Republic of Germany leading to Assembly consideration of the question was welcomed by Australia, Austria, Egypt, Finland, Indonesia, Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, the Sudan, Togo and Zaire. Austria said the issues of migration and refugees might prove to be among the most important and troubling world problems of the coming decades, directly affecting the concept of the modern nation State and of international relations.

Many States supported the establishment of a group of governmental experts, among them Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan and Zaire. Other supporters, including Greece, Norway, the Philippines, Portugal, Sierra Leone and the United Kingdom, the last on behalf of the members of the European Community (EC), said the Group should draw on existing international instruments. Pakistan thought it valuable to synthesize and develop the existing body of knowledge-which consisted of a number of scattered legal instruments and patchy experience-on the pattern of the Assembly's 1970 Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.<sup>(2)</sup>

Canada, Egypt, the Federal Republic of Germany, Malaysia, Norway, Somalia, Spain and the EC countries called on the Group to develop practical measures and/or general guidelines. New Zealand advised it to focus on specific aspects rather than be diverted by related problems that could more appropriately be handled in other United Nations organs. Italy suggested that the Group study ways of enhancing the United Nations responsiveness to emergency situations involving massive exodus of refugees.

Australia, although it would have preferred an ad hoc committee, expressed support for the Group and said it was ready to nominate an

expert. Kenya thought a comprehensive review and the preparation of guidelines based on non-interference could be carried out either on the basis of existing instruments or through the creation of a group.

Italy, Japan, Portugal and Spain called for the Group's adherence to the respect for State sovereignty and for non-intervention in internal affairs. Malaysia expressed confidence that the resolution provided the Group with clear guidelines, including non-interference in States' internal affairs and non-infringement of the prerogatives of existing international organizations and institutions.

As to the Group's composition, Indonesia and Kenya said consideration should be given to equitable geographical distribution. Australia and Kenya called, in addition, for the use of expertise in dealing with refugee questions, and the Sudan asked that experts from the developing world, especially from those States directly concerned with the problem, be asked to participate at United Nations expense. Australia, Indonesia and the Sudan believed the Group should conduct its work by consensus.

Misgivings or opposition to the creation of an expert group were voiced by, among others, Bangladesh, Ethiopia, India, Mexico and the Sudan. Bangladesh said that, although the Group could serve a useful purpose, it preferred to await a consensus on the proposal to establish it. India asserted that existing guidelines and machinery were more than adequate, and Bangladesh and Mexico said examining and improving them might help solve the problem and avoid duplication of work. Viet Nam supported making the existing machinery and instruments more effective to encourage the most appropriate solution through bilateral agreements. Ethiopia and the Sudan called for more scrupulous adherence to the existing instruments, notably the Charter of the United Nations; the Sudan also expected the group, if established, to define the role of existing organs.

India warned that, if the Security Council could not halt aggression or restore the inalienable rights of peoples and nations under foreign occupation, a subsidiary organ of the Assembly was unlikely to achieve that result. Mexico considered it the task of the Council and other appropriate organs, rather than of an expert group, to deal with political conflicts which went beyond national boundaries and threatened international peace and security. For Ethiopia, the creation of a new organ would contribute little, provide an additional instrument for interference in the internal affairs of States and lead to more refugee flows.

Morocco said a comprehensive review of the problem should clarify the practical measures

needed, including the possibility of preparing a declaration or creating a new machinery; however, the powers of the Secretary-General or the Security Council might suffice. India wanted the group to respect the principle of non-interference in States' internal affairs.

In addition to their sympathy for the human suffering involved, many countries, including Australia, Canada, China, Egypt, Finland, Greece, Japan, Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Somalia and Zambia, expressed concern at the implications of massive refugee flows, notably the burden on receiving States, destabilizing effects on the internal economic and social order, and increased tension and threats to regional and international peace and security. Zaire said it knew from experience that humanitarian duty imposed a heavy financial burden on receiving States, and Pakistan mentioned that it had spent \$200 million in 1981 to provide for the 2.5 million Afghan refugees on its territory. Indonesia stated that refugee flows not only created a burden on the receiving States but also placed the Government responsible for causing them in difficult circumstances, both internally and internationally.

Aside from natural disasters, most speakers considered the diverse causes of refugee flows to be basically political.

Most often mentioned as a cause were political and military developments, both domestic and foreign—such as political oppression, foreign intervention, armed aggression and military occupation, as Somalia put it. Ethiopia, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Sudan and Viet Nam identified colonialism as a cause, while denial of the right of peoples to self-determination was mentioned by Bangladesh, Egypt, Pakistan and Somalia. Violation of international law was cited by Democratic Kampuchea, Greece and Singapore, while human rights violations were listed by Austria, India, Sierra Leone, the United Kingdom (for the EC members) and Zambia. Racial discrimination was another cause, according to Austria, Japan and the Sudan, and apartheid was listed by Bangladesh, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Pakistan, Viet Nam and Zambia. Bangladesh, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam regarded Zionism as a cause. Iran said people sometimes fled their homelands to preserve independence, freedom and faith.

Social and/or economic factors were mentioned by Austria, Ethiopia, Italy, Singapore, the Sudan and the United Kingdom, the last on behalf of the EC members. Economic disparities and the absence of a new international economic order were other factors, according to Bangla-



desh, India, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Sierra Leone.

Specific recent events were listed by some as having caused massive flows of refugees. Democratic Kampuchea spoke of the USSR invasion of Afghanistan, wars of aggression in the Horn of Africa and in southern Africa, the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea and the tragedy of the Vietnamese "boat people". Japan spoke of millions of people forced to flee as a result of two military incursions within the past three years. Iran charged that Iraq expelled its citizens for their racial and ancestral ties with the Iranians.

For Malaysia, mass exoduses were caused by "push and pull" factors, which included propaganda, incitement and other forms of encouragement through the mass media; it hoped the expert Group would deal with States' obligations not to set such factors in motion.

A search for preventive rather than purely curative or remedial measures was called for by many, among them Australia, Canada, Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Norway, Singapore, Somalia, Zaire and Zambia. Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, Pakistan and the Sudan said humanitarian efforts should be supplemented by political action. While Canada, Egypt and Portugal stressed the need for political solutions, the Lao People's Democratic Republic said the issue should be totally depoliticized and approached from the humanitarian angle alone.

Finland said the concept of the international community's responsibility should not be seen as absolving the States that had caused a refugee problem. Democratic Kampuchea called for exerting pressure on the culprits, and the Philippines pointed to the need to deal with the acts of States that resulted in refugee flows. China saw the need to force those responsible to abide by United Nations resolutions, including the possibility of dispatching fact-finding missions. Viet Nam asserted that the political causes of the problem were too numerous and diverse to be attributed solely to the conduct of Governments of the countries of origin.

Bangladesh, Ethiopia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Morocco believed that the establishment of a new international economic order could help prevent refugee flows. In India's opinion, what was needed was a new system of international relations based on respect for independence, security and development of all peoples.

As for more specific measures, Australia suggested the establishment of early-warning mechanisms and the empowering of international organs to carry out such functions as inquiry into potential mass-flow situations, mediation

and the formulation of recommendations for their solution or improvement. Making a similar suggestion, Somalia said the findings of such a special body could form a basis for action by the General Assembly or the Security Council. Some countries, including Austria, advised that account be taken of the prerogatives of the Council and the good offices of the Secretary-General. The Federal Republic of Germany suggested improving international mechanisms-for instance by broadening the mandates of United Nations bodies and specialized agencies, creating new bodies within the system and enhancing the role of regional organizations; any recommendations regarding the institutional framework should be geared to making it easier rather than more difficult for States to seek international assistance.

A number of countries, among them Egypt, Greece, Malaysia and the Sudan, asked that special regard be paid to the right of refugees to return home. Greece also mentioned a similar right for displaced persons. Ethiopia asserted that, since there were 17 million displaced persons in the world as compared to 10 million refugees, no satisfactory solution to the refugee-flow problem could be envisaged without a simultaneous effort to solve that of displaced persons.

Egypt said the States responsible for causing refugee flows had the obligation to adopt measures for repatriation or for compensation to those who preferred not to return. While supporting the right to repatriation, Canada said that, in view of the size and complexity of the refugee situation, the idea of compensating refugees not wishing to return would require considerable study of financial and legal implications and practical aspects. Japan said due account should be taken of the right of everyone to leave any country, including his own.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/582 & Corr.1 & Add.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>2625(XXV), annex, 24 Oct. 1970 (YUN 1970, p. 789); <sup>(3)</sup>35/124, 11 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 953); <sup>(4)</sup>36/148, 16 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 940.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/823; S-G statements, A/SPC/36/L.27, A/C.5/36/94.

Meeting records: GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.40, 42-45 (24-30 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.73 (14 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.100 (16 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/148

Adopted without vote Meeting 100 16 December 1981

Approved by Special Political Committee (A/36/790) without vote. 30 November (meeting 45); 37-nation draft (A/SPC/36/L.27/Rev.1), orally revised: agenda item 66.

Sponsors: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, United Kingdom, United States, Zaire.

International co-operation to avert new flows of refugees  
The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/124 of 11 December 1980 on international co-operation to avert new massive flows of refugees,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General,

Taking note of the comments and suggestions submitted by Member States, organs of the United Nations and specialized agencies in response to General Assembly resolution 35/124,

Gravely concerned about the continuing massive flows of refugees in many parts of the world and the human suffering affecting millions of men, women and children who flee or are forcibly expelled from their homelands,

Reaffirming the strong condemnation of policies and practices of oppressive and racist régimes, as well as aggression, colonialism, apartheid, alien domination, foreign intervention and occupation, which are among the root causes of new massive flows of refugees throughout the world resulting in great human suffering,

Taking into account the importance of socio-economic factors in the creation of refugee situations,

Reaffirming the inviolability of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of other existing International instruments, norms and principles relevant, *inter alia*, to responsibilities of States with regard to averting new massive flows of refugees, as well as to the status and the protection of refugees, and also reaffirming the framework of competences of existing international organizations and institutions,

Stressing that massive flows of refugees may not only affect the domestic order and stability of receiving States but also jeopardize the political and social stability and the economic development of entire regions and thus endanger international peace and security,

Noting that, in addition to creating individual human misery, massive flows of refugees can impose great political, economic and social burdens upon the international community as a whole, with dire effects on developing countries, particularly those with limited resources of their own,

Convinced that averting new massive flows of refugees is, therefore, a matter of urgent concern for the international community as a whole,

Reaffirming its resolution 2625(XXV) of 24 October 1970, by which it approved the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,

Commending the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and his staff for their untiring humanitarian and social efforts, for which the Office of the High Commissioner has twice been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize,

Commending also for their contributions all Governments, organs of the United Nations, specialized agencies and inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations which have provided aid, and stressing the importance of their efforts in this field,

Conscious of the importance of developing, in order to avert new massive flows of refugees, appropriate means of international co-operation in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and, in particular, with the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign States and also with the principle that nothing in the Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters that are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General;

2. Welcomes the comments and suggestions submitted in response to General Assembly resolution 35/124 by Member States, organs of the United Nations and specialized agencies on international co-operation to avert new massive flows of refugees and on facilitating the return of those refugees who wish to return;

3. Emphasizes the right of refugees to return to their

homes in their homelands and reaffirms the right, as contained in its previous resolutions, of those who do not wish to return to receive adequate compensation;

4. Decides to establish a group of governmental experts of seventeen members who shall be appointed by the Secretary-General, upon nomination by the Member States concerned after appropriate consultation with the regional groups and with due regard to equitable geographical distribution, and whose expenses as a rule shall be borne by each nominating State for its expert;

5. Requests the Group of Governmental Experts on International Co-operation to Avert New Flows of Refugees, in the light of the existing relevant international instruments, norms and principles and with due regard to the rights mentioned in paragraph 3 above, to undertake as soon as possible, in order to improve international co-operation to avert new massive flows of refugees, a comprehensive review of the problem in all its aspects, with a view to developing recommendations on appropriate means of international co-operation in this field, having due regard to the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign States;

6. Requests the Group of Governmental Experts to be mindful of the importance of reaching general agreement whenever that has significance for the outcome of its work;

7. Calls upon the Group of Governmental Experts to take into account the comments and suggestions submitted to the Secretary-General in response to resolution 35/124 and any further comments and suggestions from Member States, organs and organizations of the United Nations and specialized agencies, as well as the views expressed during the debate on this item at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and also the study to be submitted to the Commission on Human Rights at its thirty-eighth session by the special rapporteur, pursuant to its resolution 29(XXXVII) of 11 March 1981, and furthermore the deliberations on this study by the Commission;

8. Calls upon Member States that have not yet submitted to the Secretary-General their comments and suggestions on this item to do so as soon as possible;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare a further compilation of the replies received in accordance with paragraph 8 above and to provide the Group of Governmental Experts with all necessary assistance and facilities for the completion of its task;

10. Calls upon the Group of Governmental Experts to submit a report to the Secretary-General in time for deliberation by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

11. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled 'International co-operation to avert new flows of refugees'.

## International protection of refugees

REPORT OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER. In his report<sup>(1)</sup> to the General Assembly on developments during 1981, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees stated that Governments were adopting an increasingly restrictive approach in granting asylum and refugee status, possibly due to continued arrival of asylum seekers and public hostility against them. Moreover, the economic recession encouraged the view that all aliens were potential competitors for limited economic opportunities, thus resulting in overlooking the special situation of refugees.

In many parts of the world, asylum seekers continued to face physical danger. In South Asia and Central America, refugees were shot down while trying to reach the safety of a refugee camp, and some 50 per cent of asylum seekers in the South China Sea reaching the shores of their country of first asylum were victims of physical assault and robbery in the course of their flight. Numerous cases of murder and abduction were also recorded. In some countries, refugees in camps were the victims of attacks by the military forces of neighbouring countries.

The High Commissioner also noted with utmost concern the cases of *refoulement*- the forcible return of asylum seekers to countries where they faced the danger of persecution or death. In addition to a large-scale distribution of identity cards to refugees in a number of countries, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) provided some 8,000 convention travel documents- papers enabling refugees to travel outside their country of asylum - to Governments on request.

The High Commissioner convened at Geneva in April a meeting of a group of experts on temporary refuge in situations of large-scale influx, as had been requested by the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme. In December, a Symposium on the Promotion, Dissemination and Teaching of Fundamental Human Rights of Refugees was held in Tokyo, under the joint auspices of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, UNHCR and the United Nations University.

**REGIONAL ACTION.** At the regional level, the Inter-American Convention on Extradition, containing a provision prohibiting the extradition of bona fide refugees, was adopted at Caracas, Venezuela, in February 1981, and the Colloquium on Asylum and the International Protection of Refugees in Latin America, meeting in Mexico in May, recognized the need for harmonizing the concepts defined in relevant inter-American conventions with those in international instruments. The African Charter of Human and People's Rights, adopted in July at Nairobi, Kenya, affirmed the right of the persecuted to seek and obtain asylum, as did the Universal Islamic Declaration on Human Rights, which was adopted in September. In November, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe adopted a recommendation on the harmonization of national procedures relating to asylum.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION.** The UNHCR Executive Committee noted at its October 1981 session<sup>(2)</sup> that, despite a broader understanding

of the principles of international protection, the basic rights of refugees had been disregarded in a number of areas in the world. It noted with particular concern that in certain areas refugees had been denied asylum, rejected at the frontier or subjected to expulsion or forcible return, and had fallen victim to pirate attacks at sea. It also noted with grave concern the military attacks on refugee camps in southern Africa and elsewhere.

The Committee stated that, in situations of large-scale influx, asylum seekers should be admitted to the extent possible to the State in which they first sought refuge, and that the principle of non-*refoulement* -including non-rejection at the frontier-should be observed. The Committee listed 16 minimum basic human standards for the treatment of asylum seekers temporarily admitted to States pending arrangements for a durable solution, and declared that asylum seekers and UNHCR were to be entitled access to each other. The Committee also called for burden-sharing with the receiving States so requesting, and urged Governments to seek removal of the root causes of large-scale movements (P. 1050).

Further, the Committee requested the High Commissioner to convene a working group- comprising representatives of the maritime States, the coastal States most concerned, potential countries of resettlement and competent international bodies- to elaborate principles and measures to deal with the complex problems arising from the rescue, disembarkation and resettlement of asylum seekers at sea. The group was requested to report to the Executive Committee in 1982.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 14 December 1981, the General Assembly urged Governments to support the High Commissioner in promoting international protection, by observing the principle of asylum and non-*refoulement* and by protecting asylum seekers in large-scale influx situations.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNHCR, A/37/12; <sup>(2)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/Add.1.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/125, para.5 (a), 14 Dec. (p. 1031).

#### Accessions and ratifications

As at 31 December 1981, the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees,<sup>(2)</sup> which entered into force on 22 April 1954,<sup>(3)</sup> and its 1967 Protocol,<sup>(4)</sup> which entered into force on 4 October 1967, had been ratified or acceded to by 89 and 87 States, respectively.

The UNHCR Executive Committee,<sup>(1)</sup> at its October session at Geneva, expressed hope for further accessions to the Convention and the Protocol and for those States maintaining geographical limitation in respect of their obliga-

tions under the Convention to withdraw that limitation. It also noted with satisfaction the measures taken by various States for the effective implementation of their obligations under the Convention, particularly as regards determination of refugee status.

By year's end, the following States (those adhering in 1981 are italicized) had ratified or acceded to the Convention:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, *Chad*, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Monaco, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe,

The Protocol had been ratified or acceded to by the following States (those adhering in 1981 are italicized):

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada,

Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

During the year, Italy acceded to the 1973 Protocol relating to Refugee Seamen, bringing the total of States parties to the instrument to 14, while there were 18 States parties to the 1957 Agreement relating to Refugee Seamen.

There were no further accessions to the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, nor to the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, and the number of States parties to those instruments remained at 32 and 10, respectively.

There were no further accessions to the, Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa, adopted in 1969 by the Organization of African Unity.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNHCR Committee, A/36/12/Add.1.

Yearbook references: <sup>(2)</sup>1951, p. 520; <sup>(3)</sup>1954, p. 256; <sup>(4)</sup>1967, p. 769.

## Chapter XXII

### Drugs of abuse

The drug abuse situation continued to deteriorate in 1981 in most parts of the world, affecting all age groups and social strata, and creating social and human problems. United Nations bodies reported expanded production and trafficking of illicit narcotic drugs and increased abuse of psychotropic substances. The work of the international drug control organs, particularly the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, focused on such priority areas as improvement of the control system, reduction of illicit drug traffic and rehabilitation of drug abusers.

In December, the General Assembly adopted two resolutions aimed at remedying the situation. In one, it adopted an International Drug Abuse Control Strategy and a five-year programme of action for 1982-1986,<sup>(8)</sup> as finalized

by the Commission in February. In the other, the Assembly acknowledged the need for a comprehensive international campaign against traffic in drugs and declared that such a campaign, in the context of the Strategy, should aim at strengthening regional and international law enforcement and co-operation.<sup>(7)</sup>

Recognizing that better-informed public opinion could increase the effectiveness of the fight against drug abuse, the Economic and Social Council, in May, urged Governments to give primary importance to the provision of full and accurate information on the hazardous effects of the abuse of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Council urged full implementation of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances

and called on both importing and exporting countries to remain vigilant so as to prevent diversion from licit to illicit uses.<sup>(3)</sup> Further, in order to maintain a world-wide balance between the supply and the legitimate demand for narcotic drugs for medical and scientific purposes, the Council appealed to the importing countries to support the longest-standing supplier countries.<sup>(4)</sup>

In addition, the Council authorized the Commission to hold a special five-day session in 1982 to examine, in detail, specific topics related to the social and human problems created by drug abuse.<sup>(6)</sup>

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs held its twenty-ninth session at Vienna, Austria, from 2 to 11 February 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> In addition to the recommendations made to the Council, it urged Governments to participate in the Certification Scheme on the Quality of Pharmaceutical Products Moving in International Commerce, as formulated by the World Health Organization, in order to prevent the importation of low-quality or falsely labelled narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances into developing countries (p. 1062). The Commission also recommended that Governments speed up and intensify measures to identify the nature, extent and characteristics of the illicit demand for drugs (p. 1059).

The International Narcotics Control Board held two sessions at Vienna—18 to 29 May (twenty-ninth session) and 13 October to 6 November (thirtieth session)<sup>(1)</sup>—and published in December a study on the demand and supply of opiates for medical and scientific needs.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1981 (E/INCB/56), Sales No. E.82.XI.1.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Narcotic Drugs, E/1981/24.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(3)</sup>1981/7 (p. 1064), <sup>(4)</sup>1981/8 (p. 1060), <sup>(5)</sup>1981/9 (p. 1059), <sup>(6)</sup>1981/10 (p. 1066), 6 May. GA: <sup>(7)</sup>36/132, 14 Dec. (p. 1062); <sup>(8)</sup>36/168, 16 Dec. (p. 1058).

Other publications: Statistics on Narcotic Drugs for 1981 Furnished by Governments in accordance with the International Treaties (E/INCB/63), Sales No. E/F/S.82.XI.6. Comparative Statement of Estimates and Statistics on Narcotic Drugs for 1981 Furnished by Governments in accordance with the International Treaties (E/INCB/65), E/F/S.83. XI.3. Bulletin on Narcotics, vol. XXXIII, Nos. 1-4. Bulletin on Narcotics: Subject Indexes for Volumes I-XX VI.

#### Long-term UN programme

An international strategy for drug abuse control and a five-year programme of action for 1982-1986 were adopted on 11 February 1981 by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.<sup>(1)</sup> In inviting the Economic and Social Council to transmit to the General Assembly the strategy and the programme, the Commission stressed the need for the full and active co-operation and dedication of all countries concerned, and recommended that the proposed projects be carried out as

much as possible in 1982 as a start for the five-year programme of action.

The strategy recognized that the global dimensions of the problem of drug abuse called for a universal approach, co-ordinated through the United Nations. It outlined a series of policy measures to improve the drug control system, achieve a balance between demand for and supply of drugs for legitimate purposes, reduce the illicit drug traffic and rehabilitate drug abusers. The five-year programme spelled out the guidelines for action, as well as 22 projects for implementation during 1982, to complement the existing United Nations activities in the field of drug abuse.

On 6 May, the Economic and Social Council, acting without vote, decided to transmit to the General Assembly at its 1981 session the strategy and the five-year programme, as well as comments made in the Council.<sup>(3)</sup> The Council's Second (Social) Committee approved the draft in like manner on 21 April, as orally proposed by its Chairman on a recommendation by the Commission. Speaking in explanation of position on behalf of the Nordic countries, Sweden stated that the strategy's success depended on the provision of adequate resources to the agencies concerned.

In a 16 December resolution,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted without vote, the Assembly adopted the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy and the programme of action, and called for their implementation by all concerned. It requested the Commission, within available resources, to establish a task force to monitor, co-ordinate and report on progress in their implementation. The task force would be composed of representatives of the Member States most interested in and affected by drug abuse problems or the licit production of drugs and by those of the United Nations drug-related bodies. The Commission was asked to review the work of the task force and report to the Assembly in 1983 and annually thereafter, through the Economic and Social Council. Further, the Assembly urged Member States to initiate or increase contributions to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (p. 1065), in order to ensure the success of the Strategy and to give a firm impetus to the battle against international drug traffickers.

Introducing the draft in the Assembly's Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, also on behalf of Australia, Bolivia, India, Malaysia, Mali, Morocco, Pakistan, Sweden and Turkey, the United States said it was intended to encourage all States to participate in the fight against all aspects of the problems associated with the production, trafficking and consumption of illicit drugs.

Subsequently, the sponsors orally revised the text by deleting a paragraph requesting the Secretary-General, within available resources, to assist in the Strategy's implementation. By another change, the task force was to include Member States interested in and affected by the "licit production of drugs" rather than by the "abuse of legally produced drugs". When the Committee approved the text, as revised, on 30 November without vote, the USSR said its joining the consensus did not signify a change in its position regarding the financing of the Fund. Belgium would have preferred that the United Nations refrain from establishing new international drug control bodies, such as the proposed task force.

Support for the Strategy and the programme were expressed in the Committee by Argentina, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway (on behalf of Nordic countries), Pakistan and the United States. The United Kingdom expressed concern that the proposed task force might duplicate the work of the Commission itself.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Narcotic Drugs (report, E/1981/24), 1(XXIX), 11 Feb.; <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/168, 16 Dec., text following. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/113, 6 May, text following.

Financial implications: ACABQ report, A/36/7/Add.17; 5th Committee report, A/36/811; S-G statements, A/C.3/36/L.88, A/C.5/36/76.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.1-4 (14-21 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-62, 63, 66, 67-70, 72 (19 Nov.-3 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.70 (10 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.101 (16 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/113

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/58) without vote, 21 April (meeting 4); oral Proposal by Chairman, on recommendation by Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1981/24); agenda item 11.

Strategy and policies for drug control

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council decided to transmit resolution 1(XXIX) of 11 February 1981 of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, entitled "Strategy and policies for, drug control", and the annex thereto, together with the comments made thereon by the Council at its first regular session of 1981, to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session.

General Assembly resolution 36/168

Adopted without vote Meeting 101 16 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/792) without vote, 30 November (meeting 66); 10-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.77), orally revised; agenda item 12.

Sponsors: Australia, Bolivia, India, Malaysia, Mali, Morocco, Pakistan, Sweden, Turkey, United States.

International Drug Abuse Control Strategy

The General Assembly,

Having received from the Economic and Social Council the report containing the draft International Drug Abuse Control Strategy that was requested by the General Assembly in resolutions 32/124 of 16 December 1977, 33/168 of 20 Decem-

ber 1978, 34/177 of 17 December 1979 and 35/195 of 15 December 1980.

Considering that the scourge of drug abuse continues to spread and has reached epidemic proportions in many parts of the world and that, as specified in the request for the inclusion of the item entitled "International campaign against traffic in drugs" in the agenda of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, it is necessary to adopt scientific, technical and political measures commensurate with the gravity of the problem,

Emphasizing the conclusion contained in paragraph 2 of Commission on Narcotic Drugs resolution 1(XXIX) of 11 February 1981 that, in order for any international action in the field of drug abuse control to be successful, the full and active co-operation and dedication of all countries must be forthcoming,

Recognizing the urgent need for an effective, comprehensive, co-ordinated global strategy to prevent and control drug trafficking, the illicit demand for drugs and drug abuse, as well as for comprehensive, co-ordinated strategies at the regional and national levels,

1. Adopts the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy and the basic five-year programme of action dealt with in Commission on Narcotic Drugs resolution 1(XXIX) which the Economic and Social Council, in its decision 1981/113 of 6 May 1981, decided to transmit to the General Assembly;

2. Urges that the international Drug Abuse Control Strategy and the programme of action be given priority by all Governments and be implemented as quickly as possible by the relevant bodies of the United Nations and other international organizations;

3. Requests the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, within available resources, to establish a task force, in consultation with the Directors-General of the appropriate specialized agencies and other United Nations drug-related bodies, composed of representatives of these agencies and bodies and representatives of the Member States most interested in and affected by the production, trafficking and consumption of and demand for illicit drugs, as well as those interested in and affected by the licit production of drugs, to review, monitor and co-ordinate the implementation of the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy and the programme of action and to submit a report to the Commission at each session or special session on the progress made in implementing the Strategy and programme of action and to provide any recommendations it deems necessary regarding future revision of such Strategy and programme of action;

4. Requests the Commission on Narcotic Drugs to review the report of its task force and to report thereon, through the Economic and Social Council, to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session and annually thereafter;

5. Urges all Member States and non-member States parties to the international drug control treaties, specialized agencies and other international organizations and private institutions concerned with the drug abuse problem to participate in and support activities related to international drug abuse control strategy and policies;

6. Also urges, in order to ensure the success of the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy and to give a firm impetus to the battle of the world community against international drug traffickers, that Member States initiate or increase contributions to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the text of the present resolution and related documents to all Member States and non-member States parties to the international drug control treaties and to all relevant international, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

Financing

Expressing its concern over the imbalance between the financial requirements of the five-year

programme of action and the funds allocated in the United Nations regular budget for international drug control activities, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, on 11 February 1981, requested the appropriate United Nations bodies to reallocate within the United Nations budget the funds needed for the efficient functioning of the international drug control system.<sup>(1)</sup> At the same time, the Commission invited the Economic and Social Council to consider that request and transmit it to other appropriate bodies.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Narcotic Drugs (report, E/1981/24), 6(XXIX), 11 Feb.

#### Drug abuse

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs, at its 1981 session,<sup>(1)</sup> observed a sharp increase in drug-related deaths and a further increase in the abuse of amphetamines, cocaine hydrochloride, barbiturates, non-barbiturate sedative-hypnotics and benzodiazepines. While heroin abuse continued to spread, the abuse of LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide) was reported levelling off. Cannabis remained the drug most widely abused in the world and stronger preparations were increasingly available on illicit markets (p. 1060). Although the recorded drug abuse predominantly affected the young, people of all age groups and social strata were found to be abusers.

In an 8 October report to the General Assembly, the Secretary-General observed a sharp increase in the illicit production, near the supply source, of more potent narcotic drugs by processes which reduced the volume and thus made smuggling easier; the illicit production of, and traffic in, psychotropic substances were also increasing in many parts of the world.<sup>(2)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Narcotic Drugs, E/1981/24; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.3/36/7.

#### Control of drug abuse

Recognizing the need for determined action to prevent or reduce illicit demand for drugs, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, on 10 February 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> recommended that Governments strengthen measures already being taken in accordance with international drug control treaties, and speed up and intensify measures to identify the nature, extent and characteristics of illicit demand. The Commission also recommended that Governments take all practicable measures to develop community-based programmes for drug abuse prevention as well as for the early identification, treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers. In addition, the Commission urged the Secretary-General, the World Health Organization, the International Labour Organisation and all other concerned international or-

ganizations to give priority to the allocation of resources to assist Member States to achieve those goals.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Narcotic Drugs (report, E/1981/24), 4(XXIX), 10 Feb.

#### Information dissemination

On the recommendation of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the Economic and Social Council, on 6 May 1981, requested Governments to give primary importance to the provision of full and accurate information on the hazardous effects of the abuse of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances.<sup>(1)</sup> The Council, by a resolution adopted without vote, also urged Governments, having due regard to their constitutional and other systems, to stop publication of material encouraging drug abuse, and asked them to confine all official statements to accurate information that avoided presumption or speculation.

When the Council's Second (Social) Committee approved the text without vote on 21 April, the United States said that, although Governments had a role to play in drug abuse prevention, each country had the sovereign responsibility to act through the mechanisms most suitable to its needs and in conformity with its own constitutional, legal and social systems. The United Kingdom accepted the consensus on the understanding that the text's provisions were not in contradiction with the freedom of the press in democratic countries.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/9, 6 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.1-3, 4 (14-21 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/9

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/58) without vote. 21 April (meeting 4); draft by Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1981/24): agenda item 11.

#### Promotion of understanding of the problems of drug abuse by the general public

##### The Economic and Social Council.

Recalling article 38, paragraph 3, of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the 1972 Protocol Amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, and article 20, paragraph 3, of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971.

Recalling also General Assembly resolution 35/195 of 15 December 1980.

Deeply concerned that the spread of drug abuse threatens the health of the young and constitutes a problem that jeopardizes the future of a number of communities,

Recognizing that better-informed public opinion could substantially increase the effectiveness of the fight against drug abuse,

Recognizing also that full and accurate information is essential if the maximum effect is to be obtained from the efforts of the International community,

1. Requests Governments to attribute primary importance to ensuring that full and accurate information concerning the hazardous effects of the abuse of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances is available to all who may be able

to assist in preventing drug abuse, especially among young people;

2. Urges Governments, having due regard to their constitutional, legal and administrative systems, to take all possible action to stop the publication or propagation of any written or other material that directly or indirectly encourages, stimulates or aims at increasing drug abuse;

3. Invites Governments to supply in the most appropriate manner all information and material necessary to ensure that national and international public opinion is correctly informed of efforts and achievements against drug abuse and the illicit drug traffic;

4. Asks the Governments and agencies concerned to confine any press releases or statements from official sources to accurate information that avoids any presumption or speculation for which no proof exists;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the present resolution to the Governments, specialized agencies, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations concerned for their consideration and appropriate action.

#### Scientific research on cannabis

The Vienna-based International Narcotics Control Board (INCB), in its 1981 report,<sup>(1)</sup> observed that cannabis and its products continued to dominate the illicit drug traffic in many countries and that the consumption of cannabis, in the high potency unavailable 10 years earlier, had risen steeply.

The Board reported that, according to studies carried out in a number of countries, heavy cannabis use could produce acute psychotic reactions, lowered resistance to disease, and adverse effects on the reproductive and endocrine systems, the lungs and even personality. Sophisticated pulmonary-function testing in many well-controlled studies concluded that cannabis smoking was more injurious to the lungs than tobacco. Even occasional use of cannabis could cause maladies severe enough to require medical intervention. The Board concluded that the dissemination of the research findings could help to discourage cannabis use, and that Governments should, therefore, make such evidence known to the public at large and conduct research so as to monitor changes in national drug use levels and public attitudes.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>INCB, E/INCB/56 (Sales No. E.82.XI.1).

#### Supply and demand

In December 1981, INCB published a study on the demand and supply of opiates for medical and scientific needs,<sup>(2)</sup> on the basis of information obtained during a series of consultations conducted in 1980 and 1981 with all Governments concerned as producers, manufacturers and consumers. The Board also continued its study of the factors that determined the balance between the demand and supply of opiates for such needs, in order to formulate a programme of action.

In its 1980 annual report,<sup>(1)</sup> submitted to the Economic and Social Council for consideration

in 1981, INCB noted that the maintenance of excessive stocks in producing countries had cast heavy additional financial and other burdens on those countries; asserted that India and Turkey, as the longest-standing producers for export, merited special consideration and practical support from the international community; and suggested that both importing and exporting countries should exercise control and monitor the movement and amount of drugs.<sup>(3)</sup>

Noting that the maintenance of a world-wide balance between the supply of narcotic drugs and the legitimate demand for them constituted an important aspect of the international drug abuse control strategy and policy, the Council, on 6 May,<sup>(5)</sup> appealed to the importing countries to support those supplier countries which had been the longest-standing producers for export of narcotic raw materials for medical and scientific purposes. It also urged major producing countries with recently established export capacity to restrict their production to meet mainly their domestic requirements. The resolution was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 5 abstentions. Acting on a February recommendation of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the Council's Second (Social) Committee approved the draft on 21 April by 41 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

In a related action of 10 February,<sup>(4)</sup> the Commission, by 25 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions, urged parties to the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, if engaged in the cultivation of *Papaver bracteatum* (the thebaine poppy), to report voluntarily to INCB on production and on the area of cultivation. The Commission recommended that INCB consider the steps necessary to monitor the production and utilization of *Papaver bracteatum*, which was not under international control.

Publications: <sup>(1)</sup>Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1980 (E/INCB/52), Sales No. E.81.XI.2;

<sup>(2)</sup>Demand and Supply of Opiates for Medical and Scientific Needs (E/INCB/52/Supp.), Sales No. E.82.XI.4.

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>INCB, E/1981/34 (summary).

Resolutions: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission on Narcotic Drugs (report, E/1981/24), 2(XXIX), 10 Feb.; <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/8, 6 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.1-3, 4 (14-21 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/8

45-0-5	Meeting	14	6	May	1981
--------	---------	----	---	-----	------

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/58) by vote (41-0-6) 21 April (meeting 4); draft by Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1981/24); agenda item 11.

Maintenance of a world-wide balance between the supply of narcotic drugs and the legitimate demand for these drugs for medical and scientific purposes

The Economic and Social Council.

Recalling the relevant provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, to limit the cultivation, production, manufacture and use of narcotic drugs to a quantity required for medical and scientific purposes,



Recalling its resolutions 1979/8 of 9 May 1979 and 1980/20 of 30 April 1980 and General Assembly resolution 35/195 of 15 December 1980.

Bearing in mind that the maintenance of a world-wide balance between the supply of narcotic drugs and the legitimate demand for those drugs for medical and scientific purposes constitutes an important aspect of the international drug abuse control strategy and policy,

Having considered the report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1980 on the world requirements and supply of narcotic raw materials for medical and scientific purposes, In particular the observations made in paragraphs 58 and 60 of the report,

Noting the observations of the Board that maintenance of excessive stocks in some countries has cast heavy additional financial and other burdens on those countries,

1. Appeals to the Governments of all importing countries to support the countries referred to in paragraph 58 of the report of the international Narcotics Control Board for 1980, which, as traditional supplier countries, have been the longest-standing producers for export of narcotic raw materials for medical and scientific purposes;

2. Urges the Governments of major producing countries that have recently set up additional capacities for export to restrict, as recommended in paragraph 60 of the report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1980, their production programmes to meet mainly their domestic requirements;

3. Requests the International Narcotics Control Board to continue a dialogue with the Governments concerned in regard to expeditious implementation of the resolutions on the subject so as to restore a lasting balance between supply and demand;

4. Requests also the Secretary-General to transmit the text of the present resolution to all Governments for their consideration.

#### Illicit traffic

In its 1980 report,<sup>(6)</sup> INCB stated that opium continued to be produced illicitly in enormous quantities and trafficked primarily in the form of heroin. Parts of the Middle East ranked as the world's main source of the illegal opiates, most of them destined for Western Europe and North America. Quantitatively, cannabis and its products dominated the illicit traffic in many countries, and the total volume of trade was mounting rapidly. Large amounts of coca leaf continued to be cultivated in Bolivia and Peru, and cocaine was manufactured mainly in Colombia and Ecuador.<sup>(5)</sup> In its 1981 report,<sup>(7)</sup> INCB said the trade in chemicals which served as precursors or agents in the illicit manufacture of drugs continued to pose serious problems because of the wide legitimate industrial use of most of them. It suggested that consideration might be given to the establishment of a precursor surveillance programme at the international level.

When the Commission on Narcotic Drugs reviewed the 1980 INCB report at its February 1981 session<sup>(4)</sup> it noted that unilateral action against the illicit drug traffic was insufficient and that there was a clear need for a co-ordinated international approach supported to the fullest extent possible by the United Nations.

On 6 May, the Economic and Social Council, by 48 votes to none, with 5 abstentions, decided

to insert in its calendar of conferences and meetings for 1982 and 1983 one meeting each year for the Sub-Commission on Illicit Drug Traffic and Related Matters in the Near and Middle East and for the Meeting of Operational Heads of Narcotics Law Enforcement Agencies, Far East Region.<sup>(9)</sup> The meetings would be held in capitals in the respective regions at dates to be determined.

The Council's Second Committee approved the decision, recommended by the Commission, on 21 April by 41 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

At its 1981 session, the General Assembly took up, at the request of Bolivia, a new agenda item entitled "International campaign against traffic in drugs". Acting without vote on 14 December,<sup>(8)</sup> the Assembly acknowledged the need for a comprehensive campaign, within the context of the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy (p. 1057), and decided that such a campaign should focus on the enactment of effective national legislation, the strengthening of regional efforts, a review of the situation and needs of transit States, the provision of technical and financial assistance to countries with limited resources for drug abuse control programmes, the strengthening of law enforcement and co-operation at the regional and international levels, and a comprehensive information campaign on the harmful effects of drug abuse.

In explanation of its position after the Assembly action, Brazil said it would have preferred the use of the word "drugs" for "narcotics" in the third and fifth preambular paragraphs since "drugs" referred both to narcotics, whose traffic occurred mainly from developing to developed countries, and to psychotropics, whose traffic occurred mainly from developed to developing countries.

The 16-nation draft was introduced in the Assembly's Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee by the Bahamas, which orally revised the text to add the adjective "illegal" before the word "possession" in the ninth preambular paragraph, in view of the fact that certain persons were entitled to possess drugs. When the Third Committee approved the draft without vote on 1 December, the United States welcomed the fact that the text did not seek to establish any costly new machinery which would have to be financed by the United Nations.

In the Third Committee debate, Argentina, the Bahamas, Madagascar, the Philippines, Turkey and the United States stressed the need for international co-operation in drug traffic control and prevention. The Bahamas and Bolivia asserted that the drug traffic had a criminal, corrupting and disturbing impact on a number of

developing countries. Turkey believed a relationship existed between international terrorism and narcotics smuggling, and that some of the proceeds were being used to destabilize countries for political ends.

Drug traffic was the topic of three letters from Bolivia to the Secretary-General during 1981. In the first, dated 9 April, Bolivia appealed to the United Nations to establish an international committee for the campaign against narcotics traffic, an emergency fund for rehabilitation of drug abusers and a multinational coca control agency, and to convene a world anti-drug conference in 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> In the second letter, dated 22 May, Bolivia described its campaign against the clandestine cocaine production and trade, and asserted that clear links existed between drug traffickers, members of international extremist guerrilla movements and arms suppliers.<sup>(2)</sup> Its request, contained in a letter of 11 August,<sup>(3)</sup> led to the inclusion in the 1981 Assembly agenda of an item on an international campaign against traffic in drugs.

Letters: Bolivia: (1) 9 Apr., A/36/179; <sup>(2)</sup> 22 May, A/36/284; <sup>(3)</sup> 11 Aug., A/36/193.

Reports: (4) Commission on Narcotic Drugs, E/1981/24; INCB, (5) E/1981/34 (summary), (6) E/INCB/52 (Sales No. E.81.XI.2), <sup>(7)</sup> E/INCB/56 (Sales No. E.82.XI.1).

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(8)</sup> GA. 36/132, 14 Dec., text following. Dec.: (9) ESC, 1981/117, 6 May, text following. Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.1-3, 4 (14-21 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May). GA: 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56, 62-65, 67, 68 (19 Nov.-1 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.97 (14 Dec.).

#### **Economic and Social Council decision 1981/117**

48-0-5

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/58) by vote (41-0-5), 21 April (meeting 4); draft by Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1981/24); agenda item 11.

#### **Calendar of conferences and meetings for 1982 and 1983**

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council decided to insert in its calendar of conferences and meetings for 1982 and 1983 one meeting each year for the Sub-Commission on Illicit Drug Traffic and Related Matters in the Near and Middle East and for the Meeting of Operational Heads of Narcotics Law Enforcement Agencies, Far East Region. The meetings are to be held in capitals in the respective regions at dates to be determined.

#### **General Assembly resolution 36/132**

Adopted without vote Meeting 97 14 December 1981

Approved by Third Committee (A/36/78S) without vote, 1 December (meeting 68); 16-nation draft (A/C.3/36/L.80), orally revised; agenda item 129.

Sponsors: Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sweden, Thailand.

#### **International campaign against traffic in drugs**

The General Assembly,

Recalling the relevant provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961, as amended by the 1972 Protocol Amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961, and the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971,

Concerned that, despite national, regional and international efforts, the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances is increasing in many parts of the world,

Recognizing that many States, including those that are not producers or significant consumers of illicit narcotics, are increasingly affected by the international drug traffic,

Bearing in mind that the extensive and increasing abuse of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances in many countries is directly linked to the volume of the traffic in illicit drugs into or through such countries,

Convinced that greater control over the production and distribution of narcotic raw materials and the reduction of the demand for illicit narcotics are necessary prerequisites for reducing the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances,

Aware of the links between drug trafficking and organized crime, illegal acquisition of firearms, exchange control violations, customs offences, various forms of criminality and other serious problems of a socio-economic nature,

Affirming the need for increased surveillance and stronger penalties regarding the use of boats, aircraft and other means of transport of any type for illicit traffic in drugs,

Acknowledging that constraints of an economic and technical nature are obstacles in many developing countries to their fight against drug trafficking,

Convinced that any liberalization of national legislation with regard to the illegal possession of and traffic in narcotics will have a negative effect on international efforts to control the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs,

Conscious of the fact that drug abuse and the related trafficking present a threat to the health and social well-being of peoples, particularly youth, and endanger the national security, resilience and future of many countries,

Mindful of the important role of an informed public opinion in the struggle against drug trafficking,

Bearing in mind United Nations programmes related to combating the problem of drug trafficking, in particular the international Drug Abuse Control Strategy,

Acknowledging the need for a comprehensive international campaign against traffic in drugs,

1. Recognizes the need for an effective international campaign against traffic in drugs in the context of the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy, which would involve activities at the national, regional and international levels, with particular emphasis on, inter alia:

(a) The enactment of effective national legislation and the strengthening of existing legislation against drug abuse, wherever necessary;

(b) The strengthening of regional efforts, with due regard to the specific problems and needs of each region;

(c) A review of the situation and needs of those States that are primarily transit States;

(d) The provision of technical and financial assistance to countries, particularly developing countries, whose limited resources are strained by their efforts to implement drug abuse control programmes;

(e) The strengthening of law enforcement efforts and increasing co-operation at the regional and international levels;

(f) A comprehensive information campaign on the hazardous effects of the abuse of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances and the dangers of drug trafficking, and on the positive achievements in this regard;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the present resolution to Member States, relevant bodies of the United Nations system and non-governmental organizations for comments and proposals on an effective international campaign against traffic in drugs and to report, through the Economic and Social Council, to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

3. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "International campaign against traffic in drugs".

#### **Trade in substandard drugs**

Expressing concern over the reported large-scale introduction of low-quality or falsely

labelled narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances into developing countries, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs,<sup>(1)</sup> on 10 February 1981, recommended that Governments participate in the Certification Scheme on the Quality of Pharmaceutical Products Moving in International Commerce, as formulated by the World Health Organization (WHO), in order to prevent the importation of such drugs (p. 824). The Commission invited WHO, the United Nations Narcotics Laboratory and other organizations concerned to assist developing countries to develop their national drug control systems.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Narcotic Drugs (report, E/1981/24), 3(XXIX), 10 Feb.

#### Implementation of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961

During 1981, no additional States adhered to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, and the total number of parties to the unamended Convention stood at 113. Three countries—Gabon, Nigeria and Rwanda—acceded in 1981 to the Convention as amended by the 25 March 1972 Protocol, and Sri Lanka acceded to the Protocol, thus bringing to 76 the total number of parties to the Convention as amended.

In accordance with the provisions of the Convention, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, on 4 February, decided to amend Schedule III of the Convention and its Protocol to include certain preparations containing dextropropoxyphene salts.<sup>(1)</sup>

On the same date, the Commission, by a roll-call vote of 21 to 4 (Federal Republic of Germany, India, Spain, United Kingdom), upheld its 1980 decision to include dextropropoxyphene in Schedule II of the Convention. This action was taken in response to a request by Spain that the Economic and Social Council review that decision. Spain maintained that the drug had a low dependence-liability and questioned the appropriateness of controlling the substance under the Convention,<sup>(3)</sup> a view shared by the three other dissenting countries in the Commission vote.<sup>(4)</sup> Subsequently, the Council's Second (Social) Committee, on an oral proposal by its Chairman, recommended approval of the Commission's decision without vote on 21 April, and the Council itself acted likewise on 6 May to confirm the 1980 decision.<sup>(2)</sup>

Decisions: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Narcotic Drugs (report, E/1981/24), 1(XXIX), 4 Feb.; <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/119, 6 Ma text following.

Note: <sup>(3)</sup>Secretariat, E/1981/39 & Add.1.2.

Report: <sup>(4)</sup>Commission on Narcotic Drugs, E/1981/24.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.1-3, 4 (14-21 Apr.) plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

Publications: Estimated World Requirements of Narcotic Drugs in 1981 (E/INCB/51), Sales No. E/F/S.81.XI.1; & Supplements Nos. 1-12 (E/INCB/51/Supp.1-12), Sales No. E/F/S.81.XI.1/Supp.1-12.

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/119

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/58) without vote, 21 April (meeting 4); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 11.

##### Review of decision 1 (S-VI) of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council decided to confirm decision 1 (S-VI) of 14 February 1980 of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on the inclusion of dextropropoxyphene in Schedule II annexed to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, and to that Convention as amended by the 1972 Protocol.

#### International control of psychotropic substance

In its annual report for 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> the International Narcotics Control Board observed that effective international control of psychotropic substances was proving more complex than was originally foreseen because of the large number of such substances, their extensive use in medicine, their rapidly developing non-medical use and the great potential for clandestine manufacture. <sup>(1)</sup> The Board believed that the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances (see below) should be fully implemented in order to stem the diversion of certain psychotropic substances into illicit channels.

In 1981, the Board noted that substantial licit over-production continued, especially in the case of amphetamines, methaqualone and other Schedule II substances, thus increasing the dangers of diversion, misuse and abuse.<sup>(3)</sup> The Board felt it imperative that more States accede as soon as possible to the 1971 Convention.

Reports: INCB: <sup>(1)</sup>E/1981/34 (summary), <sup>(2)</sup>E/INCB/52 (Sales No. E.81.XI.2), <sup>(3)</sup>E/INCB/56 (Sales No. E.82.XI.1).

Publication: Statistics on Psychotropic Substances for 1981 Furnished by Governments in accordance with the Convention of 1971 on Psychotropic Substances, Resolution I of the United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Protocol on Psychotropic Substances and Resolution 1576(L) of the Economic and Social Council (E/INCB/64), Sales No. E/F/S.82.XI.5.

#### Implementation of the 1971 Convention

In a resolution on the implementation of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances,<sup>(1)</sup> adopted, without vote, on 6 May 1981 on the recommendation of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the Economic and Social Council appealed to all States not parties to adhere promptly to the instrument and to States parties to enforce the control measures provided for under the Convention. The Council called on exporting countries to scrutinize the authenticity of each import authorization and on both importing and exporting countries concerned to ensure that the amounts of the substances involved were commensurate with legal requirements of manufacture or domestic consumption of the importing country, in order to prevent diversion

from licit manufacture and trade. In addition, the Council invited Governments to consider the Board's suggestion that they should voluntarily refrain from exporting certain substances in amounts exceeding the likely needs unless the needs were confirmed by the importing country.

When the Council's Second (Social) Committee approved the text without vote on 21 April, the United States supported the strengthening of the Convention and called for its full implementation. The United Kingdom, though not opposed to the text, expressed some doubts about the introduction of new variations in the control of psychotropic substances.

By a series of actions taken on 4 February, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs decided that Schedule IV of the Convention should be amended to include four more substances: benzphetamine,<sup>(2)</sup> mazindol,<sup>(3)</sup> phendimetrazine<sup>(4)</sup> and phentermine.<sup>(5)</sup> In addition, the Commission decided to terminate the exemption of certain preparations from control measures, in response to notifications from the Governments of Bulgaria (for Barbamil, Hexadorm-Calcium and Glutethimide)<sup>(6)</sup> and Mexico (for Almotracina "S", Dilacoran, Fenadrops, Sedadrops and Visparax).<sup>(7)</sup>

As at the end of 1981, the following 75 States were parties to the Convention (those in *italics* either ratified or acceded during 1981):

Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

#### Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC: 1981/7, 6 May, text following.

Decisions: Commission on Narcotic Drugs (report, E/1981/24), 4 Feb.: <sup>(2)</sup>2(XXIX), <sup>(3)</sup>3(XXIX), <sup>(4)</sup>4(XXIX), <sup>(5)</sup>5(XXIX), <sup>(6)</sup>6(XXIX), <sup>(7)</sup>7(XXIX).

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.1-3, 4 (14-21 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14(6May).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/7

Adopted without vote Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/58) without vote. 21 April (meeting 4); draft by Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1981/24); agenda item 11.

#### Implementation of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances

##### The Economic and Social Council,

Bearing in mind the provisions of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances,

Recalling its resolution 1576(L) of 20 May 1971, in which it endorsed the invitation of the United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Protocol on Psychotropic Substances to States, to the extent they were able to do so, to apply provisionally the measures of control provided in the Convention pending its entry into force for each of them,

Recalling also its resolutions 1773(LIV) of 18 May 1973 and 1847(LVI) of 15 May 1974, in which it urged Governments that had not yet done so to ratify or accede to the Convention as soon as possible,

Noting with deep concern the extensive and increasing abuse of psychotropic substances and the related trafficking, which often involves diversion from licit channels,

Noting that the international Narcotics Control Board has drawn attention to cases of substantial diversion of substances listed in Schedule II of the Convention, in particular of methaqualone, amphetamine and methamphetamine.

Noting, in particular, paragraphs 21 to 36 and 162 to 172 of the report of the international Narcotics Control Board for 1980.

1. Appeals to all states that have not yet adhered to the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances to become parties promptly, and pending such time to apply the measures of control provided in the Convention to the extent they are able to do so;

2. Urges States parties to the Convention that have not yet done so to enact without delay implementing laws and regulations and to enforce them fully, especially with regard to prior authorization of imports and exports, as specified in article 12, paragraph 1, of the Convention;

3. Calls upon exporting countries to use the utmost care to verify the authenticity of each import authorization and, in case of doubt, to seek to ensure that the amounts of the substances requested are commensurate with the apparent legal requirements of manufacture or domestic consumption of the importing country, and to obtain confirmation of the import certificate's authenticity, using as appropriate the good offices of the international Narcotics Control Board to facilitate such verification;

4. Calls upon importing countries to exercise continuing vigilance to ensure that the quantities of substances requested in their import certificates are commensurate with their legal requirements for manufacture or domestic consumption and to co-operate with exporting countries and the International Narcotics Control Board with a view to guarding against diversion from licit manufacture and trade;

5. Invites Governments of countries manufacturing, exporting or importing substances listed in Schedule II of the Convention to provide voluntarily to the international Narcotics Control Board in a timely manner information enabling the Board to monitor more closely the manufacture, export and import of those substances, particularly where free trading zones are involved;

6. Invites all Governments to respond positively to the suggestion of the International Narcotics Control Board that they should assess from time to time their medical and scientific requirements for substances listed in Schedule II of the Convention as well as for other controlled substances and to communicate that information to the Board for publication with a view to providing guidance for manufacture and export;

7. Further invites all Governments to consider the Board's suggestion that they should voluntarily refrain from exporting substances listed in Schedule II of the Convention in amounts that exceed countries' assessments or that clearly exceed the countries' likely needs unless prior consultation with the importing country confirms that the amount in question is desired;

8. Requests States parties and the International Narcotics Control Board to study ways in which the Convention might be strengthened by formal amendment in the light of the experience gained in the voluntary application by Governments of measures recommended by the Board;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the present resolution to all Governments and invite them to bring it to the attention of their competent authorities in order to ensure the implementation of its provisions.

#### UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control

In 1981, the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC) devoted 75 per cent of its resources to 15 country programmes, comprising a total of 28 sectoral projects. Some three fourths of the 1981 programmes were concerned with socio-economic problems associated with the opium poppy and heroin, as exemplified by the multisectoral programmes, emphasizing crop substitution, in Burma, Pakistan and Thailand. The Fund's expenditure for the year was \$8.2 million.

The Fund participated for the first time in the United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities (p. 426), in November, and received pledges totalling some \$3.5 million..

New agreements UNFDAC entered into in 1981 included a five-year multisectoral agreement with Burma, a four-year agreement for a crop substitution programme with Pakistan, multiyear research projects with Malaysia and Thailand, a special trust-fund agreement with the Federal Republic of Germany to finance most of the Buner project in Pakistan, and multi-year agreements with both Egypt and Turkey for narcotics control.

In a 10 February resolution,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission on Narcotic Drugs commended the Secretary-General for authorizing the participation of UNFDAC in the annual United Nations Pledging Conference. The Commission urged Governments to pledge greater financial support to UNFDAC and recommended that it strengthen its fund-raising activities, in particular by presenting planned projects to potential donors.

In a resolution on the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy, adopted on 16 December,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly urged Member States to initiate or increase contributions to UNFDAC in order to ensure the Strategy's success and to give an impetus to the battle against international drug traffickers.

In the Assembly's Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, Afghanistan expressed concern over the suspension, for unknown reasons, of the Fund's assistance to that country.

In 1981, 39 countries and one Territory contributed \$6.7 million to UNFDAC and 19 countries pledged \$3.7 million for 1982 (see table below).

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS FUND  
FOR DRUG ABUSE CONTROL, 1981 AND 1982  
(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollar equivalent)

Country or Territory	1981 payment	1982 pledge
Argentina	8,818	—
Australia	411,796	—
Austria	59,047	64,516
Barbados	250	—
Belgium	24,988	—
Bolivia	2,000	2,000
Brazil	5,000	5,000
Canada	205,931	—
Chile	9,500	4,000
Denmark	20,187	242,118
Egypt	—	1,217
Finland	43,203	—
France	86,445	101,770
Germany, Federal Republic of	1,397,674	1,500,000
Greece	1,918	—
Hong Kong	18,315	—
Iceland	3,200	3,200
India	7,000	—
Indonesia	—	2,000
Iran	9,769	—
Iraq	5,022	—
Italy	240,259	—
Japan	608,930	—
Kenya	6,400	—
Malawi	—	540
Malaysia	2,000	—
Malta	252	—
Mauritius	487	—
Mexico	1,937	4,000
Morocco	—	3,000
New Zealand	38,054	—
Norway	472,604	1,008,403
Pakistan	2,014	—
Portugal	6,000	—
Republic of Korea	2,000	—
Saudi Arabia	50,000	50,000
South Africa	6,384	—
Sweden	690,334	637,059
Switzerland	107,234	54,348
Togo	452	—
United Kingdom	92,750	—
United Republic of Cameroon	—	1,767
United States	2,000,000	—
Venezuela	2,000	2,000
Yugoslavia	18,000	—
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,668,154</b>	<b>3,686,938</b>

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>Commission on Narcotic Drugs (report, E/1981/24), 5(XXIX), 10 Feb.; <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/168, para. 6, 16 Dec. (p.1058).

#### Commission on Narcotic Drugs

##### Future sessions

In recognition of the need for the Commission on Narcotic Drugs to examine specific topics related to the social and human problems created by drug abuse, in more detail than was possible in the course of its biennial sessions, the Economic and Social Council, on 6 May 1981, decided that the Commission should hold a special session of five days' duration in 1982 at a time to be determined.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Council adopted the resolution by 40 votes to none, with 10 abstentions. Its Second (Social) Committee approved the Commission's draft on 21 April, by 34 votes to none, with 11 abstentions. Canada, the USSR and the United

States abstained in the Committee vote, as they considered holding a special session to be a departure from the Commission's mandate to meet biennially and were concerned about the financial implications.

Also on 6 May, the Council, by 41 votes to none, with 9 abstentions, approved the provisional agenda and documentation for the Commission's seventh special session (1982).<sup>(3)</sup> The decision, recommended by the Commission, was approved by the Second Committee on 21 April by 33 votes to none, with 11 abstentions. In another decision of the same date, the Council approved, without vote, the provisional agenda and documentation for the Commission's regular (thirtieth) session in 1983.<sup>(2)</sup> The Second Committee acted likewise on 21 April, on a draft recommended by the Commission.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC: 1981/10, 6 May, text following.

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1981/115, 6 May, text following;

<sup>(3)</sup>1981/116, 6 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.1-3, 4 (14-21 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/10

40-0-10 Meeting 14 6 May 1981

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/58) by vote (34-0-11), 21 April (meeting 4); draft by Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1981/24); agenda item 11.

Special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs

The Economic and Social Council,

Recalling its resolution 2001 (LX) of 12 May 1976,

Recognizing that the social and human problems created by drug abuse continue to increase,

Aware of the need for the Commission on Narcotic Drugs to examine specific topics related to that problem in more detail than is possible in the course of its biennial sessions,

Decides that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs shall hold a special session of five days' duration in 1982 at a time when it will not overlap with other meetings, so that costs will be minimized.

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/115

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/58) without vote, 21 April (meeting 4); draft by Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1981/24); agenda item 11.

Provisional agenda and documentation for the thirtieth session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council approved the provisional agenda and documentation for the thirtieth session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs set out

Provisional agenda and documentation for the thirtieth session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs

1. Election of officers
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Reports on action related to international drug control taken at the international level
  - (a) Report on action taken by international drug control bodies of the United Nations
  - (b) Reports of specialized agencies and international organs and organizations
  - (c) Report of the International Narcotics Control Board, with particular reference to world requirements and supply of opiates

- (d) Report on scientific research, including (I) general Information and (II) the work of the United Nations
  - Narcotics Laboratory
  - Documentation
  - Report of the Division of Narcotic Drugs
  - Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1982
  - Report on scientific research
  - Reports of specialized agencies and international organs and organizations
4. Implementation of the international treaties on the control of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances
  - Documentation
  - Report on the implementation of the international drug control treaties
  - Report on the status of multilateral treaties
5. Situation and trends in drug abuse and the illicit traffic, including reports of subsidiary bodies concerned with the illicit traffic in drugs
  - Documentation
  - Review of drug abuse and measures to reduce illicit demand
  - Review of the illicit traffic
  - Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1982
  - Latest report(s) of the Sub-Commission on Illicit Drug Traffic and Related Matters in the Near and Middle East
  - Report on the latest Meeting(s) of the Operational Heads of National Narcotics Law Enforcement Agencies, Far East Region
6. Review and implementation of the programme of strategy and policies for drug control
  - Documentation
  - Review of strategy and policies for drug control
7. Report of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control and reports related to operations financed by it
  - Documentation
  - Report of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control for 1981-1982
  - Financial data on operations financed by the Fund
8. Programme of work and priorities
  - Documentation
  - Programme of work and priorities
9. Report of the Commission on its thirtieth session

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/116

41-0-9

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/58) by vote (33-0-11), 21 April (meeting 4); draft by Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1981/24); agenda item 11.

Provisional agenda and documentation for the seventh special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council approved the provisional agenda and documentation for the seventh special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs set out below:

Provisional agenda and documentation for the seventh special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs

1. Election of officers
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Consideration of urgent proposals for scheduling or re-scheduling
  - Documentation
  - Requests and recommendations for scheduling and re-scheduling
  - Report on the status of multilateral treaties
4. Report of the International Narcotics Control Board, with particular reference to world requirements and supply of opiates
  - Documentation
  - Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1981

5. Review of the programme of strategy and policies and ongoing projects financed by the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control
  - Documentation
  - Review of strategy and policies for drug control
  - Interim report of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control
6. Development of preventive and treatment measures to reduce the illicit demand for drugs and of specific countermeasures against the illicit traffic
  - Documentation
  - Report on preventive and treatment measures to reduce the Illicit demand for drugs
  - Report on countermeasures against the Illicit traffic
  - Review of trends in drug abuse and the Illicit traffic
7. Report of the Commission on its seventh special session

#### Report of the Commission

In a decision of 6 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> adopted without vote, the Economic and Social Council took note of the 1981 report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.<sup>(2)</sup> It did so on the recommendation of its Second Committee, which approved without vote on 21 April the text submitted by the Commission.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/118, 6 May, text following.  
 Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Commission on Narcotic Drugs, E/1981/24.  
 Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.1-3, 4 (14-21 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/118

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/58) without vote. 21 April (meeting 4); draft by Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1981/24); agenda item 11.

#### Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its twenty-ninth session.

#### International Narcotics Control Board

##### Report for 1980

The Economic and Social Council, in a decision taken without vote on 6 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> took note of the 1980 report of the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB), which included information on supply and demand (p. 1060) and on international control of psychotropic substances (p. 1063). The text was approved in a similar fashion in the Council's Second Committee on 21 April, on the recommendation of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/114, 6 May, text following.  
 Meeting records: ESC: 2nd Committee, E/1981/C.2/SR.1-3, 4 (14-21 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.14 (6 May).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/114

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (E/1981/58) without vote, 21 April (meeting 4); draft by Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1981/24); agenda item 11.

#### Report of the international Narcotics Control Board

At its 14th plenary meeting, on 6 May 1981, the Council took note of the report of the international Narcotics Control Board for 1980.

#### Sessions in 1981

Composed of 13 members serving in their personal capacity, INCB held two sessions at Vienna, Austria, in 1981: 18 to 29 May (twenty-ninth session) and 13 October to 6 November (thirtieth session).

The Board continued to survey and analyse the world drug control situation and maintained dialogues with Governments to further the aims of various international drug control treaties.<sup>(1)</sup> It published in December a study on the demand and supply of opiates for medical and scientific needs (p. 1060), as requested by the Economic and Social Council in 1980.<sup>(2)</sup>

Reports: INCB, <sup>(1)</sup>E/INCB/56 (Sales No. E.82.XI.1).

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1980/20, para. 3, 30 Apr. 1980 (YUN 1980,p.963).

#### Division of Narcotic Drugs

In 1981, the United Nations Division of Narcotic Drugs provided advisory and supporting services, equipment and training, and organized or participated in conferences, workshops and seminars related to international drug control. It also co-operated in multisectoral programmes such as crop replacement, illicit traffic interdiction, preventive education, vocational rehabilitation and training in drug analysis.

The Division assisted Governments in carrying out multisectoral programmes financed by the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (p. 1065) in areas of law enforcement, training, research and drug demand reduction. As the Fund's largest executing agency, the Division was responsible in 1981 for one third of the estimated \$6.7 million Fund expenditures for projects at Headquarters and in Afghanistan, Burma, Egypt, Malawi, Malaysia and Turkey.

## Chapter XXIII

## Statistics

The Economic and Social Council, in May 1981, adopted two resolutions on statistics, on the recommendation of the Statistical Commission which met in New York from 12 to 21 January (twenty-first session).<sup>(1)</sup>

In one resolution, the Council reconfirmed the importance of the 1983 World Programme of Industrial Statistics as a way to obtain reliable and timely information on the progress of developing countries in industrialization, and urged all countries to provide data on that subject for the year 1983.<sup>(2)</sup> In the other, the Council urged the developing countries to participate in the development of their energy statistics in accordance with international guidelines and to request technical assistance, if necessary, to carry out such plans.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Statistical Office of the United Nations continued to collect and publish a wide range of statistical data, including those on international trade, industry, transport, energy, national accounts and population.

In 1981, the United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development, supported by the Statistical Office, implemented 176 country projects in statistics, of which 69 were in Africa (p. 1072). Requests for technical co-operation increased for data processing in statistics, and the adoption and distribution of software packages for editing and tabulating census and survey data continued. Micro-computer systems for processing population censuses were introduced in four countries.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12...

Resolutions: ESC, 4 May: <sup>(2)</sup>1981/1 (P. 1069) <sup>(3)</sup>1981/2 (p.1069).

Publications: 1981 Statistical Yearbook (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.S/8), Sales No. E/F.83.XVII.1; Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, vol. XXXV, Nos. 1-12, ST/ESA/STAT/SER.Q/97-108.

## Economic statistics

## 1983 World Programme of industrial Statistics

The Economic and Social Council, on 4 May 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> reconfirmed the importance of the principles of the 1983 World Programme of Industrial Statistics as a means of accelerating the development of industrial statistics programmes in developing countries to provide reliable and timely information on their progress in industrialization. The Council urged multilateral and bilateral agencies to provide resources to help

developing countries implement their plans for the Programme, and urged all countries to compile basic data on industry for or close to 1983, taking into account the relevant international recommendations.

The Council adopted the resolution without vote, following its approval in like manner by the First (Economic) Committee on 23 April, on the recommendation of the Statistical Commission.

The 1983 World Programme aimed at obtaining an overall perspective of world-wide industrial activity within the framework of an organized statistics programme.

The Statistical Commission,<sup>(4)</sup> in January, adopted the final draft of Recommendations for the 1983 World Programme of Industrial Statistics,<sup>(1)</sup> and requested the Secretary-General to encourage regional commissions to organize training workshops to discuss the adaptation of the recommendations to regional conditions. The first such workshop was convened by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (Suzhou, China, 16 November-11 December).

The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) issued in February A Statistical Review of the World Industrial Situation, 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> which its Industrial Development Board, in May, decided should be an annual publication.<sup>(3)</sup> UNIDO also completed a study on dynamic changes in comparative advantage, which included an analysis of 134 industries in over 40 developed and developing countries. Work continued on a handbook of industrial statistics, intended for publication in 1982.

An Expert Group Meeting to Review the Preliminary Draft of the Proposed Revision to the International Recommendations for Industrial Statistics met in New York from 5 to 9 October 1981. The draft revision, incorporating the experts' views, was to be submitted to the Statistical Commission in 1983.

Publications: <sup>(1)</sup>Recommendations for the 1983 World Programme of Industrial Statistics, part I: General Statistical Objectives (ST/ESA/STAT/SEAT/SER.M/71, part I), Sales No. E.81.XVII.11; part II: Organization and Conduct of Industrial Censuses (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.M/71, part II), Sales No. E.81.XVII.12 <sup>(2)</sup>A Statistical Review of the World Industrial Situation, 1980, UNIDO/IS.214 & corr. Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(4)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC, 1981/1.4 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.2, 3, 4 (21-23 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.13 (4 May).



Other publications: Yearbook of Industrial Statistics, 1980 Edition, vol I: General Industrial statistics (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.P/19, vol.I), Sales No. E.82.XVII.11, & vol.II: Commodity Production Data, 1971-1980 (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.P/19, vol.II), Sales No. E.82.XVII.12; 1981 Edition, vol. I: General Industrial Statistics (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.P/20 vol.I), Sales No. E.83.XVII.5, & vol.II: Commodity Production Data, 1972-1981 (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.P/20, vol. II), Sales No. E.83.XVII.6. Yearbook of Construction Statistics, 1973-1980 (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.U/9), Sales No. E.82.XVII.15; 1974-1981 (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.U/10), Sales No. E.83.XVII.9.

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/1

Adopted without vote Meeting 13 4 May 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/60) without vote. 23 April (meeting 4); draft by Statistical Commission (E/1981/12); agenda item 13.

#### 1983 World Programme of Industrial Statistics

##### The Economic and Social Council,

Taking note of the report of the Statistical Commission on its twenty-first session with reference to its strong endorsement of the 1983 World Programme of Industrial Statistics and of the emphasis it placed on the need for the Statistical Office, the regional commissions and other interested organizations to take an active role in promoting the participation of the developing countries in the Programme,

Recalling that the Statistical Commission endorsed the concept of the Programme at its twentieth session, at which it also requested the Secretary-General to encourage regional commissions to organize working groups to consider the recommendations for the Programme as a means of advancing their implementation at the country level,

Recalling further that the Second General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, held at Lima from 12 to 26 March 1975, adopted the Lima Declaration and Plan of Action on Industrial Development and Co-operation, in which both developing and developed countries were called upon to take specific measures to create conditions conducive to the industrial growth of the developing countries in keeping with the spirit embodied in the new International economic order, and to provide periodic reports on the actions taken and progress achieved,

Noting that, in accordance with the Statistical Commission's endorsement, the Statistical Office is publishing and distributing to countries the final version of the recommendations for the Programme,

Noting that the limited success of past programmes in this field has been primarily attributed to the lack of technical assistance support services for the developing countries,

1. Reconfirms the value and importance of the principles of the 1983 World Programme of Industrial Statistics as a means of accelerating the development of industrial statistics programmes in developing countries to provide reliable and timely information on their progress in industrialization;

2. Recommends that provision should be made for technical assistance to permit developing countries to participate in the Programme and urges the multilateral and bilateral agencies to provide resources, within the framework of their technical co-operation activities, to help developing countries implement their plans for the Programme;

3. Strongly urges that all countries should compile basic data on industry for 1983 or a year close to 1983, taking into account as far as possible the international recommendations on this subject, and recommends that developing countries should avail themselves of technical co-operation wherever necessary in order to complete the Programme successfully;

4. Requests the Secretary-General, in close co-operation with the regional commission, the specialized agencies, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and other multilateral and bilateral agencies, to co-ordinate technical co-operation activities in support of the Programme;

5. Further requests the Secretary-General, in collaboration with the above-mentioned organizations, to submit a

progress report to the Statistical Commission at its twenty-second session.

#### Energy statistics

In a resolution on international energy statistics,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted without vote on 4 May 1981, the Economic and Social Council urged the Governments of developing countries to participate in a programme of development of national statistics according to international guidelines and to request technical assistance, if necessary, to carry out that undertaking. The Council requested the Secretary-General to accord priority to the development of new statistical series in fields where there was insufficient information and to improve the timeliness, level of detail and accuracy of the statistics currently collected and disseminated.

Originally proposed by the Statistical Commission, the text was orally amended in the Council's First Committee, before its approval without vote on 23 April, to delete a preambular paragraph which would have had the Council note that energy was perhaps the gravest challenge to the existing international order.

The Statistical Commission, in January, urged developing countries to take advantage of technical co-operation under the United Nations system by requesting the services of advisers on energy statistics, and hoped that national statistical offices would provide more timely and complete responses to the Statistical Office's energy questionnaire so that the quantity and quality of international energy statistics could be improved.<sup>(1)</sup> In 1981, the Office sent the questionnaire to 190 countries.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/2, 4 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.2, 3, 4 (21-23 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.13 (4 May).

Publications: 1981 Yearbook of World Energy Statistics (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.J/25), Sales No. E/F.82.XVII.16; Energy Balances 1977-1980 and Electricity Profiles 1976-1981 for Selected Developing Countries and Areas (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.W/1), Sales No. E.83.XVII.4.

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/2

Adopted without vote Meeting 13 4 May 1981

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/60) without vote. 23 April (meeting 4); draft by Statistical Commission (E/1981/12), orally amended following informal consultations: agenda item 13.

#### International energy statistics

##### The Economic and Social Council,

Recognizing the importance of energy in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, adopted by the General Assembly on 5 December 1980.

Recalling paragraph 4 (f) of General Assembly resolution 33/148 of 20 December 1978, in which the Assembly stressed the importance of the promotion of adequate information flows regarding all aspects of new and renewable sources of energy, especially to the developing countries,

Recalling its resolution 2054(LXII) of 5 May 1977, by which it recognized the crucial role played by training in the overall

development of statistical services of Member States which are developing countries and expressed concern that, because of the lack of necessary financial and personnel resources, many developing countries, particularly the least developed, are unable on their own to set up and maintain an effective vehicle to train all levels of statisticians.

Recalling also its resolution 1978/61 of 3 August 1978, in which it expressed cognizance of the importance of ensuring the availability of new and renewable sources of energy in order to meet requirements for continued economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries, and aware of the importance of a statistical base as an integral part of planning,

Recalling further that the Statistical Commission at its twentieth session recognized that energy statistics remained an important field that continued to require further urgent consideration, co-operation and harmonization by all central statistical offices and relevant agencies,

Bearing in mind that the Committee on Natural Resources has endorsed the suggestion for setting up clearing-houses of relevant energy-related information at the national, regional and international levels and for working out procedures for sharing the information from such clearing-houses,

Aware of important gaps in energy statistics, such as the lack of comprehensive data on non-commercial fuels, information on prices, costs, value added and investment data of energy commodities,

1. Strongly urges the Governments of developing countries to participate in a programme of development of national statistics according to international guidelines and to request technical assistance if and when necessary to carry out that important undertaking;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to accord priority to the development of new statistical series in fields where insufficient information is now available and to improve the timeliness, level of detail and accuracy of the statistics currently collected and disseminated;

3. Requests the Secretary-General, in close co-operation with the regional commissions, the specialized agencies, the United Nations Development Programme and other interested organs, to strengthen and co-ordinate activities in support of energy statistics;

4. Further requests the Secretary-General to submit a progress report to the Statistical Commission at its twenty-second session.

#### National accounts statistics

The Statistical Commission, in January 1981, <sup>(1)</sup>emphasized the role of the System of National Accounts (SNA) as a framework and point of reference in establishing standards for related statistics, and urged the United Nations Statistical Office to increase its co-ordination functions in achieving consistency or reconciliation of such standards with the System.

It urged the development of specific proposals on short-term clarification and updating of SNA, if possible for submission to the Commission in 1983, and recognized the need, within available resources, to initiate research studies over a longer period to meet the demands for new kinds of information. Further, the Commission endorsed the use of the Handbook of National Accounting series for dissemination of the results of future work on national accounts.

The Commission also welcomed the proposed co-operation of international agencies and coun-

tries in the conceptual development of SNA, and endorsed the need for formalization of such co-operative and consultative arrangements in order to avoid duplication of work.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

Publications: Yearbook of National Accounts Statistics, 1981, vol. I, parts 1 & 2: Individual Country Data (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.O/11), Sales No. E.83.XVII.3, vol. I, parts I & 2; vol. II: International Tables (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.O/11/Add.1), Sales No. E.83.XVII.3, vol. II.

#### Trade statistics

In January 1981, the Statistical Commission <sup>(1)</sup>approved revised concepts and definitions in the field of international trade statistics, including recommendations for the collection, preparation and dissemination of such statistics at the national level, and requested the Secretary-General to arrange publication of the revised version of International Trade Statistics: Concepts and Definitions.

The Commission acknowledged the need to consider, at its next (1983) session, a third revision of the Standard International Trade Classification in order to make it available for use as of 1 January 1985.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

Publications: Handbook of International Trade and Development Statistics, 1981 Supplement (TD/STAT/10), Sales No. E/F.82.II.D.11. 1981 Yearbook International Trade Statistics, vol. I: Trade by Country (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.G/30), vol. II: Trade by Commodity, Commodity Matrix Tables (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.G/30/Add.1), Sales No. E/F.82.XVII.7, vols. I & II. Commodity Trade Statistics, Statistical Papers, Series D: vol. XXIV (1974 data), No. 47; vol. XXV (1975 data), No. 20; vol. XXVI (1976 data), No. 22; vol. XXVII (1977 data), Nos. 22, 23; vol. XXVIII (1978 data), Nos. 21-25; vol. XXIX (1979 data), Nos. 15, 17-23; vol. XXX (1980 data), Nos. 1-20; vol. XXXI (1981 data), Nos. 2, 8.

#### Transport statistics

The Statistical Commission, at its January 1981 session, <sup>(1)</sup>noted that a compilation by the Statistical Office of a comprehensive network of the flow of goods on world sea lanes for 1976-1978 would be completed later in 1981, and one for 1979-1980 was expected to be issued in 1982.

The Commission encouraged the Office to analyse the data on the flow of goods with reference to vessels' movements as recorded daily by Lloyd's of London Press. It requested the Secretary-General to call the attention of all Member States to the potential of the uniform system, utilized by the Statistical Office, as a tool for developing shipping statistics for their economic planning and development, and asked him to hold seminars and workshops to promote the system and to recruit technical advisers to assist the developing countries in its implementation.

Noting the need for additional funds beyond those available under a trust fund made possible through a grant from Norway for 1978-1981 for the development of shipping statistics, the Commission welcomed the Statistical Office's plan to initiate a fund-raising campaign in 1981.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

#### Statistical methods

International Comparison Project. In its January 1981 discussion of the progress made on the International Comparison Project (ICP), which began in 1968 as a tool for better assessment of the relative economic development of countries, the Statistical Commission considered the main difficulties encountered in the 1975 survey (phase III of the Project) as well as the future directions of the work. <sup>(1)</sup>

The Commission stressed the need for a more clearly defined and understandable methodology and for a strong co-ordinating role for the Statistical Office in that regard, and supported the Office's efforts to raise more extrabudgetary resources for the Project's continuation and its extension to more countries.

An Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on the Long-Term Organization of ICP (Geneva, 11-13 November) discussed the regionalization of ICP, training, technical co-operation and the establishment of priorities among the ICP elements.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

Statistical classifications. The Statistical Commission, in January 1981, endorsed the continuation of work on the harmonization of international economic classifications as well as the continued participation by the Statistical Office in the construction of the Harmonized System of the Customs Co-operation Council. <sup>(1)</sup>

The Commission also urged the Statistical Office to keep all interested Member States informed of proposals being developed by the Working Group on World-Level Classifications of the United Nations Statistical Office and the Statistical Office of the European Communities, and to improve co-ordination within the Office and between groups providing it with advice and guidance.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

#### Social and demographic statistics

In January 1981, the Statistical Commission <sup>(1)</sup> discussed the 1980 World Population and Housing Census Programme, welcomed the publication of Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses, and agreed on the need for a continuing study of census staffing and cost requirements and on the convening of an inter-regional expert group on that subject in 1982. The

Commission also expressed strong interest in a study on sex-based stereotypes and sex biases in national data systems.

It also considered national, regional and international activities carried out in connection with the World Programme for the Improvement of Vital Statistics, endorsed the Secretariat proposal to prepare a special version of Principles and Recommendations for a Vital Statistics System for policy-makers at the government level, and called for the early completion and publication of the revised Handbook of Vital Statistics Methods.

Further, the Commission confirmed the need for further work on harmonizing and standardizing definitions in housing statistics; endorsed proposals for methodological studies, multidisciplinary training programmes and seminars to assess user requirements; and agreed on the publication at five-year intervals of a Compendium Of Human Settlements Statistics to coincide more closely with national planning and housing census cycles.

Commending the Secretariat's activities aimed at improving comparability of international migration statistics, the Commission approved an international programme of collection and exchange of immigrant stock data obtained in the 1980 round of population censuses. At the request of the Commission, an Expert Group on Improvement of International Migration Statistics (New York, 21-25 September) considered technical issues.

In addition, the Commission agreed to give low priority to classifications of geographical units and to have the Provisional Guidelines on Standard International Age Classifications issued, and reaffirmed the goal of integrating social, demographic and economic data bases as a long-term objective.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

Publications: Demographic Yearbook, 1981 (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.R/11), Sales No. E/F.82.XIII.1; Population and Vital Statistics Report, vol. XXXIII, Nos. 1-4, ST/ESA/STAT/SER.135-138.

#### Environmental statistics

Noting with satisfaction the progress being made in the environmental statistics programme, especially as regards the development of an overall framework for the organization of such statistics and the completion of a survey of country practices and plans, the Statistical Commission, in January 1981, <sup>(1)</sup> requested the Statistical Office to keep the directory of country practices up to date and to continue work on the development of statistics on specific areas of environmental concern.

The Commission also requested the Secretary-General to publish the directory of country prac-

tices and plans as well as the survey on frameworks-and publications in environmental statistics, and asked the Secretariat to revise the draft conceptual framework for the development and organization of such statistics. It strongly urged the United Nations Environment Programme, which provided the initial funding for the environmental statistics project, to continue its financial support.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

#### National Household Survey Capability Programme

In 1981, 12 project formulation missions related to the National Household Survey Capability Programme took place, 12 project proposals were approved, and survey programmes began in Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Yemen.

The Statistical Commission, in January 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> reaffirmed the value and importance of the Programme as a means of obtaining, on a continuing basis, integrated and up-to-date socio-economic and demographic statistics which the developing countries needed for their development plans and programmes. The Commission stressed the importance of technical studies on survey methodology and of co-ordinating the Programme at all levels, and welcomed the arrangements for establishing communications with donor agencies and the participating countries in the formulation of country projects and in the Programme's implementation.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

#### Technical co-operation

In 1981, the United Nations Department of Technical Co-operation for Development, supported by the Statistical Office, implemented 176 country projects in statistics, of which 69 were in Africa.<sup>(1)</sup> Technical support to Governments in conducting population censuses and processing results led to the completion of 15 such censuses in 1981. Requests for technical co-operation increased for data processing in statistics, and the adoption and distribution of software packages for editing and tabulating census and survey data continued. Micro-computer systems for processing population censuses were introduced in four countries in 1981, in addition to the six where such installations were made the previous year. The total value of technical co-operation projects in statistics in 1981 amounted to some \$31 million.

The Statistical Commission, in January 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> stressed the importance of statistical training activities, including those in the use of data processing and computer-based tools, and considered that closer co-operation was needed between regional and national training centres.

It endorsed the development of statistical data-processing packages by the Statistical Office, suggested that consideration be given to developing a statistical data-processing handbook and organizing regional and subregional meetings on data processing, and requested its Working Group on International Statistical Programmes and Co-ordination to examine methods of presenting the global picture of technical co-operation activities to meet the Commission's needs.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, DP/1982/22; <sup>(2)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

#### Work programmes

##### International programmes

In a decision adopted without vote on 4 May 1981, the Economic and Social Council authorized the Working Group on International Statistical Programmes and Co-ordination of the Statistical Commission to hold its ninth session from 29 September to 2 October.<sup>(1)</sup> The Council's First (Economic) Committee approved it in like manner on 23 April, on the recommendation of the Statistical Commission.

When the Working Group met at Geneva,<sup>(3)</sup> it considered the use of administrative records for statistical purposes and ways to reduce the reporting burden on countries in supplying data to international organizations. It also reviewed the provisional agenda and documentation for the twenty-second (1983) session of the Statistical Commission, and discussed the special topics that the Commission might consider at other future sessions. The Group decided to focus at its next (1983) session on the status of the ongoing programmes of the Statistical Office, the regional commissions and the specialized agencies; long-term issues for the Commission's discussion; and co-ordination of the statistical data-collection activities of international organizations.

The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination's Sub-Committee on Statistical Activities (fifteenth session, Washington, D. C., 27 April-1 May)<sup>(2)</sup> examined a series of technical questions, including a number of statistical programmes dealing with specific subjects, policies on production and distribution of statistical publications and on dissemination of machine-readable data, long-term planning in the statistical field, and implications of technological changes for international statistical organizations.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/110, 4 May, text following.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ACC Sub-Committee on Statistical Activities, ACC/1981/26; <sup>(3)</sup>Working Group on International Statistical Programmes and Co-ordination, E/CN.3/1983/24.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.2, 3, 4 (21-23 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.13 (4 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/110

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/60) without vote, 23 April (meeting 4); draft by Statistical Commission (E/1981/12); agenda item 13.

Ninth session of the Working Group on International Statistical Programmes and Co-ordination

At Its 13th plenary meeting, on 4 May 1981, the Council decided that the ninth session of the Working Group on International Statistical Programmes and Co-ordination of the Statistical Commission would be held from 29 September to 2 October 1981.

Work Programme of the Statistical Office

The Economic and Social Council, in a decision of 4 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> approved the 1982-1983 work programme of the United Nations Statistical Office, as submitted to the Statistical Commission, and took note of the draft 1984-1989 medium-term plan for United Nations statistical activities.

Acting according to a new requirement of the programme-planning procedure laid down by the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> the Commission examined, in January 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the relative priority of activities within the work programme of the Statistical Office and identified sets of high-priority elements, but considered none of the rest to be obsolete or ineffective. It believed that statistics, which served as a basic tool for developing national and international policy in the economic and social fields, should rank high in the priority activities of the United Nations system.

Endorsing the provisional medium-term plan of the Statistical Office, the Commission gave priority to the development of concepts and methods, co-ordination, and the provision of technical co-operation in establishing and maintaining statistical and data-processing capabilities in developing countries. It believed that some activities in the subprogrammes on data collection, processing and publication might be more efficiently carried out with appropriate technology so as to release resources for other activities.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/108, 4 May (see below).

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/209, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1209).

Statistical Commission

Report on the 1981 session

As recommended by the Statistical Commission and approved by the First (Economic) Committee, the Economic and Social Council, on 4 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> took note of the report of the Commission on its January 1981 (twenty-first) session.<sup>(2)</sup> The Council acted without vote, as did its First Committee on 23 April.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/108, 4 May, text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.2, 3, 4 (21-23 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.13 (4 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/108

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/60) without vote, 23 April (meeting 4); draft by Statistical Commission (E/1981/12); agenda item 13.

Report of the Statistical Commission

At Its 13th plenary meeting, on 4 May 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Statistical Commission, on its twenty-first session, approved the work programme contained in document E/CN.3/XXI/CRP.1, as orally revised, and took note of the draft medium-term plan of the Commission contained in document E/CN.3/XXI/CRP.2.

Agenda for the 1983 session

By a decision adopted without vote on 4 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Economic and Social Council authorized the Statistical Commission to hold its twenty-second session in the first quarter of 1983 in New York. The decision also set out the provisional agenda and documentation for that session, as proposed by the Commission. The Council acted on the recommendation of its First Committee, which approved the decision without vote on 23 April.

The Commission, in January 1981, selected from among the proposed agenda items two subjects for consideration as special issues: the use of administrative records for statistical purposes and implications of new developments in information technology.<sup>(2)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/109, 4 May, text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Statistical Commission, E/1981/12.

Meeting records: ESC: 1st Committee, E/1981/C.1/SR.2, 3, 4 (21-23 Apr.); plenary, E/1981/SR.13 (4 May).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/109

Adopted without vote

Approved by First Committee (E/1981/60) without vote, 23 April (meeting 4); draft by Statistical Commission (E/1981/12); agenda item 13.

Arrangements for the twenty-second session of the Statistical Commission

At its 13th plenary meeting, on 4 May 1981, the Council decided that the twenty-second session of the Statistical Commission would be held in the first quarter of 1983 in New York. The provisional agenda and documentation for the session are set out below:

Provisional agenda and documentation for the twenty-second session of the Statistical Commission

1. Election of officers
2. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters
3. Special issues
  - (a) Administrative records
  - (b) Information technology
- Documentation
  - Report on the use of administrative records for statistical purposes
  - Report on the implications of new developments in information technology
4. Industrial, transport, energy and international trade statistics

- (a) Industrial and transport statistics
- (b) Energy statistics
- (c) International trade statistics
- Documentation
  - Progress report on the 1983 World Programme of Industrial Statistics and on transport statistics
  - Report on developments in energy statistics, including steps towards a global system of integrated energy statistics
  - Draft of the third revision of the Standard International Trade Classification (SITC) and correlation with the Harmonized System (HS)
- 5. National accounts and balances
  - (a) System of National Accounts (SNA)
  - (b) Links between the System of National Accounts (SNA) and the System of Balances of the National Economy (MPS)
- Documentation
  - Report on specific proposals with regard to (a) needed short-term clarification and updating of the System of National Accounts (SNA), including external transactions, and (b) elimination of differences among related International standards, including recommendations on international trade and the balance of payments
  - Progress report on the implementation of the guidelines and the establishment of international data series in fields selected from among national accounts, public sector statistics, income distribution statistics, input-output tables, national balance-sheet statistics and social accounting matrices
  - Report on developments in the conceptual framework for SNA/MPS comparisons and related topics
- 6. Price statistics
  - Documentation
    - Report outlining recent developments, with special reference to the Inter-agency price statistics programme
    - Report on the long-term organization of the International Comparison Project (ICP)
- 7. International economic classifications
  - Documentation
    - Progress report on the harmonization of economic classifications, including
      - (a) an outline of the status of the revision of the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC) and its co-ordination with SITC and
      - (b) co-ordination between activity and goods classifications of the United Nations and other organizations
- 8. Demographic and social statistics
  - (a) Population and housing censuses
  - (b) International migration statistics
  - (c) Social indicators and links among social, demographic and related economic and environment statistics
- Documentation
  - Report on national experiences and emerging issues
  - Progress report on the improvement of international migration statistics
  - Progress report on national and international work on social indicators, including Indicators in special fields, and on work on concepts and classifications of particular relevance to two or more fields
- 9. Environment statistics
  - Documentation
    - Report on developments, with special attention to progress on the framework for the organization of environment statistics
- 10. Technical co-operation
  - (a) Development of country capabilities: the National Household Survey Capability Programme and the Living Standards Measurement Study
  - (b) Training in statistics
  - (c) Statistical data processing
  - (d) Technical co-operation in statistics
- Documentation
  - Progress report on the National Household Survey Capability Programme and the Living Standards Measurement Study
  - Report on several aspects of training in statistics
  - Report on several aspects of statistical data processing
  - Report on technical co-operation in statistics by all members of the United Nations system, other international organizations and countries
- 11. Co-ordination and integration of international statistical programmes
  - Documentation
    - Report of the Working Group on International Statistical Programmes and Co-ordination on its ninth session
    - Report on evaluation of co-ordination in relation to four specified issues
- 12. Programme Implementation
  - Documentation
    - Progress report of the Secretary-General, prepared in co-operation with the relevant international organizations and providing an overall review of the work of the international organizations
- 13. Programme objectives and planning
  - Documentation
    - Report of the Secretary-General, prepared in co-operation with the relevant international organizations, describing future plans
    - Report containing the proposed work programme of the United Nations Statistical Office for 1984-1985 and any revisions in the medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989
- 14. Other business
- 15. Consideration of the draft provisional agenda for the twenty-third session of the Commission
- 16. Report of the Commission to the Economic and Social Council

## Chapter XXIV

# Organizational questions

The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) paid particular attention in 1981 to improving communication with intergovernmental organizations and to restructuring the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system.

The Economic and Social Council adopted four resolutions on organizational issues. Membership of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) was enlarged from 13 to 19 in July,<sup>(4)</sup> as a result of consultations which the Council in May had entrusted its President to undertake with the regional groups on the

size, composition and allocation of seats of that body.<sup>(2)</sup> By another May resolution, the Council requested the Committee on NGOs to review current consultation arrangements between the United Nations and NGOs so as to increase their effectiveness.<sup>(3)</sup>

As requested by the Council in July,<sup>(5)</sup> its President held consultations on ways to revitalize the Council. He reported in November that no consensus existed and that consultations would have to continue in 1982.

In December 1981,<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly decided to transmit to the Council a report by the Secretary-General describing arrangements for streamlining the economic and social activities of the United Nations Secretariat, with special reference to the role of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/477.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1981/43 (p. 1088), <sup>(3)</sup>1981/44 (p. 1088), 8 May; <sup>(4)</sup>1981/50, 20 July (p. 1088); <sup>(5)</sup>1981/84, 24 July (p. 1077). <sup>(6)</sup>GA: 36/187, 17 Dec. (p. 1084).

## Co-ordination in the UN system

**ACC ACTIVITIES** In 1981, ACC reviewed inter-agency action in rural development, co-ordination of information systems in the United Nations system, and support activities for international conferences and years. It also carried out cross-organizational programme analyses for better co-ordination of activities, worked on a system-wide medium-term environment programme and approved arrangements intended to strengthen the system's capacity to respond to emergencies.

In its 1980-1984 overview report,<sup>(1)</sup> ACC reaffirmed the importance of improving its communication with intergovernmental bodies and considered that the CPC-ACC Joint Meetings should remain the main instrument for discussion of substantive rather than managerial issues. It also began consideration of possible measures to deal with more basic and long-standing deficiencies which limited its effectiveness.

The other two reports submitted by ACC to the Economic and Social Council in 1981 covered its Joint Meetings with CPC (p. 1076)<sup>(2)</sup> and co-ordination of information systems in the United Nations system (p. 1386).<sup>(3)</sup>

ACC adopted 24 decisions in the course of its three 1981 sessions: 10 at its first regular session (Geneva, 13 and 14 April); 2 at the second session (Geneva, 29 and 30 June); and 12 at the third session (New York, 29 and 30 October).<sup>(7)</sup>

The decisions concerned: development and

international economic co-operation (p. 380), strengthening the capacity of the United Nations system to respond to emergencies (p. 473), the Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems (p. 1385), the functioning of ACC, terms of reference of the ACC Task Force on Long-Term Development Objectives (p. 382), science and technology for development, follow-up to the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 701), follow-up to the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (p. 408), information questions (p. 370), international co-operation on the environment (p. 841), and the outlook for financing multilateral co-operation for development (p. 420). Other decisions concerned administrative questions in the United Nations system: career development (p. 1325), the salary system (p. 1337), income tax (p. 1342), privileges and immunities (p. 1353), and enhancement of crisis management in the field (p. 1383).

The principal subsidiary bodies of ACC met as follows in 1981; <sup>(4)</sup>

Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions (CCAQ) (Personnel and General Administrative Questions) (fifty-fourth session, part I, Geneva, 26 January-6 February, and part II, New York, 23 February-6 March; fifty-fifth session, Vienna, Austria, 6-23 July); CCAQ (Financial and Budgetary Questions) (London, 9-12 March; New York, 14-18 September); Consultative Committee on Substantive Questions (CCSQ) (Operational Activities) (first regular session, New York, 9 and 10 February; second regular session, Geneva, 7-9 July); CCSQ (Programme Matters) (first regular session, Geneva, 23-27 March; second regular session, New York, 12-16 October). The ACC Organizational Committee met in New York, 29 and 30 January; Geneva, 7, 8 and 15 April; and New York, 11 and 12 June, and 19 and 20 October).

ACC bodies on specific subjects met as follows:

Inter-agency consultations on the Comprehensive New Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries, Geneva, 12 and 13 January, 28 and 29 April, and 13 and 14 July (p. 405); ad hoc inter-agency meeting on security matters (crisis management in the field), Geneva, 26 and 27 January (p. 1384); Joint United Nations Information Committee, eighth session, Tokyo, 3-6 February (p. 369); Task Force on Rural Development, Rome, Italy, 5 and 6 February (p. 401); ad hoc inter-agency meeting on transport activities, New York, 12 and 13 February; inter-agency meeting on the International Year of Disabled Persons, Paris, 24 and 25 February, and Vienna, 27 and 28 October (p. 796); Sub-Committee on Nutrition and its Advisory Group on Nutrition, seventh session, Rome, 2-6 March; Task Force on Science and Technology for Development, Geneva, 10-13 March and 1-3 April (p. 749); Task Force on Long-Term Development Objectives, Geneva, 16-18 March (p. 382); inter-agency consultations on preparations for the Inter-

national Youth Year, Vienna, 26 and 27 March (p. 1019); inter-agency meeting on preparations for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, New York, 27 and 28 March (p. 694); ad hoc inter-agency meeting on consumer protection, Geneva, 1 and 2 April (p. 557); ad hoc inter-agency meeting on aging, Vienna, 27-29 April (p. 1023); Sub-Committee on Statistical Activities, fifteenth session, Washington, D. C., 27 April-1 May (p. 1072); Technical Energy Group of the Task Force on Long-Term Development Objectives, New York, 4-6 June and 12-14 October; ad hoc inter-agency meeting on the co-ordination of disarmament-related activities, Geneva, 11 and 12 June; inter-agency meeting on outer space activities, Vienna, 14-16 September (p. 118); Intersecretariat Group for Water Resources, second session, Geneva, 19-23 October (p. 687); Ad Hoc Working Group on Inter-agency Follow-up to the Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable 'Sources of Energy, first session, New York, 17 and 18 December (p. 702).

**CPC ACTIVITIES.** CPC met in organizational session on 6 April 1981 and held its twenty-first session in New York from 4 to 29 May and on 8 and 9 June.<sup>(5)</sup>

It dealt at length with the proposed programme budget for the 1982-1983 biennium, discussing general criteria and methods for setting programme priorities as well as examining the details of the programmes and making recommendations, including those for review or deletion (p. 1274). It suggested that the General Assembly adopt official rules governing programme planning, the programme aspects of the budget, performance monitoring and evaluation procedures, and recommended designating a central and independent monitoring unit within the Secretariat (p. 1305).

In addition, CPC made methodological recommendations for future cross-organizational programme analyses; defined the scope of such an analysis of marine affairs, projected for 1983 (p. 139), and examined the focus and approach to the youth activities of the United Nations system (p. 1016). It also discussed the work of ACC on rural development (p. 401), co-ordination of information systems (p. 1386) and enhancement of crisis management in the field (p. 1384). In addition, CPC agreed to review further in 1982 the mandates and activities of United Nations Headquarters and the regional commissions (p. 608) relating to environment and water.

Joint Meetings of CPC and ACC (sixteenth series, Geneva, 29 June-1 July) discussed implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade<sup>(6)</sup> (p. 381) and co-ordination of emergency assistance by the United Nations system (p. 474).

On 23 July, the Economic and Social Council, by a decision adopted without vote, took note of the CPC report on its 1981 session and endorsed its conclusions and recommendations, taking fully into account the reservations and comments concerning modifications expressed in the Committee and in the Council.<sup>(8)</sup> The draft decision was introduced and orally revised in the Council's Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee by the United Kingdom, also on behalf of India and Pakistan, and was approved on 17 July without vote. The revisions added the words "fully" and "concerning modifications" to the clause referring to reservations and comments.

Reports: ACC, <sup>(1)</sup>E/1981/37 & Corr.1., <sup>(2)</sup>E/1981/86, <sup>(3)</sup>E/1981/95, <sup>(4)</sup>E/1982/4; <sup>(5)</sup>CPC, A/36/38.

Resolution and decisions: Res.: <sup>(6)</sup>GA, 35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503). Dec.: <sup>(7)</sup>ACC, ACC/1981/DEC/1-10, 11-12, 13-24; <sup>(8)</sup>ESC, 1981/180, 23 July 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.1-3, 5-8, 10, 12-16, 17 (2-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.40 (23 July).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/180

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/96, Part III) without vote. 17 July (meeting 17): 3-nation draft (E/1981/C.3/L.17). orally revised; agenda items 18 and 19.

Sponsors: India, Pakistan, United Kingdom.

Report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination

At its 40th plenary meeting, on 23 July 1981, the Council:

(a) Took note of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the work of its twenty-first session:

(b) Decided to endorse the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee, taking fully into account the reservations and comments concerning modifications made thereon by members of the Committee and by members of the Council;

(c) Decided to transmit the report to the General Assembly for consideration at its thirty-sixth session.

## Economic and Social Council

Proposed restructuring of the Council

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION.** The Economic and Social Council, in a resolution adopted without vote on 24 July 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> requested its President to hold consultations, including those with the President of the General Assembly, for an early resolution of the question of its revitalization, and to report back at its October/November session. The Council decided to convey its views, in the light of the President's report and of the discussions in October/November, to the 1981 Assembly session. It requested Governments to co-operate fully with its President in the pursuit of his consultations and to accord this matter their priority attention at a senior policy level. The draft resolution was submitted by the Council's officers.



The USSR, speaking on behalf of the socialist countries after the text's adoption, said the revitalization of the Council rested on the improved organization of work and on the extension of full support to that organ by all countries.

On 25 November, on an oral proposal by its President, the Council agreed to include the revitalization question in the agenda for its 1982 organizational session.<sup>(2)</sup> Before this decision was adopted without vote, the President said he concluded from his consultations with Member States that, despite general agreement on the need to revitalize the Council, no consensus existed on how to achieve that goal; consultations should, therefore, continue and the question should be considered again in 1982.

Argentina asserted that previous recommendations for restructuring the Council would not be implemented as long as the membership was not modified to allow for wider representation; what was perhaps lacking was the political will rather than proposals for reform. The United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the European Community countries, joined by the USSR, supported a proposal to postpone consideration of the question to an appropriate date.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In a decision adopted on 17 December,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly transmitted to its 1982 session, through the Economic and Social Council, the draft resolution annexed to its decision of 16 December 1980 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system.<sup>(3)</sup> The 1980 draft would have the Assembly call for the amendment of the Charter of the United Nations to equate the membership of the Council with that of the United Nations, discontinue several of the Council's subsidiary bodies and set up a schedule for consideration of certain questions by the Council. The Assembly, by its 1981 decision, invited the Council to consider the draft in the context of the latter's revitalization question and requested it to submit recommendations to the Assembly in 1982. The Assembly acted without vote, as did its Second (Economic and Financial) Committee on 7 December on a draft submitted by a Committee Vice-Chairman.

#### Resolution and decision:

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC: 1981/84, 24 July, text following.

Decisions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC: 1981/204, 25 Nov., text following.

GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/439, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 573);

<sup>(4)</sup>36/445, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: plenary, E/1981/SR.20-34, 41, 45 (1-24 July & 25 Nov.). GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 46 (24 Sep.-28 Oct. & 7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/84

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Draft by Council Bureau (E/1981/L.56); agenda Item 3.

#### Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council

The Economic and Social Council,

Having heard statements by its President and by several of its members on the need to revitalize the Council as the principal organ of the United Nations under the Charter in the economic and social fields,

Confirming Its resolution 1622(LI) of 30 July 1971.

Bearing in mind General Assembly resolution 32/197 of 20 December 1977 and the consultations being held pursuant to General Assembly decision 35/439 of 16 December 1980, concerning the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system,

1. Decides to accord primary importance to the subject of the revitalization of the Economic and Social Council;

2. Requests the President of the Economic and Social Council to hold the consultations he deems to be in the best interests of an early resolution of this Important Issue, including consultations with the President of the General Assembly, in the light of the opinions expressed in the Council at Its second regular session of 1981, and to report to the Council at its resumed second regular session of 1981;

3. Decides to convey the views of the Council, in the light of the report of the President of the Council and of the discussions at its resumed second regular session of 1981, to the General Assembly at Its thirty-sixth session;

4. Requests Governments to co-operate fully with the President of the Economic and Social Council in the pursuit of his consultations and to accord this matter their priority attention at a senior policy level.

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/204

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by Council President; agenda Item 2.

#### Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council

At its 45th plenary meeting, on 25 November 1981, the Council decided to include the question of the revitalization of the Economic and Social Council in the agenda for its organizational session for 1982.

General Assembly decision 36/445

Adopted without vote

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/695/Add.8) without vote. 7 December (meeting 46); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.134); agenda item 69 (I).

#### Implementation of section II of the annex to General

Assembly resolution 32/197 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Second Committee:

(a) Decided to transmit the draft resolution annexed to its decision 35/439 of 16 December 1980 to its thirty-seventh session through the Economic and Social Council;

(b) Invited the Economic and Social Council to consider it in the context of its deliberations on the question of the revitalization of the Council;

(c) Requested the Economic and Social Council to submit its recommendations to the General Assembly at Its thirty-seventh session.

#### Relations with NGOs

##### Consultative status

On 8 May 1981, the Economic and Social Council granted consultative status to 27 non-governmental organizations (NGOs).<sup>(4)</sup>

By that decision,<sup>(2)</sup> which was adopted without vote, the Council added eight NGOs to category

II and 19 to the Roster. In addition, it reclassified one NGO from category II to category I and three others from the Roster to category II. It also agreed to maintain on the Roster four NGOs which had applied for reclassification to category II. The Council acted on recommendations of its Committee on NGOs, which also submitted in an annex to its report<sup>(5)</sup> statements of reservations made by 11 of its members and one observer on the status of specific NGOs.

On the same date, the Council decided, also without vote, to refer back to the Committee a reclassification request submitted by the Minority Rights Group (MRG).<sup>(1)</sup> In so doing, the Council expressed hope that the Committee would continue to be guided in its work by a spirit of accommodation and consensus. The Committee had transmitted the MRG application to the Council for action after adopting, by 8 votes to 4, with 1 abstention, a motion by India not to act on a United States proposal that the Committee vote on the application.

The text, as adopted, was proposed by a Council Vice-President on the basis of informal consultations on a draft submitted by Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav text, which was later withdrawn, would have had the Council ask the Committee to consider the MRG application together with those of other NGOs, and to work in a spirit of accommodation and consensus, especially when considering those particular applications.<sup>(3)</sup>

As a result of the Council's action, there were a total of 646 NGOs with which it maintained consultative arrangements (see list below).<sup>(5)</sup> These were divided into three groups. In category I were 31 organizations broadly representative of major population segments in a large number of countries, closely involved with the economic and social life of the areas they represented, and which had marked and sustained contributions to make to United Nations achievements in social, cultural, educational, health, scientific, technological and human rights fields.

In category II were 215 internationally known organizations having special competence in, and specifically concerned with, only a few of the Council's fields of activity.

Of the 400 names on the Roster, nearly half

were of organizations that the Council (150), or the Secretary-General in consultation with the Council or its Committee on NGOs (28), considered able to make occasional and useful contributions to the Council's work. The rest were 222 organizations (as at 31 May 1981) having consultative arrangements with one or more specialized agencies or United Nations bodies.

In the Council, the debate centred around the status of MRG, the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AAPSO) and the World Peace Council (WPC).

The United Kingdom and the United States considered that MRG met all criteria for category II status and that the opposition to its reclassification was political. The United Kingdom said rejection of the application would suggest that NGOs which offended certain Governments might be excluded from consultative status. Though preferring consensus, the United States believed the Council could be asked to act on the MRG request, a view shared by Kenya.

Yugoslavia considered it currently inappropriate and harmful to consider the MRG application as it would be impossible to achieve consensus. China supported the Yugoslav proposal, and the USSR suggested referring the MRG request to the Committee on NGOs.

Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and the USSR regretted that requests by AAPSO and WPC for reclassification to category I status had not been approved, for what the last two delegations considered to be political reasons. The USSR asserted that the imperialist countries resorted to obstructionism and levelled absurd accusations at the two NGOs. Pakistan, however, considered that AAPSO engaged in subversive activities and that the Committee on NGOs should remain vigilant so as to suspend or remove those organizations which abused their consultative status. Chile maintained reservations on applications by those two NGOs.

In 1981, the Secretary-General forwarded to the Committee information submitted, by 29 NGOs on their United Nations-related activities undertaken in the preceding four years.<sup>(6)</sup> The Committee, in February, reviewed 33 of 35 such quadrennial reports.

#### NGOs in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council (ass at 31 December 1981)

##### Category I

International Alliance of Women-Equal Rights,  
Equal Responsibilities  
International Association of French-Speaking Parliamen-  
tarians  
International Chamber of Commerce  
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions

##### International Co-operative Alliance

International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA)  
International Council of Women  
International Council on Social Welfare  
International Federation of Agricultural Producers  
International Federation of Business and Professional  
Women

International Organization for Standardization (IOS)  
 International Organization of Consumers Unions (IOCU)  
 International Organization of Employers  
 International Planned Parenthood Federation  
 International Social Security Association (ISSA)  
 International Union of Local Authorities (IULA)  
 International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations (ISMUN)  
 Inter-Parliamentary Union  
 League of Red Cross Societies  
 Muslim World League  
 Organization of African Trade Union Unity (OATUU)  
 Society for International Development (SID)\*  
 United Towns Organization  
 Women's International Democratic Federation  
 World Assembly of Youth (WAY)  
 World Confederation of Labour  
 World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY)  
 World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU)  
 World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA)  
 World Muslim Congress  
 World Veterans Federation

#### Category II

Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AAPSO)  
 AFS International/Intercultural Programs. Inc. (formerly American Field Service)  
 Agudas Israel World Organization  
 Airport Associations Co-ordinating Council (AACC)  
 All-India Women's Conference  
 All Pakistan Women's Association  
 Amnesty International  
 Anti-Apartheid Movement, The  
 Anti-Slavery Society for the Protection of Human Rights, The  
 Arab Lawyers Union  
 Associated Country Women of the World  
 Association for Childhood Education International  
 Association for the Study of the World Refugee Problem  
 Bahá'í International Community  
 Baptist World Alliance  
 CARE (Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc.)  
 Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities)  
 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace  
 Catholic Relief Services-United States Catholic Conference, Inc.  
 Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America  
 Christian Democratic World Union  
 Christian Peace Conference  
 Church World Service, Inc.  
 Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches  
 Commonwealth Human Ecology Council (CHEC)  
 Conference of European Churches (CEC)  
 Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations  
 Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations (CBJO)  
 Co-ordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service

Council of European and Japanese National Ship-owners Association, The (CENSA)  
 Democratic Youth Community of Europe  
 Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration (EROPA)  
 Environment Liaison Centre\*\*  
 European Association of National Productivity Centres  
 European Insurance Committee  
 European League for Economic Co-operation  
 European Organization for Quality Control (EOQC)\*\*  
 Experiment in International Living, The  
 Federation for the Respect of Man and Humanity  
 Federation of Arab Economists, The  
 Federation of Arab Scientific Research Councils  
 Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific, Inc., The  
 Friends World Committee for Consultation  
 Howard League for Penal Reform  
 Ibero-American Institute of Aeronautic and Space Law and Commercial Aviation  
 Institute for Policy Studies-Transnational  
 Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, Inc.  
 Inter-American Federation of Public Relations Associations (IFPRA)  
 Inter-American Federation of Touring and Automobile Clubs (FITAC)  
 Inter-American Planning Society  
 Inter-American Press Association  
 Inter-American Statistical Institute  
 International Air Transport Association  
 International Association against Painful Experiments on Animals  
 International Association for Religious Freedom (IARF)  
 International Association for Social Progress  
 International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property  
 International Association for Water Law (IAWL)  
 International Association of Democratic Lawyers  
 International Association of Educators for World Peace  
 International Association of Juvenile and Family Court Magistrates  
 International Association of Penal Law  
 International Association of Ports and Harbours (IAPH)  
 International Association of Schools of Social Work  
 International Astronautical Federation  
 International Automobile Federation (FIA)  
 International Bar Association  
 International Cargo Handling Co-ordination Association  
 International Catholic Child Bureau  
 International Catholic Migration Commission  
 International Catholic Union of the Press  
 International Centre for Industry and the Environment (ICIE)  
 International Centre for Local Credit  
 International Centre of Social Gerontology\*\*  
 International Chamber of Shipping  
 International Christian Union of Business Executives (UNIA PAC)  
 International Civil Airports Association  
 International College of Surgeons  
 International Commission of Jurists  
 International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage

- International Committee for European Security and Co-operation  
 International Committee of the Red Cross  
 International Co-operation for Socio-Economic Development (CIDSE)  
 International Co-ordinating Committee of Financial Analysts' Associations  
 International Council for Adult Education (ICAE)  
 International Council for Building Research, Studies and Documentation  
 International Council of Environmental Law  
 International Council of Jewish Women  
 International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)  
 International Council of Scientific Unions  
 International Council of Societies of Industrial Design (ICSID)  
 International Council on Alcohol and Addictions  
 International Council on Jewish Social and Welfare Services  
 International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa  
 International Electrotechnical Commission  
 International Federation for Home Economics (IFHE)\*\*  
 International Federation for Housing and Planning  
 International Federation of Beekeepers' Associations  
 International Federation of Human Rights  
 International Federation of Journalists  
 International Federation of Landscape Architects  
 International Federation of Resistance Movements  
 International Federation of Senior Police Officers  
 International Federation of Settlements and Neighbourhood Centres  
 International Federation of Social Workers  
 International Federation of University Women  
 International Federation of Women in Legal Careers  
 International Federation of Women Lawyers  
 International Federation on Aging  
 International Fellowship of Reconciliation  
 International Hotel Association  
 International Indian Treaty Council  
 International Institute for Vital Registration and Statistics (IIVRS)  
 International Institute of Administrative Sciences  
 International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations  
 International Law Association  
 International League for Human Rights  
 International League of Societies for Persons with Mental Handicap  
 International Movement <sup>ATD</sup> Fourth World"  
 International Movement for Fraternal Union among Races and Peoples (UFER)  
 International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD)\*\*  
 International Organization-Justice and Development  
 International Organization of Journalists  
 International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI)  
 International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA)  
 International Prisoners Aid Association  
 International Road Federation  
 International Road Transport Union  
 International Rural Housing Association  
 International Savings Banks Institute  
 International Senior Citizens Association, Inc., The  
 International Social Service  
 International Society for Criminology  
 International Society of Social Defence  
 International Statistical Institute  
 International Touring Alliance  
 International Union for Child Welfare  
 International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources  
 International Union for Inland Navigation  
 International Union for the Scientific Study of Population  
 International Union of Architects  
 International Union of Building Societies and Savings Associations  
 International Union of Family Organizations  
 International Union of Latin Notariat  
 International Union of Lawyers  
 International Union of Producers and Distributors of Electrical Energy  
 International Union of Public Transport  
 International Union of Young Christian Democrats (IUYCD)  
 International Young Christian Workers  
 Jaycees International  
 Latin American Association of Finance Development Institutions (ALIDE)  
 Latin American Iron and Steel Institute  
 Law Association for Asia and the Western Pacific (LAWASIA)\*\*  
 Lions International-The International Association of Lions Clubs  
 Lutheran World Federation  
 Mutual Assistance of the Latin American Government Oil Companies (ARPEL)  
 Organization for International Economic Relations (IER)  
 OXFAM (Oxford Committee for Famine Relief)  
 Pan-African Institute for Development  
 Pan-African Women's Organization  
 Pan American Federation of Engineering Societies (UPADI)  
 Pan-Pacific and South-East Asia Women's Association  
 Pax Christi, International Catholic Peace Movement  
 Pax Romana  
 (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs)  
 (International Movement of Catholic Students)  
 Permanent International Association of Road Congresses (PIARC)  
 Rädda Barnen's Riksförbund (Save the Children)"  
 Rehabilitation International  
 St. Joan's International Alliance  
 Salvation Army, The  
 Save the Children Federation  
 Socialist International  
 Socialist International Women (SIW)  
 Société internationale de prophylaxie criminelle  
 Society for Comparative Legislation  
 Soroptimist International  
 Studies and Expansion Society-International Scientific Association (SEC)

Third World Foundation\*\*  
 Union of Arab Jurists  
 Union of International Associations  
 Union of International Fairs  
 United Kingdom Standing Conference on the Second  
 United Nations Development Decade  
 Universal Federation of Travel Agents Associations  
 Vienna Institute for Development  
 War Resisters International  
 Women's International League for Peace and Freedom  
 Women's International Zionist Organization  
 World Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations  
 World Association of Former United Nations Interns  
 and Fellows\*  
 World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts  
 World Association of World Federalists  
 World Confederation of Organizations of the Teach-  
 ing Profession  
 World Conference on Religion and Peace  
 World Council for the Welfare of the Blind  
 World Council of Credit Unions, Inc. (WOCCU)  
 World Council of Indigenous Peoples (WCIP)\*\*\*  
 World Council of Management  
 World Energy Conference  
 World Federation for Mental Health  
 World Federation of Catholic Youth  
 World Federation of the Deaf  
 World Jewish Congress  
 World Leisure and Recreation Association  
 World Movement of Mothers  
 World Organization of the Scout Movement (World  
 Scout Bureau)  
 World Peace Through Law Centre  
 World Population Society  
 World Society for the Protection of Animals  
 World Student Christian Federation  
 World Trade Centers Association  
 World Union for the Safeguard of Youth  
 World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations  
 World University Service  
 World Women's Christian Temperance Union  
 World Young Women's Christian Association  
 Zonta International

#### Roster

Organizations included by action  
 of the Economic and Social Council  
 African Medical and Research Foundation  
 Altrusa International, Inc.  
 American Foreign Insurance Association  
 American Foreign Law Association, Inc.  
 American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE)  
 Asian Development Center (ADC)  
 Asian Youth Council  
 Association for World Education  
 Battelle Memorial Institute  
 Bureau international de la recuperation  
 Caribbean Conservation Association  
 Catholic International Union for Social Service  
 Center for Inter-American Relations  
 Commission to Study the Organization of Peace  
 Committee for Economic Development  
 Committee for European Construction Equipment  
 (CECE)

Confederation of Asian Chambers of Commerce  
 Congress of Racial Equality (CORE)  
 Council of European National Youth Committees  
 (CENYC)  
 Council on Religion and International Affairs (CRIA)  
 Data for Development (DFD)  
 Economic Research Committee of the Gas Industry  
 (COMETEC-GAZ)  
 Engineers Joint Council  
 Environmental Coalition for North America (ENCONA)  
 European Alliance of Press Agencies  
 European Association of Refrigeration Enterprises  
 (AEEF)  
 European Confederation of Woodworking Industries  
 European Container Manufacturers' Committee  
 European Federation for the Welfare of the Elderly  
 (EURAG)  
 European Liquefied Petroleum Gas Association\*\*  
 European Mediterranean Commission on Water  
 Planning  
 European Union of Women  
 Ex-Volunteers International  
 Federation of European Manufacturers of Friction  
 Materials  
 Federation of National Committees in the Internation-  
 al Christian Youth Exchange  
 Foster Parents Plan International (PLAN)\*\*  
 Foundation for the Establishment of an International  
 Criminal Court, The  
 Friedrich Ebert Foundation  
 Gray Panthers\*\*  
 Habitat International Council\*\*  
 Help the Aged\*\*  
 Indian Law Resource Centre\*\*  
 Institute of International Container Lessors  
 International Abolitionist Federation  
 International Association for Bridge and Structural  
 Engineering  
 International Association for Community Develop-  
 ment\*\*  
 International Association for Housing Science  
 International Association for Hydrogen Energy  
 International Association for Research into Income  
 and Wealth  
 International Association for the Child's Right to Play  
 International Association for the Defence of Religious  
 Liberty  
 International Association for the Exchange of Stu-  
 dents for Technical Experience  
 International Association for the Promotion of Dem-  
 ocracy under God (Pro Deo)  
 International Association of Airport and Seaport  
 Police  
 International Association of Chiefs of Police  
 International Association of Gerontology  
 International Association of the Soap and Detergent  
 Industry\*\*  
 International Board of Co-operation for the Develop-  
 ing Countries (EMCO)  
 International Bureau of Motor-Cycle Manufacturers  
 International Center for Dynamics of Development  
 International Committee against Apartheid, Racism  
 and Colonialism in Southern Africa\*\*  
 International Committee of Outer Space Onomastics  
 (ICOSO)

- International Confederation for Disarmament and Peace\*\*
- International Confederation of Associations of Experts and Consultants
- International Container Bureau
- International Council for Commercial Arbitration
- International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation
- International Council of Psychologists\*\*
- International Federation for Documentation
- International Federation of Chemical Energy and General Workers' Unions
- International Federation of Free Journalists
- International Federation of Freight Forwarders Associations
- International Federation of International Furniture Removers
- International Federation of Operational Research Societies
- International Federation of Pedestrians
- International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Movements\*\*
- International Federation of Surveyors
- International Federation of the Blind
- International Fiscal Association
- International Hydatidological Association
- International Inner Wheel
- International Institute of Public Finance
- International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR)
- International Iron and Steel Institute
- International Juridical Organization (IJO)\*\*
- International League for the Rights and Liberation of Peoples
- International League of Surveillance Societies, The
- International Olive Growers Federation
- International Organization of Experts (ORDINEX)
- International Peace Academy
- International Peace Bureau
- International Permanent Bureau of Automobile Manufacturers
- International Police Association
- International Press Institute (IPI)
- International Prevention of Road Accidents
- International Progress Organization (IPO)
- International Public Relations Association (IPRA)
- International Real Estate Federation
- International Research Institute for Immigration and Emigration Politics
- International Schools Association
- International Shipping Federation (ISF)
- International Society for Prosthetics and Orthotics
- International Solar Energy Society
- International Textile Manufacturers Federation
- International Union of Judges
- International Union of Marine Insurance
- International Union of Police Federations
- International Union of Social Democratic Teachers
- International Union of Tenants
- International Working Group for the Construction of Sports and Leisure Facilities
- La Leche League International, Inc. (LLLl)
- Latin American Confederation of Tourist Organizations (COTAL)
- Latin American Official Workers' Confederation (CLATE)
- Liberation
- Minority Rights Group
- Movement against Racism and for Friendship between Peoples
- Movement for a Better World
- National Organization for Women (NOW)
- National Parks and Conservation Association
- OISCA International (Organization for Industrial, Spiritual and Cultural Advancement International)
- Open Door International (for the Economic Emancipation of the Woman Worker)
- Overseas Education Fund of the League of Women Voters
- Pan American Development Foundation
- Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses
- Pio Mansú International Research Centre for Environmental Structures, The
- Planetary Citizens
- Population Council, The
- Procedural Aspects of International Law Institute\*\*
- Program for the Introduction and Adaptation of Contraceptive Technology (PIACT)\*\*
- Quota International Incorporated
- Romani Union
- Rotary International
- SERVAS International
- Society for Social Responsibility in Science
- Survival International Ltd.\*\*
- Transfrigoroute Europe\*\*
- United Nations of Yoga (UNY)
- United Schools International
- United Way International
- Universal Esperanto Association
- World Alliance of Reformed Churches
- World Association for Christian Life Communities
- World Confederation for Physical Therapy
- World Development Movement
- World Environment and Resources Council (WERC)
- World Federation of Christian Life Communities
- World Federation of Health Agencies for the Advancement of Voluntary Surgical Contraception\*\*
- World Mining Congress\*\*
- World Union for Progressive Judaism
- Young Lawyers' International Association (AIJA)
- \*Reclassified in 1981 from category II to category I.
- \*\*Addition made in 1981.
- \*\*\*Reclassified in 1981 from the Roster to category II.
- Organizations included by action of the Secretary-General
- American Association for the Advancement of Science
- Asian Environmental Society
- Association for the Advancement of Agricultural Sciences in Africa
- Center for Research on the New International Economic Order, The
- Center of Concern
- Committee for International Cooperation in National Research in Demography (CICRED)
- Council for Development of Economic and Social Research in Africa, The (CODESRIA)
- Fauna Preservation Society, The
- Foresta Institute for Ocean and Mountain Studies
- Friends of the Earth (FOE)

Institut de la vie  
 International Advisory Committee on Population and Law  
 International Association against Noise  
 International Association on Water Pollution Research (IAWPR)  
 International Educational Development, Inc.  
 International Institute for Environment and Development  
 International Ocean Institute  
 International Society for Community Development  
 International Studies Association  
 International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences  
 National Audubon Society  
 Natural Resources Defence Council, Inc.  
 Population Crisis Committee  
 Population Institute  
 Sierra Club  
 Trilateral Commission, The  
 World Education  
 World Society for Ekistics

Organizations included because of consultative status with specialized agencies or other United Nations bodies

(as at 31 May 1981)

Organization	In consultative status with
African Centre for Monetary Studies	UNCTAD
Arab Federation for Engineering Industries	UNCTAD
Arab Federation of Chemical Fertilizer Producers	UNIDO
Arab Iron and Steel Union (AISU)	UNIDO
Association of African Universities	UNESCO
Association of Arab Universities	UNESCO
Association of European Jute Industries	UNCTAD
Association of Partially and Wholly French-Language Universities	UNESCO
Association of West European Builders, The (AWES)	IMCO
Baltic and International Maritime Conference, The	IMCO, UNCTAD
B'nai B'rith International Council	UNESCO
Catholic International Education Office	UNESCO, UNICEF
Centre Europe-Tiers Monde (CETIM)	UNCTAD
Centre for Latin American Monetary Studies	UNCTAD
Club de Dakar	FAO, UNIDO, ITU
Committee on Space Research (COSPAR)	ITU
Confederation of International Trading Houses Associations	UNCTAD

Organization	In consultative status with
Co-ordination Committee for the Textile Industries in the European Common Market (COMITEXTIL)	UNCTAD
Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS)	UNESCO, WHO
Engineering Committee on Oceanic Resources (ECOR)	IMCO
European Association for Animal Production	FAO
European Broadcasting Union	ITU, UNESCO
European Centre for International Co-operation (CECI)	UNIDO
European Computer Manufacturers Association	ITU
European Confederation of Agriculture	FAO, IAEA, UNESCO
European Council of Chemical Manufacturers' Federations	FAO, ICAO, ILO, IMCO, UNCTAD
European Federation of National Associations of Engineers	UNESCO, UNIDO
European Oceanic Association	UNIDO
European Tea Committee	FAO
European Tugowners Association	IMCO
European Union of Public Relations	UNIDO
Federación Latinoamericana de Periodistas	UNESCO
Federation of Afro-Asian Insurers and Reinsurers (FAIR)	UNCTAD
General Union of Chambers of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture for Arab Countries	UNCTAD
Institute of Air Transport	ICAO
Institute of International Law	ICAO
Institute on Man and Science	UNESCO
Inter-American Association of Broadcasters	ITU, UNESCO
International Academy of Pathology	WHO
International Aeronautical Federation	ICAO
International Agency for the Prevention of Blindness (Vision International)	UNICEF, WHO
International Amateur Radio Union	ITU
International Association for Cereal Chemistry (ICC)	FAO, UNIDO
International Association for Educational Assessment	UNESCO
International Association for Mass Communication Research	UNESCO
International Association for Suicide Prevention	WHO
International Association for the Study of the Liver	WHO
International Association of Agricultural Economists	FAO, UNCTAD
International Association of Agricultural Librarians and Documentalists	FAO

Organization	In consultative status with	Organization	In consultative status with
International Association of Art (IAA)	UNESCO	International Conference of Historians of the Labour Movement	UNESCO
International Association of Cancer Registries	WHO	International Copyright Society	UNESCO
International Association of Classification Societies	IMCO	International Council for Correspondence Education	UNESCO
International Association of Conference Interpreters	ILO, UNESCO	International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies	UNESCO
International Association of Crafts and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises	UNIDO	International Council of Aircraft Owner and Pilot Associations	ICAO
International Association of Drilling Contractors (IADC)	IMCO	International Council of Marine Industry Associations (ICOMIA)	IMCO
International Association of Dry Cargo Shipowners	UNCTAD	International Council of Nurses	ILO, UNESCO, WHO
International Association of Fish Meal Manufacturers	FAO	International Council of Sport and Physical Education	UNESCO
International Association of Horticultural Producers	FAO	International Council on Archives	UNESCO
International Association of Lighthouse Authorities	IMCO, ITU	International Council on Education for Teaching	UNESCO
International Association of Literary Critics	UNESCO	International Cystic Fibrosis (Mucoviscidosis) Association	WHO
International Association of Logopedics and Phoniatrics	UNESCO, UNICEF, WHO	International Dairy Federation	FAO
International Association of Medical Laboratory Technologists (IAMLT)	WHO	International Dental Federation	WHO
International Association of Microbiological Societies	WHO	International Diabetes Federation	WHO
International Association of Mutual Insurance Companies	UNCTAD	International Epidemiological Association	WHO
International Association of Students in Economics and Management	UNESCO	International Ergonomics Association	ILO, WHO
International Association of the Third Age Universities	ILO, UNESCO	International Falcon Movement	UNESCO
International Association of Universities	UNESCO	International Federation for Information Processing	ITU, UNESCO, WHO
International Association of University Professors and Lecturers	UNESCO	International Federation for Medical and Biological Engineering	WHO
International Baccalaureate Office	UNESCO	International Federation for Parent Education	UNESCO, UNICEF
International Board on Books for Young People	UNESCO, UNICEF	International Federation of Air Line Pilots Associations	ICAO, WMO
International Bureau of Social Tourism	ILO, UNESCO	International Federation of Automatic Control	UNIDO
International Centre of Films for Children and Young People	UNESCO, UNICEF	International Federation of Catholic Universities	UNESCO
International Cocoa Trades Federation	UNCTAD	International Federation of Children's Communities	UNESCO
International Commission on Illumination	ICAO, ILO	International Federation of Clinical Chemistry	WHO
International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP)	WHO	International Federation of Film Archives	UNESCO
International Committee for Plastics in Agriculture	UNIDO	International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics	WHO
International Confederation of European Beet Growers	UNCTAD	International Federation of Health Records Organizations	WHO
International Confederation of Midwives	ILO, UNICEF, WHO	International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA)	UNESCO
		International Federation of Margarine Associations	FAO
		International Federation of Medical Student Associations	WHO



Organization	In consultative status with	Organization	In consultative status with
International Federation of Multiple Sclerosis Societies	WHO	International Political Science Association	UNESCO
International Federation of Musicians	UNESCO	International Press Telecommunications Council	ITU
International Federation of Newspaper Publishers	UNESCO	International Publishers Association	UNESCO
International Federation of Organizations of School Correspondence and Exchanges	UNESCO	International Round Table for the Advancement of Counselling <sup>(IRTAC)</sup>	ILO, UNESCO
International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Associations	UNCTAD, UNIDO, WHO	International Scientific Film Association	UNESCO
International Federation of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation	WHO	International Secretariat of Catholic Technologists, Agriculturists and Economists	ILO
International Federation of Plantation, Agricultural and Allied Workers	FAO	International Shipowners' Association	IMCO, UNCTAD
International Federation of Popular Travel Organizations	UNESCO	International Social Science Council	ILO, UNESCO
International Federation of Purchasing and Materials Management <sup>(IFPMM)</sup>	UNCTAD	International Society and Federation of Cardiology	WHO
International Federation of Surgical Colleges	WHO	International Society for Burn Injuries	WHO
International Federation of the Periodical Press	UNESCO	International Society for Human and Animal Mycology	WHO
International Federation of Translators	UNESCO	International Society for Photogrammetry	UNESCO
International Federation of Travel Journalists and Writers	UNESCO	International Society of Citriculture	FAO
International Food Policy Research Institute	FAO, UNCTAD	International Society of Endocrinology	WHO
International Gas Union	ITU	International Society of Haematology	WHO
International Hospital Federation-IHF	WHO	International Society of Radiographers and Radiological Technicians	WHO
International Humanist and Ethical Union	UNESCO	International Society of Soil Science	FAO, UNESCO, WMO
International Institute for Audio-Visual Communication and Cultural Development (MEDIACULT)	UNESCO	International Sociological Association	UNESCO, WHO
International Institute for Peace	UNESCO	International Time Bureau	ITU
International League against Rheumatism	WHO	International Transport Workers' Federation	ICAO
International Leprosy Association	WHO	International Union against Tuberculosis	ILO, WHO
International Maritime Pilots' Association	IMCO	International Union for Health Education	UNESCO, WHO
International Organization against Trachoma	WHO	International Union of Aviation Insurers	ICAO
International Organization for Co-operation in Health Care	WHO	International Union of Biological Sciences	WHO
International Paediatric Association	WHO	International Union of Forestry Research Organizations	FAO
International Peace Research Association	UNCTAD, UNESCO	International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics	ICAO
International PEN	UNESCO	International Union of Independent Laboratories	UNIDO
International Pharmaceutical Federation	WHO	International Union of Nutritional Sciences	FAO, WHO
International Phosphate Industry Organization	FAO, IMCO, UNCTAD, UNIDO	International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry	FAO, WHO
		International Union of School and University Health and Medicine	UNESCO, WHO

Organization	In consultative status with	Organization	Inconsultative status with
International Union of Socialist Youth	ILO, UNESCO	World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace	UNESCO
International Union of Students	UNESCO	World Association of Industrial and Technological Research Organizations	UNIDO
International Water Supply Association	WHO	World Association of Societies of Pathology	WHO
'International Young Catholic Students	UNESCO	World Confederation of Teachers	UNESCO
International Youth Hostel Federation	UNESCO	World Crafts Council	UNESCO
Inter-Union Commission on Frequency Allocations for Radio Astronomy and Space Science	ITU	World Education Fellowship, The	UNESCO
Latin American Social Science Council	UNESCO	World Federation for Medical Education	WHO
Latin American Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries	UNIDO	World Federation of Agricultural Workers	FAO
Liaison Office of the Rubber Industries of the European Economic Community	UNCTAD	World Federation of Associations of Clinical Toxicology Centres and Poison Control Centres	WHO
Licensing Executives Society International	UNCTAD, UNIDO	World Federation of Engineering Organizations	UNESCO, UNIDO
Medical Women's International Association	WHO	World Federation of Foreign-Language Teachers Associations	UNESCO
Miners' International Federation	UNCTAD	World Federation of Neuro-surgical Societies	WHO
Oil Companies' International Marine Forum (OCIMF)	IMCO	World Federation of Nuclear Medicine and Biology	WHO
Organization for Flora Neotropica	UNESCO	World Federation of Occupational Therapists	WHO
Pacific Science Association	UNESCO, WMO	World Federation of Public Health Associations	WHO
Permanent Commission and International Association on Occupational Health	ILO, WHO	World Federation of Scientific Workers	UNESCO
Société internationale de télécommunications aéronautiques (SITA)	ITU	World Federation of Societies of Anaesthesiologists	WHO
Sri Aurobindo Society	UNESCO	World Federation of Teachers' Unions	UNESCO
Standing Conference of Rectors and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities	UNESCO	World Federation of Workers of Food, Tobacco and Hotel Industries	FAO
Trade Unions International of Agricultural, Forestry and Plantation Workers	FAO	World Future Studies Federation	UNESCO
UNDA-Catholic International Association for Radio and Television	UNESCO	World Medical Association	ILO
Union of Industries of the European Community (UNICE)	UNCTAD, UNIDO	World Movement of Christian Workers	ILO, UNESCO
United Seamen's Service, Inc.	ILO	World Organization for Early Childhood Education	UNESCO
United States Trademark Association, The	UNCTAD	World Organization of Former Students of Catholic Teaching	UNESCO
World Association for Element Building and Prefabrication	UNIDO	World ORT Union	ILO
		World Packaging Organization	UNIDO
		World Peace Council	UNCTAD, UNESCO
		World Poultry Science Association	FAO
		World Psychiatric Association	WHO

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(1)</sup>1981/163, 8 May, text following; <sup>(2)</sup>1981/164, 8 May, text following.

Draft decision withdrawn: <sup>(3)</sup>Yugoslavia, E/1981/L.25.

Lists of NGOs: <sup>(4)</sup>E/1981/INF.2/Add.1; <sup>(5)</sup>E/1982/INF.9.. Reports: <sup>(6)</sup>Committee on NGOs, E/1981/29; <sup>(7)</sup>S-G, E/C.2/775 & Add.1-5.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.11, 12, 19 (28 Apr.-8 May).

Statement: NGOs, E/1981NGO/3.

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/163

Adopted without vote

Draft by Vice-President (E/1981/L.34), based on informal consultations on draft by Yugoslavia (E/1981/L.25); agenda item 6.

Request for reclassification of status submitted by a non-governmental organization

At its 19th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council:

(a) Decided to refer back to the Committee on Non-

Governmental Organizations the request for reclassification submitted by the Minority Rights Group;

(b) Expressed the hope that the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations would continue to be guided in its future work by a spirit of accommodation and consensus.

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/164

Adopted without vote

Recommendations by Committee on NGOs (E/1981/29); agenda item 6.

#### Non-governmental organizations

At its 19th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council decided:

(a) To grant the following non-governmental organizations consultative status:

#### Category II

Environment Liaison Centre;  
European Organization for Quality Control (EOQC);  
International Centre of Social Gerontology;  
International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD);  
Law Association for Asia and the Western Pacific (LAWASIA);  
Rädda Barnen's Riksförbund (Save the Children);  
Third World Foundation;  
World Association of Former United Nations Interns and Fellows;

#### Roster

European Liquefied Petroleum Gas Association;  
Foster Parents Plan International (PLAN);  
Grey Panthers;  
Habitat International Council;  
Help the Aged;  
Indian Law Resource Centre;  
International Association for Community Development;  
International Association of the Soap and Detergent Industry;  
International Committee against Apartheid, Racism and Colonialism in Southern Africa;  
International Confederation for Disarmament and Peace;  
International Council of Psychologists;  
International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Movements;  
International Juridical Organization (IJO);  
Procedural Aspects of International Law Institute;  
Program for the Introduction and Adaption of Contraceptive Technology (PIACT);  
Survival International Limited;  
Transfrigoroute Europe;  
World Federation of Health Agencies for the Advancement of Voluntary Surgical Contraception;  
World Mining Congress;

(b) To reclassify one non-governmental organization from category II to category I and three others from the Roster to category II, as follows:

#### Category I

Society for International Development (SID);

#### Category II

International Federation for Home Economics (IFHE);  
International Movement ATD Fourth World;  
World Council of Indigenous Peoples (WCIP);

(c) To maintain the following non-governmental organizations on the Roster:

International Hydatidological Association;  
Latin American Confederation of Tourist Organizations (COTAL);  
United Schools International;  
Universal Esperanto Association.

#### Hearings and statements

The Committee on NGOs, meeting in New York on 14 April 1981, heard requests from organizations in categories I and II consultative status wishing to address the Economic and Social Council or its committees in connection with items on the Council's agenda. The Committee recommended that seven of them should

be heard on specific agenda items.<sup>(1)</sup> When it met again at Geneva on 1 July, the Committee considered requests from more organizations and recommended that eight be heard.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Secretary-General forwarded to the Council six written statements he had received from NGOs.<sup>(3)</sup>

Reports: Committee on NGOs, <sup>(1)</sup>E/1981/43 & Corr.1, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1981/93.

Statements <sup>(3)</sup>NGOs, E/1981/NGO/I-6.

#### Committee on NGOs

The Committee on NGOs, at its session at United Nations Headquarters from 9 to 20 February 1981, among other action approved its report to the Economic and Social Council on that session and a provisional agenda for its next session in 1983.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on NGOs, E/1981/29 & Corr.1.

Increase in membership. In a resolution adopted without vote on 20 July 1981, <sup>(4)</sup> the Economic and Social Council enlarged the membership of the Committee on NGOs from 13 to 19 and amended the Council's rules of procedure so that the Committee would include five members from African States, four members each from Asian, Latin American, and Western European and other States, and two members from East European States (see APPENDIX III).

This followed earlier action in which the Council, by a resolution sponsored by Ghana, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan and Yugoslavia and adopted without vote on 8 May, <sup>(3)</sup> requested its President to hold consultations with the regional groups with a view to evolving an understanding on the size, composition and allocation of the Committee's seats, and to report on his findings to the Council at its second regular session. The Council also decided to consider at that time another draft resolution submitted by the same five States on the Committee's composition.<sup>(1)</sup> That five-nation text was identical to the one eventually adopted by the Council in July, except that it would have had the Council enlarge the Committee membership to 21 instead of 19, giving the African and Asian States one more seat each.

When the Council President informed the Bureau on 17 July of the results of his consultations, the Bureau, acting as a Council committee, recommended the adoption of the draft resolution in its final form. While not objecting to the report of the Bureau,<sup>(2)</sup> the USSR maintained that the adoption of the text should not be viewed as a precedent governing the distribution of seats among the various groups of countries in other Council bodies.

Support for the expansion of membership was expressed in the Council debate by India, Pakistan and Yugoslavia.

Draft resolution deferred: <sup>(1)</sup>Ghana, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Yugoslavia, E/1981/L.26.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC Bureau, E/1981/104.

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(3)</sup>1981/143, 8 May, text following;

<sup>(4)</sup>1981/50, 20 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 31, 35, 38 (28 Apr.-8 May & 1-20 July).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/43

Adopted without vote Meeting 19 8 May 1981

5-nation draft (E/1981/L.40); agenda item 6.

Sponsors: Ghana, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Yugoslavia.

#### Composition of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

The Economic and Social Council,

Recognizing the need to enlarge the composition of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations in order to bring it into line with the present membership of the United Nations and with the principle of equitable geographical representation,

1. Decides, in the light of the need to enlarge the membership of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, to take action on this question at its second regular session of 1981 in accordance with rule 85 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council and in the light of the report of the President requested in paragraph 2 of the present resolution;

2. Requests the President of the Council to hold consultations with the regional groups with a view to evolving an understanding on the size, composition and allocation of seats of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and to report thereon to the Council at its second regular session of 1981;

3. Decides to consider the draft resolution contained in document E/1981/L.26 at its second regular session of 1981 In the light of the report of the President.

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/50

Adopted without vote Meeting 38 20 July 1981

Draft by Bureau (E/1981/104); agenda item 2.

#### Composition of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

The Economic and Social Council,

Recognizing the need to enlarge the composition of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations in order to bring it into line with the present membership of the United Nations and with the principle of equitable geographical representation,

1. Decides to enlarge the membership of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations from thirteen to nineteen;

2. Approves the following amended text of paragraph 1 of rule 80 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council:

"1. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations shall consist of nineteen Members of the United Nations elected for four years on the basis of equitable geographical representation. Accordingly, the membership of the Committee shall include:

"Five members from African States;

"Four members from Asian States;

"Four members from Latin American States;

"Four members from Western European and other States;

"Two members from East European States."

Work programme. In order to increase the effectiveness of NGO contributions to the work of the United Nations, the Economic and Social Council, on 8 May 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the Com-

mittee on NGOs to review current practice relating to the consultation arrangements with NGOs and to report its findings and recommendations to the Council in 1983. Further, it requested the Secretary-General to include in his proposed draft standard rules of procedure for special United Nations conferences a set of harmonized procedures for inviting NGOs (p. 1370).

The text, introduced by Pakistan, also on behalf of Chile, Ghana, Kenya and Sweden, was revised by the sponsors, before its adoption without vote, to have the Committee report to the Council at its first regular session of 1983 rather than at the second regular session of 1982, and to have the Secretary-General take action on NGO invitation procedures rather than have the Committee examine that question.

The Committee on NGOs, noting that more time was needed for consideration of its future activities, annexed to its report a summary of suggestions by its members.<sup>(1)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on NGOs, E/1981/29.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/44, 8 May, text following.

Financial implications: S-G statement, E/1981/29/Add.1.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.11, 12, 19 (28Apr.-8May).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/44

Adopted without vote Meeting 19 8 May 1981

5-nation draft (E/1981/L.27/Rev.1); agenda item 6.

Sponsors: Chile, Ghana, Kenya, Pakistan, Sweden.

#### Review of the future activities of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

The Economic and Social Council,

Taking note of the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, in particular annex II thereto, containing a summary of the suggestions made on item 5 of the Committee's agenda, entitled "Review of future activities",

Recognizing the growth in the number of non-governmental organizations, totalling over six hundred, which have been granted consultative status with the Council,

Acknowledging the variety of experience, professionalism and fields of activity represented by non-governmental organizations and their increasing contribution to the implementation of United Nations programmes in the economic and social fields,

Bearing in mind the fact that a large number of non-governmental organizations are making a valuable contribution to the development of developing countries through, inter alia, the mobilization of financial, technical and human resources and of public opinion,

Aware of the various ad hoc arrangements for the participation of non-governmental organizations in United Nations bodies and in major ad hoc conferences of the United Nations,

1. Requests the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to undertake a review of current practice related to the implementation of Council resolution 1296(XLIV) of 23 May 1968, bearing in mind paragraph 15 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 32/197 of 20 December 1977, in consultation with Member States, bodies and organizations of the United Nations system, the Secretariat staff concerned and representatives of non-governmental organizations, with a view to increasing the effectiveness of contributions by non-governmental organizations to the work of the Council, as well as to the relevant organs of the General Assembly and to ad hoc conferences of the United Nations in which non-governmental organizations are invited to participate;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the necessary information and assistance required by the committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to undertake such a review;

3. Also requests the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to report its findings and recommendations to the Council at its first regular session of 1983;

4. Agrees that the review called for in paragraph 1 above will be conducted by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations after the Council has taken action at its second regular session of 1981 to give effect to paragraph 1 of its resolution 1981/43 of 8 May 1981;

5. Urges non-governmental organizations to schedule their activities in relation to preparations for various ad hoc conferences of the United Nations in a manner that will enable them to make timely and effective contributions to those conferences;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to include in his proposed draft standard rules of procedure for special conferences of the United Nations, called for in General Assembly resolution 35/10 C of 3 November 1980, a set of harmonized procedures for inviting non-governmental organizations to such conferences;

7. Requests the Secretary-General, pending the outcome of the review referred to in paragraph 1 above, to ensure full compliance with the provisions of Council resolution 1296(XLIV) of 23 May 1968, as well as with the relevant provisions of Council resolution 1297(XLIV) of 27 May 1968.

Agenda for the 1983 session. In a decision adopted without vote on 8 May 1981, the Economic and Social Council approved the provisional agenda and documentation for the 1983 session of the Committee on NGOs.<sup>(1)</sup> The seven-item agenda was recommended by the Committee.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/165, 8 May, text following.

Financial implications: S-G statement, E/1981/29/Add.1.

Meetings records: ESC, E/1981/SR.11, 12, 19 (28 Apr.-8 May)

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/165

Adopted without vote

Recommendation by Committee on NGOs (E/1981/29); agenda item 6.

Provisional agenda and documentation for the 1983 session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

At its 19th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council approved the provisional agenda and documentation for the 1983 session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations set out below:

Provisional agenda and documentation for the 1983 session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

1. Election of officers

2. Adoption of the agenda

3. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification received from non-governmental organizations

Documentation

Memorandum by the Secretary-General on new applications for consultative status

Memorandum by the Secretary-General on requests for reclassification

4. Review of quadrennial reports submitted

Documentation

Report by the Secretary-General on quadrennial reports on the activities of non-governmental organizations granted consultative status in categories I and II by the Council

5. Review of future activities

Documentation

Report by the Secretary-General, in consultation with the non-governmental organizations concerned, on the practical implementation of paragraph 4 of Council resolution 1296(XLIV)

6. Provisional agenda and documentation for the next session of the Committee

7. Adoption of the report of the Committee

#### Calendar of conferences

##### 1981 meetings

The Economic and Social Council took a number of decisions in February and May 1981 that altered, or added to the 1981 calendar (p. 1367), the meeting schedule of the following subsidiary bodies: the Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission on Transnational Corporations and its Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct,<sup>(2)</sup> the Statistical Commission's Working Group on International Statistical Programmes and Co-ordination,<sup>(3)</sup> the Group of Rapporteurs and the Group of Experts on Explosives of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods,<sup>(4)</sup> and the Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development of the Commission on Human Rights.<sup>(5)</sup>

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(1)</sup>1981/102, para. (d), 6 Feb. (p. 918);

<sup>(2)</sup>1981/103, 6 Feb. (p. 605); <sup>(3)</sup>1981/110, 4 May

(p. 1073); <sup>(4)</sup>1981/129, para. (a), 6 May (p. 570);

<sup>(5)</sup>1981/149, 8 May (p. 924.)

##### 1982-1983 meetings

The Economic and Social Council, on 24 July 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> approved the provisional calendar of conferences and meetings for 1982 and 1983 as prepared by the Secretariat,<sup>(4)</sup> decided that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should meet from 19 April to 28 May 1982, and asked the General Assembly to consider the feasibility of altering dates of the sessions of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (p. 459). This decision, proposed by a Vice-President of the Council, was adopted without vote.

By a 6 May decision, the Council inserted in its 1982-1983 calendar one meeting each year for the Sub-Commission on Illicit Drug Traffic and Related Matters in the Near and Middle East and for the Meeting of Operational Heads of Narcotics Law Enforcement Agencies, Far East Region.<sup>(1)</sup>

Further, the Council decided on 2 November<sup>(3)</sup> that the Commission on Transnational Corporations would hold its 1982 session at Manila, Philippines, from 30 August to 10 September. It also authorized the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct to hold three more sessions before the Commission's 1982 session and the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting to hold two more sessions in 1982.

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(1)</sup>1981/117, 6 May (p. 1062); <sup>(2)</sup>1981/192, 24 July, text following; <sup>(3)</sup>1981/198, 2 Nov. (p. 605).

Note: <sup>(4)</sup>Secretariat, E/1981/L.20 & Corr.1.2.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.38, 41 (20, 24 July).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/192

Adopted without vote

Draft by Vice-President (E/1981/L.57): agenda Item 6.

##### Calendar of conferences and meetings

At its 41 st plenary meeting, on 24 July 1981, the Council:  
(a) Decided, subject to the provisions of its resolution 1981/83 of 24 July 1981:

- (i) That in 1982 the Committee for Programme and Coordination should meet from 19 April to 28 May;
  - (ii) To approve the provisional calendar of conferences and meetings for 1982 and 1983;
- (b) Also decided to request the General Assembly to consider at its thirty-sixth session the feasibility of altering the dates of the sessions of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme, so that its reports might be submitted in good time to the Economic and Social Council at its second regular sessions of 1982 and 1983.

#### Limitation of documentation

The Economic and Social Council, expressing deep regret at the extent to which its work at the 1981 second regular session was impeded by the late arrival or non-availability of documents, recommended that the General Assembly should conduct at its 1981 session a thorough examination of the overall problem of documentation in the United Nations (p. 1371).<sup>(1)</sup> The Council adopted the resolution without vote on 24 July, on a proposal made by a Vice-President on the basis of informal consultations.

At the same time, the Council decided to review in 1982 its agenda and work programme, the usefulness of the documentation requested under its biennial programme of work and the possibility of discontinuing for two years the provision of summary records for its sessional committees. The Council also requested the Secretary-General to inform its Bureau, eight weeks prior to the beginning of each regular session, of the state of preparedness of the documentation for that session.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/83, 24 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.20, 21, 31, 33, 41 (1-24 July).

#### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/83

Adopted without vote Meeting 41 24 July 1981

Draft by Vice-President (E/1981/L.45): agenda item 2.

##### Control and limitation of documentation

The Economic and Social Council,  
Recalling its resolutions 1979/1 of 9 February 1979, 1979/41 of 10 May 1979 and 1979/69 of 2 August 1979, which set out, inter alia, a number of practical measures designed to reduce the volume of documentation, to ensure its timely circulation in all the working languages of the Council and to improve the format and presentation of Secretariat reports dealing with economic, social and related matters, and approved revised guidelines for the format and contents of the reports of the subsidiary bodies of the Council.

Taking into account General Assembly resolutions 33/56 of 14 December 1978 and 34/50 of 23 November 1979.

Deeply concerned that, despite the above-mentioned measures and the considerable progress made in reducing the length of each document submitted by the Secretariat to a maximum of thirty-two pages, there has been a marked increase in the total volume of documentation requested by intergovernmental and expert bodies, in addition to some extremely serious delays in the submission and circulation of documentation.

Conscious of the marginal progress made by both the Council and its subsidiary bodies in streamlining their agendas and programmes of work and in reducing requests for documentation,

Aware that the problems related to the control and limitation of documentation are closely linked to the establishment of a rational calendar of conferences and meetings.

Convinced that it is desirable to rationalize and improve the calendar, agenda and programme of work of bodies in the economic and social fields by, inter alia, considering some items or questions on a biennial or triennial basis, or by ensuring a better distribution of items or questions between the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council,

Reaffirming that intergovernmental and expert bodies should keep their requests for documents to the minimum compatible with the efficient conduct of their work and within the limits of the resources available to the Secretariat,

1. Expresses its deep regret at the extent to which its work at the second regular session of 1981 was impeded by the late arrival or non-availability of documents;

2. Reaffirms the provisions of its resolutions 1979/1, 1979/41 and 1979/69;

3. Decides to carry out a thorough review, at its organizational session for 1982, of its agenda and programme of work, with a view to rationalizing and improving them, as well as a review of the documentation requested under the existing legislative authority with respect to items in the biennial programme of work of the Council, in order to determine whether any of it is redundant, has lost its usefulness or could be issued at less frequent intervals;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to submit, together with the draft basic programme of work of the Council for 1982-1983, proposals for the consideration of some items or questions on a biennial or triennial basis and suggestions for ensuring a better distribution of some items or questions between the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, and to indicate the implications thereof, including desirable changes in the calendar of conferences, in order to ensure the timely availability of documentation;

5. Instructs the subsidiary bodies of the Council to take urgent measures to streamline their agendas and programmes of work and to bring about a substantial reduction in their requests for documents, bearing in mind the duration and the cycles of their meetings, and to report to the Council on measures adopted, taking strictly into account the guidelines set forth in the pertinent resolutions and decisions of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of Intergovernmental and expert bodies, before decisions are adopted, any request for documentation that exceeds the ability of the Secretariat to prepare and process on time and within its approved resources;

7. Also requests the Secretary-General to ensure the strict observance of the thirty-two page limit for documents and the reduction of their average length;

8. Reaffirms, for a further period of two years, the provision concerning the discontinuance of summary records for certain subsidiary bodies, contained in subparagraph (b) of its resolution 1979/69, as revised by its decision 1980/133 of 2 May 1980;

9. Decides to consider, at its organizational session for 1982, the possibility of discontinuing, for an experimental period of two years, the provision of summary records for its

sessional committees and their replacement by reports reflecting the course of the discussion;

10. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure that documentation is effectively disseminated to the Economic and Social Council and its subsidiary bodies on time and simultaneously in all the working languages, in accordance with rule 13, paragraph 4, of the rules of procedure of the Council;

11. Also requests the Secretary-General to inform the Bureau of the Economic and Social Council, eight weeks prior to the beginning of each regular session, of the state of preparedness of the documentation for that session, in order to enable the Bureau to make appropriate recommendations to the Council on its agenda and organization of work;

12. Recommends that the General Assembly should undertake, on a priority basis at its thirty-sixth session, a thorough examination of the overall problem of documentation in the United Nations, under the item entitled "Pattern of conferences: report of the Committee on Conferences", and also recommends that it should entrust to the Committee on Conferences the question of a review of the calendar of conferences and meetings for the next biennium, with particular reference to the economic and social fields, with a view to adjusting the calendar to the servicing capacities within the Secretariat, taking into account the problems that are occurring with regard to the timely submission and dissemination of documentation, and should request the Committee to report thereon to the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982;

13. Invites the Secretary-General, in relation to the recommendations in paragraph 12 above, to submit to the General Assembly and the Committee on Conferences appropriate recommendations on the problem of documentation, with particular reference to the economic and social fields.

#### Work programme of the Council for 1981-1982

At its organizational session for 1981, the Economic and Social Council, having considered the draft basic programme of work for 1981-1982 submitted by the Secretary-General,<sup>(3)</sup> approved its basic work programme for 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> At the same time, it decided to consider at its first regular session the Secretary-General's report on assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia (p. 1044). The decision, adopted without vote on 6 February, was proposed by the President in the light of consultative meetings of the Council members.<sup>(4)</sup>

At its resumed second regular session, the Council, by a decision of 21 October,<sup>(2)</sup> authorized the Secretary-General to transmit directly to the 1981 session of the General Assembly the reports of the following: the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development (resumed second, third and resumed third sessions), the Trade and Development Board, the Human Rights Committee (on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights), and the Council of the United Nations University.

In 1981, the Council held an organizational session (3-6 February) and its first regular session of the year (14 April-8 May) in New York. Meeting during the first regular session were the First (Economic) and the Second (Social) Committees

and the Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The First and the Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committees met at the time of the Council's second regular session at Geneva (1-24 July). The Council held its resumed second regular session in New York on 21 October and 2 and 25 November.

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(1)</sup>1981/100, 6 Feb. (no text); <sup>(2)</sup>1981/193, 21 Oct., text following.

Draft basic work programme: <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, E/1981/1..

Draft decision adopted: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC President, E/1981/L.9..

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.1, 2, 3, 42 (3-6 Feb. & 21 Oct.).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/193

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda items 16 and 23 to 25.

Transmittal of reports to the General Assembly for consideration

At its 42nd plenary meeting, on 21 October 1981, the Council decided to authorize the Secretary-General to transmit directly to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session:

(a) The report of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development on its resumed second session and on its third and resumed third sessions;

(b) The report of the Trade and Development Board;

(c) The report of the Human Rights Committee on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(d) The report of the Council of the United Nations University.

#### Agenda for 1981 sessions

The Economic and Social Council adopted on 3 February 1981 a five-item agenda for its organizational session, as submitted by the Secretariat.<sup>(3)</sup> A 17-item provisional agenda for the Council's first regular session of 1981, drafted by the Secretariat,<sup>(6)</sup> was approved on 6 February,<sup>(1)</sup> and the agenda was adopted without change on 4 April<sup>(4)</sup> on the basis of an annotated version by the Secretariat.<sup>(5)</sup> On 8 May<sup>(2)</sup> the Council approved a provisional agenda for its second regular session, drafted by the Secretariat(s) and on 1 July it adopted the 28-item agenda on the basis of an annotated version by the Secretariat.<sup>(7)</sup> All these actions were taken without vote. (For lists of agenda items, see APPENDIX IV.)

Decisions: ESC: <sup>(1)</sup>1981/105, 6 Feb., text following; <sup>(2)</sup>1981/166, 8 May, text following.

Documents: Organizational session: <sup>(3)</sup>annotated provisional agenda (adopted), E/1981/2. 1st 1981 regular session:

<sup>(4)</sup>agenda (adopted), E/1981/44; <sup>(5)</sup>annotated provisional agenda and Secretariat report on documentation, E/1981/30 & Add. 1; <sup>(6)</sup>draft provisional agenda, E/1981/L.10. 2nd 1981 regular session: <sup>(7)</sup>annotated provisional agenda (adopted) and Secretariat report on documentation, E/1981/100 & Add.1; <sup>(8)</sup>draft provisional agenda, E/1981/L.36.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.1, 2, 3, 4, 19, 20 (3-6 Feb., 14 Apr., 8 May & 1 July).

## Economic and Social Council decision 1981/105

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President, agenda item 5; draft by President In light of consultative meetings of Council members (E/1981/L.9), orally amended by USSR; agenda item 3.

Provisional agenda for the first regular session of 1981

At its 3rd plenary meeting, on 6 February 1981, the Council approved the provisional agenda for its first regular session of 1981.

At the same meeting, in pursuance of paragraph 5 of its decision 1980/100 of 6 February 1980, the Council agreed to consider under item 1 of the provisional agenda, entitled "Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters", the type of report required on land reform and rural development, to be considered by the Council at its second regular session of 1981, and requested the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to submit to the Council suggestions in that regard.

The Council also decided that, under the same item, it should be informed of the status of publication by the Secretary-General of the recommendations of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, called for in Council resolution 1979/42 of 11 May 1979.

## Economic and Social Council decision 1981/166

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President, orally amended by Brazil; agenda item 17.

Provisional agenda and organization of work for the second regular session of 1981 of the Council

At its 19th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council decided:

(a) To consider the item entitled "Science and technology" at its resumed second regular session of 1981;

(b) To approve the draft provisional agenda for its second regular session of 1981;

(c) To approve the organization of work proposed for the second regular session of 1981.

## Arabic language services

The Economic and Social Council, on 8 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> agreed to pursue all necessary arrangements for the inclusion, no later than 1 January 1983, of Arabic among its official languages. It requested the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly in 1981 on the practical implications of such action, and agreed to finalize the arrangements at its first regular session of 1982, in the light of the Assembly's consideration of the Secretary-General's report (p. 1369). The Council took this decision without vote, based on an oral proposal by its President.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/135, 8 May, text following.

Meeting records: ESC, E/1981/SR.4, 18 (14 Apr., 8 May).

## Economic and Social Council decision 1981/135

Adopted without vote

Draft orally proposed by President; agenda item 1.

Inclusion of Arabic among the official languages of the Economic and Social Council

At its 18th plenary meeting, on 8 May 1981, the Council:

(a) Agreed to pursue all the necessary arrangements to respond fully to the request contained in General Assembly resolution 35/219 A of 17 December 1980 concerning the inclusion of Arabic among the official languages of the Economic and Social Council, no later than 1 January 1983;

(b) To that end, requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report for submission to the General Assembly at its thirty-

sixth session concerning all the practical implications of the request contained in Assembly resolution 35/219 A;

(c) Agreed to finalize the arrangements at its first regular session of 1982, in the light of the consideration by the General Assembly of the proposed report of the Secretary-General.

## Financial implications

of resolutions and decisions

Acting on an oral proposal by its President, the Economic and Social Council, on 2 November 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> took note of the Secretary-General's report on estimates of programme budget implications of resolutions and decisions adopted during its first and second regular sessions of 1981.<sup>(5)</sup> The estimates, totalling \$2,200,196 for 1981 and \$5,117,223 for 1982-1983, consisted largely of conference servicing costs at Geneva and New York, most of which were subsequently absorbed within the overall conference services appropriation.

The net addition to the 1980-1981 budget resulting from the Council's 1981 resolutions and decisions amounted to \$283,800. This amount was approved without objection on 1 December by the General Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee.<sup>(3)</sup> The Secretary-General had presented revised estimates of \$285,500 for this purpose<sup>(4)</sup> and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had recommended \$228,900.<sup>(2)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC, 1981/201, 2 Nov., text following.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ACABQ A/36/7/Add.10; <sup>(3)</sup>5th Committee, A/36/845; S-G, <sup>(4)</sup>A/C.5/36/33 & Corr.1 (revised estimates), <sup>(5)</sup>E/1981/118.

Meeting records: ESC, plenary, E/1981/SR.44 (2 Nov.); GA, 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.58 (1 Dec.).

## Economic and Social Council decision 1981/201

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President.

Summary of estimates of programme budget implications of resolutions and decisions adopted by the Council during

its first and second regular sessions of 1981

At its 44th plenary meeting, on 2 November 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Secretary-General containing the summary of estimates of programme budget implications of resolutions and decisions adopted by the Council during its first and second regular sessions of 1981.

## Report for 1981

The work of the Economic and Social Council at its organizational session and two regular sessions in 1981 was summarized in its annual report to the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> which adopted 30 resolutions and 6 decisions relating to its contents. By two of those decisions, adopted without vote on 18 December, the Assembly took note of chapters of the report allocated to plenary meetings<sup>(2)</sup> and to the Fifth Committee.<sup>(1)</sup> These actions were taken on oral proposals by the Assembly President and the Fifth Com-



mittee Chairman, respectively; the latter was approved by the Committee without vote on 17 December. The other resolutions and decisions concerned specific topics considered by the Second (Economic and Financial) Committee,<sup>(4)</sup> Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee,<sup>(5)</sup> Fourth Committee<sup>(6)</sup> and Fifth Committee.<sup>(7)</sup>

Decisions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>36/451, 18 Dec., text following; <sup>(2)</sup>36/452, 18 Dec., text following.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC: A/36/Rev.1. GA: <sup>(4)</sup>2nd Committee, A/36/691 & Add.1,2 & Add.2/Corr.1; <sup>(5)</sup>3rd Committee, A/36/792; <sup>(6)</sup>4th Committee. A/36/681; <sup>(7)</sup>5th Committee, A/36/843.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.4, 7-10, 16, 18, 20, 21, 25-28, 32, 35, 39, 41, 42, 45, 46 (25 Sep.-7 Dec.); 3rd Committee, A/C.3/36/SR.56-58, 60-70, 72, 73 (19 Nov.-4 Dec.); 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-21 (19 Oct.-9 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.66, 67, 70, 73, 76, 79, 80, 82 (8-17 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.70, 93, 101, 105 (24 Nov.-18 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/451

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/843) without vote. 17 December (meeting 82); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 12.

Report of the Economic and Social Council

At its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, took note of chapters II, III, VI, VIII to XI, XIII to XXIII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXXII and XXXIV to XXXVII of the report of the Economic and Social Council.

General Assembly decision 36/452

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 12.

Report of the Economic and Social Council

At its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1981, the General Assembly took note of chapters I, XXX and XXXVII of the report of the Economic and Social Council.

## Restructuring the economic and social sectors of the UN system

Role of the Director-General for

Development and

International Economic Co-operation

Arrangements put into effect during 1981 for streamlining the economic and social activities of the United Nations were discussed by the Secretary-General in a September report to the General Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup> He also reaffirmed the authority of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation over all relevant Secretariat entities in ensuring co-ordination and efficient management.

As part of the new arrangements, the first annual meeting of senior officials, held at Geneva on 15 April under the Secretary-General's chairmanship, discussed the United Nations budgetary situation, with particular

reference to the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983 as well as the future functioning of consultative arrangements.

The first meeting of the consultative arrangements on policy issues pertaining to economic and social activities and on planning, programming, budgeting and evaluation (Geneva, 2 July) considered issues affecting preparations for the launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development and implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.<sup>(3)</sup> The meeting also reviewed preparations and issues for the United Nations Conferences on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 689) and on the Least Developed Countries (p. 404), and discussed the implications for the United Nations of the results of the High Level Conference on Economic Co-operation among Developing Countries, convened by the Group of 77 in May (p. 383). It also considered programme planning (p. 1305).

The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), in a report transmitted to the Assembly by the Secretary-General on 1 September,<sup>(1)</sup> called for a greater clarification and specification of the authority of the Director-General and his relationships with relevant United Nations entities, particularly regarding the reporting procedure, consultative arrangements and clearance of documents. Among its 20 recommendations, JIU urged immediate publication of an official bulletin defining the Director-General's functions and authority, proposed periodic meetings between the Secretary-General and the Director-General, and suggested preparation by the latter of an annual work plan specifying priority activities for various entities. JIU also recommended that a post of Assistant Secretary-General be provided in the Director-General's Office.

In his comments on the JIU report, the Secretary-General acknowledged that experience over the previous three years confirmed the need for a clearer specification of authority and a selective articulation of methods and procedures to enable the Director-General to exercise his responsibilities and functions. Such arrangements, while recognizing the autonomy of various bodies established by the General Assembly and the responsibility of their heads to their intergovernmental bodies, must strengthen the Director-General's capacity to ensure efficient management and co-ordination of all United Nations economic and social activities and their responsiveness to policies set by the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

Acting without vote on 17 December, the General Assembly decided to transmit to the Economic and Social Council for its considera-

tion in 1982 the report of the Secretary-General and his comments on that of JIU, and to take up the question again at its 1982 session, in the light of the Council's deliberations. <sup>(4)</sup> The Second (Economic and Financial) Committee approved in like manner on 10 December the text submitted by a Vice-Chairman following informal consultations.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/419, and S-G comments, Add.1; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/477.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503); <sup>(4)</sup>36/187, 17 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 2nd Committee, A/C.2/36/SR.3-6, 10-26, 28-32, 47 (24 Sep.-10 Dec.); plenary. A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/187

Adopted without vote Meeting 103 17 December 1981

Approved by Second Committee (A/36/694/Add.8) without vote. 10 December (meeting 47); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.2/36/L.151); agenda item 69 (i).

#### Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system

The General Assembly,

Recalling Its resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New international Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Reaffirming its resolutions 32/197 of 20 December 1977 and 33/202 of 29 January 1979 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system, as well as Its resolutions 34/215 of 19 December 1979 and 35/203 of 16 December 1980 on the implementation of section VIII of the annex to resolution 32/197,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/203, the comments of the Secretary-General on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the relationships between the Director-General for Development and international Economic Co-operation and entities of the United Nations Secretariat, and the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of section IV of the annex to Assembly resolution 32/197,

1. Decides to transmit to the Economic and Social Council for consideration at Its second regular session of 1982, the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/203 and the comments of the Secretary-General on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit, and to return to the question of the relationships

between the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation and entities of the United Nations Secretariat at its thirty-seventh session, in the light of the deliberations of the Council, in order to continue to implement fully section VIII of the annex to Assembly resolution 32/197;

2. Also decides to return, at Its thirty-seventh session, to the question of the implications of the restructuring process for the regional commissions, within the overall context of its resolution 32/197, as well as in the light of further observations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination at its next session, to be held in 1982, and of the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982.

#### Structure of the Secretariat

The Secretary-General, in a report dated 29 September 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> informed the General Assembly that there were no new developments concerning the allocation of functions, posts and credits between the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development and the Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters. However, continued efforts were being made to review the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system, including the strengthening of co-operative arrangements among those new entities. A Committee of Governmental Experts was to evaluate the structure of the Secretariat in the administrative, finance and personnel areas (p. 1376).

The Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva reported that no changes as a result of the restructuring process were required for the time being in that Office.

Report: ("S-G, A/36/477.

#### Other aspects of restructuring

Other aspects of the restructuring of the United Nations system concerned: proposed restructuring of the Economic and Social Council (p. 1076); the role of resident co-ordinators in development assistance (p. 430); and the strengthening of regional commissions (p. 607).

# Trusteeship and decolonization

## Chapter I

### General questions relating to colonial countries

Two countries in the Caribbean area that had been Non-Self-Governing Territories—Antigua and Barbuda, and Belize—gained independence in 1981. About 20 Territories remained in some form of colonial status and continued to be the subject of United Nations consideration (p. 1179). Particular attention was devoted to Namibia (p. 1126) and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (p. 1118).

Aside from the consideration given to individual Territories, the General Assembly took action in November and December on general matters relating to colonial countries. In a continuing effort to secure implementation of its 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly called on administering Powers to take steps to enable dependent peoples to exercise fully their right to self-determination and independence.<sup>(9)</sup> Both the Economic and Social Council<sup>(2)</sup> (in July) and the Assembly<sup>(6)</sup> called for increased activities by organizations of the United Nations system to assist colonial peoples and their national liberation movements in implementing the Declaration. The Assembly also condemned the activities of foreign economic and other interests impeding implementation of the Declaration.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Assembly called for greater dissemination to the public of information about decolonization<sup>(10)</sup> and requested administering Powers to transmit or continue to transmit to the United Nations information on conditions in the Territories under their administration.<sup>(4)</sup> To promote international programmes for the education of persons in these Territories, it called for greater financial and other support to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa,<sup>(7)</sup> which was financing studies by 1,140 students outside their countries; it also invited States to offer fellowships and scholarships bilaterally.<sup>(8)</sup>

The Assembly's Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples held two sessions at United Nations Headquarters—21 January to

25 June and 4 to 21 August—and also held extra-session meetings on 10 and 11 November to consider the reports of visiting missions to American Samoa and Tokelau. The Committee's subsidiary bodies, the Sub-Committee on Petitions, Information and Assistance and the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, met between 9 March and 21 August, and between 10 March and 7 August, respectively.

The Committee acted on general questions relating to colonial countries as well as on individual Territories, and reported on its actions to the Assembly.<sup>(1)</sup> On general questions it dealt with most of the topics also considered by the Assembly. In addition, it condemned military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers which denied to the peoples concerned their right to self-determination (p. 1110), called on administering Powers to permit access to Territories by United Nations visiting missions (p. 1116) and urged the United States to adopt measures for the transfer of all powers to the people of Puerto Rico (p. 1113).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev. 1.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC: 1981/54, 22 July (p. 1101). GA: <sup>(3)</sup>1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49); <sup>(4)</sup>36/49 (p. 1115), <sup>(5)</sup>36/51 (p. 1108), <sup>(6)</sup>36/52 (p. 1102), <sup>(7)</sup>36/53 (p. 1118), <sup>(8)</sup>36/54 (p. 1116), 24 Nov. 1981; <sup>(9)</sup>36/68 (p. 1097), <sup>(10)</sup>36/69 (p. 1112), 1 Dec.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1184 (21 Jan.); A/AC.109/PV.1185, 1186 (27, 28 Apr.); A/AC.109/PV.1187 (25 June); A/AC.109/PV.1188-1202 (4-21 Aug.); A/AC.109/PV.1203, 1204 (10, 11 Nov.).

### Implementation of the Declaration on independence for colonial countries

#### General aspects

By a resolution of 1 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly called on administering Powers to enable dependent peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, and reaffirmed its recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples under colonial

and alien domination to exercise that right by all means at their disposal. Calling on States to give effect to the recommendations of the Committee on colonial countries, it requested the Committee to formulate proposals to eliminate colonialism, make suggestions to the Security Council with regard to likely threats to international peace and security in colonial Territories, continue to examine compliance by Member States with resolutions on decolonization, enlist world-wide support for implementation of such resolutions and recommend steps to enable the peoples of small Territories to attain self-determination and independence.

The Assembly also condemned the activities of foreign interests impeding decolonization (p. 1105), called for the withdrawal of military bases from colonial Territories (p. 1110), called for a halt to collaboration with South Africa (p. 183) and requested States to withhold assistance from that Government until Namibia exercised self-determination (p. 1145).

This resolution, sponsored by 28 nations and introduced by Sierra Leone, was adopted by a recorded vote of 130 to 3, with 10 abstentions.

An 11-nation amendment<sup>(1)</sup> with respect to the Committee's recommendation concerning Puerto Rico was introduced by the United States but not pressed to a vote, in view of a statement by the Assembly President on the intent of the resolution (p. 1113).

In addition to its resolution on implementation of the Declaration, the Assembly dealt with general decolonization issues in two resolutions concerned with peace and security, adopted on 9 December. In its Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States,<sup>(4)</sup> it included, as one of the elements of the non-intervention principle, the duty of a State to refrain from any forcible action which deprived peoples under colonial domination or foreign occupation of their right to self-determination, freedom and independence. By a separate resolution on the strengthening of international security,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples under colonial domination or foreign occupation, and urged Member States to increase their support for such peoples and for the final elimination of colonialism.

Austria, Finland (on behalf of the five Nordic States), Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal and the United States expressed reservations on the paragraph in the 1 December resolution concerning the legitimacy of the self-determination struggle by all means at the disposal of the peoples concerned; they stated that the United Nations should seek peaceful solutions and not promote violence. Lebanon said

it supported the provision on the understanding that the struggle would be confined to the areas occupied by alien or colonial Powers.

Brazil, Ireland and Samoa said their vote for the resolution should not be interpreted as endorsement of all the Committee's conclusions and recommendations. Reservations on the action proposed by the Committee in regard to Puerto Rico were voiced by Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Canada, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland (for the Nordic States), France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Somalia, Turkey and the United States.

The United States, which voted against the resolution, regretted that it contained no reference to the colonial policies of the USSR. The USSR responded that the formerly less developed peoples of that country had had the opportunity under Soviet rule of catching up with their more developed brothers.

Reservations on other points were expressed by the following: the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United States, on foreign interests impeding decolonization; Canada, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Samoa, Turkey and the United States, on military bases in colonial countries; Austria, France and the Netherlands, on collaboration with South Africa; the United States, on the Namibia question; Guatemala, on Belize (p. 1181); Indonesia, on East Timor (p. 1182); and Morocco, on Western Sahara (p. 1193).

In the debate preceding adoption of this resolution, most speakers expressed satisfaction at the significant advances towards decolonization during the past two decades but noted that this process had not taken place in Namibia and a number of small Territories. The Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and Viet Nam ascribed this situation to obstacles which colonial Powers placed in the way of independence, through the exercise of economic and military domination. Several of these speakers, together with Poland and the USSR, urged support for national liberation struggles; imperialist Powers were accused of attempting to discredit liberation movements and to plunder the wealth of dependent Territories. Viet Nam suggested that an independence timetable be prepared for the remaining Territories.

Many of these States and others, including Bulgaria and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, made the point that all Territories, regardless of size and population, geographic

location or limited resources, deserved United Nations attention in ensuring that their peoples were accorded the right to determine their future. The United Republic of Tanzania called on the administering Powers to co-operate with the Committee to ensure that appropriate recommendations were made in this regard. Zambia stressed the need to make the economies of such Territories viable so that they could support themselves after independence.

The Syrian Arab Republic remarked that more than 4 million persons in over 20 countries did not enjoy autonomy and independence, 4 million Palestinians were deprived of their right to self-determination, and more than 20 million Africans in southern Africa were subject to discrimination and occupation. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya cautioned against situations in which an imperialist Power, compelled to withdraw from a Territory, sought to undermine liberation movements and impose solutions which resulted in the creation of regimes that served the interests of imperialism. For Tunisia, a corollary of decolonization was the safeguarding of independence already acquired.

Australia objected that many draft resolutions presented to the Assembly's Fourth Committee on individual Territories were directed more at scoring points and attacking some countries than at seeking constructive solutions. The United Kingdom described the resolution before the Assembly as a creature of the past, containing little more than rhetorical abstractions and polemical clichés at a time when decolonization, outside southern Africa, concerned a number of small island Territories with a combined population of under 200,000.

Amendment not pressed: <sup>(1)</sup>Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom, United States, A/36/L.30 & Add.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/68, 1 Dec., text following; <sup>(3)</sup>36/102, para. 10, 9 Dec. (p. 145); <sup>(4)</sup>36/103, annex, para. 2 II (d), 9 Dec. (p. 148).

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/716; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/58.

Meeting records: GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/35/SR.9-20 (19 Oct.-4 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.53 (24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.72, 73, 79 (25 Nov.-1 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/68

130-3-10 (recorded vote) Meeting 79 1 December 1981  
28-nation draft (A/36/L.20 and Add.1); agenda item 19.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Barbados, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Ivory Coast, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

#### Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Decla-

ration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolutions 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, containing the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration, and 35/118 of 11 December 1980, the annex to which contains the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration,

Recalling all its previous resolutions concerning the implementation of the Declaration, in particular resolution 35/119 of 11 December 1980, as well as the relevant resolutions of the Security Council,

Recalling, in particular, its resolution ES-8/2 of 14 September 1981 concerning the question of Namibia and taking into account the relevant provisions of the Special Declaration on Namibia, adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981,

Condemning the continued colonialist and racist repression of millions of Africans, particularly in Namibia, by the Government of South Africa through its persistent, illegal occupation of the international Territory and its intransigent attitude towards all efforts being made to bring about an internationally acceptable solution to the situation obtaining in the Territory,

Deeply conscious of the urgent need to take all necessary measures to eliminate forthwith the remaining vestiges of colonialism, particularly in respect of Namibia where desperate attempts by South Africa to perpetuate its illegal occupation have brought untold suffering and bloodshed to the People,

Strongly condemning the policies of those States which, in defiance of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, have continued to collaborate with the Government of South Africa in its domination of the people of Namibia,

Conscious that the success of the national liberation struggle and the resultant international situation have provided the international community with a unique opportunity to make a decisive contribution towards the total elimination of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations in Africa,

Welcoming Warmly the achievement of independence by the peoples of Belize on 21 September 1981 and Antigua and Barbuda on 1 November 1981,

Noting with satisfaction the work accomplished by the Special Committee with a view to securing the effective and complete implementation of the Declaration and the other relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

Noting also with satisfaction the co-operation and active participation of the administering Powers concerned in the relevant work of the Special Committee, as well as the continued readiness of the Governments concerned to receive United Nations visiting missions in the Territories under their administration,

Reiterating its conviction that the total eradication of racial discrimination, apartheid and violations of the basic human rights of the peoples of colonial Territories will be achieved most expeditiously by the faithful and complete implementation of the Declaration, particularly in Namibia, and by the speediest possible complete elimination of the presence of the illegal occupying régimes thereof,

1. Reaffirms its resolutions 1514(XV), 2621(XXV), 35/118 and 35/119 and all other resolutions on decolonization and calls upon the administering Powers, in accordance with those resolutions, to take all necessary steps to enable the dependent peoples of the Territories concerned to exercise fully and without further delay their inalienable right to self-determination and independence;

2. Affirms once again that the continuation of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations-including racism, apartheid, the exploitation by foreign and other interests of economic and human resources, and the waging of colonial wars to suppress national liberation movements-is incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and poses a serious threat to international peace and security;

3. Reaffirms its determination to take all necessary steps with a view to the complete and speedy eradication of colonialism and to the faithful and strict observance by all States of the relevant provisions of the Charter, the Declaration on the Granting of independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the guiding principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

4. Affirms once again its recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of the peoples under colonial and alien domination to exercise their right to self-determination and independence by all the necessary means at their disposal;

5. Approves the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples covering its work during 1981, including the programme of work envisaged for 1982;

6. Calls upon all States, in particular the administering Powers, and the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to give effect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee for the speedy implementation of the Declaration and the other relevant resolutions of the United Nations;

7. Condemns the continuing activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration with respect to the colonial Territories, particularly Namibia;

8. Strongly condemns all collaboration, particularly in the nuclear and military fields, with the Government of South Africa and calls upon the States concerned to cease forthwith all such collaboration;

9. Requests all States, directly and through their action in the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, to withhold assistance of any kind from the Government of South Africa until the Inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence within a united and integrated Namibia, including Walvis Bay, has been restored, and to refrain from taking any action which might imply recognition of the legitimacy of the illegal occupation of Namibia by that régime;

10. Calls upon the colonial Powers to withdraw immediately and unconditionally their military bases and installations from colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones;

11. Urges all States, directly and through their action in the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, to provide all moral and material assistance to the oppressed people of Namibia and, in respect of the other Territories, requests the administering Powers, in consultation with the Governments of the Territories under their administration, to take steps to enlist and make effective use of all possible assistance, on both a bilateral and a multilateral basis, in the strengthening of the economies of those Territories;

12. Requests the Special Committee to continue to seek suitable means for the immediate and full Implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) in all Territories that have not yet attained Independence and, in particular:

(a) To formulate specific proposals for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

(b) To make concrete suggestions which could assist the Security Council in considering appropriate measures under the Charter with regard to developments in colonial Territories that are likely to threaten International peace and security;

(c) To continue to examine the compliance of Member States with the Declaration and with other relevant resolutions on decolonization, particularly those relating to Namibia;

(d) To continue to pay particular attention to the small Ter-

ritories, including the sending of visiting missions thereto, as appropriate, and to recommend to the General Assembly the most suitable steps to be taken to enable the populations of those Territories to exercise their right to self-determination, freedom and independence;

(e) To take all necessary steps to enlist world-wide support among Governments, as well as national and international organizations having a special interest in decolonization, in the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration and in the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, particularly as concerns the oppressed people of Namibia;

13. Calls upon the administering Powers to continue to co-operate with the Special Committee in the discharge of its mandate and, in particular, to permit the access of visiting missions to the Territories to secure first-hand information and ascertain the wishes and aspirations of their inhabitants;

14. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Special Committee with the facilities and services required for the implementation of the present resolution, as well as of the various resolutions and decisions on decolonization adopted by the General Assembly and the Special Committee.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaïre, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Guatemala, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia.

### Implementation by international organizations of the Declaration on colonial countries

A number of organizations in the United Nations system continued in 1981 to provide assistance to peoples of colonial countries and their national liberation movements, particularly in southern Africa. These activities were in response to a series of resolutions, the most recent in November 1981, by which the General Assembly called on international institutions to help implement the Declaration on colonial countries.

Most of these activities involved assistance to Namibians (p. 1178). In addition, several organizations completed training projects for Zimbabweans which had been in operation since before the independence of their country in April 1980.

Among other assistance rendered or planned in 1981 was the following: the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) had in operation five education and training projects benefit-

ing several liberation movements, and organized an inter-agency meeting (Dar-es-Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania, 8-11 December) at which priority needs for development assistance to such movements during the 1982-1986 programming cycle were identified; the International Labour Organisation (ILO) sent a mission to consult with the Organization of African Unity (OAU), national liberation movements and the front-line States of southern Africa on a possible expansion of ILO technical co-operation in the area; the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization trained members of liberation movements and supplied educational material; the World Food Programme made new commitments in 1981 for seven projects totalling \$12.9 million for emergency and project assistance to liberation-movement refugees and displaced persons in Angola, Zaire and Zambia; and the World Health Organization continued to provide health care for such refugees in the front-line States.

Outside Africa, the Universal Postal Union assisted several Caribbean Territories to improve their postal services.

Assistance activities in 1980/1981 were described in a report by the Secretary-General of 31 March 1981<sup>(3)</sup> (with later addenda), summarizing replies by 19 United Nations organizations to his request for information on action taken by them to implement the Declaration and other Assembly resolutions on decolonization. The report was made in response to an Assembly resolution of November 1980.<sup>(8)</sup> It included information on assistance to refugees and other persons from colonial Territories, rendered in consultation with OAU and with the active collaboration of liberation movements. Organizations also reported on steps they had taken to discontinue assistance to South Africa and to enable liberation movements to send observers to international meetings.

The President of the Economic and Social Council and the Chairman of the Committee on colonial countries reported to their respective bodies in June on their consultations with regard to the co-ordination of assistance by the United Nations system to colonial countries.<sup>(2)</sup> Continuation of these consultations, held annually in recent years, had been requested in 1980 by the Council<sup>(6)</sup> and the Assembly.<sup>(9)</sup>

Most of the report concerned assistance to Namibians (p. 1178). The two presiding officers also noted plans for increased UNDP assistance to Zimbabwe and pledges of aid to that country totalling \$1.8 billion made by 31 Governments and 26 international agencies during the Zimbabwe Conference on Reconstruction and Development, held at Salisbury in March.

On 24 June, the UNDP Governing Council requested the UNDP Administrator to continue to assist national liberation movements recognized by OAU and to study the possibility of using the Programme's funds earmarked for such movements to enable their representatives to participate in UNDP meetings, including sessions of the Council.<sup>(13)</sup>

On 9 October, the Trade and Development Board of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) requested the Secretary-General of UNCTAD to assist OAU-recognized liberation movements in southern Africa on trade and development issues (p. 209).<sup>(12)</sup>

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION. On 22 July,<sup>(7)</sup> the Economic and Social Council endorsed the observations and suggestions in its President's report. Urging United Nations organizations to accelerate the implementation of decolonization resolutions, the Council recommended that they place the topic on the agenda of their governing bodies and urged their executive heads to submit concrete proposals. It requested continued consultations between its President and the Chairman of the Committee on colonial countries, as well as a follow-up report by the Secretary-General in 1982.

The Council also requested increased assistance for Namibians (p. 1175), membership of the United Nations Council for Namibia in United Nations organizations (p. 1160) and support for the national liberation movement of South Africa (p. 208), as well as aid for refugees in Africa (p. 1040).

This resolution was adopted by 44 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions, following its approval in the Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee on 10 July by 29 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

Introducing the 25-nation resolution, Nigeria observed that it was almost identical to the text which the Council had adopted in 1980.<sup>(5)</sup>

Explaining its vote against the resolution, the United States said it would continue to oppose direct assistance to national liberation movements; the United Nations should not engage in assistance or other activities which attempted to predetermine the self-determination process.

Among those which abstained, Belgium said it could not associate itself with some provisions. Canada favoured multilateral technical assistance to national liberation movements in response to legitimate humanitarian needs but could not agree to financing a number of the activities of those movements from the United Nations budget. The Federal Republic of Germany felt that calls for additional financial outlays were hardly consistent with the budget

containment policy advocated by several major contributors. France said that, though it contributed to United Nations assistance programmes for apartheid victims, it had abstained because the text went beyond the Council's 1980 resolution. Italy concurred with the general aim of the resolution but considered that some paragraphs went beyond its humanitarian scope. The United Kingdom objected to provisions on Namibia, derogatory language used with regard to South Africa and the suggestion that that regime should be isolated.

In the discussion, Algeria called for a substantial increase in the assistance given by United Nations organizations to peoples struggling for liberation. Pakistan thought such aid should be brought into the framework of the main operational activities of the United Nations. In the view of the USSR, the active participation of United Nations agencies would be an important factor in the final phase of colonial oppression; none of them should remain indifferent. Other States which called for effective support by the United Nations system or otherwise endorsed such activities included Barbados, the Byelorussian SSR, China, Denmark (for the Nordic States), Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria and Zaire.

Several States made the point that, while some organizations had given valuable assistance, others had failed to heed Assembly resolutions asking for such aid. In particular, concern was voiced by the Byelorussian SSR, Nigeria and Viet Nam about the position towards South Africa taken by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (p. 165).

**ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES.** On 17 August, the Committee on colonial countries adopted a resolution<sup>(1)</sup> by which it recommended that United Nations organizations continue to render moral and material assistance to colonial peoples struggling for liberation, and to newly independent and emerging States. It recommended that those organizations initiate or broaden contacts with colonial peoples and their liberation movements, and make their procedures more flexible in order to speed assistance. The Committee called on organizations that had not done so to allow representatives of national liberation movements recognized by OAU to participate fully as observers in proceedings concerning their countries.

The Committee also urged increased aid for Namibians (p. 1178) and to the front-line States neighbouring South Africa and Namibia (p. 214), called for an end to collaboration between IMF and South Africa (p. 166), and requested that all support to South Africa from the United Nations system be discontinued until

Namibia exercised its right to self-determination (p. 1128).

Many of the provisions in the resolution incorporated recommendations contained in a report<sup>(4)</sup> submitted in July by the Committee's Sub-Committee on Petitions, Information and Assistance. The Sub-Committee consulted with representatives of several United Nations organizations, which provided information on their activities regarding colonial countries. The report, whose conclusions and recommendations were annexed to the Committee's report to the Assembly, also contained specific recommendations in regard to the relationship between IMF and South Africa.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 24 November, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(11)</sup> virtually identical in its operative paragraphs to the one adopted in August by the Committee on colonial countries. The Assembly added provisions by which it: requested the Secretary-General to continue to assist United Nations organizations in working out measures to implement United Nations resolutions; requested the Economic and Social Council to continue to consider, in consultation with the Committee, the co-ordination of activities in this sphere; and asked for reports from the Committee and the Secretary-General in 1982.

The Assembly adopted this resolution by a recorded vote of 124 to 6, with 23 abstentions, following a recommendation of the Fourth Committee, which had approved the 32-nation text on 9 November by a recorded vote of 115 to 6, with 22 abstentions.

The Assembly adopted by separate votes two paragraphs of this resolution concerning IMF and World Bank relations with South Africa (p. 167). Objections or reservations to these provisions were voiced by the United Kingdom, speaking for the member States of the European Community (EC), as well as by Canada, New Zealand, Portugal and Uruguay, which voted against them, and by Bolivia, Fiji, Lesotho, Mexico, Saint Lucia, Spain, Sri Lanka and Swaziland, which abstained on one or both paragraphs.

In a resolution on self-determination and human rights adopted on 28 October,<sup>(10)</sup> the Assembly called for maximizing material and other assistance by Governments and intergovernmental organizations to peoples under colonial and foreign rule, and urged States and United Nations organizations to do their utmost to ensure full implementation of the Declaration on colonial countries.

The resolution on implementation of the Declaration by United Nations organizations was introduced by Bulgaria, which stated that



the needs of colonial peoples, especially those of Namibia, greatly exceeded the assistance that had been rendered by United Nations organizations.

The United States, which voted against the resolution, said it opposed aid by the specialized agencies to national liberation movements and it objected to the politicization of those agencies.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC member States, said they could not support the resolution because of its references to IMF and the World Bank and its attempts to politicize the work of United Nations organizations; the EC members reaffirmed their support for the principle of universality and their respect for the independence of those organizations. Denmark, speaking for the Nordic States, said that, while they recognized the specialized agencies' role in this area, they had had to abstain because of new elements added to the resolution in 1981; they believed the agencies should remain universal.

Among others which abstained, Austria said some provisions interfered with the independence of the specialized agencies, while Portugal remarked that some of the language would not serve the interests of aid recipients. Argentina, Denmark (for the Nordic States), Spain and Turkey expressed reservations on references to particular States or regions (p. 1145).

Brazil voted for the resolution but felt that the paragraph on membership for the Council for Namibia should not set a precedent.

In the Fourth Committee's debate on decolonization, a number of States called for increased assistance by United Nations organizations to colonial peoples. These included Cyprus, Egypt, Greece, Jordan, Mali, Uganda and Zaire. The Byelorussian SSR believed that such organizations should develop more effective co-operation with liberation movements and gear their aid programmes more closely to their needs. The Ukrainian SSR said some organizations had not taken the necessary measures to provide the assistance called for by the Assembly.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1; <sup>(2)</sup>ESC President, E/1981/89 (identical report by Committee on colonial countries Chairman in A/36/23/Rev.1); <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/154 & Add.1-3; <sup>(4)</sup>Sub-Committee on Petitions, Information and Assistance, A/AC.109/L.1400 & Corr.1.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(5)</sup>1980/50, 23 July 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1066); <sup>(6)</sup>ibid., para. 13 (p. 1068); (7)1981/54, 22 July 1981, text following. GA: <sup>(8)</sup>35/29, 11 Nov. 1980, para. 17 (YUN 1980, p. 1070); <sup>(9)</sup>ibid., para. 18; <sup>(10)</sup>36/9, paras. 23 & 24, 28 Oct. 1981 (p.896); <sup>(11)</sup>36/52, 24 Nov., text following. <sup>(12)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15 & Corr.1): 238(XXIII), 9 Oct.

Decision: <sup>(13)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/12, 24 June.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1191-1194, 1196 (11-17 Aug.). ESC: 3rd

Committee, E/1981-C.3/SR.4, 5, 7, 8 (6-10 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.39 (22 July). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-21 (19 Oct.-9 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.70 (24 Nov.).

Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/54

4 4 - 1 - 6 M e e t i n g 3 9 2 2 J u l y 1 9 8 1

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/97) by vote (29-1-6), 10 July (meeting 8); 25-nation draft (E/1981/C.3/L.3); agenda items 20 and 21.

Sponsors: Algeria, Bahamas, Barbados, Burundi, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations

The Economic and Social Council,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General and the reports of the President of the Economic and Social Council concerning the items entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations" and "Assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement by agencies and institutions within the United Nations system",

Having heard the statement of the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and all other resolutions adopted by United Nations bodies on this subject, including in particular General Assembly resolution 35/29 of 11 November 1980 and Council resolution 1980/50 of 23 July 1980.

Reaffirming the responsibility of the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to take all effective measures, within their respective spheres of competence, to ensure the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant resolutions of United Nations bodies,

Deeply conscious of the continuing critical need of the people of Namibia and their national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization, for concrete assistance from the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations in their struggle for liberation from the illegal occupation of their country by the racist minority regime in South Africa,

Noting the positive results of the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa, held at Geneva on 9 and 10 April 1981,

Deeply concerned that, while progress has been maintained through the continuing efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in the extension of assistance to refugees from southern Africa, the action taken so far by the organizations and agencies concerned in the provision of assistance generally to the people of Namibia is still far from adequate to meet their urgent and growing needs,

Noting with satisfaction the continuing efforts of the United Nations Development Programme in the extension of assistance to the national liberation movements concerned and commending the initiative taken by that organization in establishing channels for closer, periodic contacts and consultations between the specialized agencies and United Nations institutions and the Organization of African Unity and the national liberation movements in the formulation of assistance programmes,

Noting also the support given by the organizations within the United Nations system to the implementation of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 32/9 A of 4 November 1977,

Noting further with satisfaction the high-level meetings held at Geneva from 13 to 16 April 1981 between representatives of the General Secretariat of the Organization of African Unity and the secretariats of the United Nations and organizations within the United Nations system, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/117 of 10 December 1980, on the question of co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity,

Mindful of the relevant conclusions and recommendations adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981,

1. Takes note of the reports of the President of the Economic and Social Council and endorses the Observations and suggestions contained therein;

2. Reaffirms that the recognition by the General Assembly, the Security Council and other United Nations organs of the legitimacy of the struggle of colonial peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and independence entails, as a corollary, the extension by the United Nations system of organizations of all the necessary moral and material assistance to the peoples of the colonial territories and their national liberation movements;

3. Expresses its appreciation to those specialized agencies and organizations within the United Nations system which have continued to co-operate in varying degrees with the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant resolutions of United Nations bodies, and urges all the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to accelerate the full and speedy implementation of the relevant provisions of those resolutions;

4. Requests the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, in the light of the intensification of the liberation struggle in Namibia, to do everything possible as a matter of urgency to render, in consultation with the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations Council for Namibia, increased assistance to the people of Namibia, in particular in connection with the Nationhood Programme for Namibia;

5. Requests the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, to continue to take all necessary measures to withhold any financial, economic, technical or other assistance to the Government of South Africa until that Government restores to the people of Namibia their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, and to refrain from taking any action which might imply recognition of, or support for, the illegal occupation of Namibia by that régime;

6. Requests also the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the apartheid policy of the Government of South Africa, to intensify their support for the oppressed people of South Africa and to take such measures as will isolate the apartheid régime and mobilize world public opinion against apartheid;

7. Urges the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system which have so far not granted full membership to the United Nations Council for Namibia to do so without delay;

8. Expresses its appreciation to the Governments and the organizations concerned for their pledges of contributions made at the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa and urges all Governments and the organizations within the United Nations system to contribute generously to the funds earmarked for assistance to refugees in Africa, in particular those persons displaced as a result of the

oppressive rule which the minority racist régime of South Africa imposes in both Namibia and South Africa;

9. Notes with satisfaction the arrangements made by several specialized agencies and United Nations Institutions which enable representatives of the national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity to participate fully as observers in the proceedings relating to matters concerning their respective countries, and calls upon those international institutions which have not yet done so to follow this example and make the necessary arrangements without delay, including arrangements to defray the cost of the participation of those representatives;

10. Recommends that all Governments should intensify their efforts in the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system of which they are members to ensure the full and effective implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant resolutions of United Nations bodies;

11. Urges those specialized agencies and organizations within the United Nations system which have not already done so to include in the agenda of the regular meetings of their governing bodies a separate item on the progress made by those organizations in their implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant resolutions of United Nations bodies;

12. Further urges the executive heads of the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to formulate, with the active co-operation of the Organization of African Unity, and to submit, as a matter of priority, to their governing and legislative organs concrete proposals for the full implementation of the relevant United Nations decisions;

13. Draws the attention of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to the present resolution and to the discussions on the subject at the second regular session of 1981 of the Council;

14. Requests the President of the Economic and Social Council to continue consultations on these matters with the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid and to report thereon to the Council;

15. Requests the Secretary-General to follow the implementation of the present resolution and to report thereon to the Council at its second regular session of 1982;

16. Decides to keep these questions under continuous review.

General Assembly resolution 36/52

124-6-23 (recorded vote) Meeting 70 24 November 1981

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/681) by recorded vote (115-6-22), 9 November (meeting 21); 32-nation draft (A/C.4/36/L.9); agenda items 95 and 12.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian, SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iran, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe,

implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the International institutions associated with the United Nations

The General Assembly,

Having considered the item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial

Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the International institutions associated with the United Nations",

Recalling the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, and the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration, contained in the annex to its resolution 35/118 of 11 December 1980, as well as all other relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on this subject, in particular resolution 35/29 of 11 November 1980,

Recalling also its resolution ES-8/2 of 14 September 1981 on the question of Namibia,

Taking into account the relevant decisions adopted by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981, by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-sixth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 23 February to 1 March 1981, by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the Question of Namibia, held at Algiers from 16 to 18 April 1981, by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Panama City on 5 June 1981 and by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981,

Having examined the reports submitted on the item by the Secretary-General, the Economic and Social Council and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Aware that the struggle of the people of Namibia for self-determination and independence is in its most crucial stage and that after the failure of the pre-Implementation talks, held at Geneva from 7 to 14 January 1981, it has sharply intensified as a consequence of the defiant attitude and stepped-up aggression of the illegal colonialist régime of Pretoria against the Namibian people and the increased all-round support rendered to that régime by the United States of America and other Western States, and that it is therefore incumbent upon the entire international community decisively to intensify concerted action in support of the people of Namibia and their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization, for the attainment of their goal,

Deeply conscious of the critical need of the Namibian people and their national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization, and of the peoples of other colonial Territories for concrete assistance from the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system in their struggle for liberation from colonial rule and in their efforts to achieve and consolidate their national independence,

Reaffirming the responsibility of the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to take all necessary measures, within their respective spheres of competence, to ensure the full and speedy Implementation of the Declaration and other relevant resolutions of the United Nations, particularly those relating to the provision of moral and material assistance, on a priority basis, to the peoples of the colonial Territories and their national liberation movements,

Deeply concerned that, although there has been progress in the extension of assistance to refugees from Namibia, the actions taken hitherto by the organizations concerned in providing assistance to the people of the Territory through their national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization, still remain inadequate to meet the urgent needs of the Namibian people,

Expressing its confident hope that closer contacts and consultations between the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system and the Organization of African Unity and the national liberation movement concerned will help to overcome procedural and other difficulties which have impeded or delayed the implementation of some assistance programmes,

Recalling its resolution 35/227 D of 6 March 1981, in which it requested all specialized agencies and other organizations and conferences of the United Nations system to grant full membership to the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia,

Expressing its appreciation to the General Secretariat of the Organization of African Unity for the continued co-operation and assistance extended by it to the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system in connection with the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations,

Expressing its appreciation also to the Governments of the front-line States for the steadfast support extended to the people of Namibia and their national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization, in their just and legitimate struggle for the attainment of freedom and independence despite increased armed attacks by the forces of the racist régime of South Africa, and aware of the particular needs of those Governments for assistance in that connection,

Noting with satisfaction the intensified efforts of the United Nations Development Programme in the extension of assistance to the national liberation movements and commending its initiative in establishing channels for closer periodic contacts and consultations between the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system and the Organization of African Unity and the national liberation movements in the formulation of assistance programmes,

Noting also the support given by the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to the implementation of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 32/9 A of 4 November 1977,

Gravely concerned at the continued collaboration between the International Monetary Fund and the Government of South Africa in disregard of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly,

Noting with satisfaction the high-level meetings held at Geneva in April 1981 between representatives of the General Secretariat of the Organization of African Unity and the secretariats of the United Nations and other organizations of the United Nations system, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/117 of 10 December 1980, on the question of co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity,

Mindful of the necessity of keeping under continuous review the activities of the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system in the implementation of the various United Nations decisions relating to decolonization,

1. Approves the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to the question:

2. Reaffirms that the specialized agencies and other organizations and institutions of the United Nations system should continue to be guided by the relevant resolutions of the United Nations in their efforts to contribute, within their spheres of competence, to the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

3. Reaffirms also that recognition by the General Assembly, the Security Council and other United Nations organs of the legitimacy of the struggle of colonial peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and independence entails, as a corollary, the extension by the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system of all the necessary moral and material assistance to those peoples and their national liberation movements;

4. Expresses its appreciation to those specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system which have continued to co-operate in varying degrees with the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in the implementation of the Declaration and other relevant

resolutions of the United Nations, and urges all the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to accelerate the full and speedy implementation of the relevant provisions of those resolutions;

5. Expresses its concern that the assistance extended thus far by certain specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to the colonial peoples, particularly the people of Namibia and their national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization, is far from adequate in relation to the actual needs of the peoples concerned;

6. Regrets that the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund continue to maintain links with the colonialist racist minority régime of South Africa, as exemplified by the continued membership of South Africa in both agencies, and that neither has taken the necessary measures towards the full implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

7. Deeply deplores the persistent collaboration between the International Monetary Fund and South Africa, in disregard of repeated resolutions to the contrary by the General Assembly, and calls upon the International Monetary Fund to put an end to such collaboration;

8. Urges the executive heads of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to draw the particular attention of their governing bodies to the present resolution with a view to formulating specific programmes beneficial to the peoples of the colonial Territories, particularly Namibia;

9. Requests the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to render or continue to render, as a matter of urgency, all possible moral and material assistance to the colonial peoples struggling for liberation from colonial rule;

10. Requests once again the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to continue to provide all moral and material assistance to the newly independent and emerging States;

11. Reiterates its recommendation that the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system should initiate or broaden contacts and co-operation with the colonial peoples and their national liberation movements, directly or, where appropriate, through the Organization of African Unity, and review and introduce greater flexibility in their procedures with respect to the formulation and preparation of assistance programmes and projects so as to be able to extend the necessary assistance without delay to help the colonial peoples and their national liberation movements in their struggle to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

12. Notes with satisfaction that the South West Africa People's Organization continues to be the recipient of a number of programmes established within the framework of the United Nations Institute for Namibia at Lusaka and that the United Nations Council for Namibia, in co-operation with the South West Africa People's Organization, continues to represent the people of Namibia at meetings of the specialized agencies and other organizations and institutions of the United Nations system, and urges those agencies and organizations to increase their assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization, the United Nations Institute for Namibia and the Nathonhood Programme for Namibia;

13. Urges the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system which have not already done so to include in the agenda of the regular meetings of their governing bodies a separate item on the progress they have made in the implementation of the Declaration and other relevant resolutions of the United Nations;

14. Urges the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, to take all necessary measures to withhold any financial, economic, technical or other assistance from the Government of South Africa, to discontinue all support to that

Government until it restores to the people of Namibia their inalienable right to self-determination and Independence and to refrain from taking any action which might imply recognition of, or support for, the legitimacy of the domination of the Territory by that régime;

15. Notes with satisfaction the arrangements made by several specialized agencies and organizations of the United Nations system which enable representatives of the national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity to participate fully as observers in the proceedings relating to matters concerning their respective countries, and calls upon those agencies and organizations which have not yet done so to follow this example and to make the necessary arrangements without delay;

16. Urges the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system which have so far not granted full membership to the United Nations Council for Namibia to do so without delay;

17. Urges the specialized agencies and other organizations and institutions of the United Nations system to extend, as a matter of priority, substantial material assistance to the Governments of the front-line States in order to enable them more effectively to support the struggle of the people of Namibia for freedom and independence and to resist the violation of their territorial integrity by the armed forces of the racist régime of South Africa, directly or, as in Angola, through puppet traitor groups in the service of Pretoria;

16. Urges the specialized agencies and other organizations and institutions of the United Nations system to assist in accelerating progress in all sectors of the national life, particularly in the development of the economies of the small Territories;

19. Recommends that all Governments should intensify their efforts in the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system of which they are members to ensure the full and effective implementation of the Declaration and other relevant resolutions of the United Nations and, in that connection, should accord priority to the question of providing assistance on an emergency basis to the peoples in the colonial Territories and their national liberation movements;

20. Proposes, under article III of the Agreement between the United Nations and the International Monetary Fund, the urgent inclusion in the agenda of the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund of an item dealing with the relationship between the Fund and South Africa and further proposes that, in pursuance of article II of the Agreement, the relevant organs of the United Nations should participate in any meeting of the Board of Governors called by the Fund for the purpose of discussing the item;

21. Draws the attention of the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in the annex to General Assembly resolution 35/118, in particular to those provisions calling upon the agencies and organizations to render all possible moral and material assistance to the peoples of the colonial Territories and their national liberation movements;

22. Urges the executive heads of the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, having regard to the recommendations contained in paragraph 11 above and the provisions of paragraph 21 above, to formulate, with the active co-operation of the Organization of African Unity where appropriate, and to submit, as a matter of priority, to their governing and legislative organs concrete proposals for the full implementation of the relevant United Nations decisions, in particular specific programmes of assistance to the peoples of the colonial Territories and their national liberation movements;

23. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to assist the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system in working out appropriate measures for implementing the relevant resolutions of the United

Nations and to prepare for submission to the relevant bodies, with the assistance of those agencies and organizations, a report on the action taken since the circulation of his previous report in implementation of the relevant resolutions, including the present resolution;

24. Requests the Economic and Social Council to continue to consider, in consultation with the Special Committee, appropriate measures for co-ordination of the policies and activities of the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system in implementing the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

25. Requests the Special Committee to continue to consider this question and to report thereon to the General Assembly at Its thirty-seventh session.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sea Tome end Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Luxembourg, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica,<sup>a</sup> Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat It had intended to vote In favour.

### Foreign interests impeding implementation of the Declaration on colonial countries

The Committee on colonial countries and the General Assembly adopted resolutions in 1981 seeking a halt to the activities of foreign economic and other interests impeding decolonization.

**ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES.** By a resolution adopted on 14 August<sup>(1)</sup> by 20 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, the Committee on colonial countries reaffirmed the right of the peoples of dependent Territories to dispose of their natural resources in their best interests, and reiterated that any administering or occupying Power which subordinated those peoples' interests to foreign economic and financial interests violated its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. Reaffirming that the activities of foreign interests exploiting the Territories' resources were a major obstacle to independence, it condemned such activities and the policies of Governments supporting or collaborating with them. It called on Governments to put an end to enterprises owned by their na-

tionals that were detrimental to the interests of the Territories' inhabitants, and to prevent new investments counter to those interests. It invited Governments and United Nations organizations to ensure that the permanent sovereignty of colonial Territories over their natural resources was safeguarded, called for the abolition of discriminatory and unjust wage systems, and requested a United Nations information campaign on the pillaging of natural resources and exploitation of the population of those Territories.

Other provisions in the resolution were directed against nuclear and military collaboration with South Africa (p. 181), economic and trade agreements with that regime (p. 185) and the supply of petroleum (p. 175). The Committee also condemned South Africa for plundering Namibia's resources, and urged respect for the permanent sovereignty of the colonial Territories over their natural resources (p. 677).

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 24 November, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on foreign interests in colonial countries<sup>(2)</sup> which included the provisions in the Committee's resolution (with some wording changes) and added several paragraphs. By these additional clauses, the Assembly requested the Committee to monitor the situation in Non-Self-Governing Territories (NSGTs) so as to ensure that economic activities there were aimed at strengthening and diversifying their economies in the interests of the indigenous peoples, and requested the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations to prepare a register of the profits derived by transnational corporations from their activities in colonial Territories.

The Assembly also called on States to terminate all collaboration with South Africa (p. 167), and called on France and others to refrain from supplying that country with installations for producing nuclear materials and military equipment (p. 182). It called for an end to military activities and bases in Namibia and other Territories (p. 1110).

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 110 to 16, with 23 abstentions, following its approval in the Fourth Committee on 16 November by a recorded vote of 93 to 16, with 28 abstentions. The Assembly adopted by separate votes paragraph 9, condemning collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear field, and paragraph 10, calling for the termination of all collaboration with that country; both paragraphs mentioned individual Western States by name.

In a resolution of 1 December concerning implementation of the Declaration on colonial countries, the Assembly condemned the continuing activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding implementation of

the Declaration with respect to colonial Territories, particularly Namibia.<sup>(3)</sup>

Introducing the 24 November resolution on behalf of its 30 sponsors, Angola said it was regrettable that certain Western countries, Israel and transnational corporations had intensified their activities in colonial Territories, thereby thwarting the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of those Territories.

Among those voting against the resolution, Australia said it risked having negative consequences for small NSGTs. Belgium, Finland, New Zealand and the United States challenged the idea that all foreign economic and other activities in such Territories were automatically detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants; the United States added that preparation of a register of transnational corporation profits from colonial Territories would be an inappropriate and time-consuming use of resources. France could not accept an automatic condemnation of foreign interests, stating that the real problem lay in the disarray of markets and the unbalanced relations between developing and industrialized countries. The Federal Republic of Germany said that to condemn all such interests as impeding decolonization was tantamount to saying that the Territories did not or should not benefit from facilities and economic capacities built up with the aid of foreign capital. Ireland agreed that not all foreign economic interests should be condemned out of hand. Israel regarded the text as unacceptable because of its broad generalizations.

The Netherlands, while agreeing that operations of transnational corporations harmful to decolonization should be exposed, said that, in general, investments and technology transfer benefited the inhabitants of dependent Territories. Portugal thought foreign investments could promote social and economic development, provided that they were properly controlled and used.

Canada stated that the call for Governments to put an end to certain activities by their nationals in colonial Territories contradicted the principle, to which Canada was firmly attached, that home Governments of transnational corporations must not exercise their national laws in an extraterritorial manner.

The United Kingdom, explaining why the EC member States could not support the resolution, said it confused the situations in small Territories, Namibia and South Africa, and took little account of the real needs of the people of dependent Territories for investment and economic development.

Among the States which abstained in the vote, Chile said the generalization that all foreign economic interests impeded decolonization conflicted with Assembly resolutions by which colo-

nial Powers had been urged to ensure the economic viability of the Territories they administered. Liberia, Norway and Sweden supported the general objective of the resolution but did not consider all foreign economic and other activities in colonial Territories as necessarily detrimental. Fiji, which voted in favour, said such activities were not an obstacle to self-determination unless the people concerned decided that they were.

Objections or reservations to the paragraphs citing specific States for collaboration with South Africa were voiced by Argentina, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, the Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, the Federal Republic of Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, the United Kingdom (for the EC members), the United Republic of Cameroon, the United States and Uruguay.

Provisions on military activities in colonial Territories were objected to by the United Kingdom, on behalf of the EC members.

During the general debate on the item in the Fourth Committee, most speakers, in particular Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, the Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Haiti, Hungary, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia, condemned the activities of foreign economic and other interests which continued to follow selfish financial and economic policies in colonial Territories, particularly in Namibia.

Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR stated that foreign economic interests continued to dominate the economies of small island Territories and exploit their human and natural resources, thereby impeding the development of independent national economies and making it difficult for them to prepare themselves for independence. These States and others, including Hungary and Mongolia, held both transnational corporations and the States which supported them responsible for such activities.

The Congo rejected arguments that foreign economic interests did not necessarily impede decolonization; if felt that, to eliminate every vestige of colonialism, resolute action was needed against all foreign interests which gave significant material support to administering Powers.

Attempts to justify the activities of foreign interests as beneficial to the Territories, said Czechoslovakia, were a ploy to divert attention from their plunder of resources for profit and their exploitation of cheap labour. The Lao People's Democratic Republic stated that foreign interests had in all cases impeded decolonization and created only temporary employment and dependent economies. In the view of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, NSGTs had experienced serious economic recession because the administering Powers had neglected their economic and social development; those Powers must be made to repay their debt after the Territories achieved their independence. Madagascar considered that any attempt to retain a neo-colonialist structure under the guise of maintaining prosperity would only perpetuate injustice and exploitation.

Poland stated that economic motives had led to the rise of colonialism, and its vestiges also rested on economic interests. With rare exceptions, said Uganda, the activities of foreign interests had led to a prolongation of colonial status. In Yugoslavia's view, the activities of foreign interests were oriented towards their own profits rather than towards developing the Territories' self-reliance.

A number of States stressed the responsibility of the administering Powers and the need for other outside economic assistance. Afghanistan argued that administering Powers must make every effort to build a viable economy for NSGTs. India said the administering Powers should initiate education for self-reliance; they could no longer be permitted to treat a colony's resources and population as instruments to further their own ambitions. Indonesia, while holding administering Powers responsible for providing arrangements and infrastructure that would enable colonial peoples to stand on their own feet, recognized that transnational corporations could play a constructive role in the economic development of such Territories. Mauritania said those who administered colonial Territories must recognize the right of a people to control its own resources; but it also paid tribute to all efforts to help develop the economic infrastructures of dependent Territories. Sierra Leone saw the value of investments that contributed to the Territories' economic stability and viability, but warned that such activities would deter independence if they did not contribute to a people's political and economic preparedness.

Other countries, however, including Australia, Austria, New Zealand and the United States, were of the opinion that foreign economic interests could benefit colonial countries, which

needed outside help. Taking issue with the assertion that all activities of foreign economic and other interests were detrimental to colonial peoples, Australia said that would be tantamount to arguing that no foreign investment or development assistance should be provided to dependent Territories. Austria remarked that, while transnational corporations were natural supporters of the status quo and did not feel the same responsibility for a Territory's political future as the inhabitants did, foreign economic interests could be vital to industrial development, under mechanisms and codes that set forth rules and rights. New Zealand believed that the activities in question should be judged by practical criteria and not simply be dismissed for doctrinaire reasons. The United States said many representatives had realized that, despite inequities and irregular patterns of investment, foreign participation in their own countries' economies had greatly benefited their peoples; it seemed inconsistent, therefore, to declare that such activities were automatically harmful to the people of a dependent Territory.

The Ivory Coast suggested that the Assembly appeal to the Governments of the countries whose corporations were involved in undesirable activities to use all political, legislative and administrative means to bring those corporations to reason.

Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Mongolia, among others, supported the proposal, first mentioned in the debate by the German Democratic Republic, that the Centre on Transnational Corporations compile a register of the profits derived by transnational corporations from colonial Territories. Such action, it was argued, would unmask foreign exploitation.

Much of the debate dealt with the impact of foreign economic and other assistance to South Africa, which the majority of speakers regarded as a principal means enabling that régime to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia. This point was made by China, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guinea, Mexico, Nigeria, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Zaire and Zambia, among others.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/51, 24 Nov., text following; <sup>(3)</sup>36/68, para. 7, 1 Dec. (p. 1098).

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/710; S-G statements, A/C.4/36/L/20, A/C.5/36/48.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1191-1193, 1195 (11-14 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.2-8, 16, 17, 22 (1 Oct.-16 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.50 (23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.70 (24 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/51

110-16-23 (recorded vote) Meeting 70 24 November 1981

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/680) by recorded vote (93-16-28), 16 November (meeting 22); 30-nation draft (A/C.4/38/L.4 and Corr.1); agenda item 94.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian SSR, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa

The General Assembly,

Having considered the item entitled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa",

Having examined the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to this question.

Taking into consideration the chapters of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia relating to the question,

Recalling its resolutions 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, containing the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration and 35/118 of 11 December 1980, the annex to which contains the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration, as well as all other resolutions of the United Nations relating to the item,

Taking into account the relevant provisions of the Maputo Declaration in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and the Programme of Action for the Liberation of Zimbabwe and Namibia, adopted by the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held at Maputo from 16 to 21 May 1977, as well as the Lagos Declaration for Action against Apartheid, adopted by the World Conference for Action against Apartheid,

Recalling the Declaration on Namibia and the Programme of Action in Support of Self-Determination and National Independence for Namibia, contained in General Assembly resolution S-9/2 of 3 May 1978,

Recalling also the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Panama City on 5 June 1981,

Bearing in mind the relevant resolutions adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-seventh ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 15 to 26 June 1981, and endorsed by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981,

Bearing in mind also the relevant provisions of the New Delhi Declaration, adopted by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981, as well as the final communiqué of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries on the Question of Namibia, held at Algiers from 16 to 18 April 1981,

Taking into account the relevant provisions of the Special Declaration on Namibia, adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981,

Bearing in mind further the Declaration on Foreign Investment in South Africa, adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-fifth ordinary session, held at Freetown from 18 to 28 June 1980,

Reaffirming the solemn obligation of the administering Powers under the Charter of the United Nations to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Territories under their administration and to protect the human and natural resources of those Territories against abuses,

Reaffirming that any economic or other activity which impedes the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and obstructs efforts aimed at the elimination of colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa and other colonial Territories is in direct violation of the rights of the inhabitants and of the principles of the Charter and all relevant resolutions of the United Nations,

Reaffirming that the natural resources of all Territories under colonial and racist domination are the heritage of the peoples of those Territories and that the exploitation and depletion of those resources by foreign economic interests, in particular in southern Africa, in association with the illegal racist minority régime of South Africa, constitute a direct violation of the rights of the peoples and of the principles stated in the Charter and all relevant resolutions of the United Nations,

Noting with profound concern that the colonial Powers and certain States, through their activities in the colonial Territories, have continued to disregard United Nations decisions relating to the item and that they have failed to implement in particular the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolutions 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970 and 35/28 of 11 November 1980, by which the Assembly called upon the Governments which had not yet done so to take legislative, administrative or other measures in respect of their nationals and the bodies corporate under their jurisdiction that own and operate enterprises in colonial Territories, particularly in Africa, which are detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories, in order to put an end to such enterprises and to prevent new investments which run counter to the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories.

Condemning the intensified activities of those foreign economic, financial and other interests which continue to exploit the natural and human resources of the colonial Territories and to accumulate and repatriate huge profits to the detriment of the interests of the inhabitants, particularly in southern Africa, thereby impeding the realization by the peoples of the Territories of their legitimate aspirations for self-determination and independence,

Strongly condemning the support which the racist minority régime of South Africa continues to receive from those foreign economic, financial and other interests which are collaborating with it in the exploitation of the natural and human resources of the international Territory of Namibia, in the further entrenchment of its illegal racist domination over the Territory and in the strengthening of its system of apartheid,

Taking into account the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the hearings on Namibian uranium held in New York from 7 to 11 July 1980,

Strongly condemning the investment of foreign capital in the production of uranium and the collaboration of certain Western countries and other States with the racist minority régime of South Africa in the nuclear field which, by providing that régime with nuclear equipment and technology, enables it to develop nuclear and military capabilities and to become a nuclear Power, thereby promoting South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia,

Deploping that South Africa and the colonial Powers continue to engage in activities and dispositions of a military character and to establish and maintain bases and other military installations in Namibia and other colonial Territories in violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter and of General Assembly resolution 1514(XV),



Deeply concerned about the conditions in other colonial Territories, including those in the Caribbean region and certain Territories in the Pacific region, where foreign economic, financial and other interests continue to deprive the indigenous populations of their rights over the wealth of their countries, and where the indigenous peoples of those Territories continue to suffer from a loss of land ownership as a result of the failure of the administering Powers concerned to restrict the sale of land to foreigners, despite the repeated appeals of the General Assembly,

Conscious of the continuing need to mobilize world public opinion against the involvement of foreign economic, financial and other interests in the exploitation of natural and human resources, which impedes the independence of colonial Territories and the elimination of racism, particularly in southern Africa,

1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the peoples of dependent Territories to self-determination and independence and to the enjoyment of the natural resources of their Territories, as well as their right to dispose of those resources in their best interests;

2. Reiterates that any administering or occupying Power which deprives the colonial peoples of the exercise of their legitimate rights over their natural resources or subordinates the rights and interests of those peoples to foreign economic and financial interests violates the solemn obligations it has assumed under the Charter of the United Nations;

3. Reaffirms that, by their depletive exploitation of natural resources, the continued accumulation and repatriation of huge profits and the use of those profits for the enrichment of foreign settlers and the entrenchment of colonial domination over the Territories, the activities of foreign economic, financial and other interests operating at present in the colonial Territories, particularly in southern Africa, constitute a major obstacle to political independence and to the enjoyment of the natural resources of those Territories by the indigenous inhabitants;

4. Condemns the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the colonial Territories as impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as well as the efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid racial discrimination;

5. Condemns the policies of Governments that continue to support or collaborate with those foreign economic and other interests engaged in exploiting the natural and human resources of the Territories, including in particular illegally exploiting Namibia's marine resources, thus violating the political, economic and social rights and interests of the indigenous peoples and obstructing the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration in respect of those Territories;

6. Strongly condemns the continuing collaboration of certain Western countries and other States with South Africa in the nuclear field which, by providing the racist régime with nuclear equipment and technology, enables it to increase its nuclear capability, and calls upon all Governments to refrain from all such collaboration with that régime;

7. Requests the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to continue to monitor closely the situation in other Non-Self-Governing Territories so as to ensure that all economic activities in those Territories are aimed at strengthening and diversifying their economies in the interests of the indigenous peoples and their speedy accession to Independence, and that those peoples are not exploited for political, military and other purposes detrimental to their interests;

8. Strongly condemns those Western countries and all other States, as well as the transnational corporations, which continue their investments in, and supply of armaments and oil and nuclear technology to, the racist régime of South Africa, thus buttressing it and aggravating the threat to world peace;

9. Strongly condemns the collusion by the Governments of certain western countries and other states, particularly

those of the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, with the racist régime of South Africa in the nuclear field and calls upon the Government of France and all other Governments to refrain from supplying the racist minority régime of South Africa, directly or indirectly, with installations that might enable it to produce uranium, plutonium and other nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment;

10. Calls upon all States, in particular the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Japan, Belgium, Israel and Italy, to take urgent, effective measures to terminate all collaboration with South Africa in the political, diplomatic, economic, trade, military and nuclear fields and to refrain from entering into other relations with the racist régime of South Africa in violation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and of the Organization of African Unity;

11. Calls once again upon all Governments that have not yet done so to take legislative, administrative or other measures in respect of their nationals and the bodies corporate under their jurisdiction that own and operate enterprises in colonial Territories, particularly in Africa, which are detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories, in order to put an end to such enterprises and to prevent new investments which run counter to the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories;

12. Requests all States to refrain from making any investments to the benefit of, or extending loans to, the minority racist régime of South Africa and to refrain from any agreements or measures to promote trade or other economic relations with it;

13. Calls upon those oil-producing and oil-exporting countries that have not yet done so to take effective measures against the oil companies that supply crude oil and petroleum products to the racist régime of South Africa;

14. Requests all States that have not yet done so to take effective measures to end the supply of funds and other forms of assistance, including military supplies and equipment, to the régimes that use such assistance to repress the peoples of the colonial Territories and their national liberation movements;

15. Condemns all military activities and dispositions of a military character in Namibia and other colonial Territories which are prejudicial to the interests of the peoples of those Territories and to their right to self-determination and Independence;

16. Calls upon South Africa and the colonial Powers concerned to end the military activities and dispositions of a military character in Namibia and other colonial Territories and to eliminate the military bases in accordance with the provisions of the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly, in particular paragraph 9 of the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/118;

17. Reiterates that the exploitation and plundering of the natural resources of Namibia by South African and other foreign economic interests, in violation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974, are illegal and contribute to the maintenance of the illegal occupation régime;

18. Strongly condemns South Africa for its continued exploitation and plundering of the natural resources of Namibia, in complete disregard of the legitimate interests of the Namibian people, and for its illegal extension of the territorial sea and its proclamation of an economic zone off the coast of Namibia;

19. Calls once again upon all States to discontinue all economic, financial and trade relations with South Africa concerning Namibia and to refrain from entering into economic, financial or other relations with South Africa, acting on behalf of or concerning Namibia, which may lend support to its continued illegal occupation of that Territory;

20. Invites all Governments and organizations of the United Nations system, having regard to the relevant provisions of the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, contained in General Assembly resolution 3201(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, and of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, contained in Assembly resolution 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, to ensure that the permanent sovereignty of the colonial Territories over their natural resources is fully respected and safeguarded;

21. Requests the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations to prepare from available sources a register indicating the profits that transnational corporations derive from their activities in colonial Territories and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

22. Calls upon the administering Powers to abolish every discriminatory and unjust wage system prevailing in the Territories under their administration and to apply an equitable system of wages;

23. Requests the Secretary-General to continue, through the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, a sustained and broad campaign with a view to informing world public opinion of the facts concerning the pillaging of natural resources in colonial Territories and the exploitation of their indigenous populations by foreign monopolies and the support they render to the colonialist and racist régimes;

24. Appeals to all non-governmental organizations to continue their campaign to mobilize international public opinion for the enforcement of economic and other sanctions against the Pretoria régime;

25. Requests the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to continue to examine this question and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Austria, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia,<sup>a</sup> Malawi, Norway, Paraguay, Rwanda, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat It had intended to vote "in favour".

### Military bases in colonial countries

Military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration which might impede implementation of the Declaration on colonial countries was the subject in 1981 of a consensus by the Committee on colonial countries and of paragraphs in four General Assembly resolutions on implementation of the Declaration on colonial countries.

**ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES.** On 14 August, the Committee on colonial countries adopted a consensus<sup>(1)</sup> by which it deplored the fact that colonial Powers had taken no steps to implement past Assembly resolutions asking them to withdraw immediately and unconditionally their military bases and installations from colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones. The Committee reiterated its conviction that, in a great number of instances, such activities and arrangements constituted a serious impediment to the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration. It condemned all military activities and arrangements which denied the peoples concerned their right to self-determination, and deplored the establishment and maintenance, by colonial Powers and their allies, of military bases and other installations in Territories under their administration which impeded implementation of the Declaration and were incompatible with the United Nations Charter.

The Committee deprecated the continued alienation of land in colonial Territories for military installations, stating that the large-scale utilization of local economic and manpower resources for such purposes diverted resources which could be more beneficially used for the Territories' economic development. It requested an intensified United Nations publicity campaign on military activities and arrangements in colonial Territories.

The Committee also condemned South Africa's use of armed force in Namibia and called for a halt to military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa (p. 181).

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** In its resolution of 24 November on foreign interests impeding implementation of the Declaration on colonial countries,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly condemned military activities and dispositions in Namibia and other colonial Territories prejudicial to the interests and the right to self-determination and independence of the peoples of those Territories. It called on South Africa and the colonial Powers concerned to end such military activities and eliminate military bases.

In its resolution of 1 December on implementation of the Declaration,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly called on colonial Powers to withdraw immediately and unconditionally their military bases and installations from colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones.

In resolutions on Bermuda and the Turks and Caicos Islands<sup>(3)</sup> and on Guam,<sup>(4)</sup> adopted on 25 November, the Assembly recognized that the presence of military bases and other installations could impede implementation of the Declaration, and reaffirmed that their presence

should not prevent the peoples of those Territories from exercising their right to self-determination and independence.

In the debates in the Fourth Committee and the Assembly preceding adoption of these resolutions, several States cited military activities which they saw as impeding decolonization. The Byelorussian SSR said military bases in Guam, Puerto Rico, Diego Garcia, Bermuda, the Turks and Caicos Islands, Micronesia and other colonial Territories ran counter to the interests of the peoples of those Territories and the aims of decolonization. The USSR stated that such bases were used for suppressing the national liberation struggle and for interfering in independent States.

Hungary expressed concern at the alienation of land for military bases, adding that such installations did irreparable harm to a Territory's economy besides heightening tension in the region. India regarded the military activities of administering Powers in small Territories, particularly the maintenance of bases, as ultimately detrimental to the interests of the local population, making them targets for attack by competing Powers. Others calling for the dismantling of military bases and condemning military activities in dependent Territories were Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Poland, the Syrian Arab Republic and the Ukrainian SSR.

Samoa said it could not agree with the unconditional call for withdrawal of military bases, as it was not in accordance with the wishes of the people involved. Turkey thought the provision should have been formulated in the same way as the clauses on this subject in the Assembly's resolutions on Bermuda and the Turks and Caicos Islands and on Guam. The United States did not believe the presence of military bases in NSGTs necessarily interfered with the full exercise of the right to self-determination. Reservations were also voiced by the Netherlands and New Zealand.

The United Kingdom, on behalf of the EC member States, stated that they rejected the tendentious and inaccurate references to military activities and facilities contained in the resolution on foreign interests.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/51, paras. 15 & 16, 24 Nov. (p. 1109); <sup>(3)</sup>36/62, para. 5, 25 Nov. (p. 1200); <sup>(4)</sup>36/63, paras. 7, 25 Nov. (p. 1189); <sup>(5)</sup>36/68, para. 10, Dec. (p. 1098).

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1191-1193, 1195 (11-14 Aug.).

### Information dissemination

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES. on 21 August, the Committee on

colonial countries approved a series of conclusions and recommendations by its Sub-Committee on Petitions, Information and Assistance, for continued United Nations activities to publicize decolonization.<sup>(1)</sup> The activities were to include intensified work by United Nations information centres, particularly in certain countries of Western Europe and the Americas, as well as speaking engagements by United Nations officials and the wider dissemination of basic United Nations texts. Special emphasis was to be placed on Namibia (p. 1165). In light of what the Sub-Committee saw as the limited coverage given to decolonization in the mass media, particularly in Western Europe and the Americas, the United Nations Department of Public Information was asked to undertake a concerted effort to obtain wider coverage and to prepare in 1982 an analysis of the causes for the limited coverage.

A report by the Sub-Committee, also approved by the Committee on 21 August, referred to the important role played by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in regard to decolonization. The Sub-Committee reiterated its appeal to those organizations to intensify their campaigns in support of all colonial peoples and their national liberation movements. It proposed steps to permit continued contacts between NGOs and the United Nations in this regard.

Other requests for dissemination of information were contained in decisions adopted by the Committee on 14 August relating to foreign activities impeding implementation of the Declaration (p. 1105), military bases in colonial countries (p. 1110) and Namibia.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution adopted on 1 December,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue giving widespread and continuing publicity to United Nations work for decolonization through all available media, including publications, radio and television. States, United Nations organizations and NGOs were invited to help disseminate that information, which would cover the dangers of colonialism, the efforts of colonial peoples to achieve self-determination and the assistance being provided by the international community.

This resolution, sponsored by 19 nations and introduced by Sierra Leone, was adopted by a recorded vote of 138 to none, with 6 abstentions.

In a resolution on the right to self-determination,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted on 28 October, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to give maximum publicity to the Declaration on colonial countries and the widest possible publicity to the struggle by oppressed peoples for self-determination and national independence.

On 10 December, the Assembly adopted a resolution on the dissemination of information on Namibia,<sup>(5)</sup> by which it decided to launch a campaign to expose and denounce the collusion of certain Western countries with the South African racists. Also, in its resolution of 24 November on foreign interests impeding implementation of the Declaration,<sup>(3)</sup> it requested a United Nations campaign on the pillaging of natural resources and exploitation of the populations of colonial Territories.

In the debate preceding adoption of the resolution on dissemination of information on decolonization, Viet Nam suggested that United Nations information centres in Western Europe and the Americas focus increased attention on such information. However, the United Kingdom, which abstained in the vote on the resolution, questioned whether it was logical for the United Nations to expand rather than contract its decolonization activities, given the dwindling number of Territories. Though voting for the text, Belgium regretted the lack of objectivity in United Nations publications on decolonization, while Japan doubted the need to intensify studies and information dissemination in this area.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on colonial countries. A/36/23/Rev.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/9, para. 25, 28 Oct. (p. 896);

<sup>(3)</sup>36/51, para. 23, 24 Nov. (p. 1110); <sup>(4)</sup>36/69, 1 Dec., text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/121 E, para. 4, 10 Dec. (p. 1168).

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/716; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/58.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1185, 1186 (27, 28 Apr.), 1187 (25 June), 1202 (21 Aug.). GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.50, 53 (23, 24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.72, 73, 79 (25 Nov.-1 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/69

138-0-6 (recorded vote) Meeting 79 1 December 1981  
19-nation draft (A/36/L.21 Add.1); agenda item 19.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Barbados, Congo, Egypt, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Madagascar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

#### Dissemination of information on decolonization

The General Assembly,

Having examined the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to the question of publicity for the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization,

Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and all other resolutions and decisions of the United Nations concerning the dissemination of information on decolonization, in particular General Assembly resolution 35/120 of 11 December 1980.

Reiterating the importance of publicity as an instrument for furthering the aims and purposes of the Declaration and mindful of the continuing pressing need for taking all possible steps to acquaint world public opinion with all aspects of the problems of decolonization with a view to assisting effectively

the peoples of the colonial Territories to achieve self-determination, freedom and independence,

Aware of the increasingly important role being played in the widespread dissemination of relevant information by a number of non-governmental organizations having a special interest in decolonization.

1. Approves the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to the question of publicity for the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization;

2. Reaffirms the importance of effecting the widest possible dissemination of information on the evils and dangers of colonialism, on the determined efforts of the colonial peoples to achieve self-determination, freedom and independence and on the assistance being provided by the international community towards the elimination of the remaining vestiges of colonialism in all its forms;

3. Requests the Secretary-General, having regard to the suggestions of the Special Committee, to continue to take concrete measures through all the media at his disposal, including publications, radio and television, to wide wide-spread and continuous publicity to the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization and, inter alia:

(a) To continue, in consultation with the Special Committee, to collect, prepare and disseminate basic material, studies and articles relating to the problems of decolonization and, in particular, to continue to publish the periodical *Objective: Justice* and other publications, special articles and studies, including the *Decolonization series*, and to select from them appropriate material for wider dissemination by means of reprints in various languages;

(b) To seek the full co-operation of the administering Powers concerned in the discharge of the tasks referred to above;

(c) To intensify the activities of all information centres, particularly those located in Western Europe and the Americas;

(d) To maintain a close working relationship with the Organization of African Unity by holding periodic consultations and by systematically exchanging relevant information with that organization;

(e) To enlist the support of non-governmental organizations having a special interest in decolonization in the dissemination of the relevant information;

(f) To ensure the availability of the necessary facilities and services in this regard;

(g) To report to the Special Committee on the measures taken in implementation of the present resolution;

4. Invites all States, the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system and non-governmental organizations having a special interest in decolonization to undertake or intensify, in co-operation with the Secretary-General and within their respective spheres of competence, the large-scale dissemination of the information referred to in paragraph 2 above;

5. Requests the Special Committee to follow the implementation of the present resolution and report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New

Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Luxembourg, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom, United States.

Observance of the Week of Solidarity  
with the colonial peoples of southern Africa

The Week of Solidarity with the Colonial Peoples of Southern Africa Fighting for Freedom, Independence and Equal Rights, observed annually in the week beginning 25 May-Africa Liberation Day-was marked in 1981 by a special meeting on that date held at Paris during the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa (p. 165). At that meeting, the Chairman of the Committee on colonial countries noted that nine African countries with a total population of 22 million had achieved independence in the nine years since the General Assembly called for the observance in 1972.<sup>(3)</sup> He added that the Namibia situation stood in sharp contrast to those successes and warranted a determined effort by the international community to overcome the barriers impeding a solution.

By a letter of 25 May, the USSR transmitted to the Secretary-General a message of congratulations addressed by the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to the States and peoples of Africa on the occasion of Africa Liberation Day,<sup>(1)</sup> pledging to co-operate with the liberated countries and strengthen ties with the national liberation movement.

On 21 August, the Committee recommended that the Assembly consider changing the title of the observance to "Week of Solidarity with the Peoples of Namibia and All Other Colonial Territories, as well as those in South Africa, Fighting for Freedom, Independence and Equal Rights".<sup>(2)</sup> The Committee decided that its Chairman should consult on the matter with the presiding officers of the other United Nations bodies concerned. The Assembly took no action on the recommendation during 1981.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>USSR, 25 May, A/36/287.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA; 2911(XXVII), 2 Nov. 1972 (YUN 1972,p.553).

### Puerto Rico

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES. In connection with its review of the list of Territories to which the Declaration on

colonial countries was applicable, the Committee on colonial countries adopted on 20 August 1981 a resolution by which it reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration and its full applicability with respect to Puerto Rico.<sup>(2)</sup> Recalling five resolutions and a decision on the subject which it had adopted since 1972, the Committee once again urged the United States Government to adopt all necessary measures for the full transfer of all powers to the people of Puerto Rico, to assist the Committee in the application of its resolutions relating to Puerto Rico and, in particular, to co-operate in the sending of a fact-finding mission of the Committee to visit the territory. The Chairman was requested to hold consultations regarding that mission. The Committee also recommended that the General Assembly examine the question of Puerto Rico as a separate item at its thirty-seventh (1982) session.

The Committee commissioned its Rapporteur to prepare, with the Secretariat's assistance, a report updating information on Puerto Rico, including the opinions of its political parties, social, cultural and labour organizations and other institutions. The report would be presented to the Committee early in 1982 to facilitate consideration of the item by the Assembly at its 1982 session and to assist the work of the Committee with regard to Puerto Rico in future years. The Committee decided to keep the question of Puerto Rico under review.

This resolution was adopted by 11 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions. Before adopting it, the Committee heard 29 representatives of organizations in connection with the topic.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION. The subject of Puerto Rico was raised during the General Assembly debate leading to the adoption of its resolution of 1 December<sup>(4)</sup> on implementation of the Declaration on colonial countries.

By paragraph 5 of that resolution, the Assembly approved the 1981 report of the Committee on colonial countries, including its work programme for 1982. The United States introduced an 11-nation amendment<sup>(1)</sup> to add to the end of that paragraph: "but takes no decision on the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of the Special Committee's resolution set forth in chapter I, paragraph 87, of its report" (the recommendation that the Assembly examine the Puerto Rico question in 1982).

Before the adoption of the resolution, the President stated that, after consultations with numerous delegations, he believed the accepted interpretation of the intent and implications of the draft resolution as it stood was as follows:

"Adoption of the draft resolution in its present form would have the effect of recognizing the fact that the Special Committee had recommended that the General Assembly should 'examine the question of Puerto Rico as a separate item at its thirty-seventh session', but it would not constitute a decision by the General Assembly to do so. It is my understanding that, on the basis of this formal interpretation of the significance of the Assembly's action, the sponsors no longer found it necessary to ask for a vote on their amendment."

During the debate on the resolution, the United States opposed the Committee's recommendation as unwarranted, politically motivated, and interference in the internal affairs of both the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States. The United States, as well as Australia and Japan, recalled that the Assembly had decided in 1953,<sup>(3)</sup> following a plebiscite approving the Commonwealth Constitution of 1952, that the people of Puerto Rico had effectively exercised their right to self-determination. Similar points were made by Canada and France. Supporting this position, the United Kingdom said the current elected government of Puerto Rico had no desire to proceed to separate independence.

Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal and Turkey also opposed separate consideration of Puerto Rico in the Assembly, as did Finland on behalf of the five Nordic States. Reservations were also expressed by Austria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Fiji, Jordan, Lebanon, New Zealand and Somalia, while India recalled that it had abstained in the Committee's votes on the matter.

El Salvador, Guyana and Senegal were among those which supported the President's explanation that the Assembly action was not an endorsement of the Committee's recommendation to place Puerto Rico on the Assembly's agenda in 1982.

Bolivia reserved its position on the Committee's recommendation, stating that it was undesirable to alter without due consideration certain agreements on political procedures, at the risk of hampering decolonization. Costa Rica and Venezuela endorsed self-determination for Puerto Rico, Costa Rica adding that the Committee's resolution must not be used to impose any type of political organization; only the people could decide that matter. Guatemala also considered that only the people of Puerto Rico could exercise the right to determine its future, without coercion and without being made the object of the political designs of other States. Indonesia stated that the political status of Puerto Rico was a matter for the people to decide.

Favouring Assembly consideration of Puerto

Rico, Cuba stated that the people of Puerto Rico had never had the right to decide its future, because sovereignty continued to be exercised by the United States Congress; its status was purely colonial. The Syrian Arab Republic said the United Nations must respond to the unanimous desire for Assembly consideration expressed by the large number of Puerto Ricans from all political, cultural and trade union groups who had addressed the Committee in August. Those representatives, said the USSR, had submitted unchallengeable evidence that the territory was in a full state of colonial dependence on the United States.

Support for the Committee's recommendation was also expressed by Bulgaria, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Mongolia. Algeria interpreted the Assembly resolution as acceptance of the recommendation that Puerto Rico be placed on the agenda of the 1982 session.

In the Fourth Committee's debate on implementation of the Declaration, Angola voiced solidarity with the liberation struggle of the Puerto Rican people. Czechoslovakia believed that the Declaration on colonial countries should be applied to Puerto Rico. Hungary thought the United Nations should pay more attention to the desire of many Puerto Ricans for independence, adding that military installations there did not promote the people's well-being. The Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nicaragua, the Ukrainian SSR and Viet Nam supported the right of Puerto Ricans to self-determination.

Amendment not pressed: <sup>(1)</sup>Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom, United States: A/36/L.30 & Add.1.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>748(VIII), 27 Nov. 1953 (YUN 1953, p. 539); <sup>(4)</sup>36/68, 1 Dec. 1981 (p. 1097).

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1196-1201 (17-20 Aug.); GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/35/SR.9-20 (19 Oct.-4 Nov.); plenary, A/36-PV.72, 73, 79 (25 Nov.-1 Dec.).

## Other general questions concerning NSGTs

### Informations to the United Nations

In accordance with Chapter XI, Article 73 e, of the Charter of the United Nations, Member States responsible for the administration of Territories which had not attained a full measure of self-government were obligated to send each year to the Secretary-General information on economic, social and educational conditions in those Territories, subject to security and constitutional limitations.

During 1981, information was transmitted to the Secretary-General with respect to the following Non-Self-Governing Territories (NSGTs):

Australia: Cocos (Keeling) Islands

New Zealand: Tokelau

United Kingdom: Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands (Malvinas), Gibraltar, Montserrat, Pitcairn, St. Helena, Turks and Caicos Islands

United States: American Samoa, Guam, United States Virgin Islands

The Associated State of Antigua attained independence on 1 November as Antigua and Barbuda, and was admitted to the United Nations on 11 November (p. 348). Belize, on which the United Kingdom formerly reported, attained independence on 21 September and was admitted to the United Nations on 25 September (p. 349). General<sup>(3)</sup> report by the Secretary to the General Assembly on the subject of information from NSGTs indicated that he had received no information concerning Antigua, Brunei and St. Kitts-Nevis. The United Kingdom had previously informed the Assembly or the Secretary-General that these Territories had become self-governing and that information on them would no longer be sent to the United Nations. Nor had information been received on Western Sahara, Spain having informed the Secretary-General in 1976 that it had terminated its presence in the Territory and considered itself exempt from any international responsibility in connection with the administration of the Territory.<sup>(5)</sup>

With respect to East Timor, Portugal informed the Secretary-General in a note verbale of 26 March 1981<sup>(1)</sup> that it had nothing to add to the information it had provided in a 1979 note (stating that conditions in the Territory had prevented it from assuming its responsibilities for the administration of East Timor).<sup>(6)</sup>

Information on NSGTs supplied by the administering Powers was considered by the Committee on colonial countries in its examination of conditions in individual Territories (p. 1179).

On 4 August the Committee adopted a resolution on this subject,<sup>(2)</sup> provisions of which were incorporated by the General Assembly into a resolution it adopted on 24 November.<sup>(4)</sup> In this resolution, the Assembly reaffirmed that, in the absence of a decision by the Assembly that an NSGT had attained full self-government, the administering Power should continue to transmit information. The Assembly requested the administering Powers concerned to transmit or continue to transmit the information prescribed in Article 73 e of the Charter, as well as the fullest possible information on political and constitutional developments in the Territories, within a

maximum period of six months following the expiration of the administrative year. The Committee was requested to continue to discharge its functions in this regard and to report in 1982.

This resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 149 to none, with 3 abstentions, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, which had approved the text, sponsored by 20 nations, on 17 November by a recorded vote of 122 to none, with 3 abstentions.

During the debate on the text in the Fourth Committee, most speakers supported the draft but some voiced reservations. The United Kingdom, which abstained in the vote, stated that it was not for the Assembly to decide if there was an obligation to transmit such information, although the United Kingdom would continue to transmit it when necessary. Japan voted for the text but said it did not accept the implications of the paragraph stating that information should continue to be transmitted in the absence of an Assembly decision to the contrary.

Note verbale: <sup>(1)</sup>Portugal, 26 Mar., A/36/160.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/563.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/49, 24 Nov., text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(5)</sup>1976, p. 738; <sup>(6)</sup>1979, p. 1117.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1188 (4 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9, 14, 15, 20, 22, 23 (19 Oct.-17 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.70 (24 Nov.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/49

149-0-3 (recorded vote) Meeting 70 24 November 1981

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/678) by recorded vote (122-0-3), 17 November (meeting 23); 20-nation draft (A/C.4/36/L.10); agenda item 92.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guinea, Guyana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Qatar, Romania, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia.

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 1970(XVIII) of 16 December 1963, in which it requested the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to study the information transmitted to the Secretary-General under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations and to take such information fully into account in examining the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration,

Recalling also its resolution 35/26 of 11 November 1980, in which it requested the Special Committee to continue to discharge the functions entrusted to it under resolution 1970(XVIII),

Having examined the chapter of the report of the Special Committee dealing with the transmittal of information under Article 73 e of the Charter and the action taken by the Committee in respect of that information,

Having also examined the report of the Secretary-General on the question.

Deplored the fact that some Member States having responsibilities for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories have ceased to transmit information under Article 73 e of the Charter,

1. Approves the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to the information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations;

2. Reaffirms that, in the absence of a decision by the General Assembly itself that a Non-Self-Governing Territory has attained a full measure of self-government in terms of Chapter XI of the Charter, the administering Power concerned should continue to transmit information under Article 73 e of the Charter with respect to that Territory;

3. Requests the administering Powers concerned to transmit, or continue to transmit, to the Secretary-General the Information prescribed in Article 73 e of the Charter, as well as the fullest possible information on political and constitutional developments in the Territories concerned, within a maximum period of six months following the expiration of the administrative year in those Territories;

4. Requests the Special Committee to continue to discharge the functions entrusted to it under General Assembly resolution 1970(XVIII), in accordance with established procedures, and to report thereon to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, United Kingdom, United States.

#### UN visiting missions

During 1981, the Committee on colonial countries, sent visiting missions to two NSGTS. One went to Tokelau in June at the invitation of New Zealand (p. 1190); the other went to American Samoa in July at the invitation of the United States (p. 1179).

The Committee adopted a resolution on the question of visiting missions on 4 August.<sup>(1)</sup> It stressed the need to continue to dispatch missions to colonial Territories, called on the administering Powers to permit access by those missions to Territories under their administration, and requested the Committee Chairman to consult with the administering Powers and report back as appropriate.

The Chairman reported in July on consultations about visiting missions he had held with ad-

ministering Powers in response to a 1980 request by the Committee.<sup>(2)</sup> Noting with satisfaction the positive attitude of the Governments that had invited missions in 1981, he stressed the need to continue to dispatch them. His report was annexed to the Committee's report to the Assembly; an appendix listed the 25 visiting missions sent by the Committee or the Assembly since 1965.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 1049.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries, A/AC.109/PV.1184, 1188 (21 Jan., 4 Aug.).

#### Scholarships and fellowships

The Secretary-General reported to the General Assembly in 1981<sup>(1)</sup> that, up to 30 September, the following 32 States had offered to make scholarships and fellowships available to persons from NSGTS for secondary, vocational and post-graduate studies: Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, India, Iran, Israel, Italy, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United States, Yugoslavia.

After considering the Secretary-General's report, the Assembly adopted on 24 November, without vote, a resolution<sup>(2)</sup> by which it expressed appreciation to the Member States that had made scholarships available and invited all States to make or continue to make generous offers of study and training facilities to inhabitants of NSGTS, providing travel funds whenever possible. The Assembly also urged the administering Powers to ensure widespread and continuous dissemination of such offers in the Territories under their administration, and to provide facilities to enable students to take advantage of them.

This resolution was approved without objection by the Fourth Committee on 17 November, on the basis of a proposal by 28 nations.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/580 & Add. 1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA. 36/54, 24 Nov., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.12-20, 22, 23 (22 Oct.-17 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.70 (24 Nov.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/54

Adopted without vote Meeting 70 24 November 1981

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/683) without objection, 17 November (meeting 23); 28-nation draft (A/C.4/36/L.11); agenda item 97.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Guinea, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, New Zealand, Nigeria, Qatar, Romania, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia.



Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for Inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/31 of 11 November 1980,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General on offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories, prepared under General Assembly resolution 845(IX) of 22 November 1954,

Considering that more scholarships should be made available to the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories in all parts of the world and that steps should be taken to encourage applications from students in those Territories.

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General;

2. Expresses its appreciation to those Member States that have made scholarships available to the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories;

3. Invites all States to make or continue to make generous offers of study and training facilities to the inhabitants of those Territories that have not yet attained self-government or independence and, whenever possible, to provide travel funds to prospective students;

4. Urges the administering Powers to take effective measures to ensure the widespread and continuous dissemination in the Territories under their administration of information relating to offers of study and training facilities made by States and to provide all the necessary facilities to enable students to avail themselves of such offers;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution;

6. Draws the attention of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to the present resolution.

#### UN Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa

A total of 1,140 persons held scholarships under the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa during the year ended 30 September 1981, according to a report by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly.<sup>(1)</sup> The largest number, 533, were from South Africa (p. 212). Another 431 were from Zimbabwe, under authorization given by the General Assembly in 1980<sup>(2)</sup> to continue such assistance for a one-year transitional period to students from the former Southern Rhodesia. Namibians held 135 scholarships under the Programme (p. 1178). The remainder of the recipients were from countries which had been under Portuguese administration prior to independence: 23 from Guinea-Bissau, 7 from Sao Tome and Principe, 6 from Angola, 4 from Cape Verde and 1 from Mozambique.

Ninety-seven new scholarship awards were made under the Programme during the 12-month period: 52 to South Africans, 25 to Namibians (of which 13 were financed by the United Nations Fund for Namibia) and 20 to Zimbabweans, the latter being the last given to nationals of that State. The number of new awards, the report stated, had been substantially less than in previous years because of decreased contributions and higher scholarship costs. The

Programme had been unable to consider any new awards for the 1981/1982 academic year.

Forty-seven per cent of the scholarship holders attended institutions in Africa (Benin, Botswana, Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe). Another 9 per cent studied in developing countries outside Africa (Grenada, India, Montserrat, Pakistan, Philippines). The remainder were in institutions in developed countries (Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, France, Ireland, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States).

Thirty-eight States contributed a total of \$3,593,954 to the Programme in 1981, as shown in the following table. In addition, two pledged \$96,639 for future years (Australia, \$40,975; Switzerland, \$55,664).

#### CONTRIBUTIONS DURING 1981 TO THE UN EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

(as at 31 December 1981; in US dollars)

Country	Collections during 1981
Argentina	3,607
Australia	40,975
Austria	34,500
Bahamas	500
Barbados	500
Brazil	10,000
Burma	1,000
Canada	250,000
Chile	1,000
Denmark	391,517
Ethiopia	3,000
Finland	96,061
France	84,685
Germany, Federal Republic of	60,398
Greece	8,500
India	2,000
Indonesia	3,000
Iran	5,000
Ireland	42,326
Italy	45,000
Japan	200,000
Kenya	1,375
Malaysia	1,000
Mexico	1,000
Netherlands	56,899
New Zealand	13,696
Nigeria	30,000
Norway	740,225
Philippines	3,000
Suriname	1,000
Sweden	342,612
Switzerland	111,328
Thailand	1,000
Trinidad and Tobago	1,250
Turkey	1,000
United States	1,000,000
Venezuela	3,000
Yugoslavia	2,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,593,954</b>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In a resolution of 24 November,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly noted with grave concern the significant decline in 1981 contributions over those of previous

years and the consequent decrease in the number of scholarship holders, and requested that the Secretary-General and the Programme's Advisory Committee take all possible measures to promote contributions. The Assembly also appealed to States, institutions, organizations and individuals to offer greater financial and other support to the Programme to ensure its continuation and expansion.

This resolution was adopted without vote following its approval in like manner by the Fourth Committee on 9 November. The draft was sponsored by 39 nations.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/147.

Resolutions: GA: <35/30, para. 3, 11 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 296); <36/53, 24 Nov. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.13-21 (23 Oct.-9 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.70 (24 Nov.).

#### **General Assembly resolution 36/53**

Adopted without vote Meeting 70 24 November 1981

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/682) without vote, 9 November (meeting 21); 39-nation draft (A/C.4/36/L.S); agenda item 96.

Sponsors: Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Mali, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### **United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa**

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, in particular resolution 35/30 of 11 November 1980,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on

the Programme for 1980/81, containing an account of the work of the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and of the operation of the Programme during the year,

Noting with grave concern the significant decline in the level of contributions received in 1981 and the consequent sharp decrease in the number of new awards granted and the total number of scholarship holders,

Strongly convinced that the continuation and expansion of the Programme is essential in order to assist the peoples of South Africa and Namibia,

Recognizing that supplementary contributions are urgently required in order to enable the Programme to meet its current level of obligations and that increased contributions for the coming fiscal year are required to meet the growing needs for assistance,

Taking account of the desirability of providing educational opportunities and counselling to student refugees in a broad spectrum of professional, cultural, technical and linguistic disciplines suitable for their future functions, notably, in the fields of development and international co-operation,

1. Endorses the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa;

2. Takes note with grave concern of the deficit facing the Programme in the current financial year because of escalating costs and a decrease in contributions in both absolute and real terms;

3. Expresses its appreciation to all those who have supported the Programme by providing contributions, scholarships or places in their educational institutions;

4. Requests the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa to take all possible measures for the promotion of generous contributions to the Programme;

5. Appeals to all States, institutions, organizations and individuals, in view of the increasing demand for educational opportunities by the people of South Africa and Namibia and the rapidly increasing costs of higher education and training, to offer greater financial and other support to the Programme in order to ensure its continuation, effectiveness and expansion.

## **Chapter II**

# **International Trusteeship System**

The Trusteeship Council continued during 1981 to supervise, on behalf of the Security Council, the one Trust Territory remaining under the International Trusteeship System—the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, a strategic Territory administered by the United States (p. 1120). The Council examined the annual report submitted by the Administering Authority,<sup>(3)</sup> heard nine petitioners, and examined 18 written petitions and 17 communications concerning the Territory.<sup>(1)</sup> As in previous years, the Council heard and questioned Special Representatives of the Administering Authority and Advisers—representatives of the Territory attached to the Administering Authority's delegation. Following a general debate in which Council members gave their

opinions on conditions in the Territory, the Council adopted a report to the Security Council containing its conclusions and recommendations.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Trusteeship Council held its forty-eighth session at United Nations Headquarters from 18 May to 11 June. Of the Council's five members (China, France, USSR, United Kingdom, United States), China did not participate in the session.

List of petitions and communications: (1)<sup>1</sup>T/1828/Add.1.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>TC, S/14709; <sup>(3)</sup>United States, transmitted by S-G note, S/14496 (T/1830), and corrigenda, transmitted by United States in notes verbales, T/1832 (18 May) and T/1833 (19 May).

Decisions: TC, T/1835.

Meeting records: TC, T/PV. 1506-1522 (18 May-11 June).

## General aspects

### Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

On 10 June 1981, the Council decided to send a periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in 1982 or 1983.<sup>(1)</sup> Specific arrangements were to be decided by the Council not later than at its 1982 session.

Recalling that the last such mission had been in 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> the United States recommended that the customary three-year interval between missions be maintained. In the event of a plebiscite or other significant political development warranting the dispatch of a mission, the United States would consult Council members.

Also referring to the usual three-year interval, France said it would be premature to decide in 1981 on the mission which would normally go to the Territory in 1983. The United Kingdom said it too could agree to defer the decision until the Council's next session. The USSR, however, believed the Council should decide in 1981 that the mission should go in 1982, since the previous mission had originally been scheduled for 1979.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>TC, S/14709.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>19802, p. 1036.

Meeting records: TC, T/PV.1515, 1521 (22 May, 10 June).

### Co-operation with the Committee on colonial countries

At its 1981 session, the Trusteeship Council considered together the questions of attainment of self-government or independence and co-operation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. On 28 May,<sup>(1)</sup> the Council drew the Security Council's attention to the conclusions and recommendations adopted on the attainment of self-government or independence by the Territory and to the statements made by Trusteeship Council members on that question (p. 1121).

During the Council's discussions of these two items, the United States maintained that Article 85 of the Charter of the United Nations clearly limited the functions of the General Assembly to Trust Territories not designated as strategic; co-operation between the Council and an Assembly committee was not applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. France and the United Kingdom were of a similar view, observing that, under the Charter, the Trusteeship Council reported only to the Security Council on matters regarding strategic areas. On the other hand, the USSR stated that the provisions

of the Declaration on colonial countries<sup>(2)</sup> applied to the Trust Territory and that nothing in Article 83 of the Charter prohibited United Nations bodies, particularly the Committee on colonial countries, from monitoring the situation in the Territory.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>TC, S/14709.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49).

Meeting record: TC, T/PV.1519 (28 May).

### Fellowships and scholarships

Under a programme initiated by the General Assembly in 1952,<sup>(3)</sup> offers of scholarships and fellowships to students from Trust Territories had been made in past years by 11 States: Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Tunisia, USSR, Yugoslavia. In a report to the Trusteeship Council covering the period 25 May 1980 to 14 May 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General indicated that he had received no information from these States that the offers were being utilized by persons from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The United States told the Council that most Micronesian students pursuing higher education sought placement in the United States, though many were enrolled in Australia, Fiji, Papua New Guinea and other English-speaking countries in the Pacific region.

The Council took note of the Secretary-General's report on 27 May.<sup>(2)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, T/1831; <sup>(2)</sup>TC, S/14709.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 557(VI), 18 Jan. 1952 (YUN 1951, p. 788).

Meeting record: TC, T/PV.1517 (27 May).

### Information dissemination

A report of the Secretary-General covering the period 1 May 1980 to 30 April 1981<sup>(1)</sup> described activities by the United Nations Department of Public Information (DPI) in distributing United Nations documents, official records and information materials to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, by airmail to individual addresses as well as by bulk sea shipments.

The United States told the Trusteeship Council that since the advent of constitutional government in various areas of the Territory, United Nations information had been channelled directly to the authorities of the new constitutional Governments; also, tape recordings of the Council's debates were widely used by local radio stations. France favoured the continued distribution by the Territorial Government of the verbatim records of Council debates. The USSR suggested that DPI study the possibility of supplying more materials to the Territory, particularly such fundamental documents as the General

Assembly's 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Trusteeship Council took note of the Secretary-General's report on 27 May.<sup>(2)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, T/1829; <sup>(2)</sup>TC, S/14709.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49).

Meeting record: TC, T/PV.1516 (27 May).

Co-operation with CERD and the  
Decade against racial discrimination

At its 1981 session,<sup>(1)</sup> the Trusteeship Council considered together the questions of co-operation with the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) and the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (1973-1983) (p. 864).

During the discussion, the United States said it was proud of the absence of racial discrimination and the strong protection of human rights which was guaranteed by law throughout the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. It noted with pride that CERD had welcomed the information received on human rights in the Territory.

The USSR deplored what it saw as the Administering Authority's fundamental failure to respect the human rights of the islands' inhabitants, and called on the Trusteeship Council to activate its co-operation with CERD and to implement the Programme for the Decade.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Council decided on 28 May to take note of the statements made on this item.

On 11 June, the Council decided it was not in a position to accept an invitation to the Seminar on Effective Measures to Prevent Transnational Corporations and Other Established Interests from Collaborating with the Racist Régime of South Africa (Geneva, 29 June-3 July), organized by the Commission on Human Rights in co-operation with the Special Committee against Apartheid (p. 188). The USSR regretted that the invitation had not been accepted, since the Seminar fell within the framework of the Decade against racial discrimination. The United States said it could not support Council participation in the Seminar, whose subject was far removed from the Council's work.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>TC, S/14709.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 3057(XXVIII), annex. 2 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 524).

Meeting record: TC, T/PV.1519, 1522 (28 May, 11 June),

## Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, administered by the United States in accordance with a Trusteeship Agreement approved by

the Security Council in 1947,<sup>(7)</sup> included more than 2,100 islands and atolls scattered over an area of some 7.8 million square kilometres of the western Pacific Ocean, north of the Equator. The islands, with a total land area of about 1,850 square kilometres, form three major archipelagos- the Marianas, the Carolines and the Marshalls-collectively known as Micronesia. In 1980, the Territory's population totalled 132,632.

Ultimate executive and administrative authority for the Government of the Territory and responsibility for carrying out international obligations undertaken by the United States with respect to it were vested in a High Commissioner, appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the United States Senate.

There were four political entities within the boundaries of the Territory- the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands and Palau. Each had its own constitution and popularly elected legislature and executive head.

In 1981, conditions in the Territory were considered by the Trusteeship Council, which adopted a report to the Security Council containing its conclusions and recommendations<sup>(4)</sup> after considering the annual report submitted by the United States as Administering Authority.<sup>(5)</sup> Conclusions and recommendations were also adopted by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.<sup>(3)</sup> The General Assembly's Fourth Committee received a draft decision on the subject<sup>(1)</sup> but decided to adjourn debate on it.

**TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL ACTION.** On 11 June, by 2 votes to 1, with 1 abstention, the Trusteeship Council adopted the report of its Drafting Committee containing an outline of conditions in the Territory and conclusions and recommendations thereon, for inclusion in the Council's report to the Security Council.<sup>(4)</sup>

The conclusions and recommendations had been adopted separately by the same vote. They dealt with self-determination and independence (p. 1121), politics and government (p. 1123), economic conditions (p. 1123), social conditions (p. 1125), education (p. 1125), resettlement of the Bikini and Enewetak populations (p. 1125), and radioactive waste management and damage claims (p. 1126).

The United States explained that it had abstained in the voting inasmuch as the conclusions and recommendations were addressed to the Administering Authority; it would study them carefully and try to the extent possible to bring to fruition many of the Council's expressed wishes.

The USSR, explaining its negative vote, said much of the report was sharply at odds with the real state of affairs in the Territory and would encourage the United States in its policy to fragment and annex Micronesia, perpetuate United States domination, and transform it into a military beach-head threatening peace and security.

**ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES.** On 20 August, the Committee on colonial countries adopted conclusions and recommendations on the Territory,<sup>(3)</sup> dealing with self-determination and independence as well as political and economic conditions. It expressed regret at the Administering Authority's refusal to co-operate with it by declining to participate in the Committee's examination of the Territory, and called on the United States to send a representative to keep the Committee informed. Noting that reports on the Territory were before the Security Council, the Committee called attention to Article 83 of the Charter of the United Nations, under which the Security Council exercised all United Nations functions relating to strategic areas, with the Trusteeship Council's assistance on political, economic, social and educational matters.

The Chairman transmitted the Committee's conclusions to the Security Council by a letter of 26 August.<sup>(2)</sup>

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION.** A draft decision on the Trust Territory,<sup>(1)</sup> repeating most of the recommendations in the consensus adopted by the Committee on colonial countries, was introduced in the Fourth Committee by the Syrian Arab Republic, with Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia and Ethiopia joining as sponsors. However, the Fourth Committee, by a recorded vote of 71 to 30, with 20 abstentions, adopted on 23 November a motion by Australia to adjourn consideration of the item. Australia pointed out that the Committee had not previously dealt with the question since, under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, the Security Council, with the assistance of the Trusteeship Council, had fully exercised United Nations functions regarding the Territory.

The Niger supported the Australian proposal, remarking that the Administering Authority's co-operation was indispensable if the decisions approved by the Committee were to be implemented, and in this case there was no consensus in the Committee. Norway also favoured adjournment, stating that there was no reason to change the procedure under which the Territory was dealt with by the Trusteeship Council. The United States said the draft decision's sponsors sought to change the Committee's long-standing practice of not making pronouncements on the Territory, out of deference

to the Security Council, the Trusteeship Council and the Charter.

The USSR opposed the Australian proposal, stating that discussion of the Territory in the Fourth Committee was relevant in view of the concern expressed by representatives of the Territory that the United States was attempting to annex it. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Syrian Arab Republic believed the question was one of self-determination and independence under the Declaration on colonial countries,<sup>(6)</sup> and should be debated by the Assembly.

Before the adoption of the Australian motion, a number of delegations commented on the Territory during the Committee's discussion of individual colonial Territories. The comments related to self-determination and independence and to economic conditions.

Draft decision not acted upon: <sup>(1)</sup>Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Syria" Arab Republic, A/C.4/36/L.15/Rev.1.

Letter: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries Chairman, 26 Aug., S/14651.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1; <sup>(4)</sup>TC, S/14709; <sup>(5)</sup>United States, transmitted by S-G note, S/14496 (T/1830) and corrigenda, transmitted by United States in notes verbales, T/1832 (18 May) and T/1833 (19 May).

Resolution: <sup>(6)</sup>GA, 1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1946-47, p. 398.

Meeting records: TC, T/PV.1506-1522 (18 May-11 June); Committee colonial countries, A/AC.109/PV.1193-1195, 1201 (12-20 Aug.); GA, 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-20, 22, 24, 25 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.).

#### Self-determination and independence

Reporting on the status of negotiations between United States and Micronesian representatives on future political status, the United States informed the Trusteeship Council in the Administering Authority's annual report that a compact of free association had been initialled on 31 October 1980 by representatives of the United States and of the Federated States and the Marshall Islands, and on 17 November by the President-elect of Palau. The compact defined the political status of the three areas and their relationship with the United States in the post-trusteeship period, recognizing their capacity to manage their own foreign affairs. Several subsidiary agreements remained to be negotiated.

**TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL ACTION.** In the conclusions and recommendations of its report (p. 1120), under the heading "Constitutional developments and progress towards self-government or independence", the Trusteeship Council reaffirmed the right of the Micronesian people to self-determination, including the right to independence. It noted that substantial progress had been made in the political status negotiations,

and that the compact of free association had been initialled by the prospective parties. While appreciating the need for the Administering Authority to review its policy on the Trust Territory, the Council nevertheless noted that it had not been possible, during its 1981 session, to confirm the United States intention to seek to terminate the Trusteeship Agreement by 1981.

The Council trusted that the negotiations would lead to a mutually satisfactory outcome which respected the personality of every party. It noted with interest the statements by representatives of the constitutional governments emphasizing their desire to maintain preferential and close relations with the Administering Authority after termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. It noted the Administering Authority's stated intention to invite the international community to observe, through the appropriate United Nations organs, the referendum on the compact of free association, to be held in each of the affected areas once the compact was signed.

The Council said it did not wish to make precise recommendations on the future political status of the various Micronesian entities and reiterated its view that free association was not incompatible with the Trusteeship Agreement, provided the populations concerned freely accepted it. The Council favoured a political education programme (p. 1123).

The Council noted that the United States had reaffirmed its intention to proceed in a manner fully consistent with the United Nations Charter and to take up the matter of termination of the Agreement at the appropriate time with the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council. It again expressed hope that the Micronesians would establish, after termination of the Agreement, the all-Micronesian entity which they had agreed upon in 1977.

In the Council's debate, the United States said its new Administration was undertaking a review of its Micronesian policy with only one preconception- that the ultimate result of the political status negotiations must be fully and freely approved by the peoples and governments concerned. The United States had long and ardently supported the idea of the Territory's unity; the political separation that had occurred was a result of the peoples' will, expressed in open referenda observed by Council members.

France desired to see the Trusteeship Agreement terminated as soon as possible, in accordance with the wishes of the people and with the Charter; it considered that the United States had so far carried out virtually all its political commitments towards the Micronesians. The United Kingdom was pleased that the United

States still sought to encourage co-operation among Micronesians to achieve an all-Micronesian entity, and hoped the Administering Authority's policy review would be completed as soon as possible so that progress could resume towards achieving the aims of trusteeship.

The USSR stated that, instead of leading the Territory towards decolonization, the United States was perpetuating its domination over the area, pursuing militarization and implementing a policy of dismemberment and annexation; any change in the Territory's status must be introduced only following a Security Council decision.

The representatives of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands and Palau indicated that the initialled compact of free association had the support of their respective peoples and urged the Administering Authority to expedite its policy review so that they could move forward to a prompt resumption of the negotiations on subsidiary agreements.

**ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES.** In the conclusions and recommendations it adopted on 20 August (p. 1121), the Committee on colonial countries reaffirmed the right of the people of the Territory to self-determination and independence. Reiterating the Administering Authority's obligation to create conditions that would enable the people to exercise that right freely, it urged the United States to undertake a political education programme to that end. Noting the Administering Authority's intention to seek termination of the Trusteeship Agreement in the near future, the Committee said this should be done in strict conformity with the United Nations Charter. Recognizing that the people must decide their political destiny, it called on the United States to preserve the Territory's unity until the people had exercised their right to self-determination and independence.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION.** During the Fourth Committee's debate on individual Territories, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia and the Ukrainian SSR said that Micronesia was being fragmented and dismembered by the Administering Authority, which was attempting to annex some regions of the Territory. The USSR regarded such annexation as a violation of the United Nations Charter; although the Congress of the Federation of Micronesia had adopted many resolutions aimed at preserving the Territory's unity, the United States continued to ignore the legitimate interests of the Micronesians. Kuwait endorsed the view of the Committee on colonial countries that the United States should preserve

the territorial integrity and unity of the Territory until its people were ready to exercise their right to self-determination.

Czechoslovakia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the USSR and Viet Nam opposed the maintenance of military bases in the Territory by the Administering Authority and said they impeded the Territory's decolonization and endangered the region's security. Hungary stated that building military bases had done irreparable harm to the Territory's economy.

#### Politics and government

The United States reported to the Trusteeship Council that a new constitution for Palau had been endorsed in a referendum held on 9 July 1980, elections for a new government had taken place on 4 November 1980, and on 1 January 1981 the new government had assumed power and the new constitution had gone into effect. The referendum was observed by a Visiting Mission of the Council.<sup>(1)</sup>

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL ACTION. In its report (p. 1120), under the heading "Political advancement", the Trusteeship Council said it was pleased to note that, with the achievement of constitutional government in Palau, there were constitutional governments throughout the Trust Territory. It noted that responsibility for administrative matters throughout the Territory was exercised by those governments and that the High Commissioner's power to suspend legislation had been invoked only rarely.

The Council welcomed the increasing contacts which the constitutional governments had made with nations in the region. It noted with particular interest that the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands and the Northern Mariana Islands had achieved full membership in the South Pacific Commission, and that the Federated States had observer status in the South Pacific Forum.

The Council was seriously concerned at the slow pace of the political education programme in preparation for the future plebiscite. It insisted that the people of Micronesia must be made fully aware of their options and noted the Administering Authority's assurances that such a programme would be set in train, in co-operation with the constitutional governments.

The Council welcomed the reduction of the Administering Authority's staff at Trust Territory headquarters in Saipan, and noted the statement by the representative of the Administering Authority that his office would function in future as a technical and management assistance institution, handing over responsibility for direct administration to the new constitutional governments. At the same time, it said the size of

the civil service throughout the Territory remained a cause for concern, burdening territorial budgets and absorbing a disproportionate share of trained personnel. It urged the Administering Authority to help create private sector jobs so that the civil service could be reduced without exacerbating unemployment.

In the Council's debate, the United States expressed the view that the evolution towards Self-government in the Territory might well emerge as the single most significant step away from trusteeship and dependency. Speaking of plans for a political education campaign, the United States reaffirmed its commitment, subject to Congressional approval, to finance the major expenses involved, but pointed out that the constitutional governments had generally assumed responsibility for public information with respect to self-government.

The United Kingdom stressed that voters must be fully aware of their choices and of the likely consequences of choosing one option over another. France, referring to difficulties that had arisen in the transfer of power from the Administering Authority to local governments, suggested that arrangements be made to avoid the later repudiation of freely adopted decisions and to prevent legal complications.

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES. In its conclusions and recommendations of 20 August (p. 1121), the Committee on colonial countries noted that responsibility for administrative matters throughout the Territory was exercised by local authorities but regretted that the High Commissioner maintained the power to suspend certain legislation, although that power was rarely invoked. The Committee recalled that the Administering Authority was obliged to transfer all power to the Territory's elected leaders.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(1)</sup>1980, p. 1036.

#### Economic conditions

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL ACTION. Under the heading "Economic advancement", the Trusteeship Council, in its report (p. 1120), noted with regret that the Territory's economy did not generate sufficient funds to cover the administrative and social expenditure of the constitutional governments. In particular, structural imbalances seemed not to have been significantly reduced. It felt that since the Micronesians were on the verge of choosing their future status, economic assistance to the Territory should be maintained at least at its current level to enable the people to achieve a measure of economic independence.

The Council noted with satisfaction that the Administering Authority would provide the

funds needed to attain the goals of the five-year capital improvement plan ending in 1981 and hoped that final contracts might be awarded speedily. It regretted that the second phase of the capital improvement programme, for development of the outer islands, was intended only for later implementation, and it hoped some parts of the programme would be implemented before the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

It noted that the Micronesian economy continued to be affected by inflation and energy price rises, though efforts had been made to find and develop alternative energy sources, particularly solar energy and wind power. Noting that water and electricity supplies remained erratic in certain places, it favoured modernization of diesel generators.

The Council noted that the Territory's exports amounted in value to only one fifth of its imports and that income from copra and tuna fish had declined in the past year. As there could be no rapid increase in funds derived from agriculture, handicrafts, fishing and tourism, the Council urged the Administering Authority to promote development of the kinds of production that could satisfy local needs, especially for food. It noted that the Administering Authority was assisting the constitutional governments to develop local products, thereby discouraging purchases of similar products abroad. It reiterated the view that taxes and duties should be designed to discourage imports of locally obtainable goods.

The Council strongly encouraged the Territory's leaders to develop relations with regional and international programmes.

It noted with satisfaction that the maritime authorities of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands and Palau were working to strengthen their legislation on the protection of the 200-mile oceanic zones. It took note of the Administering Authority's intention of extending assistance to ensure respect for the Micronesians' rights over those zones.

In the Council's view, transport and communications continued to be a serious problem. It hoped legal problems resulting from the transfer of ownership of ships and aircraft to the constitutional governments would be solved rapidly, and regretted that the road network remained inadequate in some places. It welcomed the expansion of the tourism industry but hoped local interests and social structures would be safeguarded and the environment preserved.

In the discussion, France said it appeared from the Administering Authority's report that the Territory's inhabitants were more than ever dependent on United States assistance, which provided more than 90 per cent of their financial

resources; France was concerned that no major investment had been made, studies had not always been followed up and few projects had achieved results. The United Kingdom saw many areas of economic progress in the past 12 months and paid tribute to the urgency with which certain projects had been pursued; it urged that as much assistance as possible be given for infrastructural, educational and training programmes before the Trusteeship Agreement was terminated. The USSR stated that the economic and social situation remained stagnant; the United States paid no attention to developing viable economic conditions and ending the Territory's dependence on foreign financing.

The United States informed the Council that, out of the \$238.7 million which the Administering Authority had committed to the Territory's capital improvement programme, \$23.6 million was for 1980/1981.

The representatives of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands and Palau expressed concern about the lack of economic progress in the Territory and stressed the need for greater economic assistance.

**ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES.** In its conclusions and recommendations of 20 August (p. 1121), the Committee on colonial countries expressed satisfaction with the Administering Authority's funding of the Territory's capital improvement plan, and noted that the Authority's role was increasingly restricted to overseeing that programme and the expenditure of funds appropriated by the United States Congress. The Committee urged the United States to continue taking measures to guarantee the right of the Micronesians to own and dispose of the Territory's natural resources and to establish and maintain control of their future development. It noted that the Territory's maritime authorities intended to strengthen existing legislation on the exploitation, management and conservation of a 200-mile exclusive economic zone, and hoped that the Micronesians' rights over that zone would be respected and that they would receive all benefits from it.

The Committee noted with satisfaction the assistance provided to the Territory by certain international and regional bodies, and encouraged the Territory's leadership to develop relations with such agencies, particularly those in the United Nations system.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION.** Czechoslovakia, speaking in the Fourth Committee's debate on individual Territories, stated that the Territory had reached a pitiful economic state: agriculture had practically disappeared, the unemployment rate was 13 per cent, and there had been no development of the infrastruc-



ture or of transport and communications. In Hungary's view, the United States was not ensuring proper use of the Territory's natural resources. Mongolia said the United States had caused the economy and social system in Micronesia to worsen, its external dependence to increase and its agriculture to decay. The USSR saw the economic situation as evidence of the Administering Authority's indifference.

#### Social conditions

Under the heading "Social advancement", the Trusteeship Council, in its report (p. 1120), welcomed the establishment of a Health Manpower Training Program for the Trust Territory, which had already trained more than 100 Micronesians. However, it regretted that the health services had only two qualified Micronesian doctors. Commending the Administering Authority for its continuing efforts to improve health standards, the Council noted a marked reduction in major diseases due to vaccination programmes, as well as a decline in deaths from intestinal diseases. However, it urged attention to local outbreaks of tuberculosis and leprosy.

The Council continued to be deeply concerned by the serious unemployment problem and the imbalance between wage-earners in the public and private sectors. Stating that it was disturbed by communications it had received on youth problems such as unemployment and juvenile delinquency, it trusted that the Administering Authority would devote due attention to the consequences of the particularly young age structure.

In the debate, the USSR described the state of medical care as catastrophic and said the situation regarding training of medical personnel was not much better, as illustrated by the paucity of Micronesian physicians. The United Kingdom endorsed a suggestion for a study of the social effects of the Trusteeship System and said it had been disturbed by reports of social problems among youth.

#### Education

In the section of its report (p. 1120) dealing with "Educational advancement", the Trusteeship Council considered that the Administering Authority had served the Trust Territory well in providing a system of universal primary schooling throughout the islands. It welcomed the high rate of secondary school attendance and hoped that higher educational and vocational training schemes would be improved in preparation for termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

Noting with concern what it called the precarious situation at the College of Micronesia, the Territory's principal institution for higher educa-

tion, the Council urged the Administering Authority to ensure that its facilities were not allowed to deteriorate to the point that its accreditation in the United States educational system was jeopardized.

The Council welcomed vocational programmes and the recognition given to imparting technical skills; it urged the Administering Authority to expand such programmes. It noted the Authority's efforts to improve the general level of teacher qualification, including the new teacher certification requirement, and hoped sufficient incentives would be given to improve teachers' prospects in relation to the civil service.

#### Other questions

##### Resettlement of the Bikini and Enewetak populations

In the section of its report (p. 1120) entitled "Population movements", the Trusteeship Council dealt with the situation of the people of Bikini and Enewetak atolls in the Marshall Islands, who had had to relocate to other islands because of radioactive contamination from nuclear-weapon tests three decades earlier. It took note of a statement by the Acting Deputy High Commissioner and Special Representative of the Administering Authority that work would continue towards improving conditions for the displaced people and strengthening the health and food programmes in those and other areas in the Marshall Islands affected by nuclear problems.

The Council noted with regret that the health programme proposed under recent United States legislation had not been implemented. It noted that there was some doubt as to who would be covered by the plan and urged the parties to find a speedy solution.

The Council regretted that not all the people of Enewetak had been able to re-establish their homes on the atoll as they had hoped. However, it noted that interim measures had been taken, in close consultation with the people of Enewetak, for their resettlement. It reiterated its concern that any resettlement proposal should take fully into account any remaining health hazards.

It also noted that a master plan for the relocation of the Bikinians was currently under review. The Council welcomed the steps taken to improve the temporary conditions of the people of Bikini on Kili and Ejit Islands, while recognizing their ultimate intention to return to Bikini when it was safe to do so. It also welcomed the decision to construct an airstrip on Kili.

In the debate, the United States said it was aware of its continuing responsibility to mitigate the situation. The rehabilitation effort on

Enewetak had resulted in the return of the people, and the population of Bikini had also received substantial assistance.

France said it was impressed by United States efforts to decontaminate and improve Enewetak but shared the concern about medical assistance to the islanders and hoped a speedy solution would be found to the problem of the Bikinians living on Kili. The USSR said the Administering Authority had taken no steps to meet the appeals of the affected people for eradication of the pernicious effects of the nuclear explosions and for guaranteed medical assistance; moreover, nothing in the Charter of the United Nations or the Trusteeship Agreement gave the United States the right to test weapons of mass destruction in the Territory. The United Kingdom, referring to a request from the Enewetak people to continue under United States trusteeship after the Trusteeship Agreement was terminated, hoped they would find a solution to their problems within the Marshall Islands, as it would be unfortunate if smaller units were to seek further trusteeship arrangements or even delay the end of the current Agreement.

#### Radioactive waste management

In the section of its report (p. 1120) devoted to "Land and people", the Trusteeship Council noted the concern expressed by Micronesian representatives about the possible dangers of dumping nuclear waste in the Pacific region. It noted

in particular the appeal of Francisco C. Ada, Special Representative of the Administering Authority from the Northern Mariana Islands, who had stated to the Council his opposition to making the Pacific a storage area for nuclear waste.

The Council noted observations by the Administering Authority in response to a communication on this matter received in 1980. The observations were to the effect that the research vessel *Vema*, whose activities had been protested in a communication to the Council from the Governor of the Northern Mariana Islands, was engaged in a sea-bed sediments survey, outside the 200-mile limit, as part of a long-term international feasibility study for nuclear waste disposal, unrelated to a proposed Japan-United States feasibility (land-based) study on storage of spent fuel.

#### Claims

The Trusteeship Council dealt in its report (p. 1120) with the question of war damage claims brought against the Japanese Government, mainly for damages sustained by Micronesians during the Second World War, and of post-war claims against the United States Government. It reiterated its concern that the claims had not been fully settled as determined by the Micronesian Claims Commission and called on the parties to make further efforts to resolve the long-standing issue in the best interest of the innocent victims.

### Chapter III

## Namibia

Several United Nations organs were active in 1981 with respect to Namibia-the largest Territory still under colonial rule.

From 7 to 14 January, a meeting was held at Geneva among the parties directly concerned, under the auspices of the United Nations and chairmanship of the Secretary-General with the aim of facilitating agreement on a cease-fire and a date to begin implementing a Security Council-approved plan for elections leading to independence for the Territory. The so-called settlement plan, which the Council had endorsed in 1978,<sup>(20)</sup> provided for a cease-fire, the establishment in Namibia of a United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) elections under United Nations supervision, the formulation and adoption of a constitution, and the achievement of independence.

Participating in the Geneva meeting were

delegations from South Africa, whose occupation of Namibia had been declared illegal by the General Assembly and the Security Council, and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), recognized by the Assembly as the national liberation movement. Among the observers were the front-line States bordering Namibia and South Africa, and the members of the "Contact group", made up of the five Western States (Canada, France, Federal Republic of Germany, United Kingdom, United States) that had proposed the settlement plan. The Secretary-General reported to the Security Council afterwards<sup>(21)</sup> that the meeting had not achieved its objective; the South African Government was not currently prepared to sign a cease-fire agreement and proceed with implementation.

Following brief consideration by the Security Council late in January, the General Assembly

took up the question in March at its resumed thirty-fifth session, after having postponed consideration in December 1980 in light of the upcoming Geneva meeting. Ten resolutions on Namibia were adopted at the resumed session. By one of them, the Assembly called on the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, and said it would consider necessary action if the Council failed to act.<sup>(12)</sup> Another resolution also contained a call for sanctions, along with a reaffirmation of Namibia's right to self-determination.<sup>(3)</sup> In addition, the Assembly urged States to break off economic relations with South Africa whenever they concerned Namibia.<sup>(4)</sup>

In April, the Security Council again considered the Namibia question but, because of negative votes by three permanent members (France, United Kingdom, United States), it did not adopt four draft resolutions sponsored by the African members of the Council, calling for the imposition of mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa.

The International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, meeting in Paris in May, adopted a Special Declaration on Namibia in which it called for the urgent implementation of the settlement plan and emphasized the need for increased political and diplomatic pressure against South Africa, reinforced by sanctions. In August, a consensus text deploring the Security Council's failure to impose mandatory sanctions and endorsing a call for an emergency special session of the Assembly was adopted by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

In light of the Council's failure to act, the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly was convened from 3 to 14 September to deal with the question. The Assembly demanded unconditional implementation of the settlement plan without delay or modification, and again urged the Council to impose sanctions.<sup>(13)</sup>

In December, at its regular 1981 session, the Assembly adopted six more resolutions on Namibia. It called on all States to sever all diplomatic, consular and trade relations with South Africa, and detailed a number of economic measures to be taken by the international community.<sup>(15)</sup> As it had done in September, it rejected what it described as manœuvres by certain contact group members aimed at undermining the consensus behind the settlement plan.<sup>(14)</sup>

The United Nations Council for Namibia met at Panama City in June and adopted the

Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, calling on all United Nations Member States to act unilaterally and collectively to impose comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. The Council continued throughout the year its efforts to secure implementation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia, and its drafts served as the basis for most of the resolutions adopted by the Assembly on this question in 1981.

The Council's report<sup>(1)</sup> was sent to the Assembly, which established its work programme for 1981<sup>(5)</sup> and 1982.<sup>(16)</sup> The Assembly also repeated earlier requests that the Council be granted full membership in United Nations organizations as the Administering Authority for Namibia,<sup>(6)</sup> and authorized a co-operative programme between the Council and non-governmental organizations.<sup>(17)</sup>

The Assembly decided in March to launch a world campaign of information dissemination to support United Nations resolutions for a free and independent Namibia.<sup>(10)</sup> In this connection, it decided in December to expose and denounce the collusion of certain Western countries with South Africa.<sup>(18)</sup>

On economic issues, the Assembly, in March, requested Governments, particularly those of specified Western States, to prohibit their corporations from dealing in and prospecting for Namibian uranium.<sup>(11)</sup> The United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, meeting at Nairobi, Kenya, condemned the plunder and illegal exploitation of Namibian energy resources by South Africa and multinational corporations (p. 1171).

Namibians outside their country continued to receive assistance from several United Nations programmes. The main source of financing was the United Nations Fund for Namibia, which spent \$7.7 million in 1981. The Assembly authorized a further appeal for contributions in March<sup>(9)</sup> and in December it allocated \$1 million from the United Nations budget for the Fund's use in 1982.<sup>(19)</sup>

The Nationhood Programme for Namibia, financed largely from this Fund, had a programme of 46 projects for training of personnel and research in preparation for independence. In March, the Assembly expressed appreciation to Angola for having offered a site for a vocational training centre for Namibians under this Programme.<sup>(s)</sup>

At Lusaka, Zambia, the United Nations Institute for Namibia had 415 students and gave diplomas in management and development studies to 80 graduates. The Assembly commended its training and research work, and authorized a further fund appeal.<sup>(7)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Council for Namibia, A/36/24; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, S/14333.  
 Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/227 A (p. 1149), <sup>(4)</sup>35/227 B (p. 1151), <sup>(5)</sup>35/227 C (p. 1161), <sup>(6)</sup>35/227 D (p. 1162), <sup>(7)</sup>35/227 E (p. 1177), <sup>(8)</sup>35/227 F (p. 1174), <sup>(9)</sup>35/227 G (p. 1172), <sup>(10)</sup>35/227 H (p. 1166), <sup>(11)</sup>35/227 I (p. 1169), <sup>(12)</sup>35/227 J (p. 1152), 6 Mar.; <sup>(13)</sup>ES-8/2, 14 Sep. (p. 1153); <sup>(14)</sup>36/121 A (p. 1154), <sup>(15)</sup>36/121 B (p. 1157), <sup>(16)</sup>36/121 C (p. 1163), <sup>(17)</sup>36/121 D (p. 1164), <sup>(18)</sup>36/121 E (p. 1167), <sup>(19)</sup>36/121 F (p. 1173), 10 Dec. <sup>(20)</sup>SC:435(1978), 29 Sep. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 915).

## Namibia question

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. The Secretary-General reported to the Security Council on 19 January 1981<sup>(37)</sup> on implementation of two 1978 Council resolutions on the Namibia question. He informed the Council that a pre-implementation meeting under the auspices and chairmanship of the United Nations had been held at Geneva from 7 to 14 January, with the aim of facilitating agreement on a date for the cease-fire and the beginning of implementation in early 1981.

Delegations from South Africa and SWAPO had participated in the meeting, led respectively by the South African Administrator-General of Namibia, Danie Hough, and the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma. The front-line States and Nigeria, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the contact group of the five Western States had attended as observers. The Secretary-General had chaired the opening sessions, and the working sessions had been chaired by Brian E. Urquhart, United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs.

Detailed presentations had been made to the meeting on behalf of the United Nations regarding the manner in which the Secretary-General's Special Representative for Namibia and UNTAG would fulfil their responsibilities.

The South African delegation had asserted that the United Nations had disqualified itself from supervising free and fair elections in Namibia, in particular by recognizing SWAPO as the sole representative of the people of Namibia, and that consequently a definite date for implementation would be acceptable only after an unspecified period in which the United Nations would express its impartiality. In response, the Chairman had pointed out that the matter of trust and confidence was a two-way street and that the key to entering a new phase was a definite agreement to proceed on a specific date with implementation.

The President of SWAPO had reiterated his organization's acceptance of the Council's settlement resolution and had stated that SWAPO was ready to sign a cease-fire, to agree to a target date for the arrival of UNTAG in Namibia, and to

co-operate with its military and civilian components. However, since South Africa had not agreed, SWAPO had no alternative but to continue with the liberation struggle.

The Secretary-General reported that the meeting had not achieved its objective. It had become clear in the course of the meeting that the South African Government was not currently prepared to sign a cease-fire agreement and proceed with implementation. However, the meeting had been important in informing the participants in detail of the manner in which the United Nations would discharge its responsibilities during implementation, and in the contacts and exchanges it had facilitated. Expressing his belief that the outcome of the meeting must give rise to the most serious international concern, the Secretary-General appealed urgently to the Government of South Africa to review the implications of the meeting and to reconsider its position at the earliest possible time.

In a letter to the Secretary-General dated 28 January,<sup>(17)</sup> South Africa transmitted a letter of the same date from its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information, expressing the view that the interests of the internal parties in Namibia had not been addressed at the Geneva meeting and enclosing statements made at the meeting by three of their representatives. The letter stated that the internal parties remained concerned at what they considered to be United Nations partiality towards SWAPO and the lack of equal treatment of the political parties. Consequently they did not have confidence in United Nations supervision and control of free and fair elections; in their view, the United Nations had failed at Geneva to rectify its bias in favour of SWAPO. It would therefore be premature to proceed with a discussion of setting a date for implementation.

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION (JANUARY). In accordance with a request by Tunisia on behalf of the African Group, contained in a letter of 29 January,<sup>(21)</sup> the Security Council considered the Namibia question and the Secretary-General's report on 30 January.

The Secretary-General informed the Council that he had addressed a letter to the South African Foreign Minister on 22 January expressing hope that the Government would give serious attention to his appeal for a reconsideration of its position, and stating his concern over the effect of the stalemate on Namibia and the whole region. The Secretary-General hoped that efforts would not be relaxed to ensure the early attainment of independence for Namibia.

All 15 members of the Council participated in the debate, expressing appreciation to the Secretary-General and his staff for their efforts

in preparing and conducting the Geneva meeting, and regret and disappointment that the meeting had not achieved its objectives. Most speakers paid tribute to the efforts by the front-line States and Nigeria, OAU and members of the contact group to bring about implementation of the Council's resolutions. Several representatives commended SWAPO for the sense of responsibility and constructive spirit with which it had supported efforts towards a settlement.

China, the German Democratic Republic, Japan, Mexico, the Niger, the Philippines, Tunisia, Uganda and the USSR attributed the meeting's failure to the intransigent attitude of South Africa and the obstacles it had raised to implementing the settlement plan. China said South Africa would never succeed in its scheme to put its puppets in power and stage a sham independence for Namibia. Japan joined in the Secretary-General's appeal to South Africa to reconsider its position. Mexico thought the result suggested that South Africa did not believe States had made a true commitment to comply with United Nations decisions. The Philippines viewed the result as a serious set-back to United Nations efforts. In Tunisia's view, the delegations at Geneva, particularly those of Western States, must have learned a lesson from South Africa's irresponsible and defiant attitude. Uganda stated that Africa had risen in the past to the challenges of armed struggle and of negotiated settlements, and would do so again in the case of Namibia.

The German Democratic Republic and the USSR asserted that, in light of South Africa's policy of obstruction, the Security Council should take decisive action under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations (on action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression) to ensure that the Namibian people achieved genuine independence.

Ireland viewed the situation as serious and said it shared the concern of other delegations. Similar concern was voiced by Spain. The longer South Africa took to comply with the Council's decisions, said Panama, the worse the situation would become.

Among members of the contact group, France said it was certain that the parties would continue their efforts to bring about an internationally recognized peaceful solution. The United Kingdom quoted a statement by its Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs that agreement had proved impossible because the delegation led by the South African Administrator-General thought it premature to agree on an implementation date. The United States said it was reviewing the situation and

would later share its assessment with its colleagues in the contact group and the interested parties.

**ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS (FEBRUARY-MARCH).** Four resolutions dealing in whole or in part with the Namibia question were adopted by the Commission on Human Rights. On 23 February, in connection with the report of its Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on Southern Africa (p. 943), the Commission requested the Security Council to consider imposing mandatory sanctions against South Africa<sup>(39)</sup> and condemned the increased South African military presence in Namibia.<sup>(40)</sup> Also on 23 February, on the subject of foreign support of South Africa (p. 945), it affirmed the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, and requested States to end collaboration with South Africa.<sup>(41)</sup> On 6 March, dealing with self-determination of peoples, it condemned the sentencing to death of SWAPO freedom fighters by the South African courts (p. 944).<sup>(42)</sup>

The Economic and Social Council, on 8 May, decided to transmit the Commission's resolution of 23 February on sanctions to the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Special Committee against Apartheid.<sup>(63)</sup>

**COMMUNICATION (MARCH).** By a letter dated 1 March,<sup>(33)</sup> the United Republic of Cameroon transmitted, on behalf of the African Group, a resolution on Namibia adopted by the OAU Council of Ministers at its thirty-sixth session (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 23 February-1 March).

By this resolution, the Ministers: condemned South Africa for its violations of United Nations decisions, including its defiance of the United Nations plan on Namibia as manifested in its deliberate wrecking of the Geneva pre-implementation meeting; considered that the contact group members had responsibility to bring pressure on South Africa and deplored the group's apparent unwillingness to do so; endorsed a call by the Ministerial Conference of Non-Aligned Countries (New Delhi, India, 9-13 February) for the convening of the Security Council by mid-April with a view to adopting comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, and mandated several African Foreign Ministers to participate in those meetings; and, in the event of failure by the Security Council to adopt the appropriate measures, called for the convening of an emergency special session of the General Assembly.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (MARCH).** The General Assembly resumed its thirty-fifth session from 2 to 6 March 1981 to deal with the Namibia question, after having postponed consideration of the item in December 1980.<sup>(64)</sup> It adopted 10

resolutions on 6 March, three of them dealing with general aspects of the problem and the rest with specific aspects (p. 1126). Nine of the resolutions were based on texts recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1980.<sup>(70)</sup> The tenth, on the "Situation resulting from South Africa's refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia", was adopted on the basis of a text recommended by the Council on 26 February 1981.

The first of the resolutions on general aspects concerned the situation in Namibia resulting from its illegal occupation by South Africa.<sup>(49)</sup> The Assembly called on the Security Council urgently to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa to ensure that country's compliance with United Nations decisions. Reiterating United Nations responsibility for Namibia, it reaffirmed the people's right to self-determination, freedom and national independence, and called for increased support to SWAPO as their sole and authentic representative. It strongly condemned South African repression in Namibia and its manœuvres to transfer power to illegitimate groups subservient to its interests. The Assembly declared null and void measures to enforce military conscription in the Territory, condemned South Africa's increasing military build-up there and demanded the release of political prisoners. It condemned Western and other States which had assisted South Africa in developing nuclear capability, and the activities of foreign economic interests illegally exploiting Namibia's resources.

This resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 114 to none, with 22 abstentions. Sponsored by 70 nations, it was introduced by Algeria, which stated that it dealt with all aspects of the Namibia question as it stood at the end of 1980, before the pre-implementation meeting.

The second of the general resolutions concerned the intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in support of Namibia.<sup>(50)</sup> The Assembly urged States to break off economic relations with South Africa whenever they concerned Namibia and to take measures to compel South Africa to withdraw from the Territory immediately. It appealed to Governments to discourage their private investors from participating in business ventures in the Territory which helped finance the military costs of South Africa's repressive policies there. It requested the preparation of a United Nations handbook on transnational corporations operating in Namibia. The Assembly requested the Council for Namibia to urge corporations to cease supplying arms and ammunition to South Africa, to continue efforts to protect Namibia's natural resources, to notify Governments of States

whose corporations operated in Namibia of the illegality of such operations, to warn those corporations that their operations were illegal, and to send missions aimed at discouraging foreign investments in Namibia. The Council was also requested to report on foreign exploitation of Namibian uranium (p. 1168).

This resolution, introduced by Nigeria and sponsored by 65 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 131 to none, with 5 abstentions.

The third resolution of a general nature<sup>(51)</sup> had been recommended by the Council for Namibia following the Geneva pre-implementation meeting. The Assembly determined that South Africa had acted deceitfully during the protracted talks for a negotiated settlement, to the detriment of the Namibians and SWAPO. It condemned South Africa for refusing to abide by United Nations resolutions, for intensifying repression against the Namibians, and for arresting and detaining SWAPO members. South Africa was also strongly condemned for its continued acts of aggression against independent African States (p. 214). The Assembly decided to increase United Nations financing for the SWAPO office in New York. Declaring South Africa's actions to be a serious threat to peace and security, the Assembly called on the Security Council to convene urgently to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Should the Council be unable to adopt concrete measures, the Assembly would urgently consider necessary action.

This resolution, sponsored by 68 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 125 to none, with 13 abstentions. Introducing it, Algeria said the text drew a lesson from South Africa's latest act of defiance and proposed a new international approach to compel South African withdrawal. It was based on three main ideas: the flagrant illegality of the situation, the links between South Africa and certain Western countries that had not exerted enough pressure on it, and the support which the Namibians had earned through their political maturity.

On 2 March 1981, the Assembly decided without vote,<sup>(65)</sup> on an oral proposal of the President, to take note of a report by its Fourth Committee on hearings granted in November 1980 to 15 petitioners representing a number of non-governmental organizations.<sup>(70)</sup>

Also on 2 March, just prior to the debate on the Namibia question, the Assembly approved its Credentials Committee's decision to reject the credentials of the delegation of South Africa to the thirty-fifth session (p. 163).

In explanation of their abstentions on the first resolution, Austria, Belgium, Finland (on behalf of the five Nordic States), the Netherlands and New Zealand expressed reservations with re-

spect to provisions recognizing SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. Belgium saw a contradiction between that clause and the principle of free and fair elections. Australia, Belgium, Finland (for the Nordic States), Japan, the Netherlands and New Zealand reserved their positions on provisions supporting armed struggle and calling for military assistance to the Namibians. Without referring to specific provisions, Portugal said the resolution contained references with which it could not agree and paragraphs which lacked balance.

Argentina, Fiji, Greece, Ireland and Uruguay said that they had voted for one or more of the resolutions despite their strong conviction that to support armed struggle was incompatible with the United Nations Charter, which was dedicated to the peaceful settlement of disputes. Among others voting in favour, reservations were voiced by Ireland and Peru on the provisions relating to military assistance to SWAPO, and by Greece and Uruguay on the recognition of SWAPO as the sole representative of the Namibians.

Several States had reservations regarding the call for enforcement measures against South Africa by the Security Council. Austria and Greece objected to any attempt to prejudice the Council, while Finland stated on behalf of the Nordic countries that only the Council could adopt decisions binding on Member States. In Australia's view, it was improper to upset the division of duties and responsibilities assigned by the Charter to different organs. Ireland considered that the Assembly could call on the Council to impose sanctions, but the Council must decide whether to act and what to do.

Belgium felt that sanctions would be difficult to apply and would harm African States. Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zimbabwe, alluding to their proximity to South Africa, reserved their positions on the call for sanctions.

The United States, explaining the abstention of the contact group members on all 10 resolutions on Namibia adopted by the Assembly in March, said their stand implied no judgement on the merits, but few of the resolutions contributed to the objective of securing a peaceful and internationally recognized settlement.

The President of the Council for Namibia, presenting the Council's report on its 1980 activities,<sup>(69)</sup> stated that South Africa must be held totally responsible for the collapse of the Geneva pre-implementation meeting. The five Western nations which had initiated the ideas that had culminated in the settlement plan should flex their economic muscles and pressure the South African regime to comply with United Nations resolutions.

In the general debate on the Namibia question, many speakers agreed that during the past year South Africa had continued its policy of impeding implementation of the United Nations settlement plan, intensified its terror and repression against Namibians, especially members of SWAPO, and adopted a course of expanding militarization of the Territory and aggressive behaviour towards neighbouring African States. In an effort to consolidate the powers of the illegal local administration, South Africa had established a so-called Council of Ministers and had instituted compulsory military conscription for Namibians. It appeared to be negotiating on the Namibia question largely to gain time to consolidate the power of its puppet regime, headed by the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance (DTA); it had no genuine desire to reach a peaceful settlement or allow free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control. In particular, many speakers felt, South Africa appeared to fear that such elections would culminate in the legitimate victory of SWAPO.

It was obvious, said Brazil and Ecuador, that South Africa did not intend to relinquish control over Namibia or implement the United Nations plan. If South Africa was trying to buy time in order to consolidate the position of Namibia's so-called internal parties, stated Japan, chances for a peaceful solution would be diminished and the difficulties exacerbated.

The United Kingdom, on behalf of the contact group, stated that its members' object remained a peaceful and internationally recognized settlement in Namibia which, in their opinion, could be secured only through negotiations; few of the measures proposed in debate or in the draft resolutions seemed appropriate. Supporting this view, Australia, Austria, Finland and Norway commended the contact group for its persistence in keeping alive the prospects for a peaceful settlement.

Speaking for the European Community (EC) States, the Netherlands opposed any solution that was not internationally acceptable, considered that all parties must refrain from acts that might prejudice an agreement and declared that South Africa should not continue to deny independence to Namibia.

Some States, including Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic, considered that the Western Powers, because of strategic interests as well as their political, economic and military collaboration with South Africa, were a major obstacle to the elimination of the occupying forces in Namibia and were covertly collaborating with South Africa to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia. South Africa, said the

USSR, had been relying on the position of the Western countries which, in turn, had been trying to get away with empty talk.

Other States urged the members of the contact group to change their policies towards South Africa in view of the latest developments. Haiti said they must reconsider their unconditional support for the Pretoria regime. Honduras was dismayed at the lack of foresight and consistency in political action displayed by those who could influence South Africa. India hoped for a rapid reappraisal of policies by Governments which had indirectly encouraged South Africa, adding that they should be clear and forthright if their protestations about faith in human rights were genuine. Jamaica urged the Western States not to be guided by the politics of kith and kin or by short-term material interests. The authors of the independence plan, said Mexico, must prevent the latest failure from undermining the moderate voices in southern Africa.

The failure at Geneva, in the Niger's view, was a harsh snub to advocates of a dialogue with Pretoria; as efforts to persuade had not been enough, a good dose of coercion must be added. Senegal remarked that the credibility of the five Western States was at stake, now that South Africa had taken the risk of a racial war. Sri Lanka thought the five bore a special responsibility, while Sweden considered that, more than ever, they had a key role in making South Africa comply with the United Nations plan and terminate the illegal occupation. Expressing a similar view, Singapore stated that, if persuasion failed, the Western countries must be prepared to exert pressure, including sanctions.

Other States, including Botswana, Guinea, Mongolia, Uganda and Venezuela, supported the intensification of armed struggle as another way of compelling South Africa to withdraw from the Territory, as long as other means proved ineffective. No one wanted the battlefield, Angola stated, but if that was the only option the Namibians and their supporters would not flinch. Mongolia, citing a magazine article reporting a South African assertion that it had killed 3,343 SWAPO partisans over the past two years, observed that it was difficult for South African soldiers to distinguish such persons from local inhabitants. The Ukrainian SSR stated that there were over 70,000 South African troops in Namibia.

A number of speakers condemned what they regarded as the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia. Among those taking this view were Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Philippines, Qatar, Uganda and

Yugoslavia. Benin, citing information from the Council for Namibia, asserted that there were as many as 88 transnational corporations operating in Namibia.

With regard to sanctions against South Africa, many States expressed the opinion that new and concerted action should be taken to obtain South Africa's compliance, in view of its defiance of United Nations resolutions and of the 1971 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legal consequences for States of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia.<sup>(67)</sup> In Jordan's view, the Security Council's failure to take effective measures would herald further erosion of United Nations authority and give a green light for accentuated armed struggle against South Africa, thereby sparking a racial war.

Most States favoured the imposition of economic sanctions; many of these, including Afghanistan, Bahrain, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela and Viet Nam, were of the opinion that only comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter would compel South Africa to implement United Nations resolutions. Endorsing this idea, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya suggested that the Security Council meet in an African country to act on the matter.

New Zealand stated that although it had doubts about the effectiveness of sanctions, if South Africa persisted in its refusal to comply, the Council might have no alternative but to consider imposing them. Turkey urged that peace efforts be continued in parallel with Council action on sanctions at the proper time. Algeria, Benin, Bhutan, China, Ecuador, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nicaragua and Panama, all of which supported the imposition of sanctions, endorsed the position of the New Delhi Ministerial Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, supported by OAU, that, if the Council was unable to implement the required enforcement measures, an emergency special session of the General Assembly should be convened at the foreign minister level in order to review the Namibia question and adopt appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter.

Spain, however, expressed reservations on any Assembly decision which would prejudice the Council's attitude on sanctions, while Austria and Norway were of the opinion that it was not the Assembly's proper function to call on the



Council to take mandatory measures. Malta made the point that sanctions must be carefully planned and co-ordinated in advance, and that the contribution of influential countries was crucial.

The SWAPO observer stated that his organization had gone to the Geneva meeting with no pre-conditions or demands, except that it would not renegotiate any element of the United Nations plan. South Africa, however, had deliberately wrecked the meeting. The Assembly should again urge the Security Council to apply all economic sanctions against South Africa, including a total oil embargo, as recommended by OAU, the Non-Aligned Movement and the Council for Namibia. The challenge posed by South Africa to the international community was really a challenge to the contact group. If the members of that group had felt four years ago that demands for total economic sanctions were premature, they should now take the lead in calling for sanctions against the defiant regime.

The South African Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information, in a letter of 10 March to the Secretary-General,<sup>(18)</sup> rejected the Assembly's resolutions on Namibia as invalid because South Africa had been excluded from the session and the democratic parties of Namibia had been prevented from addressing it, although SWAPO had been afforded that opportunity. Those unwilling to associate themselves with the politically motivated and orchestrated campaign were responsible for approximately 80 per cent of all contributions to the United Nations. By reinforcing its bias, the Assembly had further jeopardized an internationally acceptable solution. The Assembly's approach to independence would lead Namibia into a rule of tyranny, oppression and economic retrogression which the people would never have the opportunity of changing by democratic processes. Threats of sanctions were inappropriate, as South Africa's trade with the rest of Africa in the past year had grown to well over \$1.5 billion; what was needed was increased economic co-operation between South Africa and the rest of the continent.

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION (APRIL). By a letter dated 10 April,<sup>(31)</sup> Uganda, as Chairman of the African Group, requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the Namibia question in light of South Africa's refusal to implement Council resolutions.

On 15 April, the Presidents of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Zambia, convened at Luanda, Angola, in the Front-line States Summit Meeting, reaffirmed their total support for SWAPO, stressed the urgent need to implement the United

Nations settlement plan without further delay or modification, emphasized the responsibility of the contact group to ensure implementation of the plan and underscored the special obligation of the Western five to exert pressure on South Africa to comply; the final communique of the Meeting was communicated to the Council President by a 24 April letter from Angola.<sup>(23)</sup>

At an Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting on the Namibia question (Algiers, Algeria, 16-18 April), the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries appealed to the Council to impose global mandatory sanctions against South Africa, authorized the non-aligned countries to support the convening of an emergency special session of the General Assembly in the event that the Council failed to do so, and empowered several foreign ministers to participate in the Council meeting on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement; the final communique of this Meeting was transmitted to the Secretary-General by Algeria on 23 April.<sup>(14)</sup>

By a letter dated 23 April,<sup>(32)</sup> the United Kingdom, also on behalf of Canada, France and the Federal Republic of Germany, transmitted a statement from the Western contact group following its meeting in London on 22 and 23 April. The five, after receiving a report from a United States official on his visit to 12 African States, had reiterated their commitment to an internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia at the earliest possible date, had agreed that the 1978 Security Council resolution continued to provide a solid basis for transition to independence in Namibia, had considered possibilities for strengthening that plan and had decided to continue consultations among themselves to develop more specific proposals for discussion with the parties.

The Security Council considered the situation in Namibia at 11 meetings held from 21 to 30 April. Following a debate, it voted at the last of these meetings on four draft resolutions proposing the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. None of these was adopted due to the negative votes cast by three permanent members (France, United Kingdom, United States). A fifth draft, to establish an implementation committee, was not put to a vote in light of the results on the others.

Sponsors of the first draft, to impose arms and oil embargoes and other unspecified economic and political sanctions, were Mexico, the Niger, Panama, the Philippines, Tunisia and Uganda. The four other drafts, calling for the imposition of specific types of sanctions and for the creation of a committee, were sponsored by the Niger, Tunisia and Uganda. All five were introduced by Uganda.

By the first draft,<sup>(2)</sup> the Council, acting under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, would have determined that South Africa's persistent refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia constituted a serious threat to international peace and security, that its illegal occupation of Namibia constituted a breach of peace and an act of aggression, and that its repeated armed attacks against independent States in southern Africa constituted grave acts of aggression. The Council would have decided to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa, including economic and political sanctions, an oil embargo and an arms embargo. It would have called for implementation of those measures by all United Nations Member States and specialized agencies, and urged non-member States to act accordingly; and it would have decided to establish a committee to monitor implementation.

The vote on this draft was 9 to 3, with 3 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: China, German Democratic Republic, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR.

Against: France, United Kingdom, United States.  
Abstaining: Ireland, Japan, Spain.

By the second draft,<sup>(3)</sup> the Council would have decided that States must sever all diplomatic, consular and trade relations with South Africa. The text specified a series of measures to that end, including prohibitions on imports of all commodities and products from South Africa and Namibia, dealings in or shipments of such products, and the sale and transport of goods to South Africa and Namibia, except for such items as medical supplies and educational material. Investments and other fund transfers would have been prohibited except for humanitarian purposes. Travel on a South African passport or a passport issued by South African authorities in Namibia would have been banned, as well as tourism and cultural or sports exchanges. The text also provided for action aimed at stopping emigration to South Africa. States would have had to withhold protection of investments in Namibia against the claims of a future Government of Namibia for compensation and reparation.

The vote on this draft was the same as for the preceding one.

The third text<sup>(4)</sup> would have had the Council decide to impose a mandatory embargo on the direct and indirect supply of petroleum and petroleum products to South Africa and occupied Namibia. This would have banned the sale or supply of such items, as well as sales promotion activities, shipments, investments and technical assistance to the petroleum industry, transit facilities and petroleum prospecting.

This draft received 11 votes to 3, with 1 abstention, as follows:

In favour: China, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR.

Against: France, United Kingdom, United States.  
Abstaining: Japan.

By the fourth text,<sup>(5)</sup> the Council would have decided that all States should cease providing to South Africa arms and related matériel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment, paramilitary police equipment and spare parts, as well as licences for their manufacture or maintenance. States would have been authorized to seize such items destined for or imported from South Africa. Also to have been prohibited were technology transfer to and investment in the country's arms industry, and the exchange of military personnel and weapons experts. States would have been called on to prevent the recruitment, financing, training and transit of mercenaries for service in South Africa and Namibia, as well as direct or indirect co-operation with South Africa in the development of a nuclear-weapon capability.

This draft received 12 votes to 3, as follows:

In favour: China, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR.

Against: France, United Kingdom, United States.

The fifth text,<sup>(1)</sup> not pressed to a vote, would have had the Council decide to establish a committee that would seek and examine information from any State relevant to the strict implementation of the sanctions resolutions, and report its observations to the Council.

Just before the vote, the sponsors orally inserted in the first four texts the date of 15 July as the deadline for reports by the Secretary-General on implementation of the resolutions.

Explaining its negative votes, France stated that the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions would not promote progress and would run counter to the resumption and intensification of negotiations on Namibia. The United Kingdom said the imposition of sanctions could only hamper efforts to reach a negotiated settlement leading to an internationally accepted independence for Namibia, and would cause economic harm to many African and Western countries. The United States did not believe that economic sanctions were an effective means of influencing political policy, and reiterated its commitment to continue its efforts within the contact group for a peaceful negotiated solution; it saw no reason for a resolution on an arms embargo, since such an embargo was already in effect under a 1977 Council resolution.<sup>(61)</sup>

Ireland and Spain voted for the arms and oil

embargo proposals but abstained on the two other draft resolutions proposing broader sanctions. Ireland stated that it did not think comprehensive sanctions would advance hopes for a settlement and it regarded proposals to terminate all diplomatic relations as inconsistent with diplomatic efforts to implement the settlement scheme; moreover, the Council could have indicated in advance its intention to honour its obligations to States that might face special economic problems resulting from sanctions. Spain did not think the severance of all diplomatic and trade relations or the interruption of communications would be the best way to pressure South Africa to comply with its obligations. Japan explained its abstentions on three of the drafts by stating that it doubted whether sanctions would be the most effective and expeditious means of achieving the desired end.

The USSR, regretting that the Council had been unable to adopt resolutions which would have promoted a settlement, considered that the Namibians were left with no alternative but to continue the armed struggle under SWAPO leadership. Uganda asserted that the negative votes had only strengthened the hand of South Africa, and reiterated the view that the settlement plan approved by the Council in 1978 was the only, non-negotiable basis for transition to independence in Namibia.

For the debate preceding the voting, the following Member States were invited, at their request, to participate without vote: Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Togo, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

The Security Council also extended invitations under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure<sup>a</sup> to the following: the President and five Vice-Presidents of the Council for Namibia; the Chairman of the Committee on colonial countries; Peter Mueshihange, Secretary for Foreign Relations of SWAPO, as proposed by the Niger, Tunisia and Uganda in a letter of 20 April;<sup>(15)</sup> Johnstone F. Makatini, representative of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), as proposed by same three countries in a letter of 23 April;<sup>(16)</sup> and Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, as proposed by Tunisia in a letter of 21 April.<sup>(22)</sup>

By a vote of 6 in favour (France, Ireland, Japan, Spain, United Kingdom, United States)

to 9 against (China, German Democratic Republic, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR), the Security Council rejected a request that an invitation under rule 39 be extended to Peter Kalangula, President of DTA, and others associated with his request. The proposal for this invitation was made in a letter of 20 April by France, the United Kingdom and the United States.<sup>(26)</sup>

Supporting this proposal, France, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States argued that all interested parties should be heard by the Council as a matter of equity. Speaking for the sponsors of the proposal, France wondered whether the Council's decision to invite one Namibian group but not another did not reflect regrettable discrimination between parties which should participate in a Namibian settlement. Panama, asking that the proposal be put to a vote, objected to it on the ground that the legal status of DTA flowed from an administrative act of the South African Government, which did not have the authority to take decisions on electoral activities in Namibia. Also opposed were the German Democratic Republic, Uganda and the USSR, which stated that allowing a DTA representative to take part in the proceedings would be contrary to the Council's 1978 declaration that the results of the elections organized by South Africa that year in Namibia were null and void.<sup>(62)</sup>

Delegations of 48 States participated in the Council debate on the Namibia situation, 20 of them led by foreign ministers or other officials of ministerial rank mandated to represent the Non-Aligned Movement or OAU.

Opening the debate, Uganda asserted that the Geneva meeting in January had shown that the five Western States had failed to apply the necessary pressure on South Africa, whose actions constituted a clear breach of international peace and security, particularly its massive military presence in Namibia, its use of Namibian territory for repeated armed attacks against neighbouring countries, its organization of an elaborate machinery of repression and its annexation of Walvis Bay. Since the measures employed by the Council over many years had failed, the Council had a clear obligation to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Article 41 of the Charter, as requested by the Non-Aligned Movement and OAU.

These views were shared by most speakers from African, Asian, Eastern European and

<sup>a</sup> Rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure states: "The Security Council may invite members of the Secretariat or other persons, whom it considers competent for the purpose, to supply it with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence."

Latin American States, who accused South Africa of deliberate prevarication, supported the position of SWAPO and called for implementation of the 1978 settlement plan without any amendment. Most of them also felt that the five members of the contact group must exert all possible pressure on South Africa to abide by the Council's decisions. Cuba, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, said the Namibians, under SWAPO, would not cease trying to attain independence by force of arms if other avenues were blocked.

Among the African front-line States whose delegations were led by ministers, Angola cited losses it said were due to South African attacks from Namibia-including 1,800 deaths and \$7 billion in material damage-and asked how many more violations it would have to suffer before the Council shouldered its responsibilities by imposing sanctions. Mozambique said it would never accept the argument that Namibia would become independent if colonialism was given further guarantees; the guarantees enjoyed by colonialist settlers for 50 years had not brought about independence.

The United Republic of Tanzania expressed amazement that the African States were still being asked to display tolerance and realism, after years of patience and concessions on their part; the experience of Zimbabwe had shown that, as long as negotiations were blocked, a combination of internal and external pressures was essential. Zambia stressed the threat to peace and security constituted by the illegal occupation of Namibia, and spoke of a massive build-up of South African forces in the Territory, aimed at destabilizing African States. Zimbabwe said OAU was greatly disappointed at the apparent unwillingness and half-hearted effort of the Western contact group to exert concerted pressure on South Africa so that it would co-operate in implementing the United Nations plan.

Among other African States represented by ministers, Algeria stated that the impasse over Namibian independence weakened the credibility of the United Nations. The Niger's view was that South Africa would not begin to evaluate the price of future negotiations unless comprehensive mandatory sanctions were applied. Nigeria, together with a number of other States, said it would not accept any attempt to seek a solution of the Namibian question outside the United Nations framework. Senegal stated that, despite the failure of the Geneva talks, the non-aligned countries preferred a negotiated settlement-dialogue- to confrontation. Sierra Leone thought it would be disastrous, as a result of short-sighted and immediate interests, to allow South Africa to live in its cocoon of obdu-

racy and defiance. Togo questioned the morality of States which had once respected their commitments to the peoples of dependent Territories under their administration but which now appeared ready to cast a veto against the will of Africans and all peace-loving peoples.

Similar points were made by other countries of the Non-Aligned Movement represented at the ministerial level. India stated that the temporary difficulties which sanctions might create for some African nations, and which the international community would have to find ways of alleviating, could not be used as a pretext to encourage defiance of the United Nations by a racist regime. Indonesia asserted that the failure of certain States to exert pressure on South Africa had contributed as much as South African intransigence to the collapse of the Geneva talks. Jamaica wondered whether South Africa sought to undermine the United Nations plan and convert it into a recycled version of an "internal settlement". Panama said there was every justification for measures of coercion in regard to the Namibia situation, and added that its position was basically a Latin American one. Unless the Council imposed coercive measures, stated Pakistan, South Africa would not desist from its illegal occupation of Namibia. Yugoslavia believed that further postponement of indispensable measures would only give South Africa more time to consolidate its internal solution.

Mexico, stating that the application of Chapter VII was justified in this case more than any other, said decolonization and liberation struggles must not be affected by rigid bipolar concepts of international society. Also urging the imposition of sanctions were Benin, Burundi, Democratic Yemen (on behalf of the Arab Group), Guinea, Guyana, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Philippines and Zaire.

Bangladesh considered that any further delay in implementing the Council's resolutions would only bring more suffering to Namibia; serious consideration must be given to adopting other means, including comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Brazil stated that a long process of exhortation, persuasion and negotiation had been frustrated, and no other road seemed open but to consider measures under Chapter VII. Romania encouraged a political solution but said the Council was duty-bound to consider the most energetic measures to get South Africa to eliminate the obstacles to the exercise of Namibia's rights. Singapore argued that, as the Western five were advocates of peaceful change, it was in their interest to see that such a process succeeded in Namibia; if they did not put pressure on South Africa, that process would surely fail. Sri Lanka remarked that the question of sanctions

would not have arisen if sufficient pressure had been brought to bear on South Africa.

China urged the imposition of sanctions and supported the African countries' view that, as authors of the United Nations plan on Namibia, the five Western Powers bore an unshirkable responsibility for ensuring its implementation. The German Democratic Republic stated that the application of sanctions would not contradict a solution through negotiation, since the purpose of sanctions was to compel South Africa to comply with United Nations decisions and to negotiate. The USSR asked whether the Western Powers were ready to agree to the adoption of genuine and effective sanctions against South Africa, or whether they would continue to try to procrastinate, invent subterfuges and undermine the settlement process.

Mr. Mueshihange of SWAPO, endorsing the call for sanctions, said the Western initiative on Namibia had turned out to be a contrived public relations exercise in the service of South Africa. Mr. Makatini of ANC warned against the danger of projecting the struggle to decolonize Namibia as part of the East-West conflict.

The members of the Western contact group said they understood the Council's frustration but reiterated their commitment to an internationally acceptable settlement. While they agreed that the 1978 Council resolution on implementation of a settlement continued to provide a solid basis for a transition to independence in Namibia, they were considering possibilities for strengthening the existing plan and giving greater confidence to all the parties on the future of an independent Namibia. The United Kingdom appealed to those advocating sanctions not to abandon the possibility of negotiation, as it did not believe sanctions would bring independence closer. The United States contended that sanctions did not solve problems and pledged its continued efforts, independently and within the contact group, to achieve an internationally acceptable, truly independent, stable and democratic Namibia. Canada, France and the Federal Republic of Germany expressed the conviction that there was no sound alternative to a negotiated settlement, and that recourse to force and enforcement measures would harm that effort.

Ireland stressed the need to avert a division in the Council so that a clear signal of unity and common determination could be sent to South Africa. Japan expressed support for the efforts of the Western five, welcomed their decision to continue consultations and mentioned its own contributions towards humanitarian assistance for Namibians. Spain considered that the application of indiscriminate drastic measures would

not be the best course; it was not too late for a negotiated solution, so long as all parties, and fundamentally South Africa, renounced delaying tactics.

South Africa stated that the Council, by denying DTA an opportunity to speak, had stripped away any United Nations claim to be an impartial arbiter of Namibia's future and exposed the intentions of the majority to install a SWAPO government regardless of the people's wishes. South Africa would not take sanctions lying down but would exercise all its options and react appropriately to safeguard its interests.

FURTHER COMMUNICATIONS (MAY-JUNE). In a letter dated 5 May,<sup>(24)</sup> Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States transmitted a joint communique issued in Rome on 3 May by their Foreign Ministers in which they expressed regret over the outcome of the Council's consideration, reiterated their commitment to an internationally acceptable settlement on the basis of the 1978 Council resolution and agreed that ways to strengthen that plan should be considered. They instructed their officials to develop proposals encompassing measures, including constitutional arrangements, with the aim of enhancing prospects for a negotiated settlement.

On 16 June, Guyana transmitted the Georgetown Declaration of Solidarity and Support for the Liberation of Southern Africa adopted by the International Forum on the Liberation of Southern Africa (Georgetown, Guyana, 30 April-3 May).<sup>(28)</sup> Attended by 12 States and national liberation movement representatives, the Forum deplored the vetoes cast against the sanctions proposals in the Security Council and stated that there was no alternative but armed struggle.

ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE ON SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA. The International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa (Paris, 20-27 May) (P. 165) adopted a Special Declaration on Namibia in which it called for the urgent implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia approved by the Security Council in 1978. The Conference reaffirmed United Nations responsibility for Namibia and expressed support for the struggle of the Namibians under SWAPO as their sole and authentic representative.

The Conference described the South African regime as having increased its military attacks against independent African States, taken various measures to subvert the territorial integrity of Namibia, persisted in the systematic plunder of Namibia's natural resources in collusion with foreign economic interests, and persistently frustrated the implementation of Security Council resolutions for Namibian independence.

The Conference called on the Western contact group to exert pressure on the South African régime in order to enable Namibia to attain independence without further delay. Declaring the situation in Namibia to be a threat to international peace and security, it called on all Member States to impose comprehensive sanctions against South Africa so as to ensure that country's immediate compliance with United Nations decisions on Namibia. It emphasized the need for increased political and diplomatic pressure, reinforced by sanctions, and called for increased material, financial, political, diplomatic and moral assistance to the Namibian people and SWAPO.

This Declaration, together with the Conference's Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, were transmitted to the Secretary-General, for the attention of the General Assembly and the Security Council, by a letter of 11 June from the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid.<sup>(6)</sup>

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION (JULY).** In a resolution of 22 July<sup>(44)</sup> on implementation by United Nations organizations of the General Assembly's 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,<sup>(46)</sup> the Economic and Social Council requested organizations in the United Nations system to continue to withhold financial, economic, technical and other assistance to South Africa until that Government restored Namibia's right to self-determination and independence. They were also asked to refrain from action which might imply recognition of or support for the illegal occupation. In addition, the Council requested increased assistance to Namibians from United Nations organizations (p. 1178).

**ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES.** On 14 August, the Committee on colonial countries adopted a consensus on the Namibia question<sup>(35)</sup> by which it noted with great concern that the situation had worsened as a consequence of South Africa's sabotage of the pre-implementation talks held at Geneva and its tactics and manœuvres to impose an "internal settlement". The Committee reiterated that Walvis Bay and the Penguin and other offshore islands were an integral part of Namibia, and reaffirmed that Namibia was the direct responsibility of the United Nations until national independence.

It reiterated that the only political solution for Namibia should be based on the termination of South Africa's illegal occupation and the withdrawal of its armed forces, and on the free and unfettered exercise by all Namibians of their right to self-determination and independence.

To that end, it reaffirmed the need for free elections under United Nations supervision and control in the whole of Namibia as one political entity, in accordance with the settlement plan. It regretted any attempt to revise and weaken that plan, which it called the only acceptable basis for independence.

The Committee commended SWAPO for its readiness to participate in free elections and for its flexibility in negotiations, reaffirmed support for its independence struggle by all available means and appealed for international assistance in that struggle. It demanded the release of political prisoners and the free return of political exiles.

The Committee condemned South Africa for its attempts to discredit SWAPO, its intensified military build-up in Namibia, its recruitment of Namibians into a "South West Africa Territorial Force", its forcible removal of Namibians from the Territory's northern border for military purposes and its establishment of new military bases. It called on States to prevent the recruitment, training and transit of mercenaries for service in Namibia. It also condemned military collaboration between South Africa and certain Western and other States, and called for the termination of their collaboration in the nuclear field (p. 181). It also condemned the use of Namibian territory to launch attacks against neighbouring States (p. 214).

The Committee condemned South Africa's illegal exploitation of Namibian resources, including its illegal extension of the territorial sea, its proclamation of an economic zone off the coast of Namibia and its illegal exploitation of the Territory's marine resources. It also demanded that those States whose transnational corporations continued to operate in Namibia withdraw all investments from the Territory and put an end to their co-operation with the illegal administration.

The Committee deplored the failure of the Security Council, due to the negative votes of the Western permanent members, to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa, and endorsed the call for the early convening of an emergency special session of the General Assembly to take appropriate measures.

Referring to what it called South Africa's massive publicity campaign to perpetuate its occupation of Namibia, the Committee reiterated its request for intensified efforts by the United Nations Secretariat to mobilize public opinion against that policy and to disseminate information on the liberation struggle in the Territory (p. 1166).

The consensus was transmitted to the Security Council<sup>(8)</sup> and the General Assembly<sup>(7)</sup> in letters of 17 August from the Committee Chairman.

FURTHER COMMUNICATION (AUGUST). By a letter dated 27 August,<sup>(19)</sup> the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information charged that SWAPO, aided by Cuba and the USSR, had intensified its premeditated attacks against Namibian civilians. Asserting that United Nations silence in respect of SWAPO actions was prejudicial to a peaceful solution, he invited all members of the Security Council to visit Namibia for personal observation.

ACTIVITIES OF THE UN COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA. Throughout 1981, the United Nations Council for Namibia continued to act both as a policy-making organ of the United Nations and as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia prior to independence, the role assigned to it by the General Assembly in 1967.<sup>(48)</sup> It also consulted with Governments on the implementation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia and participated in international meetings, in many of which it represented Namibia.

The Council supervised the provision of material assistance to Namibians through the United Nations Fund for Namibia (p. 1171), of which it was trustee. The Fund provided financing for the Nationhood Programme for Namibia (p. 1174) and the United Nations Institute for Namibia (p. 1176), a training institute at Lusaka, as well as for educational, social and relief assistance. In addition, the Council oversaw a public information programme on Namibia (p. 1165).

The Council also reviewed the activities of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia. The Commissioner's Office collected and analysed information on Namibia, co-ordinated and managed relief programmes, raised funds and acted as co-ordinating authority for the Nationhood Programme. The Commissioner's Regional Office at Lusaka also co-ordinated activities under that Programme and issued or renewed about 900 travel and identity documents under the Council's authority. His Regional Office at Gaborone, Botswana, continued a survey of training opportunities for Namibians and kept the New York Office apprised of developments in southern Africa.

Governments to which the Council sent missions of consultation were those of Argentina, Colombia, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Ireland, the Netherlands, Peru, Romania, Spain and Viet Nam. Joint communiques between these missions and the Governments of India and Viet Nam, issued at New Delhi on 5 August and Hanoi on 12 August, were transmitted to the General Assembly and the Security Council by letters from the Acting President of the Council for Namibia dated 11 August<sup>(10)</sup> and 17 August,<sup>(11)</sup> respec-

The Council organized a Seminar on Legal Issues concerning the Question of Namibia, held at The Hague, Netherlands, from 22 to 24 June. The Seminar was aimed at identifying possible initiatives to exert further pressure on South Africa and on foreign interests that contributed to the maintenance of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory. It also examined ways to ensure implementation of the Council's 1974 Decree No. I for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia<sup>(68)</sup> and the preservation of the territorial integrity of Namibia. Sixteen legal experts, jurists and researchers in international law participated.

The Seminar emphasized the binding character of the Decree, which provided that no person or entity was permitted to explore for, extract or export any natural resource of Namibia without the Council's consent. It recommended that extensive publicity be given to the Decree, that means be devised to identify goods of Namibian origin-including uranium (p. 1169) - and that States provide for mandatory seizure and forfeiture of goods covered by the Decree. The Seminar supported the development of programmes to enforce the obligation of the international community to bring to an end South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory. Among its other recommendations was that action in domestic courts be considered against persons alleged to have committed gross violations of the human rights of Namibians.

As requested by the General Assembly on 6 March,<sup>(52)</sup> the Council held a series of extraordinary plenary meetings at Panama City from 2 to 5 June in order to assess the situation in and concerning the Territory and to consider measures to press for implementation of United Nations resolutions. On 5 June, the Council adopted the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, which was transmitted to the General Assembly and the Security Council by a letter of 12 June from the Acting President of the Council for Namibia.<sup>(9)</sup>

In the Programme of Action, the Council called on all Member States to take immediate unilateral and collective action to impose comprehensive sanctions against South Africa in order to ensure South Africa's immediate compliance with United Nations decisions relating to Namibia. It called for the early convening of an emergency special session of the General Assembly, at the foreign minister level, to take appropriate measures. The Council called on States not to recognize any "internal settlement", reiterated the need for United Nations-supervised elections and called for increased support to SWAPO so that it could pursue its military, political and diplomatic strategies.

The Council condemned the illegal exploitation of Namibian resources and pledged to expose their plunder by South African and foreign economic interests. It decided to counter South Africa's attempts to extend the territorial sea of Namibia and proclaim an exclusive economic zone for the Territory, and reiterated its intention to act with respect to those areas under its own authority. It requested the General Assembly to instruct the Secretary-General and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to end all contracts between the United Nations and corporations which supported South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.

The Council called for voluntary measures by States to supplement the Security Council arms embargo of 1977, including cessation of trade with South Africa in weapons, ammunition, military vehicles and equipment, paramilitary police equipment and spare parts, as well as seizure of prohibited items, a ban on exchanges of military personnel and weapons experts, and national penalties for violations. It also called for an oil embargo and a series of other economic sanctions, including a ban on imports of goods originating in South Africa or Namibia and on the sale of products to those areas, except for certain items of a humanitarian nature. Other measures recommended in the Programme included a ban on investments and most other financial transfers to South Africa and Namibia, exclusion of persons travelling on South African passports, prohibition of tourist and other travel, and a halt to airline traffic.

The Programme of Action was adopted by acclamation, but with reservations by Australia, Belgium and Finland in regard to certain provisions.

The Council held a solemn meeting commemorating Namibia Day (26 August). From 26 to 30 October, it observed a Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and its Liberation Movement, SWAPO; the Council held two special meetings on 26 October, at which messages from Governments, specialized agencies and support groups were read.

The Council reported to the General Assembly at its 1981 regular session on developments concerning the Territory and on the Council's activities from 1 August 1980 to 31 August 1981.<sup>(36)</sup> The text of the Programme of Action was included in the report. The Assembly approved the 1980 and 1981 reports of the Council in its resolutions on the Council's work programme (p. 1159), as well as in its general resolutions on the Namibia question adopted in March and December. Also in those general resolutions, it supported the Council's efforts as the legal

Administering Authority for Namibia and requested Member States to co-operate with the Council.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (SEPTEMBER). The eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, devoted to the Namibia question, met at United Nations Headquarters from 3 to 14 September. It was convened after a majority of Member States concurred in a request for the session made by Zimbabwe. In the letter containing this request, dated 12 August,<sup>(34)</sup> Zimbabwe noted that the Security Council, because of the negative votes of several permanent members, had failed to adopt the four draft resolutions on sanctions placed before it in April, and that subsequent negotiations had failed to advance towards a resolution of the issues.

In a letter of 28 August,<sup>(20)</sup> the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information strongly opposed the convening of the session, pointing out that it was to begin shortly before the regular session, which already had the Namibia question on its agenda. The "emergency" character of the session had been decided upon several months previously. Instead of wasting money on the session, those convening it should pay attention to the plight of millions throughout Africa who lacked basic necessities.

In a letter of 2 September,<sup>(12)</sup> the President of the Council for Namibia transmitted a memorandum approved by the Council on that date. After reviewing the lengthy efforts to secure Namibia's independence, the Council called on the Assembly to adopt effective and comprehensive measures to ensure the complete isolation of South Africa and to compel it to withdraw from Namibia. South Africa, said the memorandum, had deliberately caused the failure of negotiations on independence, had continued its oppression, had continued to seek international recognition for illegitimate groups it had installed in Namibia, and had committed a manifest breach of peace and security.

Also on 2 September,<sup>(29)</sup> Madagascar transmitted a telegram from its President dated 30 August, proposing that the Assembly decide to apply immediately the United Nations settlement plan or that the Council for Namibia unilaterally proclaim the independence of Namibia under the auspices of SWAPO. On 3 September,<sup>(27)</sup> the German Democratic Republic transmitted a message from the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party and Chairman of the Council of State, expressing the expectation that the Assembly would strongly reaffirm and actively support the right of the Namibian people to independence, self-determination and territorial integrity. On



9 September,<sup>(25)</sup> Egypt transmitted a press release issued on 8 September by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs affirming that South Africa's aggressive policies would have a negative impact on efforts to achieve Namibian independence.

On 9 September,<sup>(30)</sup> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines transmitted a telegram of the same date from its Minister for Foreign Affairs urging renewed efforts to fix a new date for the holding of a supervised election in Namibia, a diplomatic offensive to convince South Africa that it would be isolated if the question was not resolved and, should that approach fail, the appointment of an Assembly committee to consider further options. Lastly, on 17 September,<sup>(13)</sup> Algeria, on behalf of the African Group, transmitted a communiqué, issued at the end of an emergency summit of the front-line States and Nigeria (Lagos, Nigeria, 11 September), condemning 'South Africa's aggression against Angola (p. 217) and rejecting any attempt to revise the 1978 Security Council resolution on a Namibian settlement.

On 14 September, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the Namibia question<sup>(53)</sup> by which it reaffirmed that the 1978 Security Council resolution was the only basis for a settlement, rejected manœuvres by certain members of the Western contact group aimed at undermining the international consensus embodied in that resolution and demanded the immediate commencement of its unconditional implementation without prevarication, qualification or modification, not later than December 1981. The Assembly urged the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, and called on States to do likewise and to cease all dealings with that country. It requested the Council for Namibia to monitor the boycott and bring instances of contact between South Africa and Member States to the Assembly's attention. It called for increased international assistance to SWAPO and to the front-line States (p. 214).

This resolution, sponsored by 70 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 117 to none, with 25 abstentions. Introducing it, Algeria said it reflected the legitimate frustration felt at the Security Council's inability to exercise its prerogatives in the case of breaches of the peace. The United Nations could not shirk its duty just because the Council was blocked.

On 4 September, before starting its debate on the Namibia question, the Assembly approved its Credentials Committee's decision to reject the credentials of the South African delegation to the emergency special session (p. 164).

Explaining the abstentions of the five contact group members on the resolution on the Namibia question, Canada said they were not taking a

substantive position on the resolution and did not regard it as affecting the course of the negotiations. They did not believe it contributed to their objective of a peaceful, internationally recognized settlement. Moreover, the Assembly could not arrogate to itself powers it did not have.

Among the others which abstained in the vote, Portugal, as well as the United Kingdom speaking for the EC members, said they could not support the paragraphs attacking individual States. The United Kingdom also disassociated the EC members from any endorsement of armed struggle, as well as from the description of any group as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, and said they remained committed to the division of competences between the Security Council and the Assembly. Ireland did not want to be associated with any implication of bad faith on the part of contact group members; also, it favoured selective rather than comprehensive sanctions, and thought unco-ordinated or ineffective measures could be damaging to the ends sought. Norway, on behalf of the Nordic States, said that, under the Charter, only the Security Council had the authority to impose mandatory sanctions, while Australia and Japan cited difficulties with the paragraphs on SWAPO and sanctions. Austria mentioned the negotiating process as its reason for abstaining. Chile said some paragraphs might be invoked as an excuse to evade negotiations.

Though voting in favour, Argentina said it could not accept requests for comprehensive mandatory sanctions, which only the Security Council was competent to apply; it also had reservations on the paragraphs on SWAPO, support for armed struggle, mention of certain countries and monitoring of sanctions. Bolivia believed some ideas with regard to the sovereign decisions of States could have been omitted, while Brazil thought some provisions might give rise to technical inconsistencies and deserved closer study. Fiji and Honduras voiced reservations on the references to armed struggle; they, together with Turkey, had difficulties with the paragraph criticizing members of the contact group. Lesotho, referring to its geopolitical situation, reserved its position on sanctions, as did Botswana. Uruguay said it could not accept the institutionalization of the armed struggle; it also had reservations about sanctions and thought States could not have limitations or monitoring imposed on their conduct of international relations.

During the general debate a majority of speakers, including most African States, agreed that South Africa's continued refusal to implement the settlement plan had resulted in a serious

threat to international peace and security. As evidenced by its recent aggression against Angola, South Africa was seeking not only to maintain its illegal grip on Namibia but also to destabilize neighbouring countries. The already critical situation had been aggravated by the failure of the Security Council to adopt mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa; lest the Council's inaction be construed by South Africa as a sign that it could continue to act with impunity, the Assembly must endorse the application of such sanctions as well as other measures to isolate South Africa and ensure its compliance.

Some States, commenting on the stated intention of the contact group to strengthen the 1978 settlement plan, were of the view that the group was in fact trying to weaken and undermine the plan by revising its terms to make them more acceptable to South Africa.

On this point, Kenya, representing the OAU Chairman, objected to the notion that South Africa might be empowered to write a constitution for Namibia before the plan was implemented; the right to draw up a constitution belonged to the Namibian people alone, Kenya stated. Ethiopia saw the Western Powers as attempting to subvert the very plan they had drafted, thereby acknowledging that they attached greater importance to their imperialist interests in southern Africa than to Namibia's emancipation. Guinea said there was irrefutable evidence of a scheme to undermine the prospects for success of the United Nations plan and to impose a neo-colonialist solution on the Namibians. Zambia considered that any attempt to sidetrack the provisions of the plan as already accepted by both sides would only aggravate a dangerous situation, and that it should be implemented without delay. Zimbabwe said the Western initiative to devise so-called confidence-building measures that would allay the fears of the minority in Namibia had created a state of expectancy which had delayed implementation of the independence plan.

Brazil wondered whether the proposed revisions were intended to deny SWAPO a fair chance to participate in future elections and to deprive the Government of an independent Namibia of any power to run the country in a sovereign manner. The German Democratic Republic said the Western representatives had been shamefacedly silent about the nature of the new proposals, but from press reports they appeared to be aimed at imposing on the Namibians obligations running counter to their right to self-determination and at satisfying South African interests. Gabon, Hungary and Jamaica insisted that the 1978 Security Council resolution not be

modified, but be implemented in its original form, while Sweden said it should be made clear that the United Nations, in its settlement plan, had a firm basis of principles which must not be compromised. China thought the efforts of one country to revise the resolution were unwise.

On behalf of the contact group members, the Federal Republic of Germany stated that, although many countries were tempted to abandon negotiations, the group was working actively to revive them in the belief that a peaceful solution was possible on the basis of the 1978 resolution. To that end, proposals were being formulated concerning the implementation of the United Nations plan which would provide the added assurances the group thought essential in order to gain the confidence of all parties and obtain their agreement.

The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, expressed grave concern at the consequences of the continuing delay in agreeing on implementation of the settlement plan, and reiterated that South Africa must abide by its declared willingness to let Namibia gain independence in accordance with that plan; the EC members urged everyone concerned, especially South Africa, not to throw away the progress that had been achieved and to examine all possibilities that might help bring about agreement on implementation without delay.

The efforts of the contact group were supported by Belgium and Japan; Japan added that it was ready to consider all constructive proposals for an early and internationally acceptable solution. Australia considered it strange that the contact group should be singled out for criticism because of the intransigence of South Africa, which had prevented implementation of the plan.

Many States, including Egypt, Gabon, Haiti, Nepal, Rwanda and Singapore, believed that, as the authors of the settlement plan, the five Western Powers of the contact group bore a special responsibility to use their leverage with South Africa to ensure the immediate implementation of the plan. Costa Rica made a similar appeal and added that the collective use of force should be among the actions taken by the United Nations. Spain appealed to South Africa to accept the plan, stating that there was little use in exerting pressure on that country unless its Government took steps towards a just and lasting solution. Thailand urged the contact group to spare no effort in completing its task and to avoid giving South Africa any ground for delay.

Some countries criticized the United States for seeking to link the attainment of a Namibian settlement to the withdrawal of foreign troops from Angola. Guyana stated that elements unrelated to the nature of the struggle in Namibia

were being introduced as a red herring intended to serve as a pretext for delaying and placing limitations on Namibia's independence. The USSR said events in Angola were completely unconnected to the problem of Namibia and fell within the exclusive purview of the Angolan Government.

Jordan, Kuwait, Suriname and others objected to placing the question in the context of East-West rivalry. In Bhutan's view, the objective must be to decolonize Namibia quickly and not to settle or bring in other differences which did not contribute to the solution. Botswana, while acknowledging the danger to peace and security in Africa inherent in the involvement of extra-continental Powers in African political life, supported the sovereign right of any State to identify its enemies and choose its friends, especially in situations of armed conflict. The Congo said the struggle was not between communism and capitalism but between oppression and freedom. Togo stated that the issue had been skilfully distorted; whereas the Namibian problem was a simple one of decolonization, it had been turned into a complex ideological issue involving East-West rivalry and the security of the Western world.

Albania stated that the problem would be solved only if the South African racists were made to withdraw and if super-Power interference and intrigues were halted. The Central African Republic said South Africa's refusal to recognize the international status of Namibia had worsened the Namibia situation and opened Africa to the struggle between hegemonistic influences.

Many States, including Bahrain, Brazil, the Comoros, Guyana, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Sierra Leone and the United Republic of Cameroon, criticized the three Western permanent members of the Security Council which had voted in April against enforcement action by the Council. Cape Verde said that, if South Africa persisted in its arrogance, its partners should refrain from blocking the operation of Chapter VII of the Charter. Equatorial Guinea considered that South Africa's intransigence had been buttressed by the statements made by some countries in the Council. Uganda described the vetoes as manifestations of naked power divorced from responsibility, and expressed concern at what it saw as a tendency by some Powers to demobilize the Council with regard to situations that threatened peace and security.

A number of States, including Cuba, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Madagascar, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Yemen, strongly urged the Assembly, in view of the immobilization of the Council, to take concerted collective interna-

tional action by continuing to urge the Council to invoke the sanctions envisaged under Chapter VII and, at the same time, calling on States to impose such measures individually and collectively. The imposition of coercive measures or a boycott was also urged by Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Ghana, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

Fiji thought consideration should be given to whether measures going beyond the existing arms embargo were necessary. Others, including Malaysia and Panama, spoke in more general terms of the need to intensify international pressure against South Africa, and Cyprus said the United Nations must take steps to compel South Africa to end its occupation. In Colombia's view, the failure to achieve a settlement for Namibia indicated the need for the United Nations to make use of the instruments provided for in the Charter to prevent continuation of the conflict. It was imperative for the credibility of the United Nations, said the Gambia, that measures to ensure South Africa's early compliance be applied without delay. Trinidad and Tobago believed that South Africa's continued failure to implement the independence plan must lead to the full and effective application of measures under Chapter VII.

Iraq asked the Assembly to call for maximum assistance to SWAPO and the front-line States, to overthrow the Pretoria regime. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said it would continue to provide material and moral support to the Namibians.

Norway and Sweden expressed support for the efforts of the contact group to reach a settlement, but considered that the negotiation process should be fortified by additional pressure on South Africa in the form of mandatory economic sanctions. Morocco took a similar position on sanctions while expressing its conviction that the contact group was still in a position to play a positive role. Argentina appealed for new efforts by the contact group members to achieve internationally acceptable independence for Namibia, and Peru said the Powers with direct access to the parties should compel South Africa to implement the plan.

Austria's view was that negotiations should continue but with a commitment that, if persuasion and argument failed, carefully devised coercive measures should be employed. The Bahamas

and Finland favoured the continuation of negotiations combined with increased pressure on South Africa. In Ecuador's view, the Assembly should demand the unconditional implementation of the independence plan and, failing that, sanctions should be imposed. Madagascar repeated its proposal to have the Council for Namibia proclaim the Territory's independence (p. 1140), stating that independence would have to be achieved without South Africa's co-operation and, if necessary, against its wishes. Further efforts must be made to deal with the remaining obstacles, said Malta, but it must be made clear to South Africa that it would not be allowed to disregard the provisions it had professed to accept in principle.

Commenting on South Africa's complaint that the United Nations was partial on the Namibia question, Angola said the Organization was enjoined by the Charter to be biased on the side of peace, security, freedom, independence, liberation, decolonization and justice; no one had the right to ask it to go against its principles.

The SWAPO observer stated that his organization had been recognized even before elections as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people because it was the only indigenous liberation movement with the organizational sophistication, military capability, human resources, political programme and international standing to resist South Africa's colonial domination in Namibia. It remained ready to sign a cease-fire agreement with South Africa once the latter agreed to follow that example, in order to open the way for implementation of the United Nations plan. However, it had no interest in reopening negotiations on the plan, a compromise formula accepted by the two principal protagonists-SWAPO and South Africa-which should be implemented without further delay or dilution.

As requested by the General Assembly in its resolution of 14 September, the Secretary-General submitted a report on 17 November, with later addenda,<sup>(38)</sup> transmitting replies from 18 States and two international institutions associated with the United Nations, providing information on action taken or envisaged by them to implement the resolution.

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ACTION (NOVEMBER).** On 2 November, the Economic and Social Council, in a resolution on the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia,<sup>(45)</sup> called on the home countries of those corporations to bring about an immediate withdrawal of all existing investments in Namibia, and reaffirmed the Security Council's 1971 resolution<sup>(60)</sup> calling on States to abstain from entering into economic relations with South Africa in respect of Namibia.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (DECEMBER).** The General Assembly considered the Namibia question during its regular session at meetings between 19 November and 11 December. On 10 December, the Assembly adopted six resolutions on the question (p. 1127), two of which were on general aspects. The texts were recommended by the Council for Namibia in its 1981 report.

The first of these resolutions, on the situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory,<sup>(58)</sup> included a number of provisions from the Assembly's resolution of 6 March on this aspect.<sup>(49)</sup> Other provisions were repeated from the resolution of 14 September,<sup>(53)</sup> including the call for international assistance to the front-line States (p. 214), reaffirmation of the 1978 Security Council resolution as the only basis for a peaceful settlement, rejection of manœuvres by certain contact group members aimed at undermining the consensus embodied in that resolution and the demand that implementation of that resolution commence immediately. By three provisions that had not been in the earlier resolutions on the Namibia question, the Assembly condemned collusion with South Africa in the nuclear field by Governments of certain Western and other States (p. 182), urged the Security Council to act decisively against dilatory manœuvres and fraudulent schemes of the illegal occupation regime aimed at frustrating the liberation struggle, and declared South Africa liable to compensate the victims and their families in cases of disappearance of Namibians.

This resolution, introduced by Nigeria and sponsored by 52 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 120 to none, with 27 abstentions.

The other resolution on general aspects concerned action by Member States in support of Namibia.<sup>(59)</sup> The Assembly called on all States to sever all diplomatic, consular and trade relations with South Africa, and requested them specifically to prevent or prohibit imports and exports, the international sale of goods, including petroleum and uranium (p. 1169), arms traffic, investments and other financial transfers, travel by their nationals and persons bearing South African passports, airline operations, and the recruitment and training of mercenaries. States were asked to renounce those elements of bilateral or multilateral treaties in which South Africa had claimed to represent Namibia. The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare a comprehensive programme of assistance to States neighbouring South Africa and Namibia (p. 215), and requested the Council for Namibia to continue to monitor the boycott of South Africa.

This resolution, introduced by Algeria and sponsored by 61 nations, was adopted by a

recorded vote of 118 to none, with 29 abstentions.

The Namibia question was also dealt with in several Assembly resolutions adopted under other agenda items.

In a resolution of 28 October on the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (1973-1983),<sup>(54)</sup> recommended by the Economic and Social Council on 6 May,<sup>(43)</sup> the Assembly reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

The Assembly adopted a resolution on 24 November on foreign interests impeding decolonization<sup>(55)</sup> in which it reiterated that exploitation of Namibia's natural resources by South African and other foreign interests was illegal and contributed to the maintenance of the occupation regime. The Assembly condemned South Africa for its continued exploitation of those resources, and called on States to discontinue all economic, financial and trade relations with South Africa concerning Namibia.

In another resolution of the same date,<sup>(56)</sup> on implementation by international organizations of the Declaration on colonial countries, the Assembly urged increased assistance to United Nations programmes aiding the Namibians and SWAPO (p. 1171). It also urged organizations of the United Nations system to withhold assistance from South Africa, to discontinue all support to that Government until it restored Namibia's right to self-determination, and to refrain from action that might imply recognition or support for the legitimacy of South Africa's domination of the Territory.

In a resolution of 1 December<sup>(57)</sup> on implementation of the Declaration, the Assembly requested States to withhold assistance from South Africa until a united Namibia achieved independence.

The Assembly decided on 18 December,<sup>(66)</sup> when suspending its thirty-sixth session, that the appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia would be one of the items on the agenda when the session resumed in 1982.

Argentina and Fiji, explaining their reservations while voting in favour of the first of the two general resolutions on the Namibia question, and Australia, Austria, Iceland (for the five Nordic States), Ireland, Japan, Portugal and the United Kingdom (for the EC States), explaining their abstention in the voting, objected to the provisions reaffirming the legitimacy of armed struggle and calling for military assistance. Some of these States argued that armed struggle should not be endorsed as a legitimate means of achieving goals, especially when efforts to achieve Namibia's independence by peaceful

means were under way, that military support for armed struggles should not be encouraged, and that the United Nations had a responsibility to seek peaceful solutions. Canada said the contact group considered armed struggle to be the least likely avenue to Namibian independence.

On the provision recognizing SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, reservations were voiced by Argentina, Austria, Iceland (for the Nordic countries), Japan and the United Kingdom (for the EC States). It was stated that although SWAPO had an important role to play in the independence process, free elections and not the General Assembly should determine the ultimate representatives of the Namibian people.

Objections to provisions singling out individual States or criticizing manoeuvres by certain members of the contact group were voiced by Australia, Belgium, Chile, Iceland (for the Nordic States), Ireland, Japan, Nepal, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom (for the EC States), which abstained. Belgium thought they could jeopardize the successful outcome of the dialogue on Namibia. Iceland said some wording seemed to cast doubt on the negotiating effort, which the Nordic countries supported. Ireland said it did not wish to be associated with implications of bad faith on the part of some contact group members; moreover, the condemnation of collusion with South Africa by specified States seemed unwarranted and unnecessarily divisive. For the contact group, Canada stated that the reference to manoeuvres by certain members of the group to undermine the settlement plan was an ill-informed misinterpretation.

Among those voting for this resolution, Indonesia, Liberia and Suriname said they would have abstained on the paragraphs singling out certain States if they had been voted on separately. In Argentina's view, such references detracted from support for the resolution and therefore from its effectiveness. Samoa had doubts about the usefulness of selective accusations, and Sri Lanka said it would have been happier if such references had been avoided. Botswana, Burma, Costa Rica, Fiji, the Gambia, Morocco, Peru, Saint Lucia, Senegal and Turkey also voted in favour with reservations on this point.

Canada said the contact group members would abstain on all of the resolutions on the Namibia question, so as not to compromise their role as negotiators; however, they regarded the texts as vituperative, unjust, inaccurate, unrealistic and unhelpful in the search for a settlement. Also abstaining on the two resolutions on general aspects, New Zealand stated that they did not seem calculated to assist the contact group's efforts, and could have the opposite effect.

A number of States explained their abstentions on the resolution concerning sanctions against South Africa. For the contact group, Canada stated that the consequence of breaking off all contacts with South Africa would be the end of negotiations on implementation of the independence plan. Costa Rica said that, if it had voted in favour, it would have been obliged to impose on its citizens sanctions and restrictions forbidden by its constitutional system and by the International Covenants on Human Rights.<sup>(47)</sup> Ireland favoured sanctions chosen by the Security Council but regarded those proposed in the resolution as excessive and thought they would be ineffective if adopted only by the Assembly. Japan doubted that comprehensive mandatory sanctions would be the most effective and expeditious means of achieving the desired end. New Zealand thought the resolution was at odds with efforts to build a climate of confidence between the parties. Portugal said that total isolation of South Africa would make it impossible to hold the dialogue with that country on which a peaceful solution to the Namibia question could be based. Spain did not believe that imposing indiscriminate drastic measures was the best course and thought that breaking diplomatic relations, political and cultural discrimination, and the interruption of communications could be counter-productive.

Lesotho mentioned its geographical location with respect to South Africa in explaining why it had abstained. Swaziland observed that the States of southern Africa would be highly vulnerable to sanctions. Reservations were also voiced by Botswana.

Among those voting for the sanctions resolution with reservations, Brazil believed it went beyond the scope of an Assembly resolution, Fiji had difficulties with the provision to prohibit travel to South Africa and Namibia, while Samoa said the exercise of governmental power must not unreasonably infringe on the rights and freedoms of the individual.

Argentina, Australia and Chile said only the Security Council and not the General Assembly could impose or extend sanctions. Austria and Spain had reservations on provisions which might prejudice the Council's attitude in this regard.

In explanation of vote on the resolution on foreign interests in colonial countries, France said that, although it did not recognize the validity of Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia, its Government discouraged French investments in and trade with Namibia.

During the general debate on the Namibia question, Canada, speaking for the five members of the contact group, stated that only a negotiat-

ed settlement accepted by the Namibians, South Africa, the front-line States and the United Nations could achieve independence for Namibia. The Foreign Ministers of the group, meeting in New York on 24 September, had decided to relaunch their negotiations on Namibia, suspended since the break-up of the Geneva meeting in January. The group proposed three phases of negotiations. First, the parties would commit themselves to a set of constitutional principles designed to build confidence in the electoral process and in the future of an independent Namibia; to that end the five States were suggesting guidelines for the constituent assembly and broad principles for the constitution, without attempting to write a constitution themselves. The second phase would deal with arrangements for transition to independence; the group would make suggestions to ensure a fair and impartial transition. The third phase would begin with a public commitment by all parties to a date for beginning implementation of the Security Council's independence plan.

Most speakers reiterated the view that the 1978 settlement plan should be implemented immediately and without alteration. Brazil would not support any arrangements implying partial implementation, while Mali stated that any attempt to limit the scope of the plan or deviate from its fundamental goals would be a denial of international commitments and an infringement on the right of peoples to self-determination. Mexico, arguing that the agreement on a settlement plan could not be changed, said no political expediency or confrontation between Powers could violate the right of the Namibians to independence. Flexibility and negotiation were praiseworthy, said Nicaragua, but only when they were shared by all parties and not dictated by outside interests. Yugoslavia feared that attempts to introduce changes in the plan so as to induce South Africa to implement what was left of it might lead to circumvention of the plan and irreparably damage the international consensus on Namibia. Liberia said no effort should be spared to prevent breaking that consensus. Poland urged implementation without further delay.

Angola stated that it did not wish to prejudice the outcome of the contact group's latest initiative, but its cynicism and right to reserve judgement were understandable in light of South Africa's past performance. Botswana said the front-line States were always ready to listen to constructive suggestions, provided no attempt was made to subvert the United Nations plan. The United Republic of Tanzania, though acknowledging that certain measures of confidence were necessary in any negotiation, said disproportionate

attention had been given to South Africa, which had demanded concession after concession. Zambia offered assurances of its co-operation as long as there was no attempt to compromise Namibia's independence.

Guyana, Malaysia, Mauritania, Singapore and Venezuela expressed concern that the renewed negotiations carried out by the contact group might undermine the settlement plan. Among African States, Algeria sought assurances that the new initiative was not a plan to impose on the Namibians a regime they had not chosen or a formula to conceal South Africa's new demands. Benin, the Congo and the Sudan stated that the constitutional guarantees sought by South Africa for the white minority would serve to consolidate and perpetuate a social, political and economic regime based on inequality. Egypt noted that the constitutional proposals introduced by the contact group had been rejected by the front-line States on the ground that the Namibians had the right to draft their own constitution and to choose the form of government they wished. No one could dictate to the Namibians the terms of their future constitution, stated Madagascar; the sovereignty of the constituent assembly to be elected under the United Nations plan could not be restricted. The United Republic of Cameroon was of the view that if constitutional guarantees were the last price to be paid by Namibia for independence, they should not be rejected a priori.

Chad said it deplored the decision of the contact group to take up the question of Walvis Bay-claimed by South Africa-only after Namibia's independence. Kenya opposed the linkage of the settlement of Namibia's independence to the domestic affairs of any of the neighbouring sovereign States.

The German Democratic Republic said the aim of the contact group and South Africa was to place the future legislative assembly under tutelage and create a neo-colonialist status for Namibia. The Lao People's Democratic Republic, referring to what it described as a false announcement by certain Western agencies that an agreement had been reached between the contact group and the front-line States, said it had become almost a habit for some new event to occur just before the Assembly took up the Namibia question, designed to influence or mislead that consideration. Mongolia said even the Western press had acknowledged that the real purpose of the contact group's new initiative was to delay free elections indefinitely, while the Ukrainian SSR maintained that the purpose was to prevent SWAPO from coming to power.

The Congo, Finland, Japan, Mauritania, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Sri

Lanka, Togo, Turkey, the United Kingdom (on behalf of the EC members) and Zaire supported the new efforts by the contact group to reach a peaceful and internationally recognized settlement or expressed hope that those efforts would succeed. Australia, while deploring the delays in implementing the settlement plan, stated that the only constructive and realistic efforts to resolve the question were being made by the contact group and that rejection of those efforts was inappropriate. Austria maintained that the 1978 Security Council resolution was a declaration of principle; flexibility must be allowed in implementing it by accommodating new proposals if they were designed to promote independence and met the approval of the parties. Sweden noted that the Nordic Foreign Ministers had appealed to the Governments of the contact group to act for the earliest implementation of the United Nations plan.

Many speakers condemned the exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia and the non-compliance of States with the 1974 Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia. Commenting on foreign interests operating in Namibia, Czechoslovakia observed that the value of United States investments in Namibia exceeded \$2 billion, while the USSR cited the report of the Council for Namibia to the effect that, of 88 transnational corporations operating in Namibia, 53 were based in countries of the contact group-25 in the United Kingdom, 15 in the United States, 8 in the Federal Republic of Germany, 3 in France and 2 in Canada.

Many States, including Cyprus, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, Pakistan, Romania, Sierra Leone and Venezuela, continued to insist that the situation in southern Africa constituted a clear threat to international peace and security, making it incumbent on the Security Council to act. Support for such action, especially the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, as the surest way to assure South Africa's compliance with United Nations resolutions was expressed by many States, including Bangladesh, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, China, Czechoslovakia, Djibouti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mexico, Mongolia, Nigeria, the Philippines, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yemen. Iraq stated that, since the Security Council was not acting, the Assembly should take the necessary steps against South Africa.

Ireland, Portugal and Spain stated that isolating South Africa further would not be conducive to resolving the problem. Senegal and Sierra Leone, while encouraging the approach of the contact group, believed that if the new initiatives failed the Assembly should consider measures to

isolate South Africa. Kuwait mentioned measures taken in May by the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries to strengthen the prohibition against the sale of Arab petroleum to South Africa. The Syrian Arab Republic stated that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions was the last peaceful method available for exerting pressure on South Africa.

Peru, Uganda and others urged States which had an influence on South Africa to put pressure on it to speed the cessation of Namibia's occupation. In Tunisia's view, either the five Western States obliged South Africa to respect legality or the Security Council would have to act.

Regarding the argument advanced by South Africa that the United Nations was not impartial with regard to Namibia, India said that, although the Organization had been partial towards the just cause of the Namibian people, it would no longer have to take sides once the stage had been set for fair elections, since it had no reason to prefer one Namibian to another.

Some countries, including Bulgaria, Ethiopia and Togo, were of the opinion that there seemed no alternative but to intensify armed struggle under the leadership of SWAPO. Since South Africa had rejected dialogue, said Burundi, SWAPO had every reason to envisage the most appropriate methods for re-establishing its rights. Pakistan thought that appeals to SWAPO to forswear the armed struggle sounded more and more hollow as South Africa got away with breaking up the peaceful negotiating process on specious grounds. If a peaceful solution on an agreed basis was further delayed, said Thailand, the alternative of an intensified armed struggle would gain credibility as the only viable solution.

A number of States, including Bahrain, Benin, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Guinea, Hungary, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Nigeria, Qatar, the USSR and Viet Nam, maintained that South Africa was encouraged in its defiance of United Nations resolutions by its Western allies. Albania stated that super-Power rivalry in Africa encouraged South Africa to pursue its policies. China said South Africa's extreme truculence since the beginning of 1981 had been brought about by the support it had received from a super-Power which had twice used the veto to block a condemnation of that regime; the effect was to provide the other super-Power with opportunities for infiltration and expansion in southern Africa under the pretext of supporting the national liberation struggle.

A number of countries deplored the increasing militarization of Namibia. The Byelorussian SSR stated that South Africa had placed 40 mili-

tary bases along the border with Angola and 35 in the so-called police zone, while military expenditures in South Africa during 1981-1982 were to increase threefold compared with 1974. The USSR criticized assistance to South Africa by Western Powers, stating that, relying on such aid, the Pretoria regime had placed more than 100,000 South African soldiers in Namibia, amounting to more than a tenth of the Territory's population.

The observer for SWAPO stated that the Pretoria regime was trying to dictate the entrenchment of certain constitutional guarantees for the white racists and exploiters in Namibia. It was not planning to leave Namibia; the bottom line of its strategy was no SWAPO government in any circumstances. However, SWAPO was destined to score victory through the bullet or the ballot; until a cease-fire agreement was signed, the armed struggle would continue unabated.

Draft resolution not voted upon: <sup>(1)</sup>Niger, Tunisia, Uganda, S/14463.

Draft resolutions not adopted: <sup>(2)</sup>Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Tunisia, Uganda: S/14459; Niger, Tunisia, Uganda: <sup>(3)</sup>S/14460/Rev.1, <sup>(4)</sup>S/14461, <sup>(5)</sup>S/14462.

Letters and notes verbales (nv):

<sup>(6)</sup>Committee against Apartheid Chairman: 11 June, A/36/319-S/14531. Committee on colonial countries Chairman, 17 Aug.: <sup>(7)</sup>A/ES-8/4, <sup>(8)</sup>S/14635. Council for Namibia President (P) and Acting President: <sup>(9)</sup>12 June, A/36/327-S/14546; <sup>(10)</sup>11 Aug., A/36/433-S/14629; <sup>(11)</sup>17 Aug., A/36/450-S/14644; <sup>(12)</sup>2 Sep., A/ES-8/3 (p).

Algeria: <sup>(13)</sup>for African Group, 17 Sep., A/36/525; <sup>(14)</sup>for non-aligned countries, 23 Apr., A/36/222-S/14458 & Corr.1 (nv).

Niger, Tunisia, Uganda: <sup>(15)</sup>20 Apr., S/14452; <sup>(16)</sup>23 Apr., S/14456.

South Africa: <sup>(17)</sup>28 Jan., S/14346; <sup>(18)</sup>10 Mar., A/36/124; <sup>(19)</sup>27 Aug., S/14652; <sup>(20)</sup>28 Aug., A/36/461.

Tunisia: <sup>(21)</sup>29 Jan., S/14347; <sup>(22)</sup>21 Apr., S/14453.

Others: <sup>(23)</sup>Angola, 24 Apr., S/14464; <sup>(24)</sup>Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom, United States, 5 May, S/14474; <sup>(25)</sup>Egypt, 9 Sep., A/ES-8/9; <sup>(26)</sup>France, United Kingdom, United States, 20 Apr., S/14451; <sup>(27)</sup>German Democratic Republic, 3 Sep., A/ES-8/8; <sup>(28)</sup>Guyana, 16 June, A/36/330 S/14548; <sup>(29)</sup>Madagascar, 2 Sep., A/ES-8/7-S/14677; <sup>(30)</sup>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, 9 Sep., A/ES-8/11 (nv); <sup>(31)</sup>Uganda, 10 Apr., S/14434; <sup>(32)</sup>United Kingdom, 23 Apr., S/14457; <sup>(33)</sup>United Republic of Cameroon, for African Group, 1 Mar., A/35/794-S/14390.

Note: <sup>(34)</sup>S-G, annexing Zimbabwe letter, A/ES-8/1.

Reports: <sup>(35)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1; <sup>(36)</sup>Council for Namibia, A/36/24; S-G, <sup>(37)</sup>S/14333, <sup>(38)</sup>A/36/696 & Add.1-4.

Resolutions:

Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): <sup>(39)</sup>4(XXXVII), <sup>(40)</sup>5(XXXVII), <sup>(41)</sup>8(XXXVII), 23 Feb.; <sup>(42)</sup>14(XXXVII), paras. 3 & 11, 6 Mar.

Economic and Social Council: <sup>(43)</sup>1981/30, 6 May (p. 866); <sup>(44)</sup>1981/54, para. 5, 22 July (p. 1101); <sup>(45)</sup>1981/86, 2 Nov. (p. 190).

General Assembly: <sup>(46)</sup>1514(XXV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49); <sup>(47)</sup>2200 A (XXI), annex, 16 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 423); <sup>(48)</sup>2248(S-V), sect. II,



19 May 1967 (YUN 1967, p. 709); (49)35/227 A, 6 Mar. 1981, text following; <sup>(50)</sup>35/227 B, 6 Mar., text following; <sup>(51)</sup>35/227 J, 6 Mar., text following; <sup>(52)</sup>ibid., para. 11; <sup>(53)</sup>ES-8/2, 14 Sep., text following; <sup>(54)</sup>36/8, para. 4, 28 Oct. (p. 867); <sup>(55)</sup>36/51, paras. 17-19, 24 Nov. (p. 1109); <sup>(56)</sup>36/52, 24 Nov. (p. 1102); <sup>(57)</sup>36/68, para. 9, 1 Dec. (p. 1098); <sup>(58)</sup>36/121 A, 10 Dec., text following; <sup>(59)</sup>36/121 B, 10 Dec., text following.

Security Council: <sup>(60)</sup>301(1971), 20 Oct. 1971 (YUN 1971, p. 560); <sup>(61)</sup>418(1977), 4 Nov. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 161); <sup>(62)</sup>439(1978), para. 3, 13 Nov. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 916).

Decisions; <sup>(63)</sup>ESC: 1981/136, 8 May (p. 945). GA: <sup>(64)</sup>35/450 (item 27), 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1116); <sup>(65)</sup>35/451, 2 Mar. 1981, text following; <sup>(66)</sup>36/461 (item 18 (i)), 18 Dec. (p. 350).

Yearbook references: <sup>(67)</sup>1971, p. 581; <sup>(68)</sup>1974, p. 152; 1980, <sup>(69)</sup>p. 1109, <sup>(70)</sup>p. 1113.

Financial implications: ACABQ report, A/36/7/Add.16; 5th Committee reports, A/35/801, A/36/815; S-G statements, A/C.5/35/120, A/C.5/36/59.

#### Meeting records:

Security Council: S/PV.2263, 2267-2277 & 2267/Corr.1 (30 Jan. & 2-30 Apr.).

General Assembly: Plenary: A/35/PV.102-111 (2-6 Mar.); A/ES-8/PV.3-12 (4-14 Sep.); (A/36/PV.64-68, 70, 71, 93, 94 (19 Nov.-11 Dec.). 5th Committee: A/C.5/35/SR.64, A/C.5/36/SR.68 (5 Mar., 9 Dec.).

Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1189-1195 (6-14 Aug.).

General Assembly decision 35/451

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda item 27.

#### Question of Namibia

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 2 March 1981, the General Assembly took note of the report of the Fourth Committee.

General Assembly resolution 35/227 A

114-0-22 (recorded vote) Meeting 111 6 March 1981  
70-nation draft (A/35/L.50 and Add.1); agenda item 27.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling, in particular, its resolutions 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967 and subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council relating to Namibia, as well as the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971, delivered in response to the request addressed to it by the Council in its resolution 284(1970) of 29 July 1970,

Recalling also its resolutions 3111 (XXVIII) of 12 December 1973, and 31/146 and 31/152 of 20 December 1976, by which it, *inter alia*, recognized the South West Africa People's Organization as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people and granted observer status to it,

Taking into consideration the Algiers Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Algiers from 28 May to 1 June 1980,

Taking into consideration the resolution on Namibia adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-fifth ordinary session, held at Freetown from 18 to 28 June 1980, and endorsed by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its seventeenth ordinary session, held at Freetown from 1 to 4 July 1980, especially its decision reaffirming the unequivocal support of member States for the just armed struggle of liberation waged by the people of Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole legitimate and genuine representative of the Namibian people, and the reiteration of its earlier decision to grant to the United Nations Council for Namibia permanent observer status in the organization of African Unity,

Recalling the Declaration adopted by the International Conference in Solidarity with the Struggle of the People of Namibia, held in Paris from 11 to 13 September 1980,

Stressing the grave responsibility of the international community to take all possible measures in support of the Namibian people in their liberation struggle under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization.

Strongly condemning South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, its brutal repression of the Namibian people and its ruthless exploitation of the people and resources of Namibia, as well as its attempts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia,

Indignant at the arbitrary imprisonment and detention of political leaders and followers of the South West Africa People's Organization, the killing of Namibian patriots and other acts of brutality, including the wanton beating, torture and murder of innocent Namibians, and the arbitrary inhuman measures of collective punishment and measures designed to intimidate the Namibian people and to destroy their will to fulfil their legitimate aspirations for self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia,

Indignant at South Africa's refusal to comply with Security Council resolutions 385(1976) of 30 January 1976, 431 (1978) of 27 July 1978, 435(1978) of 29 September 1978 and 439(1978) of 13 November 1978 and at its decisions aimed at transferring power to illegitimate groups subservient to its interests in order to maintain its policies of domination and exploitation of the people and natural resources of the Territory,

Renewing its call upon the international community, especially all Member States, to refrain from according any recognition to or co-operating with any régime which the illegal South African administration may impose upon the Namibian people in disregard of the provisions of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council relating to Namibia,

Strongly reiterating its support for the national liberation movement of Namibia, the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, in their struggle to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia,

Reaffirming its full support for the armed struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization,

Noting with satisfaction the persistent opposition of the Namibian people to South Africa's illegal presence in the Territory and to its oppressive racist policies and, in particular, the Progress of their struggle in all its forms for national liberation under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization,

Strongly condemning as an act of colonial expansion the decision of South Africa to annex Walvis Bay and to claim sovereignty over the Penguin and other offshore islands, thereby undermining the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia,

Strongly deploring the policies of those States which, despite the relevant decisions of the United Nations and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971, continue to maintain diplomatic, economic, consular and other relations with South Africa, purporting to act on behalf of or concerning Namibia, as well as military or strategic collaboration, all of which has the effect of supporting or encouraging South Africa in defiance of the United Nations,

Strongly condemning the racist régime of South Africa for its efforts to develop a nuclear capability for military and aggressive purposes,

Deeply concerned by the increasing militarization of Namibia and by the continuing acts of aggression against neighbouring Independent African States, particularly Angola and Zambia, which have caused extensive loss of human lives and destruction of economic infrastructures,

Reaffirming that the resources of Namibia are the inviolable heritage of the Namibian people and that the exploitation of those resources by foreign economic interests under the protection of the repressive racist colonial administration, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974, is illegal and contributes to the maintenance of the illegal occupation regime,

Commending the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia in the discharge of the responsibilities entrusted to it under the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until Independence,

1. Approves the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

2. Reiterates that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until genuine self-determination and national independence are achieved in the Territory and, for this purpose, reaffirms the mandate given to the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence;

3. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the Penguin and other offshore islands, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and as recognized in General Assembly resolutions 1514(XV) and 2145(XXI), as well as in subsequent resolutions of the Assembly relating to Namibia, and the legitimacy of their struggle by all means at their disposal, including armed struggle, against the illegal occupation of their Territory by South Africa;

4. Reaffirms that the South West Africa People's Organization, the national liberation movement of Namibia, is the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people;

5. Supports the armed struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia;

6. Calls upon Member States, specialized agencies and other International organizations to render increased and sustained support and material, financial, military and other assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization to enable it to intensify its struggle for the liberation of Namibia;

7. Welcomes the Declaration adopted by the International Conference in Solidarity with the Struggle of the People of Namibia;

8. Strongly supports the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia in the discharge of the responsibilities entrusted to it under the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until Independence;

9. Requests all Member States to co-operate fully with the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence, in discharging the mandate entrusted to it under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2248(S-V) and subsequent resolutions of the Assembly;

10. Declares that the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa constitutes an act of aggression against the Namibian people and against the United Nations, which has direct responsibility for the Territory until independence;

11. Strongly condemns the South African régime for its persistent refusal to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly relating to Namibia;

12. Strongly condemns the manoeuvres of South Africa in Namibia aimed at transferring power to illegitimate groups subservient to its interests in order to maintain its policies of domination and exploitation of the people and natural resources of the Territory;

13. Strongly condemns the illegal South African administration for its decision to establish compulsory military service for all Namibians between the ages of 16 and 25, a decision which will increase the suffering of the Namibian people by disrupting their lives and forcing many to seek refuge in neighbouring countries and will thus impose an additional burden on United Nations programmes of assistance designed to ensure adequate shelter and support for Namibian refugees;

14. Declares that all measures by the illegal occupation regime to enforce military conscription in Namibia are illegal, null and void;

15. Solemnly reaffirms that genuine independence of Namibia can be achieved only with the direct and full participation of the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, in all efforts to implement resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia and that the only parties to the conflict in Namibia are, on the one hand, South Africa, which is illegally occupying the Territory and committing aggression against the people, and, on the other, the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, supported by the United Nations, which has direct responsibility for the Territory until independence;

16. Calls upon the international community, especially all Member States, to continue to refrain from according any recognition to or co-operation with any regime which the illegal South African administration may impose upon the Namibian people in disregard of the provisions of Security Council resolutions 385(1976), 435(1978) and 439(1978) and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Council;

17. Reiterates that, in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations, in particular General Assembly resolution S-9/2 of 3 May 1978 and Security Council resolution 432(1978) of 27 July 1978, Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia and that any decision by South Africa to annex Walvis Bay is therefore illegal, null and void;

18. Affirms that the offshore islands of Namibia, including Penguin, Ichaboe, Hollamsbird, Mercury, Long, Seal, Halifax, Possession, Albatross Rock, Pomona, Plum Pudding and Sinclair's, are an integral part of Namibia and that any decision by South Africa to claim sovereignty over those islands is illegal, null and void;

19. Strongly condemns the illegal South African administration for its massive repression of the people of Namibia and their national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization, with the intention of establishing an atmosphere of intimidation and terror for the purpose of imposing upon the Namibian people a political arrangement aimed at undermining the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia as well as perpetuating the systematic plunder of the natural resources of the Territory;

20. Demands that South Africa immediately release all Namibian political prisoners, including all those imprisoned or

detained under the so-called internal security laws, martial law or any other arbitrary measures, whether such Namibians have been charged or tried or are being held without charge in Namibia or South Africa;

21. Strongly condemns South Africa for its ever-increasing military build-up in Namibia, its recruitment and training of Namibians for tribal armies and the use of other agents to carry out its policy of military attacks against independent African States, particularly Angola and Zambia, its threats and acts of subversion and aggression against these countries and the forcible and massive displacement of Namibians from their homes for military and political purposes;

22. Calls upon all States to take effective legislative measures to prevent the recruitment, training and transit of mercenaries for service in Namibia;

23. Declares that South Africa's consistent defiance of the United Nations, its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia and its war of repression against the Namibian people, its persistent acts of aggression launched from bases in Namibia against independent African States, its present policy of colonial expansion, its policy of apartheid its development of nuclear weapons constitute a serious threat to international peace and security;

24. Condemns those Western and other States which have assisted South Africa in developing a nuclear capability and urges again all Member States, individually and collectively, to frustrate the attempts by South Africa to develop nuclear weapons;

25. Strongly condemns the activities of all foreign economic interests operating in Namibia under the illegal South African administration which are exploiting illegally the resources of the Territory and demands that transnational corporations and others engaged in such exploitation comply with all relevant resolutions of the United Nations by immediately abstaining from any new investment or activities in Namibia, by withdrawing from the Territory and by putting an end to their co-operation with the illegal South African administration;

26. Strongly condemns South Africa for obstructing the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385(1976), 435(1978) and 439(1978) and for its manoeuvres, in contravention of those resolutions, designed to consolidate its colonial and neo-colonial interests at the expense of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people for genuine self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia;

27. Demands that South Africa urgently comply fully and unconditionally with the resolutions of the Security Council, in particular resolution 385(1976) and subsequent resolutions of the Council relating to Namibia;

28. Calls upon the Security Council to act decisively against any dilatory manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of the illegal occupation régime aimed at frustrating the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, for self-determination and national liberation, as well as at negating the achievements of their just struggle;

29. Solemnly calls upon the Security Council to convene urgently to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to ensure South Africa's immediate compliance with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations relating to Namibia.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco,

Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe,

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

#### General Assembly resolution 35/227 B

130-0-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 111 6 March 1981

65-nation draft (A/35/L.51 and Add.1); agenda item 27.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in support of Namibia

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Namibia,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolutions 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967, as well as its subsequent resolutions relating to Namibia,

Recalling Security Council resolution 283(1970) of 29 July 1970 by which the Council, inter alia, called upon all States to discourage their nationals or companies of their nationality not under direct governmental control from investing or obtaining concessions in Namibia and, to this end, to withhold protection of such investments against claims of a future lawful Government of Namibia,

Bearing in mind Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974,

Recalling the Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action in Support of Self-Determination and National Independence for Namibia, contained in General Assembly resolution S-9/2 of 3 May 1978,

Taking into consideration the Algiers Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Algiers from 26 May to 1 June 1980,

Affirming that the resources of Namibia are the inviolable heritage of the Namibian people and that the exploitation of those resources by foreign economic interests under the protection of the repressive illegal South African administration is in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council,

Strongly deploring the policies of those States which, despite the relevant decisions of the United Nations and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971, continue to maintain diplomatic, economic, consular and other relations with South Africa, purporting to act on behalf of or concerning Namibia, as well as military or strategic collaboration, all of which has the effect of supporting or encouraging South Africa in its defiance of the United Nations,

Strongly condemning the support which the illegal South African administration continues to receive from those foreign economic, financial and other interests which are collaborating with it in its exploitation of the human and natural resources of, and in the further entrenchment of its illegal and colonialist domination over, the international Territory of Namibia,

Conscious of the continuing need to mobilize world public opinion against the involvement of foreign economic, financial and other interests in the exploitation of the human and natural resources of Namibia, which contributes to the perpetuation of the illegal South African occupation of Namibia,

1. Calls upon those States which have not yet done so to comply with the relevant provisions of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council relating to Namibia and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of June 1971;

2. Urges those States which have not yet done so to break off economic relations with South Africa whenever they concern Namibia and to take measures to compel the Government of South Africa to withdraw immediately from Namibia, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 2145(XXI) and 2248(S-V), as well as subsequent resolutions of the Assembly and the Security Council relating to Namibia;

3. Reiterates that the resources of Namibia are the inviolable heritage of the Namibian people and that the exploitation of those resources by foreign economic interests under the protection of the repressive racist colonial administration, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, is illegal and contributes to the maintenance of the illegal occupation régime;

4. Strongly condemns the activities of all foreign corporations operating in Namibia under the illegal South African administration which are exploiting the human and natural resources of the Territory, and demands that such exploitation cease forthwith;

5. Appeals to Governments to discourage private investors from their countries from participating in business ventures in Namibia which, by making available additional resources, enables the South African régime to finance the military costs of its repressive policies in Namibia;

6. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to communicate with corporations supplying arms and ammunition to South Africa and urge them to cease such activities;

7. Requests once again all Member States to take all appropriate measures to ensure the full application of, and compliance with, the provisions of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, and such other measures as may be necessary to assist in the protection of the natural resources of Namibia;

8. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue its efforts to ensure the implementation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultation with the United Nations Council for Namibia, an indexed handbook on transnational corporations operating in Namibia;

10. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia:

(a) To notify the Governments of States whose corporations, whether public or private, operate in Namibia of the illegality of such operations and of the position of the Council in this regard;

(b) To send missions of consultation to Governments whose corporations have investments in Namibia in order to review with them all possible action to discourage the continuation of such investments;

(c) To contact administering and managing bodies of foreign corporations operating in Namibia to warn them of the illegal basis on which they are operating in Namibia and of the position of the Council in this regard;

11. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to draw the attention of the specialized agencies to Decree No.

1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia in order that those agencies may assist the Council in promoting its full implementation;

12. Further requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue to examine the exploitation of and trade in Namibian uranium by foreign economic interests and to report on its findings to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom, United States.

#### General Assembly resolution 35/227 J

125-0-13 (recorded vote) Meeting 111 6 March 1981

68-nation draft (A/35/L.59 and Add.1); agenda item 27.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Situation resulting from South Africa's refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolutions relating to the question of Namibia, in particular resolutions 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967, and Security Council resolutions 385(1976) of 30 January 1976, 432(1978) of 27 July 1978, 435(1978) of 29 September 1978 and 439(1978) of 13 November 1978,

Strongly condemning the South African racist régime for its continued refusal to implement Security Council resolutions 432(1978), 435(1978) and 439(1978),

Indignant at the blatant manner in which South Africa deliberately caused the collapse of the pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva from 7 to 14 January 1981,

Deplored the fact that South Africa has not accepted the principle of independence for Namibia,

Highly commending the sense of responsibility, statesmanship and positive approach demonstrated by the South West Africa People's Organization to ensure the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia, particularly at the pre-implementation meeting.

Cognizant of the heavy involvement in the exploitation of the natural resources and in other illegal economic activities in Namibia of some members of the Western contact group stated to be engaged in the promotion of the implementation of Security Council resolutions 35/(1976) and 435(1978),

Taking into consideration the relevant resolution adopted by the Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa at the meeting held at Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania from 19 to 23 January 1981.

Noting the relevant parts of the New Delhi Declaration adopted by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981,

Deeply concerned about the present critical situation in Namibia, which constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security,

1. Declares the urgent need to ensure the early attainment of the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to genuine self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia;

2. Solemnly reaffirms that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until genuine self-determination, freedom and national independence are achieved in the Territory and renews its determination to ensure the effective and complete discharge of this responsibility;

3. Declares that it is incumbent upon all States to exercise fully their responsibilities in the effort to obtain genuine independence for Namibia;

4. Strongly condemns the persistent refusal of the South African racist régime to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia, in particular its rejection of Security Council resolutions 432(1978), 435(1978) and 439(1978);

5. Determines once again that the South African racist régime acted deceitfully through unilateral measures and sinister schemes within Namibia during the protracted period of talks for a negotiated settlement in Namibia to the detriment of the Namibian people and the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative, and in contravention of resolutions of the Security Council, in particular resolutions 385(1976) of 30 January 1976, 431(1978) of 27 July 1978, 432(1978) of 27 July 1978, 435(1978) of 29 September 1978 and 439(1978) of 13 November 1978, and relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

6. Solemnly reaffirms that the parties to the conflict in Namibia are, on the one hand, South Africa, which is illegally occupying the Territory and committing aggression against the people, and, on the other, the Namibian people, under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization, supported by the United Nations, which has direct responsibility for the Territory until genuine independence;

7. Reiterates its unflinching support for the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, in its heroic struggle for the liberation of the Territory and renews its call to the international community to render all material, financial, military, political and diplomatic assistance to that organization for the immediate termination of South Africa's illegal and racist colonial occupation of the Territory;

6. Strongly condemns South Africa for its intensification of the repression against the Namibian people and for its increasing arrests and detentions of leaders and members of the South West Africa People's Organization;

9. Strongly condemns the colonialist and racist régime of Pretoria for its continued acts of aggression against Independent African States, in particular Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe;

10. Decides to increase the financial provision in the budget of the United Nations Council for Namibia to finance the Office of the South West Africa People's Organization in New York in order to ensure the expanded representation of the people of Namibia through the South West Africa People's Organization at the United Nations;

11. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the discharge of its responsibilities as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, to hold a series of plenary meetings outside United Nations Headquarters during 1981 and to recommend appropriate action to the General Assembly in the light of the refusal by South Africa to implement Security Council resolution 435(1978) and requests the Secretary-General to defray the cost of these meetings and to provide the necessary staff and services for them;

12. Solemnly declares that South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia, its persistent defiance of the United Nations, its war of repression being waged against the Namibians, its repeated acts of aggression launched from bases in Namibia against independent African States, its colonialist expansion and its policy of apartheid constitute a serious threat to international peace and security;

13. Solemnly calls upon the Security Council to convene urgently to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to ensure South Africa's immediate compliance with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations relating to Namibia;

14. Decides that, in the event of the Security Council's inability to adopt concrete measures to compel South Africa to end its illegal occupation by withdrawing from Namibia, it will urgently consider necessary action in accordance with the Charter, cognizant of the fact that this is a unique instance in which the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility for promoting self-determination, freedom and national independence for Namibia.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

#### General Assembly resolution ES-8/2

117-0-25 (recorded vote) Meeting 12 14 September 1981

70-nation draft (A/ES-8-L.1/Rev.2 and Rev.2/Corr.1); agenda item 5.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Question of Namibia

The General Assembly,  
Having considered the question of Namibia at an emergency Special session,

Declaring that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa together with the repeated acts of aggression committed by South Africa against neighbouring States constitute a breach of international peace and security,

Noting with regret and concern that the Security Council failed to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security when draft resolutions proposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations were vetoed by the three Western permanent members of the Council on 30 April 1981,

Noting further with grave concern that the Security Council failed on 31 August 1981, on account of the veto of the United States of America, to exercise its responsibilities in the face of unprovoked massive armed aggression against Angola,

Taking note of the memorandum of the United Nations Council for Namibia dated 2 September 1981,

Having heard the statement by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority of the Territory until genuine independence is achieved,

Having heard the statements by the Secretary for Foreign Relations of the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people,

Having heard the statements by African Ministers and by Ministers of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries,

1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, as well as the subsequent relevant resolutions and decisions of the Assembly and the Security Council;

2. Reaffirms that Namibia is the legal responsibility of the United Nations until genuine self-determination and national independence are achieved in terms of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, in particular resolutions 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967;

3. Reaffirms its support for the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, and for its armed struggle to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence;

4. Strongly condemns South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its persistent refusal to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, thus violating the principles of the Charter and defying the authority of the United Nations;

5. Condemns South Africa for its increased oppression of the Namibian people, for the massive militarization of Namibia and for its armed attacks against neighbouring States, particularly Angola;

6. Calls upon Member States, specialized agencies and other international organizations to render increased and sustained support and material, financial, military and other assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization to enable it to intensify its struggle for the liberation of Namibia;

7. Calls upon the international community to extend, as a matter of urgency, all support and assistance, including military assistance, to the front-line States in order to enable them to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity against the renewed acts of aggression by South Africa;

8. Strongly condemns the exploitation and plunder of the natural resources of Namibia by South Africa and Western transnational corporations, in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974;

9. Reaffirms that Security Council resolution 435(1978) of 29 September 1978, in which the Council endorsed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, is the only basis for a peaceful settlement;

10. Firmly rejects the latest manoeuvres by certain members of the Western contact group aimed at undermining the international consensus embodied in Security Council reso-

lution 435(1978) and depriving the oppressed Namibian people of their hard-won victories in the struggle for national liberation;

11. Demands the immediate commencement of the unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435(1978) without any prevarication, qualification or modification and not later than December 1981;

12. Strongly urges the Security Council, in the light of the serious threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa, to respond positively to the overwhelming demand of the international community by immediately imposing against that country comprehensive mandatory sanctions as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter;

13. Calls upon all States, in view of the threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa, to impose against that country comprehensive mandatory sanctions in accordance with the provisions of the Charter;

14. Also strongly urges States to cease forthwith, individually and collectively, all dealings with South Africa in order totally to isolate it politically, economically, militarily and culturally;

15. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to monitor the boycott of South Africa and to bring instances of contacts between Member States and South Africa to the attention of the General Assembly as necessary;

16. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to study the modalities for monitoring this boycott of South Africa and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session on the arrangements which may be required;

17. Requests all States to report to the Secretary-General on measures taken by them to implement the relevant provisions of the present resolution;

18. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly as appropriate, but not later than 31 December 1981, on the implementation of the present resolution.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab, Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland,<sup>a</sup> Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat It had intended to vote In favour.

General Assembly resolutions 36/121 A

120-0-27 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981

52-nation draft (A/36/L.23/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1); agenda item 36.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua, and Barbuda, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe,

Sierra Leone. Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda. United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon. United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Situation In Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling, in particular, its resolutions 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967 and subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council relating to Namibia, as well as the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971, delivered in response to the request addressed to it by the Council in its resolution 284(1970) of 29 July 1970.

Recalling a/so its resolutions 3111 (XXVIII) of 12 December 1973, and 31/146 and 31/152 of 20 December 1976, by which it, inter alia, recognized the South West Africa People's Organization as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people and granted observer status to it,

Taking into consideration the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Panama City on 5 June 1981.

Taking into consideration resolution CM/Res.853(XXXVII) on Namibia adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-seventh ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 15 to 26 June 1981, and endorsed by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981, as well as decisions of the Organization of African Unity reaffirming the unequivocal support of member States for the just armed struggle of liberation waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole legitimate and genuine representative of the Namibian people,

Strongly condemning France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America for their collusion with the South African racists manifested in the triple vetoes in the Security Council, where the majority of the world body demonstrated its determination to adopt concrete political and economic measures aimed at isolating terrorist South Africa in order to compel it to vacate Namibia,

Taking into consideration the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa and the Special Declaration on Namibia, adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held at Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981.

Welcoming the establishment of a Solidarity Fund by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and of an Emergency Namibia Liberation Fund by the Organization of African Unity to support the efforts of the South West Africa People's Organization in its liberation struggle,

Stressing the grave responsibility of the international community to take all possible measures in support of the Namibian people in their liberation struggle under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization.

Strongly reiterating its support for the national liberation movement of Namibia, the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people in their struggle to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia,

Reaffirming its full support for the armed struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization.

Strongly condemning South Africa's continued illegal occupation Of Namibia, its brutal repression of the Namibian

people and its ruthless exploitation of the people and resources of Namibia, as well as its attempts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

Indignant South Africa's refusal to comply with Security Council resolutions 385(1976) of 30 January 1976, 431(1978) of 27 July 1978, 435(1978) of 29 September 1978 and 439(1978) of 13 November 1978 and at its manoeuvres aimed at gaining international recognition for illegitimate groups which it has installed in Namibia and which are subservient to Pretoria's interests in order to maintain its policies of domination and exploitation of the people and natural resources of Namibia,

Strongly condemning the racist régime of South Africa for its efforts to develop a nuclear capability for military and aggressive purposes,

Deeply concerned by the increasing militarization of Namibia and by the continuing acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States, particularly Angola and Zambia, which have caused extensive loss of human lives and destruction of economic infrastructures,

Noting with grave concern that the Security Council failed on 31 August 1981, on account of the veto of the United States of America, to exercise its responsibilities in the face of unprovoked massive armed aggression against Angola,

Reaffirming that the resources of Namibia are the inviolable heritage of the Namibian people and that the exploitation of those resources by foreign economic interests under the protection of the repressive racist colonial administration, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974, is illegal and contributes to the maintenance of the illegal occupation régime,

Indignant at the arbitrary imprisonment and detention of political leaders and followers of the South West Africa People's Organization, the killing of Namibian patriots and other acts of brutality, including the wanton beating, torture and murder of innocent Namibians, and the arbitrary inhuman measures of collective punishment and measures designed to intimidate the Namibian people and to destroy their will to fulfil their legitimate aspirations for self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia,

Commending the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia in the discharge of the responsibilities entrusted to it under the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence,

1. Approves the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

2. Requests all Member States to co-operate fully with the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence, in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967 and subsequent resolutions of the Assembly;

3. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and as recognized in General Assembly resolutions 1514(XV) and 2145(XXI), as well as in subsequent resolutions of the Assembly relating to Namibia, and the legitimacy of their struggle by all means at their disposal, including armed struggle, against the illegal occupation of their territory by South Africa;

4. Reiterates that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until genuine self-determination and national independence are achieved in the Territory and, for this purpose, reaffirms the mandate given to the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence;

5. Strongly supports the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia in the discharge of the responsibilities

entrusted to it both as a policy-making organ of the United Nations and as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia;

6. Reaffirms that the South West Africa People's Organization, the national liberation movement of Namibia, is the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people;

7. Supports the armed struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia;

8. Solemnly reaffirms that the genuine independence of Namibia can be achieved only with the direct and full participation of the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, in all efforts to implement resolutions of the United Nations relating to Namibia and further reaffirms that the only parties to the conflict in Namibia are, on the one hand, South Africa, which is illegally occupying the Territory and committing aggression against the people, and, on the other, the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, supported by the United Nations, which has direct responsibility for the Territory until independence;

9. Calls upon Member States, specialized agencies and other international organizations to render sustained and increased support and material, financial, military and other assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization to enable it to intensify its struggle for the liberation of Namibia;

10. Strongly condemns the South African régime for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and for its persistent refusal to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations relating to Namibia;

11. Strongly condemns the manœuvres of South Africa in Namibia aimed at transferring power to illegitimate groups subservient to its interests in order to maintain its policies of domination and exploitation of the people and natural resources of the Territory and declares that actions taken in this regard by the racist Pretoria régime are illegal, null and void;

12. Strongly condemns South Africa for its ever-increasing military build-up in Namibia, its recruitment and training of Namibians for tribal armies and the use of mercenaries to carry out its policy of military attacks against independent African States, particularly Angola and Zambia, its threats and acts of subversion and aggression against those countries and the forcible and massive displacement of Namibians from their homes for military and political purposes;

13. Strongly condemns the illegal South African administration for its introduction of compulsory military service for Namibians;

14. Declares that all measures by the illegal occupation régime to enforce military conscription in Namibia are illegal, null and void;

15. Strongly condemns South Africa for obstructing the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385(1976), 435(1978) and 439(1978) and for its manœuvres, contravention of those resolutions, designed to consolidate its colonial and neo-colonial interests at the expense of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people for genuine self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia;

16. Condemns South Africa for its increased oppression of the Namibian people, for the massive militarization of Namibia and for its armed attacks against neighbouring States, particularly Angola;

17. Strongly condemns the collusion by the Governments of certain Western countries and other States, particularly those of the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, with the racist régime of South Africa in the nuclear field and calls upon France and all other States to refrain from supplying the racist minority régime of South Africa, directly or indirectly, with installations that might enable it to produce uranium, plutonium and other nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment;

18. Strongly condemns the activities of all foreign

economic interests operating in Namibia under the illegal South African administration which are exploiting illegally the resources of the Territory and demands that transnational corporations and others engaged in such exploitation comply with all relevant resolutions of the United Nations by immediately abstaining from any new investment or activities in Namibia, by withdrawing from the Territory and by putting an end to their co-operation with the illegal South African administration;

19. Declares that, by their depletive exploitation of natural resources and continued accumulation and repatriation of huge profits, the activities of foreign economic, financial and other interests operating at present in Namibia constitute a major obstacle to its political independence;

20. Calls upon the international community, especially all Member States, to continue to refrain from according any recognition to or co-operation with any régime which the illegal South African administration may impose upon the Namibian people in disregard of the provisions of Security Council resolutions 385(1976), 435(1978) and 439(1978) and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Council;

21. Reiterates that, in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations, in particular General Assembly resolution S-9/2 of 3 May 1978 and Security Council resolution 432(1978) of 27 July 1978, Walvis Bay and, the offshore islands of Namibia are an integral part of Namibia and that any decision by South Africa to annex Walvis Bay is therefore illegal, null and void;

22. Affirms that the offshore islands of Namibia—including Penguin, Ichaboe, Hollamsbird, Mercury, Long, Seal, Halifax, Possession, Albatross Rock, Pomona, Plum Pudding and Sinclair's—are an integral part of Namibia and that any decision by South Africa to claim sovereignty over those islands is illegal, null and void;

23. Strongly condemns the illegal South African administration for its massive repression of the people of Namibia and their national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization, with the intention of establishing an atmosphere of intimidation and terror for the purpose of imposing upon the Namibian people a political arrangement aimed at undermining the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia as well as perpetuating the systematic plunder of the natural resources of the Territory;

24. Demands that South Africa immediately release all Namibian political prisoners, including all those imprisoned or detained under the so-called internal security laws, martial law or any other arbitrary measures, whether such Namibians have been charged or tried or are being held without charge in Namibia or South Africa;

25. Demands that South Africa account for all "disappeared" Namibians and release any who are still alive and declares that South Africa shall be liable for damages to compensate the victims, their families and the future lawful Government of an independent Namibia for the losses sustained;

26. Declares that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa continues to constitute an act of aggression against the Namibian people and against the United Nations, which has direct responsibility for the Territory until independence;

27. Declares that South Africa's defiance of the United Nations, its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia, its war of repression against the Namibian people, its persistent acts of aggression launched from bases in Namibia against independent African States, its policy of apartheid and its development of nuclear weapons constitute a serious threat to international peace and security;

28. Calls upon the international community to extend, as a matter of urgency, full support and assistance, including military assistance, to the front-line States in order to enable them to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity against the repeated acts of aggression by South Africa;

29. Demands that South Africa urgently comply fully and unconditionally with the resolutions of the Security Council,



in particular resolutions 385(1976) and 435(1978) and subsequent resolutions of the Council relating to Namibia;

30. Reaffirms that Security Council resolution 435(1978), in which the Council endorsed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, is the only basis for a peaceful settlement;

31. Firmly rejects the manoeuvres by certain members of the Western contact group aimed at undermining the international consensus embodied in Security Council resolution 435(1978) and at depriving the oppressed Namibian people of their hard-won victories in the struggle for national liberation;

32. Demands the immediate commencement of the unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435(1978) without any prevarication, qualification or modification and not later than December 1981;

33. Strongly urges the Security Council to act decisively against any dilatory manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of the illegal occupation regime aimed at frustrating the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, for self-determination and national liberation, as well as at negating the achievements of their Just struggle;

34. Strongly urges the Security Council, in the light of the serious threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa, to respond positively to the overwhelming demand of the International community by immediately imposing against that country comprehensive mandatory sanctions, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/121 B

118-0-29 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981

61-nation draft (A/36/L.24 and Add.1); agenda item 36.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Action by Member States in support of Namibia  
The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia,

Recalling its resolutions 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967, as well as its subsequent resolutions relating to Namibia,

Recalling its resolution 3295(XXIX) of 13 December 1974, by which it requested all Member States to take measures to ensure compliance with Decree No. 1 for the Protection Of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974.

Taking into consideration the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Panama City on 5 June 1981.

Recalling its request to the Security Council, in the light of the serious threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa, to respond positively to the overwhelming demand of the international community by immediately imposing against that country comprehensive mandatory sanctions as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

Recalling its call upon States, in view of the threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa, to impose against that country comprehensive mandatory sanctions in accordance with the provisions of the Charter,

Recalling its call upon States to cease forthwith, individually and collectively, all dealings with South Africa in order totally to isolate it politically, economically, militarily and culturally,

Conscious of the continuing need to mobilize world public opinion against the involvement of foreign economic, financial and other interests in the exploitation of the human and natural resources of Namibia, which contributes to the perpetuation of the illegal South African occupation of Namibia,

1. Requests all States to take legislative, administrative and other measures, as appropriate, in order effectively to isolate South Africa politically, economically, militarily and culturally, in accordance with General Assembly resolution ES-8/2 of 14 September 1981;

2. Calls upon all States to sever all diplomatic, consular and trade relations with South Africa;

3. Requests all States, in furtherance of the objective of bringing to an end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, to prevent:

(a) The import into their territories of all commodities and products originating in South Africa or illegally occupied Namibia and exported therefrom after the date of the present resolution, whether or not the commodities or products are for consumption or processing in their territories, whether or not they are imported in bond and whether or not any special legal status with respect to the import of goods is enjoyed by the port or other place where they are imported or stored;

(b) Any activities by their nationals or in their territories which would promote or are calculated to promote the export of any commodities or products from South Africa or occupied Namibia, and any dealings by their nationals or in their territories in any commodities or products originating in South Africa or occupied Namibia and exported therefrom after the date of the present resolution, including in particular any transfer of funds to South Africa or occupied Namibia for the purposes of such activities or dealings;

(c) The sale or supply by their nationals or from their territories of any commodities or products-whether or not originating in their territories, but not including supplies intended strictly for medical purposes, educational equipment and material for use in schools and other educational institutions, publications, news material and, in special humanitarian circumstances, foodstuffs-to any person or body in South Africa or occupied Namibia or to any other person or body for the purposes of any business carried on in or operated from South Africa or occupied Namibia and any activities by their nationals or in their territories which promote or are calculated to promote such sale or supply;

4. Requests all States not to make available to the regime of South Africa or illegally occupied Namibia, or to any commercial, industrial or public utility undertaking, including

tourist enterprises, in South Africa or occupied Namibia, any funds for investment or any other financial or economic resources, and to prevent their nationals and any persons within their territories from making available to the régime or to any such undertaking any such funds or resources and from remitting any other funds to persons or bodies within South Africa or occupied Namibia, except payments exclusively for pensions or for strictly medical, humanitarian or educational purposes or for the provision of news material and, in special humanitarian circumstances, foodstuffs;

5. Requests all States to prevent the entry into their territories, save on exceptional humanitarian grounds, of any person travelling on a South African passport, regardless of its date of issue, or on a purported passport issued by or on behalf of the illegal administration of South Africa in Namibia;

6. Calls upon all States to prohibit travel by their nationals to South Africa or occupied Namibia for any purpose, including tourism, sports and scientific and cultural exchanges;

7. Requests all States to prevent airline companies constituted in their territories and aircraft of their registration or under charter to their nationals from operating to or from South Africa or occupied Namibia and from linking up with any airline company constituted or aircraft registered in South Africa or occupied Namibia;

8. Reiterates that the exploitation of the resources of Namibia by foreign economic interests under the protection of the repressive racist administration, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, of relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, is illegal and contributes to the maintenance of the illegal occupation régime;

9. Requests once again all Member States to take all appropriate measures, including legislation and enforcement action, to ensure the full application of, and compliance with, the provisions of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia;

10. Calls upon all States to prohibit State-controlled corporations from investing or obtaining concessions in Namibia, as called for in Security Council resolutions 276(1970) of 30 January 1970, 283(1970) of 29 July 1970 and 301(1971) of 20 October 1971;

11. Calls upon all States to prohibit companies of their nationality not under direct governmental control from investing or obtaining concessions in Namibia and to announce that they will not protect such investments against claims of a future lawful Government of Namibia;

12. Requests all States to prevent investment in projects or corporations within their territories by corporations or individuals of South African nationality, or based in South Africa or illegally occupied Namibia;

13. Requests all States to adopt legislation which will penalize corporations dealing with South Africa or with entities in illegally occupied Namibia by the denial of tax relief and the imposition of fines exceeding the amount of profits derived from those dealings;

14. Requests all States to prohibit:

(a) The sale or supply of petroleum or petroleum products to any person or body in South Africa or occupied Namibia, or to any person or body for the purpose of eventual supply to South Africa or occupied Namibia;

(b) Any activities by their nationals or in their territories which promote or are calculated to promote the sale or supply of petroleum or petroleum products to South Africa or occupied Namibia;

(c) The shipment in vessels, aircraft or any other means of transportation of their registration, or under charter to their nationals, of any petroleum or petroleum products to South Africa or occupied Namibia;

(d) Any investments in, or provision of technical and other assistance, including technical advice and spare parts, to the petroleum industry in South Africa or occupied Namibia;

(e) The provision of transit facilities in their territories, including the use of their ports, airports, roads or railway net-

work, to vessels, aircraft or any other means of transportation carrying petroleum or petroleum products to South Africa or occupied Namibia;

(f) Any activities by their nationals or in their territories which promote or are calculated to promote the prospecting for petroleum in South Africa or occupied Namibia;

15. Requests all States to cease forthwith any provision to South Africa of arms and related matériel of all types, including the sale or transfer of weapons and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment, paramilitary police equipment and spare parts for the aforementioned, and to cease as well the provision of all types of equipment and supplies and grants of licensing arrangements for the manufacture or maintenance of the aforementioned, which would further strengthen South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia;

16. Requests all States to ensure that arms-export agreements provide for guarantees that would prevent embargoed items or any components thereof from reaching South Africa through third countries under any circumstances, including sub-contracts by firms from one country to another;

17. Requests all States to prohibit the export of spare parts for embargoed aircraft and other military equipment belonging to South Africa, and the maintenance and servicing of such equipment;

18. Requests all States to prohibit government agencies and corporations under their jurisdiction from transferring technology for the manufacture of arms and related matériel of all types to South Africa;

19. Requests all States to prohibit government agencies, corporations and individuals under their jurisdiction from investing in the manufacture of arms and related matériel in South Africa;

20. Requests all States to prohibit all imports of arms and related matériel of any type from South Africa;

21. Requests those States that have not yet done so to renounce those elements of bilateral or multilateral treaties in which South Africa has claimed to represent Namibia, or to take other action to ensure that those treaties cannot be interpreted as applying to Namibia;

22. Requests the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which operate the Ureenco uranium-enrichment plant, to have Namibian uranium specifically excluded from the Treaty of Almelo, which regulates the activities of Ureenco;

23. Requests all States, by making use of article 35 B of the Convention on International Civil Aviation, signed at Chicago on 7 December 1944, to prohibit the carriage of Namibian uranium or other products emanating from Namibia above their territory;

24. Calls upon all States to take effective legislative measures to prevent the recruitment, training and transit of mercenaries for service in Namibia

25. Urges, having regard to the principles set forth in Article 2 of the Charter, States not Members of the United Nations to act in accordance with the provisions of the present resolution;

26. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultation with the United Nations Development Programme, a comprehensive programme of assistance to States which are neighbours of South Africa and Namibia, on the understanding that such assistance should not only envisage the overcoming of short-term difficulties but be designed to enable those States to move towards complete self-reliance;

27. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the Preparation of the above programme;

28. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to seek from any States information relevant to the implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on Namibia, particularly Assembly resolution ES-8/2, and to compile information from other sources;

29. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia, in implementation of paragraph 15 of General Assembly resolu-

tion ES-8/2, to continue to monitor the boycott of South Africa and to submit to the Assembly at Its thirty-seventh session a comprehensive report on all contacts between Member States and South Africa, containing a systematic analysis of the information received from Member States and other sources on the continuing political, economic, financial and other relations of States and their economic and other interests with South Africa and of measures taken by Member States to terminate all dealings with the racist régime of South Africa;

30. Requests all States to co-operate fully with the United Nations Council for Namibia in the fulfilment of its tasks concerning the Implementation of resolution ES-8/2 and to supply such information as may be sought by the Council in pursuance of the present resolution;

31. Requests all States to report to the Secretary-General by the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly on the measures taken by them to implement the present resolution;

32. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at Its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua, New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

#### Work programme of the UN Council for Namibia

The General Assembly adopted resolutions in March and December 1981 on the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia and on the Council's representation of Namibia in international organizations. All four texts were based on the Council's recommendations. (For the 1981 activities of the Council, see p. 1139.)

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (MARCH). The first of the resolutions on the work programme, adopted on 6 March,<sup>(3)</sup> outlined the tasks set for the Council in 1981. Among the activities was formulation of a programme of co-operation with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) engaged in supporting the liberation struggle. Other tasks were defined in regard to information dissemination (p. 1166) and the conduct of hearings on South African exploitation of Namibia's natural resources. The Council was also given functions in respect of the United Nations

Fund for Namibia (p. 1171), the Nationhood Programme for Namibia (p. 1174) and the United Nations Institute for Namibia (p. 1177). The Assembly allocated \$200,000 for the Council's use in promoting the liberation struggle and decided to finance the New York office of SWAPO.

This resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 132 to none, with 5 abstentions, and was sponsored by 67 nations. India stated, in introducing the text, that the activities it outlined charted a new course of action which would lead to early independence for Namibia if pursued with support from the entire United Nations membership.

In another resolution of the same date, on action by intergovernmental or organizations and NGOs with respect to Namibia,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly requested specialized agencies and other organizations and conferences of the United Nations system to grant the Council full membership as the Administering Authority for Namibia, and asked them to waive the assessment of Namibia during the period in which it was represented by the Council. It requested all organizations and conferences to invite the Council to participate as a full member whenever Namibian rights and interests were involved. Finally, it asked United Nations organizations to give priority to the allocation of funds for assistance to Namibians (p. 1178).

This resolution, introduced by Nigeria, was adopted by a recorded vote of 133 to none, with 5 abstentions. The draft was sponsored by 65 nations.

Explaining its vote in favour of these resolutions, Ireland stated that, while generally supporting the activities of the Council, it maintained some reservations about the extent of the Council's competence.

During the debate, most, speakers supported the Council's activities. Guyana stated that its work continued to complement the efforts of SWAPO on the battlefield. India said the Council had been handicapped by inadequate appreciation of its responsibilities, by deliberately ambivalent attitudes and at times even by total hostility; suggestions in the Council that it should condone South African actions or remain patient were inadmissible. Indonesia said the Council's special missions to various States had played a role in sharpening the international focus on the Namibia question. The Lao People's Democratic Republic stated that Governments, particularly those of Western countries, that had not yet recognized the Council as the sole Administering Authority for Namibia must change their attitude by accepting the mandate entrusted to the Council by the Assembly.

The Niger asked why the international com-

munity did not give the Council the means and powers it needed to set itself up at Windhoek, organize a State there, and cause justice and democracy to flower. Panama stated that the Council must promote and strengthen its co-operation with NGOs supporting the liberation struggle. Senegal saw a need to strengthen the Council's powers. Tunisia also urged support for the Council as the most effective body for putting an end to South Africa's presence in Namibia.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (DECEMBER). The General Assembly adopted a further resolution on the Council's work programme on 10 December.<sup>(9)</sup> In addition to most of the functions assigned to it in March, the Assembly decided that the Council should review the political, military and social aspects of the liberation struggle and, through contacts with Governments and corporations, counter the support given by foreign economic interests to the South African administration in Namibia. It was also asked to pursue its study of the uranium trade (p. 1169). The Secretary-General was requested to prepare a reference book on transnational corporations operating in Namibia. The Council was requested to accede to conventions against apartheid and racial discrimination, and Assembly committees were requested to invite a Council representative to participate on matters affecting Namibian rights and interests. An office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia was authorized in Luanda, and financial support for the SWAPO office in New York was to continue. The Secretary-General was asked, in consultation with the Council, to prepare for a conference at an appropriate time in support of the Namibian independence struggle.

This resolution, introduced by India, was adopted by a recorded vote of 137 to none, with 10 abstentions, and was sponsored by 69 nations.

Also on 10 December, in a resolution on action by intergovernmental organizations and NGOs with respect to Namibia,<sup>(10)</sup> the Assembly repeated the provisions of its March resolution on the subject and also requested full membership of Namibia in the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, as well as the end of all contracts between the United Nations, UNDP and the specialized agencies, and corporations supporting South Africa's illegal occupation. The Assembly asked the Council to undertake a co-operative programme with NGOs and support groups engaged in supporting the struggle of the Namibian people, and decided to allocate \$200,000 to the Council for that and related purposes.

This resolution, sponsored by 69 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 127 to none, with 20 abstentions. Turkey, which introduced it, observed that the Council was already a full member of the International Labour Organisation, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, and an associate member of the World Health Organization.

The Assembly dealt with the Council's role in two resolutions on general aspects of the Namibia question, also adopted on 10 December. In one of these, on the situation in Namibia resulting from its illegal occupation by South Africa,<sup>(7)</sup> the Assembly requested States to co-operate with the Council and supported its efforts as a policy-making organ and the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence. In the other resolution, on action by Member States in support of Namibia,(s) the Assembly requested States to co-operate with the Council in the implementation of the Assembly's resolution of 14 September<sup>(5)</sup> and to supply information sought by the Council.

In its resolution of 24 November,<sup>(6)</sup> on implementation by United Nations organizations of the Declaration on colonial countries,<sup>(2)</sup> the Assembly urged specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to grant full membership to the Council. A similar provision was included in an Economic and Social Council resolution of 22 July on the same subject.<sup>(1)</sup>

Several States which voted for the resolution on the Council's work programme made comments in explaining their vote. Brazil stated that granting full membership to the Council by United Nations organizations should not set a precedent for other intergovernmental bodies, given the *sui generis* character of the Namibia question. Ireland, though generally supporting the Council's activities, had difficulties about certain of its recommendations and reservations about its powers in regard to certain issues. Japan, too, had reservations about parts of the Council's report and work programme. Portugal reserved its position on the question of enlarging the Council's mandate. Samoa questioned the appropriateness of mandating the Council to concern itself with military aspects of the armed struggle.

Australia and New Zealand, which abstained on both of the 10 December resolutions, expressed concern about the financial implications

of some of the proposed activities, including \$400,000 for Council meetings away from New York and \$200,000 for co-operation with NGOs. Ireland, abstaining on the resolution on action by organizations, did not think it was wise to end all dealings between the United Nations and unnamed corporations or to interfere with the competences of specialized agencies regarding contracts.

In the debate on the Namibia question, Czechoslovakia stated that the Council could long since have solved the Namibian independence problem if South Africa had not put up desperate resistance, and if it had not enjoyed all-round support by world imperialism and reactionary forces. Peru supported full participation of the Council in specialized agencies and United Nations conferences. The Sudan was pleased by the spirit of co-operation between the Council and SWAPO. The United Republic of Tanzania commended the Council for its role in preparing Namibia for eventual independence and said it should continue to serve as the nerve centre of United Nations activities regarding the Territory.

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC: 1981/54, para. 7, 22 July (p. 1102). GA: <sup>(2)</sup>1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49); <sup>(3)</sup>35/227 C, 6 Mar. 1981, text following; <sup>(4)</sup>35/227 D, 6 Mar., text following; <sup>(5)</sup>ES-8/2, 14 Sep. (p. 1153); <sup>(6)</sup>36/52, para. 16, 24 Nov. (p.1104); <sup>(7)</sup>36/121 A, paras. 2 & 5, 10 Dec. (p. 1155); <sup>(8)</sup>36/121 B, para. 30, 10 Dec. (p. 1159); <sup>(9)</sup>36/121 C, 10 Dec., text following; <sup>(10)</sup>36/121 D, 10 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: ACABQ report, A/36/7/Add.16; 5th Committee reports, A/35/801, A/36/815; S-G statements, A/C.5/35/120, A/C.5/36/59.

Meeting records: GA: Plenary, A/35/PV.102-106, 107-111 (2-6 Mar.); A/36/PV.64-68, 70, 71, 93, 94 (19 Nov.-11 Dec.). 5th Committee, A/C.5/35/SR.64, A/C.5/36/SR.68 (5 Mar., 9 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 35/227 C

132-0-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 111 6 March 1981  
67-nation draft (A/35/L.52 and Add.1); agenda item 27.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Z i m b a b w e .

#### Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Namibia,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolution 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967, by which it established the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until independence,

Taking into consideration the Algiers Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Algiers from 28 May to 1 June 1980.

Reaffirming that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations and that the Namibian people must be enabled to attain self-determination and independence in a united Namibia,

Convinced of the need to continue consultations with the South West Africa People's Organization in the formulation and implementation of the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia as well as in any matter of interest to the Namibian people,

Bearing in mind the need to reaffirm the solemn commitment of the United Nations in support of self-determination, freedom and national independence for Namibia,

Reaffirming the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the Penguin and other offshore islands,

Convinced of the need to intensify co-operation between the United Nations Council for Namibia and those non-governmental organizations which are actively involved in support of the liberation struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative, for self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia,

Commending the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia in the discharge of the responsibilities entrusted to it under General Assembly resolution 2248(S-V) and subsequent resolutions of the Assembly relating to Namibia,

1. Approves the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, including the recommendations contained therein, and decides to make adequate financial provision for their implementation;

2. Decides that the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the discharge of its responsibilities as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, shall:

(a) Continue to mobilize international support in order to press for the withdrawal of the illegal South African administration from Namibia in accordance with the resolution of the United Nations relating to Namibia;

(b) Counter the policies of South Africa against the Namibian people and against the United Nations, as well as against the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia;

(c) Denounce and reject all fraudulent constitutional or political schemes through which South Africa may attempt to perpetuate its system of colonial oppression and exploitation of the people and resources of Namibia;

(d) Endeavour to ensure non-recognition of any administration or entity installed at Windhoek not issuing from free elections in Namibia, conducted on a territory-wide basis, under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with Security Council resolutions, in particular resolutions 385(1976) of 30 January 1976, 435(1978) of 29 September 1978 and 439(1978) of 13 November 1978, and subsequent relevant resolutions in their entirety;

(e) Secure the territorial integrity of Namibia as a unitary State, including Walvis Bay and the Penguin and other offshore islands;

(f) Represent Namibia in intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, bodies and conferences to ensure that the rights and interests of Namibia shall be adequately protected;

(g) Take all appropriate measures to ensure the full application of, and compliance with, the provisions of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974, and such other measures as may be necessary to assist in the protection of the natural resources of Namibia;

(h) Conduct hearings in order to obtain relevant information from all available sources to denounce in depth South African schemes of ruthless exploitation of the people and resources of Namibia, including the exploitation of labour,

the militarization of the Territory and the plunder of its natural resources;

(i) Formulate policies of assistance to Namibians and co-ordinate assistance for Namibia provided by the specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies within the United Nations system;

(j) Review the destructive effects of South African policies on Namibian children and formulate, in co-operation with the United Nations Children's Fund and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, an appropriate programme of action to assist Namibian children outside Namibia and report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session;

(k) Formulate and direct a world-wide programme of dissemination of information on the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, on its schemes to perpetuate its exploitation and control of the people and resources of the Territory and on the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative, to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia;

(l) Inform leading opinion makers, media leaders, political and academic institutions and other concerned non-governmental organizations of Member States about the objectives and functions of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization and also hold consultations with, and seek the co-operation of, those personalities and institutions by inviting them on special occasions to participate in the deliberations of the Council, thereby ensuring the most effective mobilization of public opinion in support of the cause of the Namibian people;

(m) Act as trustee of the United Nations Fund for Namibia and, in this capacity, administer and manage the Fund;

(n) Co-ordinate, plan and direct the Nationhood Programme for Namibia in consultation with the South West Africa People's Organization;

(o) Provide broad guidelines and formulate the principles and policies for the United Nations Institute for Namibia and include in its annual report to the General Assembly a chapter on the activities of the Institute;

(p) Continue to consult with the South West Africa People's Organization in the formulation and implementation of its programme of work, as well as in any matter of interest to the Namibian people;

3. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to formulate a programme of co-operation with non-governmental organizations which are actively engaged in supporting the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative, in order to intensify international action in support of the liberation struggle of the Namibian people;

4. Decides to allocate the sum of \$200,000 to be used by the United Nations Council for Namibia to establish contacts with non-governmental organizations, to attend conferences in solidarity with Namibia arranged by those organizations, to disseminate information on the conclusions of such conferences and to engage in such other activities as will promote the cause of the liberation struggle of the Namibian people;

5. Decides to make adequate financial provision in the budget of the United Nations Council for Namibia to finance the office of the South West Africa People's Organization in New York in order to ensure appropriate representation of the people of Namibia through the South West Africa People's Organization at the United Nations;

6. Decides to continue to defray the expenses of representatives of the South West Africa People's Organization, whenever the United Nations Council for Namibia so decides;

7. Declares that the United Nations is committed to genuine self-determination and national independence for Namibia and that all United Nations programmes for the benefit of the Namibian people will be carried out in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly in sup-

port of the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic liberation movement, to achieve genuine self-determination and national independence for Namibia;

8. Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to review the requirements of the units which service the Council so that the Council may fully discharge all tasks and functions arising out of its mandate.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of United Kingdom, United States.

#### General Assembly resolution 35/227 D

133-0-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 111 6 March 1981  
65-nation draft (A/35/L.53 and Add.1); agenda item 27.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolution 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967, by which it established the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the Territory until independence,

Recalling the Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action in Support of Self-Determination and National Independence for Namibia, contained in General Assembly resolution S-9/2 of 3 May 1978.

Taking into consideration the Algiers Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Algiers from 28 May to 1 June 1980.

Bearing in mind the Declaration adopted by the International Conference in Solidarity with the Struggle of the People of Namibia, held in Paris from 11 to 13 September 1980.

Reaffirming the responsibility of the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to take all effective measures, within their respective spheres of competence, to ensure the full and speedy implementation of

the resolutions of the United Nations relating to Namibia, particularly in the provision of moral and material assistance, on a priority basis, to the people of Namibia and the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative,

Convinced of the need to grant all possible material assistance to Namibians who are victims of South Africa's repressive and discriminatory policies,

1. Requests all specialized agencies and other organizations and conferences within the United Nations system to grant full membership to the United Nations Council for Namibia so that it may participate as the Administering Authority for Namibia in the work of those agencies, organizations and conferences;

2. Requests all specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to grant a waiver of the assessment of Namibia during the period in which it is represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia;

3. Requests all Intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, bodies and conferences to ensure that the rights and interests of Namibia shall be protected and to invite the United Nations Council for Namibia to participate, in its capacity as the Administering Authority for Namibia, as a full member whenever such rights and interests are involved;

4. Expresses its appreciation to the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system for their assistance to Namibia and requests them to give priority to the allocation of funds for material assistance to the Namibian people.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom, United States,

#### General Assembly resolution 36/121 C

137-0-10 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981

69-nation draft (A/36/L.25 and Add.1); agenda item 36.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Leo People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia,

Recalling its resolution 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967, by which It established the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence,

Taking into consideration the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Panama City on 5 June 1981.

Reaffirming that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations and that the Namibian people must be enabled to attain self-determination and independence in a united Namibia,

Convinced of the need to continue consultations with the South West Africa People's Organization in the formulation and implementation of the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia as well as in any matter of interest to the Namibian people,

1. Approves the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, including the recommendations contained therein, and decides to make adequate financial provision for their implementation;

2. Decides that the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the discharge of its responsibilities as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, shall:

(a) Continue to mobilize international support in order to press for the withdrawal of the illegal South African administration from Namibia in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations relating to Namibia;

(b) Counter the policies of South Africa against the Namibian people and against the United Nations, as well as against the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia;

(c) Denounce and seek the rejection by all States of all fraudulent constitutional or political schemes through which South Africa may attempt to perpetuate its presence in Namibia;

(d) Ensure non-recognition of any administration or entity installed at Windhoek not issuing from free elections in Namibia, conducted on a territory-wide basis, under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council, in particular resolutions 385(1976) of 30 January 1976, 435(1978) of 29 September 1978 and 439(1978) of 13 November 1978, and subsequent relevant resolutions in their entirety;

3. Decides that the United Nations Council for Namibia shall:

(a) Consult Governments in order to mobilize support for the cause of Namibia and to further the implementation of United Nations resolutions on the question of Namibia;

(b) Represent Namibia in United Nations conferences and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, bodies and conferences to ensure that the rights and interests of Namibia shall be adequately protected;

4. Decides that Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, shall participate as a full member in all conferences and meetings organized by the United Nations to which all States or, in the case of regional conferences and meetings, all African States, are invited;

5. Decides that the United Nations Council for Namibia shall also:

(a) Review the progress of the liberation struggle in Namibia in its political, military and social aspects and prepare periodic reports related thereto;

(b) Consider the compliance of Member States with the relevant United Nations resolutions relating to Namibia, taking into account the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971;

(c) Consider the activities of foreign economic interests operating in Namibia with a view to recommending appropriate policies to the General Assembly in order to counter the support which those foreign economic interests give to the illegal South African administration in Namibia;

(d) Continue to examine the exploitation of and trade in Namibian uranium by foreign economic interests and report

on its findings to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

(e) Notify the Governments of States whose corporations, whether public or private, operate in Namibia of the illegality of such operations;

(f) Send missions of consultation to Governments whose corporations have investments in Namibia in order to review with them all possible action to discourage the continuation of such investments;

(g) Contact administering and managing bodies of foreign corporations operating in Namibia regarding the illegal basis on which they are operating in Namibia;

(h) Draw the attention of the specialized agencies to Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974;

(i) Take all measures to ensure compliance with the provisions of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, including consideration of the institution of legal proceedings in the domestic courts of States and other appropriate bodies;

(j) Conduct hearings, seminars and workshops in order to obtain relevant information on the exploitation of the people and resources of Namibia by South African and other foreign interests and to expose such activities;

(k) Prepare and publish reports on the political, economic, military, legal and social situation in and relating to Namibia;

(l) Secure the territorial integrity of Namibia as a unitary State, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands of Namibia;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, in accordance with the guidelines established by the United Nations Council for Namibia, an indexed reference book on transnational corporations operating in Namibia;

7. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia, in its capacity as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, to accede to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid and such other related conventions as may be appropriate;

8. Requests all committees and sub-committees of the General Assembly to continue to invite a representative of the United Nations Council for Namibia to participate whenever the rights and interests of Namibians are discussed, and to consult closely with the Council before submitting to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session any draft resolution which may involve the rights and interests of Namibians;

9. Decides to make adequate financial provision in the section of the programme budget of the United Nations relating to the United Nations Council for Namibia to finance the office of the South West Africa People's Organization in New York in order to ensure appropriate representation of the people of Namibia through the South West Africa People's Organization at the United Nations;

10. Decides to continue to defray the expenses of representatives of the South West Africa People's Organization, whenever the United Nations Council for Namibia so decides;

11. Declares that all United Nations programmes for the benefit of the Namibian people will be carried out in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly in support of the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative, to achieve genuine self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia;

12. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue to consult with the South West Africa People's Organization in the formulation and implementation of its programme of work, as well as in any matter of interest to the Namibian people;

13. Requests the Secretary-General to establish an office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia at Luanda early in 1982;

14. Requests the Secretary-General, in order to facilitate

financial reporting to the United Nations Council for Namibia, to ensure that, within the section of the programme budget of the United Nations relating to the Council, the accounts shall reflect closely the activities of the Council as described in the report of the Council to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session;

15. Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to review the requirements of personnel and facilities of all units which service the Council so that the Council may fully discharge all tasks and functions arising out of its mandate;

16. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the discharge of its responsibilities as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, to hold a series of plenary meetings in Africa during 1982 and to recommend appropriate action to the General Assembly, in the light of the refusal by South Africa to implement Security Council resolution 435(1978), and requests the Secretary-General to defray the cost of these meetings and to provide the necessary staff and services for them;

17. Requests the Secretary-General to give the widest possible publicity to the extraordinary plenary meetings through all the means at his disposal, including special publications, press releases, and radio and television broadcasts;

18. Requests the Secretary-General, after consulting the United Nations Council for Namibia regarding its assessment of the situation pertaining to Namibia, to carry out preparatory work with a view to organizing, at an appropriate time, an international conference in support of the struggle of the Namibian people for independence;

19. Further requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the preparatory arrangements made.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Melts, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Guatemala, Luxembourg, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/121 D

127-0-20 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981

69-nation draft (A/36/L.26 and Add.1); agenda item 36.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.



Action by Intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia,

Taking into consideration the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at Its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Panama City on 5 June 1981.

Bearing in mind the Declarations adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981.

1. Requests all specialized agencies and other organizations and conferences of the United Nations system to grant full membership to Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, so that It may participate as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia in the work of those agencies, organizations and conferences;

2. Requests all specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to grant a waiver of the assessment of Namibia during the period in which it is represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia;

3. Requests all intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, bodies and conferences to ensure that the rights and interests of Namibia shall be protected and to invite Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, to participate as a full member whenever such rights and interests are involved;

4. Requests the International Atomic Energy Agency to grant full membership to Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia;

5. Requests the Secretary-General and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme to take the necessary administrative action to end all contracts between, on the one hand, the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme and the specialized agencies and, on the other hand, corporations that directly or indirectly support South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the above provisions;

7. Requests the Economic and Social Council to consider granting membership in the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia;

8. Expresses its appreciation to the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system for their assistance to Namibia, to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, to the United Nations Institute for Namibia and to the Nationhood Programme and requests them to give priority to the allocation of funds material assistance to the Namibian people;

9. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to undertake a programme of co-operation with non-governmental organizations and support groups that are actively engaged in supporting the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative, in order to intensify international action in support of the liberation struggle of the Namibian people;

10. Decides to allocate the sum of \$US 200,000 to be used by the United Nations Council for Namibia to undertake a programme of co-operation with non-governmental organizations, including support to conferences in solidarity with Namibia arranged by those organizations, dissemination of conclusions of such conferences and support to such other activities as will promote the cause of the liberation struggle of the Namibian people, subject to decisions of the Council in each individual case, on the recommendation of the South West Africa People's Organization.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentine, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia,

Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

#### Information dissemination

The General Assembly decided on 6 March 1981 to launch a world campaign to support United Nations resolutions for a free and independent Namibia. During the year, the Council for Namibia and the United Nations Department of Public Information (DPI) continued their efforts to acquaint world public opinion with the Namibia question by means of publications, films, radio programmes and the provision of speakers.

DPI covered the work of the Council by issuing releases to the press, delegations and NGOs, arranging press briefings and including articles on Namibia in United Nations publications. A booklet was prepared on the Council's 1981 meetings at Panama City,<sup>(1)</sup> and the DPI periodical *Objective: Justice* also republished the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action (p. 1139).

Radio coverage relating to Namibia was in the form of short-wave broadcasts of meetings, newscasts, and weekly and monthly programmes in over 20 languages. There was also extensive film, television and photo coverage. A short feature film entitled "Freedom for All", edited from "Namibia: A Trust Betrayed", was produced as part of the 1980-1981 "Vignette" series. A poster was produced with the slogan "Stop the plunder of Namibia's natural resources".

The Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia prepared the substantive parts of the periodical *Namibia Bulletin*<sup>(2)</sup> and published *Namibia in the News*,<sup>(3)</sup> a newsletter distributed to Member States and NGOs.

The Council organized on 26 October the annual commemoration of the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia, and its Liberation Movement, SWAPO, holding two special meetings at United Nations Headquarters that were addressed by United Nations officials and representatives of regional groups and organizations.

On 14 April, the Council<sup>(5)</sup> amended the terms of reference of its Standing Committee III, instructing it to consider ways of informing the public on all aspects of the Namibia question in light of South Africa's defiance of United Nations resolutions. The Committee was to entrust DPI and other Secretariat units with specific tasks under the Committee's programme.

In its consensus on the Namibia question adopted on 14 August (p. 1138), the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples requested the Secretary-General, in view of the massive publicity campaign by the Government of South Africa designed to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia, to intensify his efforts, through all available media, in order to mobilize world public opinion against South Africa's Namibia policies and intensify dissemination of information about the liberation struggle.<sup>(4)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (MARCH). In a resolution of 6 March 1981,<sup>(6)</sup> adopted on the basis of a text recommended by the Council for Namibia in 1980, the General Assembly decided to launch a world campaign to support United Nations resolutions for a free and independent Namibia, and asked the Council to formulate a programme that would include publications on the political, economic, military and social consequences of the illegal occupation of Namibia, as well as radio programmes, advertisements, films, posters, press releases and briefings. The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to direct DPI to assist the Council in disseminating information with a view to mobilizing public support for the independence of Namibia. Organizations in the United Nations system were requested to intensify the dissemination of information on Namibia in consultation with the Council. The Secretary-General was requested urgently to prepare a comprehensive economic map of Namibia.

This resolution, sponsored by 68 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 133 to none, with 5 abstentions. Introducing it, Bulgaria said there was a need to expose the assistance rendered by certain Western States to South Africa.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (DECEMBER). In a further resolution on this subject, adopted on 10 December,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Council for Namibia to consider ways of increasing the dissemination of information on Namibia. The Assembly decided to expose and denounce the collusion of certain Western countries with South Africa. The campaign was to include the following, in addition to elements mentioned in the March resolution: publications on legal matters and on the territorial integrity of Namibia; film-strips and slide sets; booklets con-

taining Council declarations, communiqués and press releases by missions of the Council, and United Nations resolutions; and a booklet on protection of Namibia's natural resources. Statistics on Namibia were to be included in United Nations publications. Opinion makers, media leaders, NGOs and support groups were to be informed about the Council's objectives and functions. Member States were requested to broadcast programmes and publish material in their official news media, to commemorate Namibia Day and to issue special postage stamps for the occasion.

This resolution, sponsored by 57 nations and based on a text from the Council,<sup>(5)</sup> was adopted by a recorded vote of 125 to none, with 23 abstentions. Introducing the draft, Yugoslavia stated that the public in some countries was still not sufficiently aware of the Namibian problem and the media of certain countries either did not publicize sufficient information or the publicized information was biased.

Explaining its abstention in the vote on the resolution, Japan stated that the information to be disseminated must be accurate, fair and balanced. Spain said it could not support the decision to launch an international campaign to denounce some countries, since that would presuppose imposing directives on information media. Greece and Ireland also expressed reservations on the reference to certain Western countries. New Zealand said it was not enthusiastic about the request for an additional 1982 appropriation of \$381,000 for the information activities called for in the resolution.

Costa Rica, Fiji, Liberia, Nepal, Portugal, Samoa, Thailand and Turkey, which voted for the resolution, expressed reservations against enumerating specific countries for criticism in respect of their relations with South Africa (p. 170).

Publications: <sup>(1)</sup>United Nations Council for Namibia: Meetings at Panama City, Panama, 2-5 June 1981 (DPI/704);

<sup>(2)</sup>Namibia Bulletin. Nos. 1/81 & 2/81; <sup>(3)</sup>Namibia in the News, Nos. 1/81-20/81.

Reports: <sup>(4)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1; <sup>(5)</sup>Council for Namibia, A/36/24.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(6)</sup>35/227 H, 6 Mar., text following; <sup>(7)</sup>36/121 E, 10 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: ACABQ report, A/36/7/Add.16; 5th Committee reports, A/35/801, A/36/815; S-G statements, A/C.5/35/120, A/C.5/36/59.

Meeting records: GA: Plenary: A/35/PV.102-106, 107-111 (2-6 Mar.); A/36/PV.64-68, 70, 71, 93, 94 (19 Nov.-11 Dec.). 5th Committee: A/C.5/35/SR.64, A/C.5/36/SR.68 (5 Mar., 9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 35/227 H

133-0-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 111 6 March 1981  
68-nation draft (A/35/L.57 and Add.1); agenda item 27.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia,

Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Dissemination of Information on Namibia

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolutions 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967, as well as subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council relating to Namibia.

Recalling also the Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action in Support of Self-Determination and National Independence for Namibia, contained in General Assembly resolution S-9/2 of 3 May 1978.

Taking into consideration the Algiers Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Algiers from 28 May to 1 June 1980.

Stressing the urgent need to mobilize international public opinion on a continuous basis with a view to assisting effectively the people of Namibia to achieve self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia and, in particular, to intensify the world-wide and continuous dissemination of information on the struggle for liberation being waged by the people of Namibia, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative,

Reiterating the importance of publicity as an instrument for furthering the mandate given by the General Assembly to the United Nations Council for Namibia and mindful of the pressing need for the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat to intensify its efforts to acquaint world public opinion with all aspects of the question of Namibia,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to direct the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, in addition to its responsibilities relating to southern Africa, to assist the United Nations Council for Namibia in the implementation of its programme of dissemination of information in order that the United Nations may intensify its efforts to generate publicity and disseminate information with a view to mobilizing public support for the independence of Namibia;

2. Requests all specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to intensify the dissemination of information on Namibia in consultation with the United Nations Council for Namibia;

3. Decides to launch a world campaign to support United Nations resolutions for a free and independent Namibia and, to this end, requests the United Nations Council for Namibia, in co-operation with the appropriate organs of the United Nations, to formulate a programme of activities on dissemination of information, including the following:

(a) Preparation of publications on the political, economic, military and social consequences of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa;

(b) Production of radio programmes in English, French, German and Spanish designed to draw the attention of world public opinion to the current situation in Namibia;

(c) Production of material for publicity through radio and television broadcasts;

(d) Placement of advertisements in newspapers and magazines;

(e) Production of films on Namibia;

(f) Production of posters;

(g) Full utilization of the resources related to press releases, press conferences and press briefings in order to

maintain a constant flow of information to the public on all aspects of the question of Namibia;

4. Requests the Secretary-General urgently to undertake, in consultation with the United Nations Council for Namibia, the preparation of a comprehensive economic map of Namibia.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of. United Kingdom, United States.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/121 E

125-0-23 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981

57-nation draft (A/36/L.27 and Add.1); agenda item 36.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Dissemination of information on Namibia

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia,

Taking into consideration the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Panama City on 5 June 1981.

Recalling its resolution ES-8/2 of 14 September 1981.

Stressing the urgent need to mobilize international public opinion on a continuous basis with a view to assisting effectively the people of Namibia in the achievement of self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia and, in particular, to intensify the world-wide and continuous dissemination of information on the struggle for liberation being waged by the people of Namibia, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative,

Deploring the increased assistance rendered by certain Western countries, especially the United States of America, to South Africa in the political, economic, military and cultural fields and expressing its conviction that this assistance should be exposed by the United Nations Council for Namibia by all means available to it,

Reiterating the importance of publicity as an instrument for furthering the mandate given by the General Assembly to the United Nations Council for Namibia and mindful of the pressing need for the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat to intensify its efforts to acquaint world public opinion

with all aspects of the question of Namibia, In accordance with policy guidelines formulated by the Council,

1. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to consider ways and means of increasing the dissemination of information relating to Namibia;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, In all its activities of dissemination of information on the question of Namibia, follows the policy guidelines laid down by the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to direct the Department of Public Information, in addition to its responsibilities relating to southern Africa, to assist, as a matter of priority, the United Nations Council for Namibia in the implementation of its programme of dissemination of information In order that the United Nations may intensify its efforts to generate publicity and disseminate information with a view to mobilizing public support for the independence of Namibia, particularly in the Western countries;

4. Decides to launch an international campaign in support of the cause of Namibia and to expose and denounce the collusion of certain Western countries with the South African racists and, to this end, requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to formulate a programme of activities on dissemination of information, including the following:

(a) Preparation and dissemination of publications on the political, economic, military and social consequences of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, as well as on legal matters and on the question of the territorial integrity of Namibia;

(b) Production and dissemination of radio programmes in English, French, German and Spanish designed to draw the attention of world public opinion to the current situation in Namibia;

(c) Production of material for publicity through radio and television broadcasts;

(d) Placement of advertisements in newspapers and magazines;

(e) Production of films, film-strips and slide sets on Namibia;

(f) Production and dissemination of posters;

(g) Full utilization of the resources related to press releases, press conferences and press briefings in order to maintain a constant flow of information to the public on all aspects of the question of Namibia;

(h) Production and dissemination of a comprehensive economic map of Namibia;

(i) Preparation and wide dissemination of booklets, containing:

(i) The text of official declarations of the Council;

(ii) Joint communiqués and press releases issued by missions of consultation of the Council;

(iii) Resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the question of Namibia together with relevant portions of Assembly resolutions on the question of foreign economic interests operating in Namibia and on military activities in Namibia;

(j) Publicity for and distribution of an indexed reference book on transnational corporations involved in Namibia;

(k) Preparation and dissemination of a booklet based on a study on the implementation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the Council on 27 September 1974;

(l) Acquisition of already published books and pamphlets for further dissemination;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to allocate, in consultation with the United Nations Council for Namibia, sales numbers to publications on Namibia selected by the Council;

6. Requests the Department of Public Information to indicate specifically, at the time of preparation of its budget, the items in its work programme that relate to dissemination of information on Namibia;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the United

Nations Council for Namibia with the work programme of the Department of Public Information for the year 1982 covering the activities of dissemination of Information on Namibia, followed by quarterly reports on the programmes undertaken, including details of expenses Incurred;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to establish, In consultation with the United Nations Council for Namibia, basic statistics on Namibia, and to include these statistics In the appropriate United Nations publications;

9. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue to inform leading opinion makers, media leaders, political and academic institutions and other concerned non-governmental organizations, cultural organizations and supported groups about the objectives and functions of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization and also to hold consultations with, and seek the co-operation of, those personalities and institutions by inviting them on special occasions to participate in the deliberations of the Council;

10. Requests Member States to broadcast programmes on their national radio and television networks and to publish material in their official news media, informing their populations about the situation in Namibia and the Obligation of Governments and peoples to assist in the struggle of Namibians for independence;

11. Requests all Member States to commemorate and publicize Namibia Day and to issue special postage stamps for the occasion;

12. Requests the Secretary-General to direct the United Nations Postal Administration to issue a special postage stamp on Namibia by the end of 1982 in commemoration of Namibia Day.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Caps Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

## Economic and social conditions

### Uranium exploitation

In its 1981 report,<sup>(1)</sup> the Council for Namibia stated that the significant uranium deposits in Namibia had been the target of massive exploitation by foreign economic interests in collaboration with South Africa. The Council cited information obtained during its July 1980 hearings

on Namibian uranium<sup>(6)</sup> that companies from France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States had been exploiting Namibian uranium in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, adopted by the Council in 1974.<sup>(5)</sup>

In its Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted on 5 June 1981 (p. 1139), the Council condemned the illegal exploitation of Namibian natural resources, particularly uranium, by South African and other foreign economic interests. It pledged follow-up action on the results of the uranium hearings in order to mobilize the international community to ensure compliance with General Assembly decisions and to prepare the legal framework for future compensation due to the Namibian people after independence.

The Council's Seminar on Legal Issues concerning the Question of Namibia (The Hague, Netherlands, 22-24 June), in proposing measures to enforce the repeated calls by the Assembly for action against exploiters of Namibia's natural resources (p. 11939), recommended that it should become standard practice for all uranium to display a certificate of origin before enrichment, given the difficulty of ascertaining its origin once it had been processed.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (MARCH). By a resolution of 6 March 1981 on the subject of Namibian uranium,<sup>(2)</sup> based on a draft recommended in 1980 by the Council for Namibia, the Assembly drew the Security Council's attention to the threat to peace and security caused by South Africa's development of a nuclear capability using Namibian uranium, and requested the Council to ensure that South Africa did not continue to acquire foreign nuclear technology. It requested the Governments of States whose corporations were involved, particularly those of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States, to prohibit their corporations from dealing in and prospecting for Namibian uranium. Condemning the collusion of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel and the United States with South Africa in the nuclear field, it called on all States to refrain from supplying the régime with installations that might enable it to produce nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment (p. 181).

This resolution, sponsored by 44 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 108 to none, with 26 abstentions. Introducing the draft, Yugoslavia said it was based on the findings of the 1980 hearings on Namibian uranium, which had found that the continuing exploitation of Namibian uranium by South Africa and foreign economic

interests constituted one of the main obstacles to the independence of Namibia.

In explanation of vote, Austria, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Portugal, which abstained, and Fiji, Panama, Togo and Turkey, which voted for the resolution, expressed reservations concerning the selective criticism of specific States. Suriname and Uruguay, which voted in favour, stated that, had there been a separate vote on the paragraph singling out certain countries for criticism, they would have abstained.

Japan, abstaining, stated that references to it in the resolution were unjustified because it was not purchasing Namibian uranium.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION (DECEMBER). In its resolution of 10 December on action by Member States in support of Namibia,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly requested States to prohibit the carriage of Namibian uranium in flights above their territory. It also requested the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, which operated the Ureenco uranium-enrichment plant, to have Namibian uranium specifically excluded from the Treaty of Almelo, which regulated the activities of Ureenco.

(The recommendation on Ureenco originated in the Council for Namibia in 1980, as a result of its hearings on Namibian. The Treaty of Almelo, named for the place in the Netherlands where one of the two operational Ureenco plants was located, was due for renewal in 1981.)

In another resolution of 10 December,<sup>(4)</sup> on the work programme of the Council for Namibia, the Assembly decided that the Council should continue to examine the exploitation of and trade in Namibian uranium by foreign economic interests and report to the Assembly in 1982 on its findings.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Council for Namibia, A/36/24.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/227 I, 6 Mar., text following; <sup>(3)</sup>36/121 B, paras. 22 & 23, 10 Dec. (p. 1158); <sup>(4)</sup>36/121 C, para. 5 (d), 10 Dec. (p. 1163).

Yearbook references: <sup>(5)</sup>1974, p. 152; <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 1111.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/35/801; S-G statement, A/C.5/35/120.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/35/PV.102-106, 107-111 (2-6 Mar.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/35/SR.64 (5 Mar.).

#### General Assembly resolution 35/227 I

108-0-26 (recorded vote) Meeting 111 6 March 1981  
44-nation draft (A/35/L.58 and Add.1); agenda item 27.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Question of Namibian uranium

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967.

Recalling Security Council resolutions 264(1969) of 20 March 1969, 269(1969) of 12 August 1969, 276(1970) of 30 January 1970, 283(1970) of 29 July 1970 and 301 (1971) of 20 October 1971.

Recalling the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971.

Recalling the enactment of the United Nations Council for Namibia, on 27 September 1974, of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,

Recalling its request, contained in its resolution 3295 (XXIX) of 13 December 1974, that all States should comply with Decree No. 1,

Taking into consideration the Algiers Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Algiers from 28 May to 1 June 1980.

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the hearings on Namibian uranium conducted by the Council from 7 to 11 July 1980.

Recalling its resolution 35/28 of 11 November 1980 on the activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa,

1. Approves the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the hearings on Namibian uranium and the conclusions and recommendations contained therein;

2. Reaffirms that the natural resources of Namibia are the inviolable heritage of the Namibian people and that the rapid depletion of the natural resources of the Territory as a result of the systematic plunder by foreign economic interests, in collusion with the illegal South African administration, is a grave threat to the integrity and prosperity of an independent Namibia;

3. Declares that any State which deprives the Namibian people of the exercise of their legitimate rights over their natural resources or subordinates the right and interests of that people to foreign economic and financial interests violates the solemn obligations it has assumed under the Charter of the United Nations;

4. Declares that, by their depletive exploitation of natural resources and the continued accumulation and repatriation of huge profits, the activities of foreign economic, financial and other interests operating at present in Namibia constitute a major obstacle to its political independence;

5. Calls once again upon all Governments which have not yet done so to take legislative, administrative or other measures in respect of their nationals and the bodies corporate under their jurisdiction that own and operate enterprises in Namibia to put an end to such enterprises and to prevent new investments or prospecting in the Territory;

6. Draws the attention of the Security Council to the fact that the hearings on Namibian uranium have shown serious violations of Council resolutions 276(1970), 283(1970) and 301 (1971) and requests the Council to take appropriate action;

7. Also draws the attention of the Security Council to the increased threat to international peace and security caused by the development by South Africa of a nuclear capability using Namibian uranium and the dangers of nuclear proliferation arising from the sale of Namibian uranium without safeguards by South Africa, and requests the Council to take action to ensure that South Africa does not continue to acquire nuclear technology from other countries;

8. Requests the Governments of States whose corporations are involved in Namibian uranium, in particular the Governments of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, to take measures to prohibit their State-owned corporations and other corporations, together with their subsidiaries, from dealings in Namibian uranium and all prospecting activities in Namibia;

9. Notes that the exploitation of Namibian uranium by Western countries, in particular the members of the European Atomic Energy Community, the nature of South Africa's policies regarding Namibian uranium, the collaboration with South Africa by certain Western countries, the transfer of nuclear technology to South Africa and South Africa's large-scale participation in the export of natural and enriched uranium seriously impede the early attainment of independence by Namibia;

10. Notes with grave concern the participation of foreign Governments and State-controlled corporations in the extraction and processing of Namibian uranium and their collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear field, which contributes directly to the development of South Africa's nuclear capability, thus hindering international efforts to secure South Africa's withdrawal from the Territory;

11. Condemns all activities regarding Namibian uranium being carried out in the Territory by State-owned or State-controlled corporations, activities which constitute a clear violation by the Governments concerned of binding resolutions of the Security Council and are thus violations of Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations;

12. Strongly condemns the collusion of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel and the United States of America with South Africa in the nuclear field, and calls upon all States to refrain from supplying the South African régime, directly or indirectly, with installations that might enable it to produce uranium, plutonium and other nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment;

13. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue to gather information on Namibian uranium and to take action as appropriate.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

#### Economic and social surveys

The Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), on 24 June 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> welcomed the UNDP Administrator's intention to prepare, in co-operation with the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, a comprehensive report on development problems of an independent Namibia, taking also into account the activities under the Nationhood Programme (p. 1174).

The Trade and Development Board of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), on 9 October,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the UNCTAD Secretary-General to consult and

prepare with other United Nations agencies and bodies, in collaboration with the South West Africa People's Organization, a comprehensive and in-depth social and economic survey of Namibia.

A review of economic conditions, covering both Namibia and South Africa, was prepared by a consultant for UNCTAD and was issued in August 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> in accordance with a request made by UNCTAD in 1979.<sup>(4)</sup>

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCTAD consultant, TD/B/869.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB (report, A/36/15 & Corr.1), 238(XXIII), para. 1, 9 Oct. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/Rev.1), 81/12, para. 2, 24

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1979 p. 572

#### Energy resources

In a resolution on new and renewable energy sources in Namibia,<sup>(1)</sup> adopted on 21 August 1981, the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (Nairobi, Kenya, 10-21 August) (p. 690) strongly condemned the plunder and illegal exploitation of Namibian energy resources by South Africa and multinational corporations, and deplored South African military activities in Namibia and Angola which were having serious ecological consequences, thereby limiting the future potential of new and renewable energy sources.

The resolution was adopted by 77 votes to none, with 24 abstentions. Explaining their abstentions in the vote Australia, Austria, Canada, Colombia, Iceland (for the five Nordic States), the United Kingdom (for the European Community States), the United States and Uruguay said the subject-matter of the draft was not within the concern of the Conference.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (report, A/CONF.100/11, Sales No. E.81.1.24) 4, 21 Aug.

## International assistance

United Nations assistance to Namibia, rendered to Namibians outside the Territory, continued in 1981 through the United Nations Institute for Namibia (p. 1176) and the Nationhood Programme for Namibia (p. 1174). These two programmes received financing mainly from the United Nations Fund for Namibia (see below) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), supported by voluntary contributions.

By a resolution of 24 November calling for continued implementation by United Nations organizations of decolonization resolutions,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly expressed concern that assistance to colonial peoples, particularly those of Namibia, was far from adequate. It urged United Nations organizations to increase their

assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the Institute for Namibia and the Nationhood Programme. In a preambular paragraph, the Assembly stated that the Namibian struggle had intensified as a consequence of the defiant attitude and stepped-up aggression of the Pretoria régime and the increased all-round support to that régime rendered by the United States and other Western States, and that intensified action in support of the Namibians and SWAPO was therefore necessary.

In explanation of vote on this resolution, the United States, which voted against it, said it rejected the unfounded charge of all-round support for South Africa. Among those which abstained, Argentina, Spain and Turkey, as well as Denmark, speaking for the Nordic States, expressed reservations on the reference to particular States or regions.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/52, 24 Nov. (p. 1102).

#### UN Fund for Namibia

The United Nations Council for Namibia reported<sup>(1)</sup> that the United Nations Fund for Namibia, which became operative in 1972<sup>(5)</sup> and for which the Council was trustee, continued to serve in 1981 as the main vehicle through which the Council channelled its assistance. The Fund financed three main programmes: the Institute for Namibia, the Nationhood Programme, and educational, social and relief assistance to Namibians.

While the Institute and the Nationhood Programme were set up with particular reference to the future attainment of independence, including the establishment of State machinery and the assumption of administrative responsibilities by Namibians, the third programme emphasized the immediate needs and welfare of Namibians. This programme was administered by the Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and financed from the General Account of the Fund.

Under this programme, 109 Namibians were studying on scholarships in nine countries. In addition, training was given in radio broadcasting, teaching and the English language. Among the beneficiaries were 14 graduates of the Institute for Namibia. Medical assistance was provided to Namibian refugees in Angola to help combat an outbreak of meningitis and assistance was provided to individual Namibians in need of emergency medical or dental treatment.

The Fund received income from all sources amounting to \$6,930,550 in 1981 and spent \$7,745,017. Included in these amounts were \$2,196,766 in income to the General Account and \$1,178,570 in expenditures, financed from that Account, for educational, social and relief

assistance. The rest went to either the Institute or the Nationhood Programme.

Contributions from States and the public to the General Account received during 1981 totalled \$874,901 and were made by 28 countries (see table below). Other funding came from UNDP and a \$500,000 allocation from the United Nations budget, authorized by the General Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(4)</sup>

On 16 December 1981, the Council for Namibia decided to streamline the Fund's administration by authorizing the Committee on the United Nations Fund for Namibia to approve new projects under the Nationhood Programme and the General Account, unless the Committee decided to refer the decisions to the Council.

CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED BY THE  
UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR NAMIBIA, 1981  
(as at 31 December 1981)

Contributor	Amount in US dollars)		
	General Account	Nationhood Programme	Institute for Namibia
Argentina	3,607	—	—
Australia	35,284	—	—
Austria	16,700	—	—
Bahamas	—	—	1,000
Barbados	500	—	—
Brazil	10,000	—	20,000
Canada	—	—	145,833
Chile	—	—	1,000
China	20,000	—	—
Denmark	18,153	—	308,111
Finland	48,031	114,443	168,108
France	—	—	126,126
Germany, Federal	—	—	—
Republic of	—	—	43,984
Greece	4,500	—	5,500
Guyana	15,843	—	—
Iceland	4,400	—	—
India	1,000	1,000	2,000
Iran	4,000	—	—
Ireland	15,134	8,306	15,134
Italy	—	—	30,000
Japan	10,000	—	190,000
Mexico	5,000	—	—
Netherlands	42,674	—	37,933
New Zealand	4,280	—	—
Nigeria	20,000	5,000	5,000
Norway	—	168,223	176,227
Pakistan	3,000	—	—
Panama	1,000	—	—
Philippines	1,000	—	—
Suriname	1,000	1,000	1,000
Sweden	575,032	575,032	599,572
Trinidad and Tobago	1,493	—	—
Turkey	1,000	—	—
United States	—	—	500,000
Venezuela	2,000	—	1,000
Yugoslavia	10,000	—	—
Public donations	270	373	152,046
Total	874,901	873,377	2,529,574

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION By a resolution on the Fund adopted on 6 March,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly expressed appreciation to the States, organizations and individuals that had contributed, and requested the Secretary-General and the President of the Council for Namibia to

intensify appeals for further contributions. Governments were invited to appeal to their national organizations for voluntary contributions.

This resolution, introduced by Venezuela and sponsored by 69 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 133 to none, with 5 abstentions.

By a further resolution on the Fund adopted on 10 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly decided to allocate to it, as a temporary measure, \$1 million from the United Nations budget for 1982. It requested the organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to plan and initiate new measures of assistance to Namibians in the context of the Nationhood Programme and the Institute. It decided that the Council for Namibia should continue to formulate policies of assistance to Namibians, co-ordinate assistance for Namibia provided by the United Nations system, administer and manage the Fund, and consult with SWAPO on assistance to Namibians. The Assembly repeated its appeal for contributions to the Fund. Other provisions of the resolution dealt with the Institute (p. 1177) and the Nationhood Programme (p. 1174).

This resolution, introduced by Venezuela and sponsored by 69 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 142 to none, with 5 abstentions.

In explanation of vote, Japan, New Zealand and Portugal, which voted in favour, expressed reservations about the increasing sums being allocated to the Fund from the United Nations budget. Japan observed that the \$1 million figure was 100 per cent above the previous year's allocation to the Fund, which had been established as a voluntary fund.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Council for Namibia, A/36/24.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/227 G, 6 Mar., text following;  
<sup>(3)</sup>36/121 F, 10 Dec., text following.

Decision: <sup>(4)</sup>GA: 35/442, 16 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1116).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1972, p. 616.

Financial implications: ACABQ report, A/36/7/Add.16; 5th Committee reports, A/35/801, A/36/815; S-G statements, A/C.5/35/120, A/C.5/36/59.

Meeting records: GA: plenary: A/35/PV.102-106, 107-111 (2-6 Mar.); (A/36/PV.64-68, 70, 71, 93, 94 (19 Nov.-11 Dec.)). 5th Committee: A/C.5/35/SR.64, A/C.5/36/SR.68(5 Mar., 9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 35/227 G

133-0-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 111 6 March 1981  
69-nation draft (A/35/L.56 and Add.1); agenda item 27.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Granada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.



## United Nations Fund for Namibia

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the United Nations Fund for Namibia,

Recalling Its resolution 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966, by which it decided to terminate the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and assume direct responsibility for the Territory until independence, and its resolution 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967, by which It established the United Nations Council for Namibia,

Recalling also its resolution 2679(XXV) of 9 December 1970, by which it decided to establish the United Nations Fund for Namibia,

Recalling further its resolution 3112 (XXVIII) of 12 December 1973, by which it appointed the United Nations Council for Namibia trustee of the United Nations Fund for Namibia,

Reaffirming its determination to continue to discharge its responsibility with regard to the Territory in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2248(S-V) and subsequent resolutions of the Assembly and the Security Council,

Taking into consideration the Algiers Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Algiers from 28 May to 1 June 1980.

Mindful that, by assuming direct responsibility for Namibia, the United Nations accepted a solemn obligation to grant all possible support to the Namibian people in their struggle for self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia,

Convinced of the need to grant all possible material assistance to Namibians who are victims of South Africa's repressive and discriminatory policies,

1. Takes note of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the United Nations Fund for Namibia and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained therein;

2. Expresses its appreciation to all States, the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, governmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals that have made voluntary contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia;

3. Decides that the utilization of the resources of the United Nations Fund for Namibia should be considered also in the context of the implementation of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia;

4. Requests the Secretary-General and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to intensify appeals to Governments, Intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals for generous voluntary contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia;

5. Invites Governments to appeal once more to their national organizations and institutions for voluntary contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia;

6. Expresses its appreciation to the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system for their assistance to Namibians and requests them to give priority to the allocation of funds for material assistance to the Namibian people;

7. Expresses its appreciation of the efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to assist Namibian refugees;

8. Decides that Namibians shall continue to be eligible for assistance through the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa;

9. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session on the implementation of the present resolution.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kam-

puchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom, United States.

## General Assembly resolution 36/121 F

142-0-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981  
69-nation draft (A/36/L.28 and Add.1); agenda item 36.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

## United Nations Fund for Namibia

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the United Nations Fund for Namibia,

Recalling its resolution 2679(XXV) of 9 December 1970, by which it decided to establish the United Nations Fund for Namibia,

Recalling also its resolution 3112(XXVIII) of 12 December 1973, by which it appointed the United Nations Council for Namibia trustee of the United Nations Fund for Namibia,

Taking into consideration the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Panama City on 5 June 1981.

Recalling its resolution 34/92 A of 12 December 1979, by which it approved the Charter of the United Nations Institute for Namibia,

Commending the Institute for its effective contribution in promoting the acquisition of skills by young Namibians, thus enabling them to contribute to the administration of a future independent Namibia, and for its research activities into the various political, economic and social aspects of the question of Namibia,

Recalling its resolution 31/153 of 20 December 1976, by which it decided to launch a comprehensive assistance programme within the United Nations system, covering both the period of struggle for independence and the initial years of independence of Namibia,

1. Takes note of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the United Nations Fund for Namibia;

2. Expresses its appreciation to all States, the specialized agencies and other organizations in the United Nations system, governmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals that have made voluntary contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, the United Nations Institute for Namibia and the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, and calls upon them to increase their assistance to Namibians through these channels;

3. Decides that the utilization of the resources of the United Nations Fund for Namibia should be considered also in the context of the implementation of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia;

4. Decides to allocate as a temporary measure to the United Nations Fund for Namibia the sum of \$1 million from the regular budget of the United Nations for 1982;

5. Urges the organizations of the United Nations system to waive programme-support costs in respect of projects in favour of Namibians financed from the United Nations Fund for Namibia and other sources;

6. Requests the Secretary-General and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to intensify appeals to Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals for generous voluntary contributions to the General Account of the United Nations Fund for Namibia and to the special accounts for the Nationhood Programme and the United Nations Institute for Namibia;

7. Invites Governments to appeal once more to their national organizations and institutions for voluntary contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia;

8. Requests the specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, when planning and initiating their new measures of assistance to Namibians, to do so within the context of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia;

9. Expresses its appreciation for the efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to assist Namibian refugees and requests him to expand those efforts in view of the substantial increase in the number of Namibian refugees;

10. Decides that Namibians shall continue to be eligible for assistance through the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa;

11. Decides that the United Nations Council for Namibia shall:

(a) Continue to formulate policies of assistance to Namibians and co-ordinate assistance for Namibia provided by the specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies of the United Nations system;

(b) Continue to act as trustee of the United Nations Fund for Namibia and, in this capacity, administer and manage the Fund;

(c) Provide broad guidelines and formulate the principles and policies for the United Nations Institute for Namibia;

(d) Co-ordinate, plan and direct the Nationhood Programme for Namibia in consultation with the South West Africa People's Organization, with the aim of consolidating all measures of assistance by the specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies of the United Nations system into a comprehensive assistance programme;

(e) Continue to consult with the South West Africa People's Organization in the formulation and implementation of assistance programmes for Namibians;

(f) Report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on activities in respect of the United Nations Fund for Namibia, the United Nations Institute for Namibia and the Nationhood Programme for Namibia;

12. Commends the efforts of the United Nations Institute for Namibia to provide substantive support for the struggle for freedom of the Namibian people and the establishment of an Independent State of Namibia;

13. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to prepare and publish, through the United Nations Institute for Namibia, a comprehensive reference book on Namibia, covering all aspects of the question of Namibia as considered by the United Nations since its inception, in accordance with the outline prepared by the Council;

14. Urges those specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system which have not done so to review with the United Nations Institute for Namibia ways and means of strengthening its programme of activities;

15. Further urges specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to co-operate

closely with the United Nations Institute for Namibia in their efforts to support its programme;

16. Commends the progress made in the implementation of the pre-independence components of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to elaborate and consider in due course policies and contingency plans regarding the transitional and post-independence phases of the Programme;

17. Expresses its appreciation to those specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies of the United Nations system that have contributed to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and calls upon them to continue their participation in the Programme by:

(a) Implementing projects approved by the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(b) Preparing new project proposals at the request of the Council;

(c) Allocating funds from their own financial resources for the implementation of the projects approved by the Council;

18. Expresses its appreciation to the United Nations Development Programme for its contribution to the financing and administration of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and calls upon it to continue to allocate, at the request of the United Nations Council for Namibia, funds from the indicative planning figure for Namibia for the implementation of the projects within the Nationhood Programme and to increase the indicative planning figure for Namibia;

19. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia with the necessary resources for the performance of the responsibilities entrusted to it by the United Nations Council for Namibia as the co-ordinating authority in the implementation of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom, United States.

#### Nationhood Programme

The Nationhood Programme for Namibia, launched by the General Assembly in 1976<sup>(4)</sup> to assist Namibians during the critical pre-independence period and the initial years of independence, continued in 1981 to finance training programmes and surveys of the Namibian economy in preparation for independence.

Forty-six projects were approved as of mid-1981, 44 per cent of which were devoted to training of personnel, 28 per cent to research,

and 27 per cent to a combination of research and training. The total cost of these projects was \$9.4 million.

Approximately 150 individual fellowships were provided, as well as group training abroad for about 60 participants. Largest among the training projects was a vocational training centre under construction in Angola, where preparatory training began in December in English, mathematics and basic sciences. In May, 25 students in Zambia began courses in radio programme production and equipment maintenance.

In the area of research, several sectoral surveys and analyses were completed-including a survey on air, sea and ground transport-and others were under way. A workshop on transport and communications, third in a series of four to plan the development of the Programme in major economic sectors, was held at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in April. To assist in implementation, SWAPO, in June, established a Committee on the Nationhood Programme to streamline procedures and review current projects.

The projects were being implemented by organizations and institutions of the United Nations system, including the Institute for Namibia, which was responsible for nine projects. An information brochure on the Programme was published in September.<sup>(1)</sup>

Contributions for the Nationhood Programme received during 1981 by the Fund for Namibia amounted to \$873,377 as of 31 December, coming from seven countries and the public (see table, p. 1172). UNDP provided about a quarter of the Programme's income; it was executing five projects concerned with manpower and skills development, and administered several projects financed by the Programme. The total expenditure under the Programme in 1981 was \$3,154,780, including remittances to the agencies executing its projects. A balance of \$1,851,188 was available as of 31 December, including unspent income from prior years.

By a resolution of 22 July<sup>(2)</sup> on implementation by United Nations organizations of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,<sup>(3)</sup> the Economic and Social Council requested organizations in the United Nations system to render, in consultation with the Organization of African Unity and the Council for Namibia, 'increased assistance to the people of Namibia, particularly in connection with the Nationhood Programme.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 6 March on the Nationhood Programme,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Council for Namibia to continue to direct and co-ordinate, in consultation with SWAPO, the planning and implementation of the Programme, and to elabo-

rate policies and contingency plans for its transitional and post-independence phases. The Assembly called on organizations and bodies in the United Nations system to continue participating in the Programme by implementing projects approved by the Council, preparing new project proposals at the Council's request and allocating funds for approved projects. It expressed appreciation to Angola for having offered a site for a vocational training centre for Namibians. The Assembly asked the Secretary-General and the Council President to appeal for funds from Governments, organizations and individuals.

This resolution, introduced by Finland and sponsored by 70 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 133 to none, with 5 abstentions.

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Nationhood Programme for Namibia (DPI/694).

Resolutions: ESC: <sup>(2)</sup>1981/54, para. 4, 22 July (p. 1102).

GA: <sup>(3)</sup>1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49);

<sup>(4)</sup>31/153, 20 Dec. 1976 (YUN 1976, p. 791); <sup>(5)</sup>35/227 F, 6 Mar. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/35/801; S-G statement, A/C.5/35/120.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/35/PV.102-106, 107-111 (2-6 Mar.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/35/SR.64 (5 Mar.).

#### General Assembly resolution 35/227 F

133-0-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 111 6 March 1981  
70-nation draft (A/35/L.55 and Add.1); agenda item 27.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Nationhood Programme for Namibia

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia,

Recalling its resolution 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966, by which it decided to terminate the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and assume direct responsibility for the Territory until independence, and its resolution 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967, by which it established the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the Territory until independence,

Recalling also the Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action in Support of Self-Determination and National independence for Namibia, contained in General Assembly resolution S-9/2 of 3 May 1978,

Recalling further its resolution 31/153 of 20 December 1976, by which it decided to launch a comprehensive assistance programme within the United Nations system, covering both the period of struggle for independence and the initial years of independence of Namibia,

Taking into consideration the Algiers Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting held at Algiers from 28 May to 1 June 1980,

Aware of the decisive stage achieved in the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination, freedom and independence under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization.

Recognizing that, by assuming direct responsibility for Namibia, the United Nations and its Member States have also assumed the responsibility for assisting the people of Namibia morally and materially,

Commending the steps taken by various specialized agencies, in particular the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, to provide assistance to Namibia in the framework of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia,

Noting with appreciation the contribution of the United Nations Development Programme in the implementation of projects related to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia,

Reaffirming its determination to fulfil its responsibility towards the people and Territory of Namibia,

1. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence, to continue to direct and co-ordinate, in consultation with the South West Africa People's Organization, the planning and implementation of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, with the aim of consolidating all measures of assistance to Namibians by the specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies of the United Nations system into a comprehensive assistance programme of the United Nations system;

2. Commends the progress made in bringing the pre-independence components of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia to the stage of implementation and requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to elaborate and consider in due course policies and contingency plans regarding the transitional and post-independence phases of the Programme;

3. Expresses its appreciation to those specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies of the United Nations system that have contributed to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and calls upon them to continue their participation in the Programme by:

(a) Implementing projects approved by the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(b) Preparing new project proposals at the request of the Council;

(c) Allocating funds from their own financial resources for the implementation of the projects approved by the Council;

4. Requests the specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, when planning and initiating new assistance measures for Namibia, to do so to the extent feasible within the context of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia;

5. Expresses its appreciation to the United Nations Development Programme for its contribution to the financing and administration of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and calls upon it to continue to allocate, at the request of the United Nations Council for Namibia, funds from the indicative planning figure for Namibia for the implementation of the projects within the Nationhood Programme;

6. Expresses its appreciation to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization for its substantial contribution to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, in particular for its emphasis on the cultural identity of the Namibian people and the preparation and implementation of an educational programme for the benefit of the Namibian people in close co-operation with the South West Africa People's Organization;

7. Expresses its appreciation to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations for its substantial contribution to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, in particular for its emphasis on the development of agricultural skills of Namibians in close and continuous co-operation with the South West Africa People's Organization;

8. Expresses its appreciation to all Governments, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals that have made voluntary contributions to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and appeals to them to make further financial contributions to the Programme through the United Nations Fund for Namibia;

9. Expresses its appreciation in particular to the Government of Angola for its decision to offer a site for the establishment, with the assistance of the International Labour Organisation, of a pilot vocational training centre for Namibians;

10. Requests the Secretary-General and President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to appeal to Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals for additional financial contributions to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia through the United Nations Fund for Namibia;

11. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia with the necessary resources for the performance of its responsibilities, entrusted to it by the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the co-ordinating authority in the implementation of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Belorussian SSR, Caps Verde, Chad, Chile, Chins, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom, United States.

#### UN institute for Namibia

The United Nations Institute for Namibia, inaugurated in 1976<sup>(4)</sup> to undertake research, training, planning and related activities with special reference to the struggle for freedom and the establishment of an independent State of Namibia, continued in 1981 to develop human resources in anticipation of independence.

The Institute, located at Lusaka, Zambia, and open to all persons of Namibian origin who fulfilled the requirements laid down by its Senate, had a student body of 415. The training programme was expanded to include teacher training courses, secretarial instruction and special preparatory courses in English, statistics and mathematics. On 24 January, 80 students, the second group, graduated from the Institute with diplomas in management and development studies, bringing the total number of graduates to 146.

The Institute had six divisions, dealing with history and politics, economics, agriculture, social and educational questions, constitutional and legal affairs, and documentation. It completed studies in various fields, with an eye to making available basic documentation for policy

formulation by the future Government of an independent Namibia.

Contributions received by the Trust Fund for the Institute amounted to \$2,529,574 in the year ended 31 December 1981. They came from 20 States and from the public (see table, p. 1172).

Total expenditure of the Institute in 1981 was \$3,411,667. The Fund had a balance of \$2,326,561 available as of 31 December, including unspent income from prior years.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 6 March on support for the Institute,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly commended its training and research work and its efforts to organize an information and documentation centre on Namibia. It requested the Council for Namibia to prepare and publish, through the Institute, a handbook on Namibia, covering aspects of the question considered by the United Nations since its inception. The Assembly amended the Institute's Charter to include a representative of the University of Zambia in its Senate. It urged organizations of the United Nations system to review with the Institute ways of strengthening its programme, encouraged closer co-operation with the United Nations Institute for Training and Research, and requested the Council President to renew his appeals for contributions from Governments, organizations and individuals.

This resolution, introduced by Turkey and sponsored by 68 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 133 to none, with 5 abstentions. It was based on a text recommended by the Council.

In its resolution of 6 March on the Council's work programme,<sup>(1)</sup> the Assembly decided that the Council would provide broad guidelines and formulate principles and policies for the Institute.

In its resolution of 10 December on the Fund for Namibia,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly urged organizations of the United Nations system to co-operate with the Institute in efforts to support its programme. It repeated the request of 6 March for a book on Namibia, referring to it this time as a comprehensive reference book. It also repeated its authorization to the Council to set policies for the Institute.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>35/227 C, para. 2 (o), 6 Mar. (p. 1161); <sup>(2)</sup>35/227 E, 6 Mar., text following; <sup>(3)</sup>36/121 F, 10 Dec. (p. 1173).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1976, p. 779.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/35/801; S-G statement, A/C.5/35/120.

Meeting records: GA: plenary, A/35/PV.102-106, 107-117 (2-6 Mar.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/35/SR.64 (5 Mar.).

General Assembly resolution 35/227 E

133-0-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 111 6 March 1981  
68-nation draft (A/35/L.54 and Add.1); agenda item 27.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Support for the United Nations Institute for Namibia

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia,

Recalling its resolution 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966, by which it decided to terminate the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and assume direct responsibility for the Territory until independence, and its resolution 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967, by which it established the United Nations Council for Namibia,

Mindful that, by assuming direct responsibility for Namibia, the United Nations accepted a solemn obligation to grant all possible support to the Namibian people in their struggle for self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia,

Convinced of the need to grant all possible material assistance to Namibians who are victims of South Africa's repressive and discriminatory policies,

Recalling its resolution 3296(XXIX) of 13 December 1974, by which it endorsed the decision of the United Nations Council for Namibia to establish the United Nations Institute for Namibia at Lusaka to enable Namibians to undertake research, training, planning and related activities, with special reference to the struggle for the freedom of Namibia and the establishment of an independent State of Namibia,

Recalling also its resolution 34/92 A of 12 December 1979, by which it approved the Charter of the United Nations Institute for Namibia,

Reaffirming the responsibility of the United Nations Council for Namibia to provide broad guidelines and formulate the principles and policies of the Institute,

Commending the Institute for its effective contribution in promoting the acquisition of skills by young Namibians, thus enabling them to contribute to the administration of a future independent Namibia,

Taking note of the annual report submitted by the Senate of the Institute to the United Nations Council for Namibia in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the Institute,

Deeply conscious of the critical need of the people of Namibia for concrete assistance from the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations in their struggle to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia,

1. Affirms its support of the United Nations Institute for Namibia in its efforts to enable Namibians to develop and acquire the necessary skills required for staffing the public services of an independent Namibia;

2. Commends the efforts of the Institute to undertake research activities into the various political, economic and social aspects of Namibia, which contribute to the struggle for the emancipation of Namibia and assist in the formulation of policies and programmes of an independent Namibia;

3. Commends also the efforts of the Institute to organize an information and documentation centre on Namibia;

4. Further commends the efforts of the Institute to provide substantive support for the struggle for freedom of the Namibian people and the establishment of an independent State of Namibia;

5. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to prepare and publish, through the Institute, a handbook on Namibia, covering aspects of the question of Namibia as considered by the United Nations since its inception;

6. Decides to amend the Charter of the Institute to include

in the membership of the Senate a representative of the University of Zambia;

7. Expresses its appreciation to those specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system which have endeavoured to co-operate with the United Nations Council for Namibia in supporting the programme of the Institute;

8. Urges those specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system which have not done so to review with the Institute ways and means of strengthening its programme of activities;

9. Recommends that the Institute should continue contacts with the United Nations Institute for Training and Research in order to review ways and means of developing closer co-operation between the two institutions in conformity with their respective policies and objectives;

10. Expresses its appreciation to all States, the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, governmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals that have made voluntary contributions to the account of the Institute in the United Nations Fund for Namibia;

11. Requests the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to renew his appeals to Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals for generous voluntary contributions to the account of the Institute in the United Nations Fund for Namibia;

12. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to include in its annual report to the General Assembly a chapter and recommendations on the activities of the Institute.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom, United States.

#### UN Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa

During 1981, the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa (p. 1117) continued to provide scholarships for Namibians.. During the 1980-1981 academic year, according to a report by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> the Programme granted 25 new awards to Namibians and extended 110, making a total of 135 scholarship holders studying in 14 foreign countries. Thirteen of the new awards were financed by the Fund for Namibia.

By a resolution of 24 November,<sup>(2)</sup> the Assembly appealed for additional funding for the voluntarily financed Programme.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/147..

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/53, 24 Nov. (p. 1118).

#### Other assistance by the UN system

A number of organizations of the United Nations system rendered technical co-operation and other assistance to Namibians and to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) during 1981, in addition to their participation in the special programmes for Namibia described in the previous sections. Examples of such activities included the following:

Six projects of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) helped to educate Namibians outside their country and two agricultural production projects provided on-the-job training; all were conducted in co-operation with SWAPO. A further 36 projects, financed by the Fund for Namibia, were administered by UNDP.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees allocated \$4 million to aid the growing number of Namibian refugees in Angola, and also assisted Namibian refugees in Botswana, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia (p. 1032). The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) provided fellowships to five graduates of the United Nations Institute for Namibia in the field of industrial management and international industrial administration.

Among specialized agencies, the International Telecommunication Union completed in June a UNDP-financed project at Ndola, Zambia, which had been training Namibians since 1977 in various telecommunication fields. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization paid teachers and supporting staff, made study grants, and sent equipment and supplies to the Namibian Health and Education Centre, as part of its assistance to SWAPO. The United Nations Children's Fund and the World Health Organization supplied emergency medical supplies to SWAPO after the bombing of Namibian refugee settlements in southern Angola.

Information on these activities was furnished in reports by the Secretary-General and by the President of the Economic and Social Council on the implementation by international organizations of United Nations resolutions pertaining to independence for colonial countries (p. 1099).

On 6 March, in its resolutions on action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations on Namibia<sup>(2)</sup> and on the Fund for Namibia,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly requested organizations of the United Nations system to give priority to the allocation of funds for assistance to Namibians.

On 29 May, the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO,<sup>(1)</sup> after considering a report by

the UNIDO Executive Director on the organizations' technical assistance to the Namibian people, expressed regret at the slow progress in the delivery of such assistance to Namibia due to South Africa's illegal occupation. The Board called on the UNIDO secretariat to intensify its

technical assistance to the Namibians, in co-operation with the United Nations Council for Namibia and SWAPO.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>IDB, A/36/16.

Resolutions: GA: (2)35/227 D, para. 4, 6 Mar. (p. 1163);

<sup>(3)</sup>35/227 G, para. 6, 6 Mar.(p. 1173).

## Chapter IV

# Other colonial Territories

The extent of progress towards self-determination and independence in individual Non-Self-Governing Territories was again examined in 1981 by the General Assembly and its Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

For most of the Territories, the United Nations Secretariat prepared working papers for the Committee, outlining recent developments. The Committee, and usually its Sub-Committee on Small Territories, examined the situation in each Territory, hearing further information in most cases from a representative of the administering Power. A set of conclusions and recommendations was approved for each Territory, and these were set out in the Committee's report to the Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> where the situation in the Territories was discussed mainly in the Fourth Committee.

On 24 and 25 November, the Assembly adopted a series of resolutions and decisions concerning the Territories.

On the question of East Timor, the Assembly called on Portugal, the East Timorese people's representatives and Indonesia to co-operate with the United Nations and guarantee self-determination.<sup>(5)</sup> On the question of Western Sahara, the Assembly welcomed efforts by the Organization of African Unity to bring about a cease-fire and organize a referendum on self-determination, and appealed for negotiations between Morocco and the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro (POLISARIO) on a cease-fire and a referendum.<sup>(2)</sup>

Resolutions were adopted by the Assembly on the following Territories: American Samoa,<sup>(4)</sup> Guam<sup>(7)</sup> and the United States Virgin Islands,<sup>(4)</sup> under United States administration, and Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Montserrat and the Turks and Caicos Islands,<sup>(6)</sup> under United Kingdom administration.

The Assembly adopted decisions on the Cocos (Keeling) Islands (p. 1182), under Australian administration, and Tokelau (p. 1190), under New

Zealand administration, and Gibraltar (p. 1186) and St. Helena (p. 1189), under United Kingdom administration. As in the case of the resolutions, these suggested measures of political, economic, social and educational advancement. In other decisions, the Assembly recommended that the Committee on colonial countries continue to review developments regarding Brunei (p. 1182), the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) (p. 1186) and Pitcairn (p. 1189).. It deferred consideration of Anguilla (p. 1181) and St. Kitts-Nevis (p. 1190) until 1982.

In addition to the small Territories dealt with in this chapter, several United Nations bodies took action on the Namibia question (p. 1126), while the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands was considered by the Trusteeship Council and the Committee on colonial countries (p. 1118). The Committee also adopted a resolution on Puerto Rico (p. 1113).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23 Rev. 1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/46 (p. 1196), <sup>(3)</sup>36/47 (p. 1192) <sup>(4)</sup>36/48 (p. 1180), <sup>(5)</sup>36/50 (p. 1185), 24 Nov.; <sup>(6)</sup>36/62 (p. 1200), <sup>(7)</sup>36/63 (p. 1188), 25 Nov.

## American Samoa

At the invitation of the United States- the administering Power-a United Nations Visiting Mission, composed of India, Sierra Leone, and Trinidad and Tobago, visited American Samoa from 12 to 21 July 1981.

In its report to the Committee on colonial countries,<sup>(2)</sup> the Mission noted that the Territory enjoyed a degree of internal self-government and had a constitution which provided for an elected governor and lieutenant-governor, a judiciary and a bicameral legislature, with the House of Representatives elected by adult suffrage and the Senate elected by custom to represent the traditional counties. The government leaders, members of both legislative chambers and traditional leaders had expressed satisfaction with the Territory's political status and a desire to maintain the relationship with the United States. The Mission sensed that that view had

resulted from the heavy dependence of the Territory on economic and financial support from the United States and from the traditional social structure of the society.

The Mission recommended that the United States take steps to develop and diversify the economy of the Territory. It urged financial assistance for port development, greater efforts to improve food production and urgent attention to energy supply in light of the high cost of imported fuel. It concluded that efforts should be made to improve the level and quality of education and that the administering Power should ensure that adequate funds were available continuously for that purpose.

On the Committee's recommendation, the General Assembly, on 24 November, adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(3)</sup> by which it endorsed the Mission's conclusions and recommendations. It called on the United States to expedite decolonization of the Territory, to ensure that its people were kept fully informed of their right to self-determination and independence, to strengthen and diversify the economy of the Territory, and to work out concrete assistance and economic development programmes. It urged the administering Power to continue to foster close relations with neighbouring islands and, in co-operation with the freely elected representatives of American Samoa, to safeguard the people's right to enjoy their natural resources by taking measures to guarantee their right to own and dispose of those resources and control their future development.

This resolution was approved by the Committee on colonial countries on 11 November<sup>(1)</sup> and by the Fourth Committee on 17 November, without objection.

In the Fourth Committee, the United States said it had already begun to implement a number of the Visiting Mission's recommendations and was encouraging political, economic and social development in American Samoa. The United States remained dedicated to the achievement of self-government and self-determination for the people of the Territory.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1; <sup>(2)</sup>Visiting Mission, A/AC.109/679 & Add.1.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/48, 24 Nov., text following.

Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.4/36/L.24.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV. 1203, 1204 (10, 11 Nov.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-13, 14, 15-20, 23 (19 Oct.-17 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.70 (24 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/48

Adopted without vote Meeting 70 24 November 1981

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.1) without objection. 17 November (meeting 23); draft by Committee on colonial countries (A/36/23/Rev.1); agenda item 19.

#### Question of American Samoa

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of American Samoa,

Having examined the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and all other resolutions and decisions of the United Nations relating to American Samoa,

Taking into account the statement of the administering Power relating to developments in American Samoa,

Conscious of the need to promote progress towards the full implementation of the Declaration in respect of American Samoa,

Welcoming the active participation of the administering Power in the related work of the Special Committee and expressing the hope that this co-operation will be strengthened further so as to accelerate progress towards the full implementation of the Declaration with regard to American Samoa,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission dispatched to the Territory in July 1981,

Aware of the special circumstances of the geographical location and economic conditions of American Samoa and stressing the necessity for diversifying the Territory's economy as a matter of priority in order to reduce its dependence on fluctuating economic activities,

1. Approves the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to American Samoa and endorses the observations, conclusions and recommendation contained therein;

2. Also approves the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to American Samoa;

3. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of American Samoa to self-determination and independence in conformity with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

4. Reiterates the view that such factors as territorial size, geographical location, size of population and limited natural resources should in no way delay the speedy implementation of the Declaration, which fully applies to the Territory;

5. Expresses its appreciation to the members of the Visiting Mission for the constructive work accomplished and to the administering Power and the Government and people of American Samoa for the co-operation and assistance extended to the Mission;

6. Calls upon the Government of the United States of America, as the administering Power, to take all necessary steps, taking into account the freely expressed wishes of the people of American Samoa, to expedite the process of decolonization of the Territory in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration;

7. Reaffirms that it is the responsibility of the administering Power to ensure that the people of American Samoa are kept fully informed of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

8. Reaffirms also the responsibility of the administering Power for the economic and social development of the Territory;

9. Calls upon the administering Power to take all possible steps to strengthen and diversify the economy of American Samoa and to work out concrete programmes of assistance and economic development for the Territory;

10. Urges the administering Power to continue to foster close relations and co-operation between the people of the Territory and the neighbouring island communities;

11. Urges the administering Power, in co-operation with the freely elected representatives of American Samoa, to



safeguard the inalienable right of the people of the Territory to the enjoyment of their natural resources by taking effective measures which guarantee the right of the people to own and dispose of those resources and to establish and maintain control over their future development;

12. Requests the Special Committee to continue the consideration of this question at its next session. Including the possible dispatch of a further visiting mission to American Samoa at an appropriate time and in consultation with the administering Power, and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

#### Anguilla

The Committee on colonial countries decided on 19 August 1981 to consider the question of Anguilla at its 1982 session, subject to any directives by the General Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup> On the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, approved without vote on 23 November 1981 on an oral proposal by its Chairman, the Assembly decided without vote on 25 November to defer consideration of the question until 1982.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/418, 25 Nov., text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1200 (19 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee. A/C.4/36/SR.9-20, 25 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

General Assembly decision 36/418

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.2) without vote, 23 November (meeting 25); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 19.

#### Question of Anguilla

At its 73rd plenary meeting, on 25 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, decided to defer until its thirty-seventh session consideration of the question of Anguilla.

#### Antigua

On 21 August 1981, the Committee on colonial countries, through its Chairman, congratulated Antigua on its decision to attain independence as the State of Antigua and Barbuda.<sup>(1)</sup> Following its independence on 1 November, the former United Kingdom-administered Territory was admitted to the United Nations as a Member State on 11 November (p. 348).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1.

Meeting record: Committee on colonial countries. A/AC.109/PV.1202 (21 Aug.).

#### Belize

Prior to its attainment of independence on 21 September 1981 and its admission as a Member State of the United Nations on 25 September (p. 349), Belize, as a Territory administered by the United Kingdom, was the subject of several letters to the Security Council and the Secretary-General.

In a letter dated 24 March,<sup>(1)</sup> Barbados, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, and Trinidad and Tobago transmitted to the Secretary-General the "Declaration of Belmopan", signed by their representatives at Belmopan, Belize, on 18 March. The signatories of that document pledged their support for the agreement reached in London on 11 March by the Governments of the United Kingdom, Guatemala and Belize, setting out a basis for settling the controversy over the Territory between Guatemala and the United Kingdom.

In a letter to the Secretary-General dated 17 July,<sup>(2)</sup> Guatemala stated that its latest talks with the United Kingdom (New York, 6-10 July) had not yielded satisfactory results; if no agreement was reached and the United Kingdom granted independence to Belize unilaterally, Guatemala would not recognize the new State and would not regard the lines between itself and Belize as frontiers.

In a letter to the Secretary-General dated 4 August,<sup>(6)</sup> the United Kingdom regretted that it had not been possible to reach agreement with Guatemala and announced that it would proceed with preparations to grant independence to Belize.

Guatemala, in a letter of 10 September to the Security Council President,<sup>(3)</sup> requested the Council to investigate the dispute with the United Kingdom over Belize and to consider whether it should make recommendations for peaceful settlement prior to the Territory's independence. In a letter of 18 September,<sup>(5)</sup> Guatemala complained of the Council's negative response to its request for a public meeting on the dispute; it added that it would refuse to recognize Belize's unilateral independence, since it considered Belize part of Guatemala.

A Guatemalan letter to the Secretary-General dated 17 September<sup>(4)</sup> conveyed the text of a note of the previous day from its Ministry of Foreign Affairs, protesting the violation of its airspace on 10 September by a British reconnaissance aircraft. The United Kingdom, on 22 September,<sup>(7)</sup> transmitted its reply rejecting the Guatemalan protest and stating that no such incursion had taken place.

On 19 August, the Committee on colonial countries, through its Chairman, congratulated Belize on its independence and welcomed its intention to apply for United Nations membership.<sup>(8)</sup>

In a preambular paragraph of its resolution of 1 December<sup>(10)</sup> on implementation of the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,<sup>(9)</sup> the General Assembly welcomed the independence of Belize. Explaining its vote against the resolution,

Guatemala opposed this paragraph and reiterated its non-recognition of the State of Belize and its borders with Guatemala.

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Barbados, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago: 24 Mar., A/36/172. Guatemala: <sup>(2)</sup>17 July, A/36/390; <sup>(3)</sup>10 Sep., S/14683 & Add.1; <sup>(4)</sup>17 Sep., S/14694; <sup>(5)</sup>18 Sep., S/14699. United Kingdom: <sup>(6)</sup>4 Aug., A/36/420; <sup>(7)</sup>22 Sep., S/14705. Report: <sup>(8)</sup>Committee on colonial countries. A/36/23/Rev.1. Resolutions: GA: <sup>(9)</sup>1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49); <sup>(10)</sup>36/68, 1 Dec.1981 (p. 1097). Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries, A/AC.109/PV.1200, 1202 (19, 21 Aug.).

#### Brunei

The Committee on colonial countries decided on 19 August 1981 to consider the question of Brunei in 1982, subject to any directives from the General Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup> On the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, approved without vote on 23 November 1981 on an oral proposal by its Chairman, the Assembly decided without vote on 25 November to defer consideration of the question until 1982 and to request the Committee on colonial countries to review and report to the Assembly on the situation in the Territory.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/414, 25 Nov., text following. Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1200 (19 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-20, 25 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

General Assembly decision 36/414

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.2) without vote. 23 November (meeting 25): oral proposal by Chairman: agenda item 19.

#### Question of Brunei

At its 73rd plenary meeting, on 25 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, decided to defer until its thirty-seventh session consideration of the question of Brunei and requested the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to continue to keep the situation in the Territory under review and to report thereon to the Assembly.

#### Cocos (Keeling) Islands

On 4 August 1981, the Committee on colonial countries adopted a consensus on the Cocos (Keeling) Islands<sup>(2)</sup> by which it reaffirmed the responsibility of Australia- the administering Power- to create conditions for self-determination, and noted Australia's continued commitment to the advancement of the islanders. The Committee also welcomed Australia's willingness to receive United Nations visiting missions in the Territory and reaffirmed that the need for further missions should be kept under review.

A decision in similar terms was adopted without vote by the General Assembly on 24 November,<sup>(1)</sup> as recommended by the Fourth Committee without objection on 17 November, on the basis of a consensus text submitted by its Chairman. By this decision, the Assembly also requested the Committee on colonial countries to report again on the Territory in 1982.

In the Fourth Committee, Australia outlined steps taken to benefit the Territory's economic and social development, and said it had maintained its commitment to the advancement of the population towards their rights, including self-determination. Australia believed that the people of the islands should determine their future political status and decide when they wished an act of self-determination to take place.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/407, 24 Nov., text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1188 (4 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-15, 16, 17-20, 23 (29 Oct.-17 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.70 (24 Nov.).

General Assembly decision 36/407

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.1) without objection. 17 November (meeting 23): draft consensus by Chairman (A/C.4/36/L.12); agenda item 19.

#### Question of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands

At its 70th plenary meeting, on 24 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, adopted the following text as representing the consensus of the members of the Assembly:

"The General Assembly, having examined the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and having heard the statement of the representative of Australia relating to the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, notes with appreciation the continuing co-operation of the Government of Australia, as the administering Power, with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in Assembly resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960. The Assembly notes with interest the continuing commitment of the administering Power to ensure the political, social, economic and educational advancement of the people of the Territory so that they may be able, as quickly as possible, to exercise fully their inalienable rights. The Assembly reaffirms that it is the responsibility of the administering Power to create conditions under which the people of the Territory will be able freely to determine their own future in conformity with resolution 1514(XV) and other relevant resolutions of the Assembly. The Assembly welcomes the continuing willingness of the administering Power to receive visiting missions in the Cocos (Keeling) Islands and requests the Special Committee, in co-operation with the administering Power, to continue to work towards the implementation of the Declaration with respect to the Territory and to report thereon to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session."

#### East Timor question

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES. The question of East Timor was considered by the Committee on colo-

nial countries on 13 August 1981. After hearing statements by Portugal as administering Power, Indonesia and the Frente Revolucionária de Timor Leste Independente (FRETILIN), the Committee decided to consider the question in 1982, subject to any directives by the General Assembly.<sup>(5)</sup>

REPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS. Responding to a 1980 Assembly request for a report on the East Timor situation,<sup>(10)</sup> the Secretary-General, in a report of 16 October 1981,<sup>(6)</sup> informed the Assembly that three letters had been received. By letter of 16 April 1981, Indonesia explained its position on the Territory; by letter of 23 December 1980, the Executive Director of the World Food Programme informed the Secretary-General that it would consider any request for food assistance in East Timor; and by letter of 9 October 1981, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees stated that it had entered into an agreement at the beginning of 1981 with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) to assist in repatriating persons from East Timor to Portugal to reunite families.

In connection with the requirement under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations that administering Powers submit information to the United Nations on Non-Self-Governing Territories (NSGTS) (p. 1114), Portugal stated in a note to the Secretary-General dated 26 March<sup>(3)</sup> that it had nothing to add to information it had provided in 1979 (to the effect that circumstances prevented it from assuming its responsibilities for administering East Timor and that it was therefore unable to supply information).<sup>(13)</sup>

In a note to the Secretary-General dated 11 August,<sup>(1)</sup> Cape Verde transmitted a document of the Permanent People's Tribunal on East Timor, which had met from 19 to 21 June at Lisbon, Portugal, declaring that the entry and presence of Indonesian troops in the Territory was an act of aggression and that Indonesia was guilty of war crimes and genocide.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. ON 24 November, the General Assembly adopted, by a recorded vote of 54 to 42, with 46 abstentions, a resolution<sup>(11)</sup> by which it reaffirmed East Timor's right to self-determination and independence, and called on Portugal, representatives of the Timorese people and Indonesia to co-operate with the United Nations to guarantee the full exercise of that right. Recalling Portugal's September 1980 pledge to undertake broad initiatives for the decolonization of the Territory,<sup>(14)</sup> the Assembly invited Portugal to continue its efforts to that end. It also expressed concern at reports of famine in the Territory, and called on United Nations organizations and States to assist the Timorese people. The Committee on colonial

countries and the Secretary-General were asked to follow implementation of the resolution. The resolution was recommended by the Fourth Committee, which approved it on 9 November by a recorded vote of 58 to 40, with 42 abstentions.

Introducing the resolution on behalf of its 23 sponsors, Zimbabwe urged the international community to encourage Portugal in expediting East Timor's decolonization, and called on Indonesia to join Portugal in ensuring the exercise of the Timorese people's right to self-determination and independence. The sponsors were disturbed at reports of recent military activities in the Territory and of possible famine there if the international community did not immediately provide humanitarian assistance.

Indonesia stated its categorical rejection of the resolution, describing it as interference in its internal affairs. Indonesia reaffirmed that the people of East Timor had exercised their right to self-determination by deciding in 1976 to become independent through integration with Indonesia. FRETILIN had ceased to exist in the Territory, since it had no support among the people. The only legal authority in East Timor was Indonesia, and references to Portugal as the administering Power were tantamount to reintroducing colonialism. Whatever discussions might take place between Indonesia and Portugal, the status of East Timor as an integral part of Indonesia was not negotiable. References to famine in East Timor were a complete fabrication; food crops had been good during the past two years and improved roads had allowed surplus food to reach storage facilities.

Portugal acknowledged its historical responsibility to protect the people's rights and identity, and said it would do its utmost to carry out that responsibility. Its efforts to establish an international commission to consider East Timor's sovereignty and self-determination had failed because of Indonesia's resistance. Human rights continued to be systematically violated in the Territory and, despite efforts by ICRC, another serious famine was expected there. Appealing to the international community to solve the East Timor problem, Portugal stated its willingness to collaborate fully with international institutions to guarantee the Territory's people a peaceful future.

Portugal's initiative regarding East Timor was endorsed by Brazil and the Central African Republic, among others,

The right of the people of East Timor to self-determination and independence was supported by a number of States, including Afghanistan, Angola, Brazil, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, Chad, Cuba, Cyprus, Guinea-Bissau,

Guyana, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda and Zimbabwe.

Angola appealed to Indonesia to withdraw its troops from East Timor and to Portugal not to abdicate its involvement in the Territory's independence. Cape Verde stated that FRETILIN was the only movement representing the true desire for self-determination of the Maubere people in the Territory. Sao Tome and Principe said Indonesia's fight for independence did not justify its neo-colonial course in East Timor.

Seychelles stated that, since Indonesia refused to comply with United Nations appeals to withdraw from the Territory, the Assembly should continue to consider the question until East Timor, under FRETILIN leadership, had achieved independence. Sierra Leone thought Indonesia might well be asked whether it had complied with the principles approved by the Assembly in 1960 for integration of an NSGT with an independent State,<sup>(9)</sup> including such factors as equal rights and opportunities to participate in government, prior attainment of advanced self-government, and a decision based on the freely and democratically expressed wishes of the people. In Zimbabwe's view, it was tragic that a third world country claimed the right to intervene in and annex another country.

The international community should not remain mute and impassive when confronted with genocide, said Guinea-Bissau. Chad also expressed the view that the Timorese had been victims of genocide. Mozambique stated that some Western countries did not care that an entire people was being massacred, so long as their economic and strategic interests were preserved and they could rely on a continuous supply of petroleum and raw materials.

In Afghanistan's view, a people's right to self-determination could not be realized through the integration of a Territory by force. Cyprus expressed concern that the non-implementation of United Nations resolutions on East Timor could set a dangerous precedent for other powerful countries with expansionist aims against their neighbours.

Haiti urged the parties to hold negotiations which would serve the interests of the East Timor people and enable them to realize their aspirations. Nicaragua hoped that Indonesia would comply with United Nations resolutions in the search for a just solution. Senegal considered that the people of East Timor should be enabled to express freely their views on their future, whereupon the parties could consult and reach an acceptable settlement.

Trinidad and Tobago expressed concern

about reports of impending famine in the Territory and urged early relief efforts.

Among those which abstained on the resolution, the Federal Republic of Germany welcomed Indonesia's declaration of readiness to negotiate with Portugal on outstanding problems, including humanitarian ones. Finland and Sweden offered to provide humanitarian assistance to East Timor, and Sweden appealed to Indonesia to keep assistance channels open.

The FRETILIN representative stated that a new Indonesian military offensive was under way, similar to those launched against his organization in 1976 and 1977. The assault would provoke a serious famine, as had happened in 1978-1979. ICRC had departed abruptly in April 1981, leaving no foreign doctors or nurses, and there was not a single foreign presence in East Timor to restrain the Indonesians. The people had endured a brutal war of aggression for the past six years, carried on by 300,000 Indonesian troops. FRETILIN would continue to fight until Indonesia acknowledged the right of East Timor to be free and independent.

States expressing support for the Indonesian position- that decolonization had already taken place in the Territory and that United Nations consideration was interference in Indonesia's internal affairs-included Bangladesh, India, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Oman, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand.

India thought it was time for the Assembly to take realities into account and remove the question of East Timor from its agenda. Jordan observed that Indonesia had exercised its right to unity, while Malaysia remarked that decolonization need not conform to a rigid pattern so long as the people's right to self-determination was not prejudiced. Thailand stated that diplomats in Jakarta had several times been invited to observe self-determination in East Timor, and a Thai representative had participated in such visits.

Bangladesh and Japan acknowledged Indonesian efforts to promote the welfare and development of East Timor. The Philippines said Indonesia had devoted considerable effort to developing education, agriculture, health, and other social and economic programmes in East Timor, as well as to alleviating the suffering caused when Portugal had abandoned it. Singapore stated that integrating the Territory into Indonesia had brought political stability and that Indonesia had devoted a considerable portion of its provincial budget to East Timor.

During the debate in the Fourth Committee, the following petitioners made statements: Michael A. Chamberlain, East Timor Human Rights Committee; Roger S. Clark, International

League for Human Rights; Richard Falk, professor at Princeton University, United States; Sister Blaise Lupo, Clergy and Laity Concerned; Sue Nichterlein, Minority Rights Group; Margo Picken, Amnesty International; Paulo Pires, Partido do Centro Social Cristão/ União Democrática Timorense; José Ramos-Horta, FRETILIN; Michael Robert, Ligue internationale pour les droits et la libération des peuples; William R. Roff, professor at Columbia University, United States; David Scott, Australian Council for Overseas Aid, Community Aid Abroad and Human Rights Council of Australia; and Jacob Xavier, Movimento Nacional para a Libertação e Independência de Timor-Dili (MNLITD).<sup>(7)</sup>

The Chairman of the Fourth Committee received three letters in October from Indonesia expressing its strong opposition to the participation of these petitioners in the Committee's deliberations.<sup>(2)</sup> Portugal sent a letter to the Committee Chairman dated 10 October,<sup>(4)</sup> stating that its Government had no representative in East Timor and that the attribution of such status to M. Pereira Coutinho, listed as a member of the MNLITD delegation in its request for a hearing, had no foundation.

Indonesia, explaining its vote for the Assembly's resolution of 1 December<sup>(12)</sup> on implementation of the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,<sup>(8)</sup> said in regard to the provision whereby the Assembly approved the 1982 work programme of the Committee on colonial countries that it opposed the discussion of East Timor in the Committee.

Letters and notes verbales (nv): <sup>(1)</sup>Cape Verde: 11 Aug., A/36/448-S/14640 & Corr.1 (nv). Indonesia: <sup>(2)</sup>5 Oct., A/C.4/36/5 (Add.1, 13 Oct.; Add.2, 20 Oct.). Portugal: <sup>(3)</sup>26 Mar., A/36/160 (nv); <sup>(4)</sup>10 Oct., A/C.4/36/7.

Reports: <sup>(5)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev. 1; <sup>(6)</sup>S-G, A/36/598.

Requests for hearing: <sup>(7)</sup>A/C.4/36/2 & Add.1-11. Resolutions: GA: <sup>(8)</sup>1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49); <sup>(9)</sup>1541(XV), 15 Dec. 1960 (ibid., p. 509); <sup>(10)</sup>35/27, 11 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1094); <sup>(11)</sup>36/50: 24 Nov. 1981, text following; <sup>(12)</sup>36/68, 1 Dec. (p. 1097).

Yearbook references: <sup>(13)</sup>1979, p. 1117; <sup>(14)</sup>1980, p. 1081.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1194 (13 Aug.). GA: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.1 (16 Sep.); 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.3, 4, 8-21 (7 Oct.-9 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.4, 70 (18 Sep., 24 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/50

54-42-46 (recorded vote) Meeting 70 24 November 1981

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/679) by recorded vote (58-40-42), 9 November (meeting 21); 23-nation draft (A/C.4/36/L.7); agenda item 93.

Sponsors: Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Cape Verde, Congo, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Vanuatu, Zimbabwe.

#### Question of East Timor

The General Assembly,

Recognizing the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination and independence in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960.

Bearing in mind that the Fifth and Sixth Conferences of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Colombo and Havana in 1976 and 1979, respectively, reaffirmed the right of the people of East Timor to self-determination and independence,

Having examined the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to East Timor and other relevant documents,

Deeply concerned at the suffering of the people of East Timor and at reports of the critical situation resulting from the new outbreak of famine in the Territory,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the question of East Timor,

Recalling the communiqué of the Council of Ministers of Portugal, issued on 12 September 1980, in which the administering Power pledged to undertake broad initiatives with a view to ensuring the full and speedy decolonization of East Timor,

Having heard the statement of the representative of Portugal, as the administering Power,

Having heard the statements of the representative of the Frente Revolucionária de Timor Leste Independente, the liberation movement of East Timor, and of various East Timor petitioners, as well as of the representatives of non-governmental organizations.

1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of East Timor to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

2. Declares that the people of East Timor must be enabled freely to determine their own future on the basis of the relevant General Assembly resolutions and internationally accepted procedures;

3. Calls upon all interested parties, namely Portugal, as the administering Power, and the representatives of the East Timorese people, as well as Indonesia, to co-operate fully with the United Nations with a view to guaranteeing the full exercise of the right to self-determination by the people of East Timor;

4. Notes the initiative taken by the Government of Portugal, as stated in the communiqué of the Council of Ministers of Portugal issued on 12 September 1980, and invites the administering Power to continue its efforts with a view to ensuring the proper exercise of the right to self-determination and independence by the people of East Timor, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514(XV), and to report to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples on the progress of its initiative;

5. Expresses its deepest concern at the reports of the critical situation resulting from the new outbreak of famine in East Timor and calls upon all specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, in particular the World Food Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, immediately to assist, within their respective fields of competence, the people of the Territory;

6. Notes with satisfaction the humanitarian aid given by some Member States and relief organizations to the people of East Timor and calls upon all Governments concerned to continue this aid with a view to alleviating the suffering of the people of the Territory;

7. Requests the Special Committee to keep the situation

in the Territory under active consideration and to follow the implementation of the present resolution;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to follow the implementation of the present resolution and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

9. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Question of East Timor".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Iran, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Gambia, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Maldives, New Zealand, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United States, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Burma, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

#### Falkland Islands (Malvinas)

On 19 August 1981, the Committee on colonial countries decided to consider the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) in 1982 subject to any General Assembly directives.<sup>(6)</sup> On the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, approved without vote on 23 November 1981, the Assembly decided without vote on 25 November to defer consideration of the question until 1982 and requested the Committee on colonial countries to keep the situation under review.<sup>(1)</sup> In proposing this action, the Fourth Committee Chairman observed that negotiations were in progress between Argentina and the United Kingdom in relation to the Territory.

The course of these negotiations was the subject of letters from the two Governments to the Secretary-General. In identical letters dated 23 March, Argentina<sup>(2)</sup> and the United Kingdom<sup>(5)</sup> said they had held ministerial-level talks in New York on 23 and 24 February and had agreed to hold further negotiations at an early date; the Argentine letter used the phrase "at the earliest possible date".

By a letter of 29 July,<sup>(3)</sup> Argentina transmitted a press declaration of 27 July announcing that it had invited the United Kingdom to expedite negotiations aimed at settling Argentina's claim to the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, on which it said no substantial progress had been made since 1965. Argentina reaffirmed its sovereignty over the is-

lands as a basis for negotiations, promised to respect the islanders' interests and said it was prepared to agree to United Nations guarantees for those interests if necessary. On 17 September,<sup>(4)</sup> Argentina sent a press announcement of 14 September announcing its decision to provide free air transport of 24 tons of food to the islands, in accordance with its policy of giving special importance to the Malvinas islanders and in view of food shortages there.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/416, 25 Nov., text following.

Letters: Argentina: <sup>(2)</sup>23 Mar., A/36/155; <sup>(3)</sup>29 Jul., A/36/412; <sup>(4)</sup>17 Sep., A/36/522. <sup>(5)</sup>United Kingdom: 23 Mar., A/36/156.

Report: <sup>(6)</sup>Committee on colonial countries. A/36/23/Rev.1

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1200 (19 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-20, 25 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

General Assembly decision 36/416

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.2) without vote. 23 November (meeting 25): oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 19.

#### Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)

At its 73rd plenary meeting, on 25 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, decided to defer until its thirty-seventh session consideration of the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and requested the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to continue to keep the situation in the Territory under review and to report thereon to the Assembly.

#### Gibraltar

On 19 August 1981, the Committee on colonial countries, taking account of continuing negotiations between the parties on the question of Gibraltar, decided to consider the question at its 1982 session, subject to any General Assembly directives.<sup>(2)</sup>

On the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, approved without objection on 17 November 1981 on the basis of a consensus text submitted by its Chairman, the Assembly adopted, without vote, a consensus statement on 24 November.<sup>(1)</sup> The Assembly noted that Spain and the United Kingdom had signed a declaration in 1980 intended to resolve the problem of Gibraltar by agreeing to start negotiations on their differences and to re-establish direct communications in the region. It urged both Governments to make it possible to initiate negotiations.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/409, 24 Nov., text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1200 (19 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-20, 23 (19 Oct.-17 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.70 (24 Nov.).

General Assembly decision 36/409

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.1) without objection, 17 November (meeting 23); draft consensus by Chairman (A/C.4/36/L.23); agenda item 19.

#### Question of Gibraltar

At its 70th plenary meeting, on 24 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, adopted the following text as representing the consensus of the members of the Assembly:

"The General Assembly, noting that the Governments of Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland signed a declaration on 10 April 1980 at Lisbon, intending, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, to resolve the problem of Gibraltar, agreeing to that end to start negotiations aimed at overcoming all the differences between them on Gibraltar, agreeing also to the re-establishment of direct communications in the region, the Government of Spain having decided to suspend the application of the measures at present in force, and both Governments agreeing to base future co-operation on reciprocity and full equality of rights, urges both Governments to make possible the initiation of the negotiations as envisaged in the consensus adopted by the Assembly on 14 December 1973, with the object of reaching a lasting solution to the problem of Gibraltar in the light of the relevant resolutions of the Assembly and in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations."

#### Guam

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES. On 13 August 1981, the Committee on colonial countries adopted conclusions and recommendations on Guam<sup>(1)</sup> that had been prepared by its Sub-Committee on Small Territories. In this text, the Committee noted with appreciation the continued active participation in its work by the administering Power (United States), enabling it to conduct a more informed and meaningful examination. It reiterated the administering Power's responsibility to ensure that the people were kept informed of their right to self-determination and independence, and to create conditions in the Territory which would enable the people to exercise that right freely. It reaffirmed that the people should not be prevented by the factor of military bases from exercising that right. Referring to United Nations visiting missions, it considered that the possibility of sending one to Guam should be kept under review.

On economic and social conditions in the Territory, the Committee called for steps by the administering Power to diversify the economy, facilitate the transfer of land to the people, work towards removing growth constraints in fishing, agriculture and transportation, guarantee the people's rights to their natural resources and protect their property rights. It urged continued efforts to promote the language and culture of the Chamorro people, who made up some 55 per cent of the population according to the 1979 census.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 25 November, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on Guam<sup>(2)</sup> by 119 votes to none, following its

approval in the Fourth Committee on 23 November by a recorded vote of 128 to none. The resolution incorporated most of the provisions contained in the text approved by the Committee on colonial countries (see above) concerning the right to self-determination, a diversified economy, land transfer, property rights, natural resources and the Chamorros. In addition, the Assembly called on the administering Power to enable the people to regain possession of unutilized land held by the federal authorities and the military, and requested the Committee, in its continuing consideration of Guam, to consider the possible dispatch of a visiting mission at an appropriate time and in consultation with the administering Power.

With regard to military bases, the Assembly recognized that their presence could constitute a factor impeding decolonization and reaffirmed its strong conviction that their presence should not prevent the people from exercising their right to self-determination and independence. This provision was the result of an amendment that replaced a paragraph in the original draft resolution by which the Assembly would have recalled past resolutions maintaining that the presence of military bases "constitutes" a factor impeding decolonization, and would have reaffirmed that the people "should not be prevented by this factor" from exercising their right to self-determination and independence.

The resolution was sponsored by Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia and the Syrian Arab Republic. The amendment had 13 sponsors and was adopted in Committee by a recorded vote of 66 to 41, with 16 abstentions. It was introduced by Samoa, which stated that its purpose was to restore the consensus language used in previous resolutions. Samoa added that military bases did not necessarily constitute an impediment to self-determination and that such an assertion was completely unjustified in Guam, whose people had expressed themselves through their representatives to the United States House of Representatives.

A sub-amendment submitted by Democratic Yemen<sup>(3)</sup> was not put to the vote. It would have replaced most of the la-nation amendment by a provision endorsing the conclusions and recommendations on military bases in Guam by the Committee on colonial countries. On the advice of the United Nations Legal Counsel, the Fourth Committee Chairman ruled that the proposal by Democratic Yemen should be considered as a sub-amendment to be put to the vote first. However, the Committee sustained an appeal by Samoa against this ruling, by a recorded vote of 50 to 44, with 20 abstentions.

In the debate, the United States said the Government of Guam had endeavoured to reduce the Territory's economic dependence, improve living standards and develop better relations with its Pacific neighbours. More diversified industries had been established, port facilities had been developed and efforts had been made to ensure the productive civilian use of federal land no longer needed for military purposes. A plebiscite had been scheduled for January 1982 on the Territory's future status. As to military bases, the people of Guam had repeatedly reaffirmed their views, most recently in 1981 when both the elected Governor and the elected legislature had reaffirmed the policy of encouraging Guam's use as a home port for United States Navy personnel.

Voting for the resolution but expressing reservations on the 13-nation amendment were Afghanistan, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Poland, the Syrian Arab Republic, the USSR and Viet Nam.

Bulgaria stated that Guam had been annexed de facto by the United States, which was expanding military installations that already occupied a third of the island. Cuba observed that the administering Power's reports did not mention that Guam was one of the world's largest military bases nor that the United States intended to keep it that way to the detriment of the people's interests. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya considered the bases a threat to the peace and security of States in the region. In the view of the USSR, Guam was a typical example of a Territory where the presence of military bases impeded economic and political development and where the administering Power was trying by every possible means to perpetuate dependency. Viet Nam stated that the size of the bases was irrelevant, as there was no guarantee they would not be used for aggression.

Supporting the amendment, Australia regretted that the draft resolution had been submitted by a small number of countries without proper consultation, introducing a divisive element. Denmark, on behalf of the five Nordic States, said that if the Committee was to continue approving draft resolutions by consensus it would have to keep to the balanced drafts of previous years on military bases. Fiji stated that the presence of bases did not necessarily impede decolonization unless the people concerned decided otherwise. Indonesia thought Guam should continue to be regarded as a decolonization issue and not in the context of great-Power rivalry. Japan considered that the original text, stating that the presence of military bases impeded decolonization, was too sweeping

and contrary to historical fact, while New Zealand found it unjustified. Senegal thought the amendment, of which it was a sponsor, would reduce confrontation.

Venezuela, which abstained in the vote on the amendment, said that, while military bases could impede decolonization, it could not agree with inappropriate observations where the adverse effects of bases had not been established.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>CoSmmitee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev. 1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/63, 25 Nov., text following.

Sub-amendment not voted upon: <sup>(3)</sup>Decmocratic Yemen, A/C.4/36/L.26.

Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.4/36/L.18.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1193, 1194 (12, 13 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-13, 14, 15-20, 22, 23, 24, 25 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/63

119 - 0 Meeting 73 25 November 1981

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.2) by recorded vote (128-0, 23 November (meeting 25); T-nation draft (A/C.4/36/L.16), amended by 13 nations (A/C.4/36/L.22); agenda item 19.

Sponsors of draft: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Syrian Arab Republic.

Sponsors of amendment: Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Japan, Liberia, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Senegal, Solomon Islands.

#### Question of Guam

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Guam,

Having examined the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and all other resolutions and decisions of the United Nations relating to Guam,

Noting that the administering Power continues to maintain military installations in the Territory,

Considering that the policy of maintaining military bases and installations in Non-Self-Governing Territories which inhibit the right of self-determination of peoples is incompatible with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations,

Having heard statement of the administering Power,

Welcoming the active participation of the administering Power in the work of the Special Committee and expressing the hope that this co-operation will be strengthened further so as to accelerate progress towards the full implementation of the Declaration in respect of Guam,

Bearing in mind the special circumstances of the geographical location and economic conditions of Guam and the necessity of diversifying the economy of the Territory as a matter of priority,

1. Approves the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to Guam;

2. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Guam to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

3. Reaffirms its conviction that questions of territorial size, geographical location, size of population and limited natural resources should in no way delay the implementation of the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) in respect of the Territory;



4. Recalls that the United States of America, as the administering Power, has the responsibility to ensure that the people of the Territory are kept fully informed of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Declaration;

5. Reiterates that it is the responsibility of the administering Power to create such conditions in the Territory as will enable the people of Guam to exercise freely and without any interference their inalienable right to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

6. Calls upon the administering Power to take all necessary steps, taking into account the freely expressed wishes of the people of Guam, to expedite the process of decolonization of the Territory in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration and other appropriate resolutions of the General Assembly;

7. Reaffirms its relevant resolutions concerning military bases in colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories, recognizes that the presence of military bases could constitute a factor impeding the implementation of the Declaration and reaffirms its strong conviction that the presence of military bases in Guam should not prevent the people of the Territory from exercising their inalienable right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration and the purposes and principles of the Charter;

8. Reaffirms the responsibility of the administering Power, under the Charter, for the economic and social development of Guam, including the adoption of all possible measures to strengthen and diversify the economy of the Territory;

9. Calls upon the administering Power, in co-operation with the territorial Government and bearing in mind that an obstacle to economic development has been the uncertainty concerning land held by the federal authorities, to facilitate the transfer of land to the people of the Territory and to protect their property rights;

10. Urges the administering Power, in co-operation with the territorial Government, to continue to take effective measures to safeguard and guarantee the right of the people of Guam to their natural resources and to establish and maintain control over their future development;

11. Urges the administering Power to continue its efforts to develop and promote the language and culture of the Chamorro people;

12. Calls upon the administering Power to take the necessary action to enable the people of Guam to regain possession of unutilized land held at present by the federal authorities and by the military;

13. Requests the Special Committee to continue the consideration of this question at its next session, including the possible dispatch of a further visiting mission to Guam at an appropriate time and in consultation with the administering Power, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Pitcairn

The Committee on colonial countries adopted a consensus statement concerning Pitcairn on 4 August 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> as recommended by its Sub-Committee on Small Territories. It noted the affirmation by the United Kingdom—the administering Power—to encourage local initiative and enterprise, and its willingness to discuss constitutional status change with the Pitcairners whenever they desired. The Committee recognized that the size of the Territory's population (61 people at the beginning of 1981) raised the question of the islanders' capacity to maintain the essential services of education, medical wel-

fare and the launching of long-boats, on which their trade with passing ships depended. It called on the administering Power to safeguard their interests.

On the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, approved without vote on 23 November on the basis of an oral proposal by its Chairman, the General Assembly decided without vote on 25 November to defer consideration of the question until 1982 and to request the Committee on colonial countries to review and report to the Assembly on the situation in the Territory.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/415, 25 Nov., text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries. A/36/23/Rev.1.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109PV.1188 (4 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36SR.9-14, 15, 16-20, 25 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

#### General Assembly decision 36/415

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.2) without vote, 23 November (meeting 25); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 19.

#### Question of Pitcairn

At its 73rd plenary meeting, on 25 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, decided to defer until its thirty-seventh session consideration of the question of Pitcairn and requested the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to continue to keep the situation in the Territory under review and to report thereon to the Assembly.

#### St. Helena

On the recommendation of its Sub-Committee on Small Territories, the Committee on colonial countries approved a consensus statement on 4 August 1981 on the question of St. Helena.<sup>(1)</sup> On the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, approved without objection on 17 November on the basis of a consensus text submitted by its Chairman, the General Assembly adopted a consensus statement without vote on 24 November,<sup>(3)</sup> couched in language similar to that used by the Committee.

In its decision, the Assembly reaffirmed the right of the people of St. Helena to self-determination and independence. It noted the commitment of the United Kingdom, as administering Power, to respect the people's wishes in advancing towards self-determination and urged that Power, in consultation with the people's elected representatives, to take steps to ensure the speedy implementation of the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.<sup>(2)</sup> The Assembly reaffirmed the importance of development assistance from the administering Power and the international community. It noted the continuance of infrastructure and community projects to

improve community welfare, including the administering Power's encouragement of local initiative, and called on the administering Power to support such activities. Noting the administering Power's positive attitude towards United Nations visiting missions, the Assembly requested the Chairman of the Committee on colonial countries to continue his consultations in that regard. It requested the Committee to report to the Assembly in 1982.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1.

Resolution and decision: Res.: GA, <sup>(2)</sup>1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49). Dec.: GA, <sup>(3)</sup>36/408, 24 Nov. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.4/36/L.18.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1188 (4 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-14, 15, 16-20, 23 (19 Oct.-17 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.70 (24 Nov.).

General Assembly decision 36/408

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.1) without objection. 17 November (meeting 23); draft consensus by Chairman (A/C.4/36/L.13); agenda item 19.

#### Question of St. Helens

At its 70th plenary meeting, on 24 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, adopted the following text as representing the consensus of the members of the Assembly:

"The General Assembly, having examined the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and having heard the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as the administering Power, reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of St. Helena to self-determination and independence in conformity with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in Assembly resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960. The Assembly notes the commitment of the Government of the United Kingdom to respect the wishes of the people of the Territory in relation to their advance towards self-determination and, in this regard, urges the administering Power to continue to take all necessary steps to ensure, in consultation with the freely elected representatives of the people of St. Helena, the speedy implementation of the Declaration in respect of this Territory. The Assembly further notes the commitment of the Government of the United Kingdom to carry out a policy aimed at implementing Assembly decision 35/409 of 11 November 1980 and reaffirms that continued development assistance from the administering Power, in conjunction with any assistance that the international community might be able to provide, constitutes an important means of developing the social and economic potential of the Territory. In this connection, the Assembly notes that a number of infrastructure and community projects aimed at improving the general welfare of the community are continuing and that the administering Power is encouraging local initiative and enterprise. The Assembly calls upon the administering Power to continue to provide full support for such activities. The Assembly further notes the positive attitude of the administering Power with respect to the question of receiving visiting missions and requests the Chairman of the Special Committee to continue his consultations in this regard with a view to dispatching such a mission to St. Helena, as appropriate. The Assembly requests the Special Committee, in continued co-operation with the administering

Power, to examine this question at its next session and to report thereon to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session."

#### St. Kitts-Nevis

The Committee on colonial countries decided on 19 August 1981 to consider the question of St. Kitts-Nevis at its 1982 session, subject to any directives by the General Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup> On the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, approved without vote on 23 November on an oral proposal by its Chairman, the Assembly decided without vote on 25 November to defer consideration of the question until 1982.<sup>(1)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/417, 25 Nov., text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries. A/36/23/Rev.1.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1200 (19 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-20, 25 (19 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73 (25 Nov.).

General Assembly decision 36/417

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.2) without vote. 23 November (meeting 25); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 19.

#### Question of St. Kitts-Nevis

At its 73rd plenary meeting, on 25 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, decided to defer until its thirty-seventh session consideration of the question of St. Kitts-Nevis.

#### Tokelau

VISITING MISSION REPORT. At the invitation of New Zealand- the administering Power-a United Nations Visiting Mission, composed of Fiji, the Ivory Coast and Yugoslavia, visited Tokelau from 28 June to 3 July 1981.

In its report to the Committee on colonial countries,<sup>(3)</sup> the Mission stated that the Tokelauans had made it clear they did not wish under current circumstances to reconsider their existing ties with New Zealand. That opinion had also been expressed by the Tokelauan communities at Wellington and Rotorua, New Zealand. In Auckland, however, some members of the community had expressed the view that the time had perhaps come for Tokelau to be given the opportunity to make effective preparations for internal self-government.

The Mission noted that the political organization of the Territory, based on the traditions of the people, was firmly established on each of the three atolls. The authority of the elders, expressed through the village fono (council), was not questioned. But the Mission thought it would be in the overall interest of the people if the General Fono were more institutionalized and organized on a permanent basis. The Mission was also impressed by the level of political awareness of the whole population.

The Mission stressed the need for economic

and social improvements-in agriculture, fisheries, handicrafts, housing, employment opportunities and communications. It favoured greater social and cultural contacts between the Territory's people and those of neighbouring islands. It requested the administering Power to improve primary education, to provide secondary education, to supply more training in modern methods, especially for local leaders and to educate young Tokelauans in matters that would enable them to run their own affairs.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On the recommendation of the Committee on colonial countries, approved on 11 November,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly, on 24 November, adopted without vote a consensus decision<sup>(1)</sup> by which it commended the Mission's conclusions and recommendations to New Zealand and the Tokelauans, and reaffirmed New Zealand's responsibility to keep the people informed of their right to self-determination. The Assembly welcomed New Zealand's assurances that it would continue to be guided solely by the people's wishes as to the Territory's future status, and called on New Zealand to continue its political education programme. It noted New Zealand's efforts to promote economic development and measures to guarantee the people's rights to their natural resources, and favoured more budgetary support and development aid by New Zealand.

The consensus decision was approved without objection by the Fourth Committee on 17 November. In the Committee, New Zealand said the Visiting Mission's recommendations would assist it in carrying out its responsibilities as administering Power. Tokelau was internally self-governing and functioned as a single political and economic entity, and the political education programme supported by New Zealand had given Tokelauan leaders a greater understanding of economic problems and political options. The people of the Territory had said they did not want to change their relationship with New Zealand, a view which the latter respected whatever the people might decide in future.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/410, 24 Nov., text following.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1; <sup>(3)</sup>Visiting Mission, A/AC.109/680.

Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.4/36/L.24

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1203, 1204 (10, 11 Nov.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-20, 23 (19 Oct.-17 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.70 (24 Nov.).

General Assembly decision 36/410

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.1) without objection, 17 November (meeting 23); draft consensus by Committee on colonial countries (A/36/23/Rev.1); agenda item 19.

#### Question of Tokelau

At its 70th plenary meeting, on 24 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, adopted the following text as representing the consensus of the members of the Assembly:

"The General Assembly, having examined the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as well as the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission which was dispatched to the Territory in June 1981, and having heard the statement of the representative of New Zealand with regard to Tokelau, notes with appreciation the constructive work accomplished by the members of the Visiting Mission, as well as the close co-operation extended to the Mission by the administering Power, the fonos (councils) and the people of Tokelau. In this regard, the Assembly commends the conclusions and recommendations of the Visiting Mission to the Government of New Zealand, as the administering Power, and to the people of Tokelau for their consideration. The Assembly reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Tokelau to self-determination in conformity with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in Assembly resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, and reaffirms further that it is the responsibility of the administering Power to keep the people of Tokelau fully informed of this right. In this regard, the Assembly notes that the people of the Territory have expressed the view that, at the present time, they do not wish to review the nature of the existing relationship between Tokelau and New Zealand. The Assembly welcomes the administering Power's assurances that it will continue to be guided solely by the wishes of the people of Tokelau as to the future status of the Territory. The Assembly also notes that the administering Power has assured the people of Tokelau of its continuing assistance in the event that they should desire to change their status. The Assembly calls upon the administering Power to continue its programme of political education within the context of its efforts to ensure the preservation of the identity and cultural heritage of the people of Tokelau. The Assembly recognizes that the economic development of Tokelau is an important element in the process of self-determination. The Assembly notes the continuing efforts of the administering Power to promote the economic development of the Territory and the measures it has taken to safeguard and guarantee the right of the people of Tokelau to all their natural resources and the benefits derived therefrom. In this regard, the Assembly notes that, in accordance with the wishes of the people of Tokelau, legislation came into force on 1 April 1980 establishing a 200-mile exclusive economic zone for the Territory. The Assembly is of the opinion that the administering Power should continue to expand its programme of budgetary support and development aid to the Territory. The Assembly requests the Special Committee to continue to examine this question at its next session in the light of the findings of the Visiting Mission, including the possible dispatch of a further visiting mission to Tokelau, as appropriate and in consultation with the administering Power, and to report thereon to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session."

#### United States Virgin Islands

On 13 August 1981, the Committee on colonial countries endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of its Sub-Committee on Small Territories regarding the United States Virgin Islands.<sup>(1)</sup>

In addition to provisions later incorporated into the resolution adopted by the General Assembly (see below), the Committee noted that a constitution for the Territory drafted by a local

constitutional convention had been approved by the United States President in July and would be presented in a territorial referendum on 3 November. Noting that positive measures had been taken to resolve the problem of aliens in the Territory, the Committee urged the administering Power to assist the territorial Government in adjusting the status of aliens. It also noted government efforts to attract investments in manufacturing. Referring to a request by the territorial Government that the United States should not proceed with legislation to extend its federal tax system to the Territory, the Committee called on the administering Power to reconsider its intention in that regard. It noted with appreciation the continued participation of the United States in the Committee's discussions on the Territory.

On the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, approved without objection on 17 November, the General Assembly adopted without vote on 24 November a 12-nation resolution<sup>(2)</sup> by which it reaffirmed the right of the people of the United States Virgin Islands to self-determination and independence, and requested the United States to expedite decolonization of the Territory. The Assembly also reaffirmed the administering Power's responsibility for ensuring the people's identity and cultural heritage, and urged it to guarantee the people's right to own and dispose of their natural resources. In addition, the Assembly urged more measures to strengthen and diversify the economy of the United States Virgin Islands. By a provision not included in the text adopted by the Committee on colonial countries, the Assembly requested the administering Power to continue to enlist the assistance of the United Nations system in the Territory's development. It requested the Committee to consider the question again in 1982, including the possible dispatch of a visiting mission.

In the Fourth Committee, the United States said that under the new draft constitution to go before the Territory's voters in November, the Virgin Islanders would assume greater responsibility for local self-government. The United States Government would assist the Virgin Islands Government in financing investigations into charges of white-collar crime and public corruption, since that was a high priority concern of the territorial Government.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/47, 24 Nov., text following.

Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.4/36/L.18.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV. 1193, 1194 (12, 13 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.9-13, 14, 15-18, 19, 20-22, 23 (19 Oct.-17 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.70 (24 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/47

Adopted without vote Meeting 70 24 November 1981

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.1) without objection, 17 November (meeting 23); 12-nation draft (A/C.4/36/L.17 and Corr.1); agenda item 19.

Sponsors: Australia, Bahamas, Denmark, Fiji, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu.

Question of the United States Virgin Islands

The General Assembly.

Having considered the question of the United States Virgin Islands.

Having examined the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and all other resolutions and decisions of the United Nations relating to the United States Virgin Islands,

Noting the active co-operation given by the administering Power, both through its participation in the work of the Special Committee and through its willingness to receive visiting missions to small Territories under its administration,

Having heard the statement of the administering Power,

1. Approves the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to the United States Virgin Islands;

2. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of the United States Virgin Islands to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

3. Reaffirms its conviction that questions of territorial size, geographical location, size of population and limited natural resources should in no way delay the speedy implementation of the Declaration with regard to the Territory;

4. Requests the Government of the United States of America, as the administering Power, to take all necessary measures, in consultation with the freely elected representatives of the people of the United States Virgin Islands, to expedite the process of the decolonization of the Territory in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

5. Reaffirms that it is the obligation of the administering Power, in consultation with the freely elected representatives of the people of the Territory, to inform the local people of the possibilities open to them in the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence and to enable them to exercise that right freely and without interference in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

6. Reaffirms that the administering Power has the responsibility for taking such measures as will ensure the preservation of the identity and cultural heritage of the people of the Territory;

7. Urges the administering Power, in consultation with the freely elected representatives of the people of the United States Virgin Islands, to safeguard the inalienable right of the people of the Territory to the enjoyment of their natural resources by taking effective measures which guarantee the right of the people to own and dispose of those resources and to establish and maintain control over their future development;

8. Reaffirms the responsibility of the administering Power, under the Charter, for the economic and social development of the United States Virgin Islands and in this regard notes that, although steady economic progress has continued in the Territory, especially in the area of service industries, there are still problems which need to be resolved, including those relating to unemployment and the infrastructure;

9. Notes the sustained efforts undertaken by the territorial Government to diversify the economy and urges the administering Power, acting in co-operation with the Government of the United States Virgin Islands, to strengthen the economy of the Territory by, wherever possible, taking additional measures of diversification in all fields;

10. Requests the administering Power to continue to enlist the assistance of the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system in the development and strengthening of the economy of the United States Virgin Islands;

11. Requests the Special Committee to continue the examination of this question at its next session, including the possible dispatch of a further visiting mission to the United States Virgin Islands at an appropriate time and in consultation with the administering Power, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Western Sahara question

The General Assembly, in November 1981, authorized United Nations co-operation with the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in organizing a referendum on self-determination for the people of Western Sahara. Agreement on this course was reached in June at the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government, which established an Implementation Committee to work out details.

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES. The question of Western Sahara was considered by the Committee on colonial countries on 14 August. After hearing statements, the Committee decided on that date to continue its consideration in 1982, subject to any directives by the General Assembly.<sup>(12)</sup>

REPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS. Responding to a 1980 General Assembly request<sup>(16)</sup> for a report on the Western Sahara situation, the Secretary-General, in a report<sup>(13)</sup> of 16 October 1981, informed the Assembly that he had received letters transmitting two OAU decisions, sent by that organization's Secretary-General on 23 September and by Kenya, as Chairman of OAU, on 14 September. Both texts were annexed to the report, and the letter from Kenya was also issued separately.<sup>(4)</sup>

By the first of these decisions, the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government, meeting at Nairobi, Kenya, from 24 to 27 June, welcomed a commitment by King Hassan II of Morocco to accept the organization of a referendum in Western Sahara, and established an Implementation Committee which, with United Nations participation; was to work out details and guarantee the exercise of the right to self-determination through a general and free referendum. The second decision, taken by the Implementation Committee at a meeting in Nairobi from 24 to 26 August, set forth the general principles and conditions of a referendum and cease-fire; the referendum would be held under an impartial interim administration assisted by an OAU or United

Nations peace-keeping force, and the population would be asked to choose between independence and integration with Morocco.

In a letter to the Secretary-General dated 9 September,<sup>(5)</sup> Madagascar transmitted a 25 July memorandum from the General Secretary of the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro (Frente POLISARIO) submitting its conditions for a referendum in the Territory; these included withdrawal of Moroccan forces and administration, installation of a provisional administration set up by the United Nations and OAU with the collaboration of the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic, and the presence of a United Nations peace-keeping force.

By letter to the President of the Security Council dated 13 October,<sup>(9)</sup> Morocco transmitted a letter from King Hassan II stating that Moroccan troops had been attacked on that date at Guelta Zemmour, in the territory of Sahara, and two Moroccan aircraft had been shot down by advanced missiles operated by non-Africans on Moroccan territory. In letters dated 16 October to the Council President<sup>(7)</sup> and the Assembly President,<sup>(6)</sup> Mauritania transmitted a 13 October communique from the Military Committee of National Recovery denying all accusations by Morocco against Mauritania and stating that it was not involved in the alleged military operations. In a letter of 20 October to the Council President,<sup>(10)</sup> Morocco transmitted a 19 October message from King Hassan to the President of Mauritania, stating that the attack had been launched from Mauritania and seeking clarification of that country's role. In a letter of 21 October,<sup>(8)</sup> Mauritania transmitted a message of the previous day from its President assuring the Secretary-General that attacks on Morocco had not originated in Mauritania.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 24 November, the General Assembly adopted, by a recorded vote of 76 to 9, with 57 abstentions, a resolution sponsored by 43 African and other States<sup>(18)</sup> by which it reaffirmed the right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination and independence, and welcomed the efforts of OAU and its Implementation Committee, including steps towards a referendum on self-determination. It urged Morocco and POLISARIO, as the two parties to the conflict, to negotiate a cease-fire and a peace agreement permitting conduct of the referendum. The Assembly reaffirmed United Nations determination to co-operate with OAU in organizing the referendum, requested the United Nations Secretary-General to co-operate closely with the OAU Secretary-General to implement the decisions of OAU and its Implementation Committee, and requested the Committee

on colonial countries to give priority to the Western Sahara question and to report in 1982. The resolution was recommended by the Fourth Committee, which approved it on 9 November by a recorded vote of 73 to 7, with 54 abstentions.

Also on 24 November, the Assembly adopted without vote a decision<sup>(20)</sup> by which it requested the Secretary-General to assist the Implementation Committee in discharging its mandate on Western Sahara and to report to the Assembly and the Security Council, as appropriate. The decision, sponsored by Kenya, was approved without objection on 9 November by the Fourth Committee.

A provision by which the Assembly noted with satisfaction the OAU resolution establishing the Implementation Committee, as well as that Committee's decision to conduct a referendum in Western Sahara, was included in a resolution on self-determination of peoples adopted on 28 October.<sup>(17)</sup>

A draft resolution proposed in the Fourth Committee by Morocco, Senegal and Zaire<sup>(2)</sup> was withdrawn by the sponsors. It would have had the Assembly welcome the OAU decision on a referendum and the readiness of all parties to co-operate fully with the Implementation Committee, authorize the Secretary-General to assist the Committee, and invite the Secretary-General to report to the Assembly and the Security Council.

Amendments to this draft were submitted by Algeria, Angola, Burundi, Cape Verde, Madagascar, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Sao Tome and Principe, and Seychelles.<sup>(1)</sup> One of the amendments would have added, to a preambular paragraph referring to the broad support in the Assembly for the OAU decisions, a phrase mentioning in particular the statements of Morocco and POLISARIO. Another amendment would have added an Assembly reaffirmation of the right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination. Further, a mention of "a self-determination referendum in Western Sahara" would have been replaced by "a general and free self-determination referendum of the people of Western Sahara". A paragraph authorizing the Secretary-General to give all necessary assistance to the Implementation Committee would have been replaced by a request that the Secretary-General co-operate fully with OAU in carrying out the Committee's decisions. Finally, the amendments would have added a request to the Committee on colonial countries to continue to consider the Western Sahara situation as a priority matter and report to the Assembly in 1982.

The three-nation draft resolution was withdrawn following a 29 October request from

the OAU Chairman to King Hassan, appealing to Morocco to withdraw its Assembly proposal and thus enable the Implementation Committee to carry out its mandate. The King responded affirmatively on 6 November; the exchange of messages was transmitted by a letter of that date from Morocco to the Secretary-General.<sup>(11)</sup> The President of Algeria responded to a similar appeal from the OAU Chairman, dated 30 October, by stating that the 43-nation resolution of which it was a co-sponsor provided a legal and political basis for the United Nations to participate with OAU in the implementation of its decisions, emphasized negotiation between the parties and contained no substantive elements that might not win the occupying Power's agreement; the President's letter was transmitted to the Secretary-General by an Algerian letter of 6 November.<sup>(3)</sup>

The resolution adopted by the Assembly was introduced in the Fourth Committee by Mexico, which stated that it differed from the Assembly's 1980 resolution on the subject<sup>(16)</sup> in that it contained no specific condemnation of Morocco or call for troop withdrawal; its purpose was to seek consensus. The sponsors agreed that peace in north-west Africa was linked to the free and democratic expression of the will of the Western Sahara people concerning their future.

Kenya, introducing the decision on United Nations assistance to the Implementation Committee, said it was designed to make possible the co-operation envisaged by that Committee between the United Nations and OAU in organizing a referendum. Kenya added that the text was not controversial and had been accepted by the parties to the dispute.

Morocco reaffirmed its commitment to the organization of a self-determination referendum and its adherence to the conditions stipulated by the Implementation Committee for the referendum and the cease-fire. But it voted against the Assembly resolution, stating that the text would pre-empt the free and democratic choice of the people as well as the responsibility and mandate of OAU and its Implementation Committee. It would be anti-democratic to dictate in advance a particular attitude on the part of a people whose will was to be consulted in a referendum. The United Nations should observe strict neutrality; all that was needed was the decision proposed by Kenya. Morocco had no doubt about the validity of the process already completed in the Sahara in conformity with international rules on decolonization.

Those opposing the resolution, including Gabon, Senegal and the United States, argued that it did not correspond to the agreements reached by OAU in Nairobi, while Zaire thought

it contained elements of discord. The United States considered that the text had precluded the desired consensus by attempting to prejudge the situation.

Explaining its abstention on the resolution, Austria regretted that OAU had not submitted its own resolution, including all agreed points; the resolution went beyond the agreement reached at Nairobi and introduced elements jeopardizing that consensus. Finland, France, the Sudan and Sweden also regarded the language as departing from OAU decisions. Norway said the resolution prejudged the peace process, and Nigeria expressed reservations because it did not reflect OAU decisions that the Implementation Committee was to conduct the referendum and that the cease-fire was to be held under its auspices.

Also abstaining, the Central African Republic thought the resolution would not facilitate the work of the Implementation Committee. Kenya cited its chairmanship of OAU and of the Implementation Committee as its reason for abstaining; it appealed for continued efforts at reconciliation between the parties. Jordan mentioned the appeal by the OAU Chairman in explaining its abstention. Tunisia abstained in order to safeguard the success of the Implementation Committee's initiatives.

Papua New Guinea announced it would not participate in the vote, stating that regional unity on Western Sahara should be encouraged.

Argentina and Fiji voted for the resolution, seeing no incompatibility between it and the decision introduced by Kenya.

Among the countries supporting that decision, France said it conformed to the OAU decision, which enjoyed the support of the parties. The United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of the European Community, supported the OAU decision since it paved the way for a peaceful solution enabling the people to exercise their right to self-determination through a referendum.

In the debate, Algeria contended that the cause of the conflict in Western Sahara was Morocco's refusal to grant self-determination to the people, under the direction of POLISARIO, their true representative; to propose a referendum organized by the occupying Power made a mockery of popular consultation and offended the honour of Africa. In Afghanistan's view, the people of Western Sahara, under the leadership of POLISARIO, were struggling to free themselves from colonialism and to end military occupation of their territory. Sao Tome and Principe said POLISARIO had been fighting for the self-determination of the Saharan people and their liberation from Moroccan colonial occupation. The right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination was also supported by Cuba,

Czechoslovakia, Fiji, India, Jordan, the USSR, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

Several of the speakers which supported the position of POLISARIO specifically endorsed the establishment (in 1976) of the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic, and some, including Angola, Chad and Viet Nam, announced that they had granted it diplomatic recognition.

Cape Verde stated that the first step towards a settlement should be an agreement between POLISARIO and Morocco to define cease-fire conditions. Cyprus appealed for a cease-fire, and deplored the non-implementation of the principle of self-determination and of United Nations and OAU resolutions. The Lao People's Democratic Republic favoured immediate talks on a cease-fire, in accordance with the wishes of OAU and POLISARIO. Zimbabwe called for negotiations without pre-conditions to bring about an immediate cease-fire; it added that independence under POLISARIO leadership was the only logical and realistic solution.

Afghanistan, Angola, Botswana, Cape Verde, Chad, Democratic Yemen, Mauritania, Mozambique and Seychelles were among those favouring negotiations between Morocco and POLISARIO. Madagascar regretted that Morocco refused to negotiate with POLISARIO, whose legitimacy was beyond question. Uganda appealed to the parties to co-operate fully with the Implementation Committee and to initiate negotiations.

Angola, Botswana, Democratic Yemen and Nicaragua urged Morocco to withdraw its troops from Saharan territory. Democratic Yemen regretted that some Arab States were pursuing regional hegemonism by occupying other Arab territories with the intention of building empires.

A number of States supported the holding of a referendum. The Comoros considered that Morocco's commitments to OAU on a referendum constituted an important step towards a solution. Mozambique said the referendum was not, as Morocco had claimed, a simple act of allegiance; it had to be organized by the Implementation Committee in co-operation with the United Nations and not by the Moroccan authorities. Zambia opposed Morocco's territorial expansionism and believed it was only through an internationally supervised referendum that Western Sahara could freely determine its destiny.

General support for the OAU initiatives on Western Sahara was voiced by a number of speakers, most of whom also favoured United Nations co-operation in measures to implement them. Among those making this point were Bangladesh, the Congo, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, the Niger, Senegal, the Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Tun-

sia, Yugoslavia and Zaire. The Sudan added that the Assembly should not take any action which might undermine OAU efforts. The United States fully supported the OAU efforts to resolve the conflict on the basis of a cease-fire and a referendum, and said the United Nations should lend its full support to OAU and should recognize and endorse the agreement between the parties. In Gabon's view, since OAU efforts were under way to define the modalities for the referendum, the United Nations should simply furnish technical assistance.

Madagascar expressed particular satisfaction at the Implementation Committee's decision to establish an interim administration to organize the referendum and welcomed its decision on identifying eligible participants in the referendum (all Saharawis listed in the 1974 census who had attained the age of 18). Mauritania reiterated its absolute neutrality towards its Moroccan and Saharan brothers, while supporting the right of the Saharan people to self-determination; it added that the United Nations should reaffirm the OAU principles and that the Security Council should make recommendations to implement the Implementation Committee's decision.

The Fourth Committee heard two petitioners on Western Sahara, namely, Brahim Mokhtar of POLISARIO and Thomas Jallaud of the Association des Amis de la République Arabe Sahraouie Démocratique.<sup>(14)</sup> Morocco objected to hearing the petitioners on the ground that the Western Sahara question was in the process of solution by the Implementation Committee.

The POLISARIO representative stated that crimes committed by Moroccan occupying forces had forced tens of thousands of Saharan citizens into exile in Algeria, while others had been deported to Morocco. However, those forces were in control of only 10 per cent of the Territory, leaving the POLISARIO army in control of the rest. More than 50 countries had recognized the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic, including 26 African States—a majority of the members of OAU. Morocco had resorted to delaying tactics, seeking to apply a policy of military fait accompli. Negotiations between POLISARIO and Morocco were the means to peace but, until a cease-fire agreement was reached, the Western Sahara people had no choice but to fight in self-defence against Moroccan aggression.

Morocco, explaining its vote for the Assembly's resolution of 1 December<sup>(19)</sup> implementation of the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,<sup>(15)</sup> said in regard to the provision whereby the Assembly approved the 1982 work programme of the Committee on colonial countries that Western Sahara did not fall within the Committee's competence.

Amendments: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, Angola, Burundi, Cape Verde, Madagascar, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, A/C.4/36/L.6 (to 3-nation draft A/C.4/36/L.2).

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(2)</sup>Morocco, Senegal, Zaire, A/C.4/36/L.2.

Letters: <sup>(3)</sup>Algeria, 6 Nov., A/C.4/36/9. <sup>(4)</sup>Kenya, annexing OAU dec., 14 Sep., A/36/512-S/14692. <sup>(5)</sup>Madagascar, 9 Sep., A/36/488. Mauritania: <sup>(6)</sup>16 Oct., A/C.1/36/6; <sup>(7)</sup>16 Oct., S/14729; <sup>(8)</sup>21 Oct., A/36/616-S/14735. Morocco: <sup>(9)</sup>13 Oct., S/14723; <sup>(10)</sup>20 Oct., S/14733; <sup>(11)</sup>6 Nov., A/C.4/36/8.

Reports: <sup>(12)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev. 1; <sup>(13)</sup>S-G, A/36/602.

Requests for hearing: <sup>(14)</sup>A/C.4/36/4 & Add.1.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(15)</sup>1514(XV), 14 Dec. 1960 (YUN 1960, p. 49); <sup>(16)</sup>35/19, 11 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1100); <sup>(17)</sup>36/9, para. 4, 28 Oct. 1981 (p. 895); <sup>(18)</sup>36/46, 24 Nov., text following; <sup>(19)</sup>36/68, 1 Dec. (p.1097).

Decision: <sup>(20)</sup>GA, 36/406, 24 Nov., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/709; S-G statements, A/C.4/36/L.8/Rev.1, A/C.5/36/47.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1195 (14 Aug.). GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.3, 4, 9-11, 12-16, 17, 18, 19-21 (7 Oct.-9 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.50 (23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.70 (24 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/46

76-9-57 (recorded vote) Meeting 70 24 November 1981

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677) by recorded vote 73-7-54, 9 November (meeting 21); 43-nation draft (A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1); agenda item 19.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenade, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iran, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Question of Western Sahara

The General Assembly,

Having considered in depth the question of Western Sahara,

Recalling the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination and independence in accordance with the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and in General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolution 35/19 of 11 November 1980 on the question of Western Sahara,

Having considered the relevant chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Having heard the statements made on the question of Western Sahara, in particular the statements of the representative of the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro.

Recalling its resolution 3/117 of 10 December 1980 on co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity,

Taking note of the decision of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981, to organize throughout the Territory of Western Sahara a general and free referendum of the people of Western Sahara on self-determination,

Taking note of the decision adopted by the Implementation



Committee on Western Sahara of the Organization of African Unity at its first ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 26 August 1981, concerning the establishment of appropriate machinery to enable the people of Western Sahara to express themselves freely and democratically on their future,

1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Charter of the Organization of African Unity and the objectives of General Assembly resolution 1514(XV), as well as the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Organization of African Unity;

2. Welcomes the efforts made by the Organization of African Unity and its Implementation Committee on Western Sahara with a view to promoting a just and definitive solution to the question of Western Sahara;

3. Takes note of the decision of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its eighteenth ordinary session to organize throughout the Territory of Western Sahara a general and free referendum of the people of Western Sahara on self-determination;

4. Welcomes the steps taken by the Implementation Committee with a view to organizing and conducting the referendum;

5. Appeals to the two parties to the conflict, Morocco and the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro, to observe a cease-fire in accordance with the decisions of the Organization of African Unity and Its Implementation Committee;

6. Urges, to that end, Morocco and the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro to enter into negotiations with a view to establishing an immediate cease-fire and concluding a peace agreement permitting the fair conduct of a general and free referendum on self-determination in Western Sahara;

7. Reaffirms the determination of the United Nations to co-operate fully with the Organization of African Unity in the fair and impartial organization of the referendum;

8. Requests to that end the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps to ensure that the United Nations participates in the organization and conduct of the referendum and to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council on this subject and on the measures requiring a decision by the Council;

9. Urgently requests the Secretary-General to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity with a view to the implementation of the decisions of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity and of its Implementation Committee, and of the present resolution;

10. Requests the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to continue to consider the situation in Western Sahara as a matter of priority and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran, Jamaica, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Rwnada, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Central African Republic, Chile, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Morocco, Senegal, United States, Zaire.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay.

bouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay.

General Assembly decision 36/406

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677) without objection. 9 November (meeting 21); draft decision by Kenya (A/C.4/36/L.19); agenda item 19.

#### Question of Western Sahara

At its 70th plenary meeting, on 24 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, decided, taking account of the resolution adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981, by which it was decided, inter alia, to establish an Implementation Committee on Western Sahara, and the decision adopted by the Implementation Committee at its first ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 26 August 1981, to request the Secretary-General to give assistance, in consultation and co-operation with the Organization of African Unity, to the Implementation Committee in the discharge of its mandate regarding the question of Western Sahara arising from the above resolution and decision and to report thereon to the Assembly and the Security Council as appropriate.

#### Other United Kingdom-administered Territories in the Americas

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COLONIAL COUNTRIES. On 4 August 1981, the Committee on colonial countries adopted decisions on the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands and Montserrat.<sup>(2)</sup> It took similar action with regard to Bermuda and the Turks and Caicos Islands on 13 August. These decisions, recommended by the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, contained provisions reaffirming the right of self-determination of peoples; reiterating that exercise of this right should not be delayed by circumstances such as size or location; urging the United Kingdom, as administering Power, to take measures to guarantee the people's right to own and dispose of their natural resources and control their development; welcoming the co-operation extended to the Committee by the United Kingdom; and calling on it to receive United Nations visiting missions at an appropriate time.

The decisions also included recommendations specific to each Territory, including the following:

Bermuda: Expressing hope that measures would be taken to foster national unity and identity, the Committee welcomed the proposal to establish a human rights commission. It reaffirmed its strong conviction that the presence of military bases in the Territory should not prevent the people from exercising their right to

self-determination and independence. It urged greater efforts to diversify the economy, heavily dependent on tourism and international company business, and continued efforts at "bermudianization".

**British Virgin Islands:** The Committee welcomed the progressive "localization" of the public service and urged the administering Power to help implement the Territory's new development plan for 1980-1983.

**Cayman Islands:** Noting growth in tourism, property development and international finance, the Committee urged greater economic diversification, with the aim of self-sufficiency. It welcomed efforts to hasten the replacement of foreign personnel by Caymanians in local government, and noted that imminent constitutional changes had not been an issue in the election held in November 1980.

**Montserrat:** The Committee noted that the territorial Government was keeping economic and social development under periodic review in order to determine the timing for any changes in constitutional status. It noted also that efforts to expand and improve the economic infrastructure had continued and that the Territory no longer needed a grant-in-aid. At the same time, it called on the United Kingdom to mobilize financial, technical and material assistance.

**Turks and Caicos Islands:** The Committee endorsed the observations and conclusions of its Visiting Mission to observe the November 1980 elections.<sup>(5)</sup> It called on the administering Power to promote economic and social development and the training of personnel, and particularly to intensify its assistance programme, as well as to work with regional and international bodies to diversify the economy. It reaffirmed its strong conviction that the presence of military bases in the Territory should not prevent the people from exercising their right to self-determination and independence.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 25 November, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the five Territories<sup>(4)</sup> by which it reaffirmed their right to self-determination and independence. It called on the United Kingdom, in consultation with the peoples' elected representatives, to diversify and strengthen the Territories' economies, work out concrete assistance programmes, safeguard the peoples' right to their natural resources, and continue to enlist assistance from the United Nations system in accelerating economic and social progress. Welcoming the positive attitude of the administering Power towards receiving visiting missions, it requested the Chairman of the Committee on colonial countries to continue consultations regarding the dispatch of future missions. The Assembly

also recognized that the presence of military bases could constitute an impediment to decolonization, and reaffirmed that the presence of foreign military bases in Bermuda and the Turks and Caicos Islands should not prevent their peoples from exercising the right to self-determination and independence.

The resolution was adopted by 117 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, following its approval by the Fourth Committee on 23 November by a recorded vote of 131 to none. The sponsors were Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia and the Syrian Arab Republic.

The provision on military bases was incorporated into the text by a 12-nation amendment, which the Committee adopted by a recorded vote of 73 to 39, with 15 abstentions. It replaced a paragraph by which the Assembly would have recalled United Nations resolutions on military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories (NSGTS), including those which maintained that the presence of such bases constituted a factor impeding decolonization, and would have reaffirmed the Assembly's strong conviction that the people of Bermuda and the Turks and Caicos Islands should not be prevented by that factor from exercising their right to self-determination and independence.

Madagascar proposed an amendment on military bases<sup>(1)</sup> which would have replaced the paragraph in the six-nation text with a paragraph recalling resolutions on military bases in NSGTS and endorsing the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee on colonial countries. This was not put to the vote, however, after the Chairman ruled that the 12-nation amendment must be voted on first because it was farthest removed in substance from the original draft. Democratic Yemen and Madagascar appealed against the Chairman's ruling, but it was upheld by a vote of 66 to 37, with 10 abstentions.

Introducing the resolution, the Syrian Arab Republic said it reflected the consensus reached in the Committee on colonial countries and contained broad principles generally accepted by all Member States. Fiji, which introduced the 12-nation amendment, said the wording it sought to replace introduced an element of controversy; moreover, the documentation before the Fourth Committee did not suggest that the facilities in question were standing in the way of self-determination.

Much of the discussion on the military-bases clause reflected arguments in the Fourth Committee's general discussion of military bases in colonial Territories (p.1111), and with regard to a similar clause in an amendment to a draft resolution on Guam (p.1187).

Opposing the 12-nation amendment and sup-

porting the original text, Cuba said the draft resolution used balanced language which the Committee on colonial countries had adopted after months of consultations. Czechoslovakia, India and Yugoslavia said the amendment did not correspond to the consensus in that Committee. Military bases in the Caribbean and elsewhere could pave the way for the launching of attacks, said the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Nigeria thought the amendment tried to create the impression that foreign military bases might not constitute an impediment to independence; however, the original text was also defective because it created the impression that bases would have that effect in all cases. The USSR stated that military bases should be removed to allow the peoples of colonial Territories to exercise self-determination freely. Viet Nam said the bases existed solely to benefit the administering Powers that had installed them. Others opposing or expressing reservations on the 12-nation amendment were Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Sao Tome and Principe, and the Syrian Arab Republic.

Trinidad and Tobago, which abstained in the vote on the amendment, said it could not go back on the decision it had supported in the Committee on colonial countries.

Supporting the amendment were Australia and Denmark, the latter on behalf of the five Nordic States; they said it was important to maintain the Fourth Committee's normal procedure of approving resolutions on small NSGTs by consensus, and no consensus could be reached without the amendment. Jordan considered that the administering Power had been remarkably co-operative with the Committee on colonial countries regarding the Caribbean Territories; it also felt that the principle of consensus must be safeguarded. New Zealand stated that there was no evidence to suggest that the presence of military bases in Bermuda or the Turks and Caicos Islands was impeding progress towards self-determination, nor had the people in those Territories expressed any concerns in that regard. Sri Lanka was dissatisfied with the original text since it implied that military bases in NSGTs constituted in themselves an impediment to decolonization; the presence of British military installations in Sri Lanka had not impeded its accession to independence.

The United Kingdom said there were very small facilities in Bermuda and the Turks and Caicos Islands which existed at the wish of the territorial Governments; it was ridiculous to suggest that they stood in the way of self-determination. The United States said its base

and telemetry station in the Turks and Caicos Islands was operated primarily by civilian personnel and had only one air force officer; in Bermuda, the United States maintained two small naval air stations which made a major contribution to the local economy in payments for services, employment and improvements in the local airfield, also used for commercial flights.

Bulgaria said the United States military bases in the Turks and Caicos Islands had been established pursuant to a decision taken by the United Kingdom, not by the people of the islands. Czechoslovakia called for the immediate dismantling of the bases in Bermuda and the Turks and Caicos Islands, while the German Democratic Republic affirmed that those bases prevented the peoples from exercising their rights.

Favouring the Madagascar amendment, Democratic Yemen said it had not really attained independence until the last British soldier in a military base on its territory had been withdrawn. Senegal, however, felt that the amendment might cause confusion, since the decisions taken by the Committee on colonial countries in 1980 and 1981 seemed contradictory on the question of military bases.

Speaking generally of the Territories under its administration, the United Kingdom stated that it would encourage them to accede to independence if that was their wish, but they would not be forced into any constitutional status which did not satisfy their right to self-determination. The United Kingdom agreed with the Committee on colonial countries that the most helpful way of achieving a first-hand awareness of the situation was to send visiting missions to dependent Territories, such as the 1980 mission to observe general elections in the Turks and Caicos Islands.

Trinidad and Tobago saw a pressing need for more action to increase the islands' viability and to combat problems caused by scarce natural resources, unfavourable trade terms, inadequate development finance, high unemployment and under-developed infrastructure.

The Fourth Committee granted a request for a hearing to W. G. Brown of the Bermuda Constitutional Conference,<sup>(3)</sup> but the petitioner did not appear.

Amendment not voted upon: <sup>(1)</sup>Madagascar, A/C.4/36/L.25.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on colonial countries, A/36/23/Rev. 1.

Request for hearing: <sup>(3)</sup>A/C.4/36/3.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/62, 25 Nov.. text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 1086.

Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.4/36/L.18.

Meeting records: Committee on colonial countries: A/AC.109/PV.1188, 1193, 1194 (4-13 Aug.) GA: 4th Committee, A/C.4/36/SR.3, 9-14, 15, 16-18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25 (7 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.73(25 Nov.).

## General Assembly resolution 36/62

117-0-2 Meeting 73 25 November 1981

Approved by Fourth Committee (A/36/677/Add.2) by recorded vote (131-0), 23 November (meeting 25); 6-nation draft (A/C.4/36/L.14), amended by 12 nations (A/C.4/36/L.21): agenda item 19.

Sponsors of draft: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Syrian Arab Republic.

Sponsors of amendment: Denmark, Fiji, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Senegal, Solomon Islands.

Question of Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands,  
the Cayman Islands, Montserrat  
and the Turks and Caicos Islands

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Montserrat and the Turks and Caicos Islands.

Having examined the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and all other resolution and decisions of the United Nations relating to the Territories listed above,

Taking into account the statement of the administering Power relating to the Territories listed above,

Noting that the administering Power has expressed its willingness to respect the wishes of the peoples of the Territories under its administration regarding their future constitutional status and reiterating that it is the obligation of the administering Power to create such conditions in those territories as will enable the peoples thereof to exercise freely and without interference their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) as well as other relevant resolutions of the Assembly,

Conscious of the need to ensure the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration in respect of the Territories concerned,

Bearing in mind that United Nations visiting missions provide an effective means of ascertaining the situation in the Territories, acquiring adequate first-hand information on the situation prevailing in those Territories and ascertaining the views of the peoples concerning their future political status,

Aware of the special circumstances of the geographical location and economic conditions of the Territories concerned and bearing in mind the necessity of diversifying and strengthening further their economies as a matter of priority in order to promote economic stability,

1. Approves the chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to Bermuda, the British Virgin

Islands, the Cayman Islands, Montserrat and the Turks and Caicos Islands;

2. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the peoples of those Territories to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

3. Reaffirms its conviction that questions of territorial size, geographical location, size of population and limited natural resources should in no way delay the speedy implementation of the Declaration with respect to the Territories concerned;

4. Calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as the administering Power, in consultation with the freely elected representatives of the peoples of the Territories concerned, to continue to take all the necessary steps to ensure the full and speedy attainment of the goals set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration in respect of the Territories;

5. Recognizes that the presence of military bases and other Installations could constitute an impediment to the implementation of the Declaration and reaffirms its conviction that the presence of foreign military bases and installations in Bermuda and the Turks and Caicos Islands should not prevent the peoples of those Territories from exercising their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration and the purposes and principles of the Charter;

6. Calls upon the administering Power, in consultation with the freely elected representatives of the peoples of the Territories concerned, to take all possible steps to diversify and strengthen further the economies of those Territories and to work out concrete programmes of assistance and economic development;

7. Further calls upon the administering Power, in cooperation with the freely elected representatives of the peoples of the Territories concerned, to safeguard the inalienable right of the peoples of those Territories to the enjoyment of their natural resources by taking effective measures which ensure the right of the peoples to own and dispose of those resources and to establish and maintain control over their future development;

8. Requests the administering Power to continue to enlist the assistance of the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system in accelerating progress in all sectors of the social and economic life of the Territories concerned;

9. Welcomes the positive attitude of the administering Power with regard to the receiving of United Nations visiting missions in the Territories under its administration and requests the Chairman of the Special Committee to continue his consultations with a view to dispatching such missions, as appropriate;

10. Requests the Special Committee to continue the examination of this question at its next session, including the possible dispatch of visiting missions in consultation with the administering Power, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

# Legal questions

## Chapter I

### International Court of Justice

Three contentious cases and a request for an advisory opinion were before the International Court of Justice in 1981.

The Court held public sittings in September and October on the Continental Shelf (Tunisia/Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), after deciding in April not to grant a request by Malta to intervene in the case (see below). In May, it recorded the discontinuance of the case on United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran (United States of America v. Iran), following an agreement between the parties (p. 1202). In November, Canada and the United States notified the Court that they had agreed to place before it a case on Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary in the Gulf of Maine Area (p. 1202). An advisory opinion was requested in July on an Application for Review of Judgement No. 273 of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal, concerning the payment of a repatriation grant to a United Nations staff member on separation from service (p. 1202).

Two Judges were re-elected and three new ones elected to the Court for terms beginning in February 1982 (p. 1203). The Court's President, Sir Humphrey Waldock (United Kingdom), was one of two Judges who died during the year.

#### Judicial work of the Court

Continental shelf delimitation between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Tunisia

At a meeting with the President of the International Court of Justice on 2 February 1981, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Tunisia exchanged Counter-Memorials in the case concerning the delimitation of the continental shelf between them. The dispute had been referred to the Court under the terms of a Special Agreement drawn up by the disputing parties in 1977 and submitted to the Court in 1978<sup>(3)</sup> and 1979.<sup>(4)</sup> Memorials (initial written pleadings) submitted by each State were filed with the Court and exchanged between the parties in May 1980.<sup>(5)</sup>

At public sittings from 19 to 23 March 1981, arguments were presented on behalf of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta and Tunisia regarding a request by Malta, made on 30 Janu-

ary, for permission to intervene in the two-party dispute. Malta made this request under Article 62 of the Court's Statute (see APPENDIX II), which states that the Court may decide on a request submitted by a State which considers that it has an interest of a legal nature that may be affected by the decision in the case. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Tunisia objected to the request.

On 14 April, the Court delivered a Judgment<sup>(1)</sup> by which it decided unanimously that Malta's request to intervene could not be granted. It noted that Malta's interest of a legal nature related essentially to any findings of the Court that might identify and assess the physical factors relevant to the delimitation of the continental shelf and to any pronouncements the Court might make regarding this, such as the significance of special circumstances. Malta's emphasis that it was not concerned with the choice of a particular line of delimitation or the establishment of general principles between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Tunisia implied that the legal interest in question would concern matters that might be directly at issue between the parties, yet Malta had plainly stated that it did not intend to submit its own interest in matters to be decided between itself and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya or Tunisia.

The Court found, therefore, that the character of the intervention sought showed that Malta's interest of a legal nature could not be considered as one that might be affected by the decision in the case. To allow such intervention would leave the parties uncertain as to how far they should consider their own separate interests vis-à-vis Malta's involvement. In the view of the Court, a State seeking to intervene under Article 62 of the Statute was not entitled to place the parties to the case in such a position.

Judges Platon D. Morozov (USSR), Shigeru Oda (Japan) and Stephen M. Schwebel (United States appended separate opinions to the Judgment.

On 16 April, in response to the requests of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Tunisia to submit additional pleadings as envisaged in their Special

Agreement, the President of the Court fixed 15 July as the final date for the filing of replies.<sup>(2)</sup> After the filing of these replies within the specified time-limit, the Court held 24 sittings, from 16 September to 21 October, at which oral arguments were presented on behalf of the two parties.

Publications: Case concerning the Continental Shelf (Tunisia/Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Application by Malta for Permission to Intervene: <sup>(1)</sup>Judgment of 14 April 1981, I.C.J. Reports 1981, I.C.J. Sales No. 458; <sup>(2)</sup>Order of 16 April 1981, I.C.J. Reports 1981, I.C.J. Sales No. 459.

Yearbook references: <sup>(3)</sup>1978, p. 944; <sup>(4)</sup>1979, p. 1121; <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 1121.

United States diplomats  
in Iran (United States v. Iran)

By an Order of 12 May 1981, the President of the International Court of Justice recorded the discontinuance of the case of the United States diplomatic and consular staff in Teheran (United States v. Iran), following an agreement between the parties, and directed that the case be removed from the Court's list.<sup>(1)</sup>

Proceedings against Iran had been instituted by the United States in 1979 following the seizure of the United States Embassy in the Iranian capital, and the Court made an Order indicating preliminary measures, including the release of United States nationals detained in Iran.<sup>(2)</sup> In a Judgment of May 1980, the Court reserved its decision on the form and amount of reparation to be made by Iran.<sup>(3)</sup> By letters of 6 April and 1 May 1981, the United States informed the Court that, in view of commitments entered into by the two States at Algiers, Algeria, on 19 January, it wished all pending proceedings relating to its claims for reparation to be discontinued. The Government of Iran made no observation on the letters.

Following the release of the detained personnel, the United States informed the Secretary-General, by a letter of 19 January, that it considered that Iran had complied fully with the Court's 1980 Judgment (p. 239).

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Case concerning United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran (United States of America v. Iran), Order of 12 May 1981, I.C.J. Reports 1981, I.C.J. Sales No. 461.

Yearbook references: <sup>(2)</sup>1979, p. 1121; <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 1121.

Maritime boundary delimitation  
between Canada and the United States

On 25 November 1981, Canada and the United States notified the Court of a Special Agreement, concluded by them on 29 March 1979 and in force as at 20 November 1981, by which they had decided to submit to the Court a question on delimitation of the maritime boundary in the Gulf of Maine area dividing their fisheries zones and continental shelves. According to the Agreement,

a five-member chamber was to be constituted after consultation with the two States in accordance with Article 26 of the Court's Statute (see APPENDIX II). In a letter from both parties accompanying the submission of the case, the Court was also notified that Canada intended to choose a judge ad hoc to sit in the case, in accordance with Article 31 of the Statute.

In a letter of 18 December, the President requested the parties to provide further explanations or clarifications on several points.

Review of a judgement by  
the UN Administrative Tribunal

On 13 July 1981, the General Assembly's Committee on Applications for Review of Administrative Tribunal Judgements decided<sup>(4)</sup> to request the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion in regard to Judgement No. 273, delivered by the Tribunal in Geneva on 15 May in the case of Ivor Peter Mortished v. the Secretary-General.

By its judgement,<sup>(1)</sup> the Tribunal determined that the applicant in the case, Mr. Mortished, was entitled, by invoking an acquired right, to receive a repatriation grant under a provision of the Staff Rules which was no longer in force on the date of his separation from the United Nations Secretariat. The former rule provided for payment of a repatriation grant to all qualifying staff members, without requiring evidence of where they planned to settle following completion of United Nations service. This had been revised effective 1 January 1980 by a provision in a 1979 General Assembly resolution that no staff member would be entitled to any part of the grant unless evidence was provided of relocation away from the country of the last duty station.<sup>(5)</sup> The Tribunal ordered payment of compensation in the amount of the repatriation grant to which Mr. Mortished would have been entitled without evidence of relocation.

The question put to the Court by the Committee, on an application by the United States, was whether the Tribunal's judgement was warranted in determining that the Assembly resolution could not be given immediate effect in requiring, for the payment of repatriation grants, evidence of relocation to a country other than the country of the staff member's last duty station.

After the Court received the Committee's request on 28 July, the President, by an Order of 6 August,<sup>(2)</sup> fixed a time-limit of 30 October for the submission of written statements by the United Nations and its Member States. The time-limit was extended to 30 November by an Order of 8 October.<sup>(3)</sup> Statements were received from France and the United States, as well as from the United Nations on behalf of Mr. Mortished.

Administrative Tribunal judgement: <sup>(1)</sup>AT/DEC/273, *Mor-tished v. S-G*.  
 Publications: Application for Review of Judgement No. 273 of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal (Request for Advisory Opinion): <sup>(2)</sup>Order of 6 August 1981, I.C.J. Reports 1981, I.C.J. Sales No. 469. <sup>(3)</sup>Order of 8 October 1981, I.C.J. Reports 1981, I.C.J. Sales No. 470.  
 Report: <sup>(4)</sup>Committee on review of Administrative Tribunal judgements, A/AC.86/25.  
 Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>GA, 34/165, sect. II, para. 3, 17 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, P. p. 1170).

### Election of Judges

On 15 January 1981, the General Assembly and the Security Council held elections to fill vacancies in the International Court of Justice created by the deaths in 1980 of Judges Richard R. Baxter (United States) and Salah El Dine Tarazi (Syrian Arab Republic). Voting independently, they elected Stephen M. Schwebel (United States) to complete Judge Baxter's term of office, due to expire on 5 February 1988, and Abdallah Fikri El-Khani (Syrian Arab Republic) to complete Judge Tarazi's term, due to expire on 5 February 1985.<sup>(6)</sup>

The President of the Court, Sir Humphrey Waldock (United Kingdom), died on 15 August 1981. Following consultations among Security Council members, the Council President informed the Secretary-General, by a note verbale of 25 August,<sup>(4)</sup> that the Council saw no purpose in holding a special election to fill the resulting vacancy, as Sir Humphrey's seat was one of the five to be filled in the triennial elections to be held during the Assembly's 1981 regular session.

On 5 November, the Assembly and the Council, voting independently, elected five Judges for a nine-year term of office to replace the five whose terms were due to expire on 5 February 1982. On the basis of a list of 14 candidates nominated by national groups,<sup>(1)</sup> together with their *curricula vitae*,<sup>(2)</sup> Judges Nagendra Singh (India) and José Maria Ruda (Argentina) were re-elected, and Sir Robert Y. Jennings (United Kingdom), Guy Ladreit de Lacharrière (France) and Kéba M'Baye (Senegal) were elected to replace Sir Humphrey Waldock, André Gros (France) and Isaac Forster (Senegal).<sup>(7)</sup>

Judge Abdullah Ali El-Erian (Egypt) died on 12 December.<sup>(3)</sup> The Security Council, by a resolution prepared in consultations among Council members and adopted unanimously on 21 December, decided that elections to fill the vacancy would take place at meetings of the Council and of the resumed thirty-sixth session of the Assembly.<sup>(5)</sup> When suspending its thirty-

sixth session on 18 December, the Assembly included this matter in the list of items to be considered at the resumed session.

Notes and note verbale (nv): S-G, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/302/Rev.1.-S/14502/Rev.1, <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/303-S/14503 & Corr.1,2, <sup>(3)</sup>S/14799. <sup>(4)</sup>SC President, 25 Aug., A/36/451-S/14645 (nv).

Resolution and decisions: Res.: <sup>(5)</sup>SC:499(1981), 21 Dec., text following. Dec.: GA: <sup>(6)</sup>35/325, 15 Jan.; <sup>(7)</sup>36/309A, 5 Nov.; <sup>(8)</sup>36/461, item 15 (c), 18 Dec. (p.350).  
 Meeting records: GA: A/35/PV.100 (15 Jan.); A/36/PV.43, 48, 105 (2 Nov.-18 Dec.). SC: S/PV.2262 (15 Jan.), S/PV.2306,2321 (5 Nov., 21 Dec.).

Security Council resolution 499(1981)

Adopted unanimously Meeting 2321 21 December 1981  
 Draft prepared In consultations among Council members (S/14809).

The Security Council,

Noting with regret the death of Judge Abdullah El-Erian on 12 December 1981.

Noting further that a vacancy in the international Court of Justice for the remainder of the term of office of the deceased judge has thus occurred and must be filled in accordance with the terms of the Statute of the Court,

Noting that, in accordance with Article 14 of the Statute, the date of the elections to fill this vacancy shall be fixed by the Security Council,

Decides that elections to fill the vacancy shall take place at a meeting of the Security Council and at a meeting of the General Assembly at its resumed thirty-sixth session.

### Report of the Court

On 17 December 1981, by a decision<sup>(1)</sup> adopted without vote on an oral proposal by its President, the General Assembly took note of the report of the International Court of Justice for the period 1 August 1980 to 31 July 1981.<sup>(2)</sup>

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/439, 17 Dec., text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>ICJ, A/36/4.

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.103 (17 Dec.)

Publications: Pleadings, Oral Arguments, Documents, Western Sahara, vol. I: Request for Advisory Opinion, Written Statements and Documents, I.C.J. Sales No. 444; vol. II: Written Statements and Documents. I.C.J. Sales No. 450; vol. III: Written Statements and Documents (concluded), I.C.J. Sales No. 462; vol. IV: Oral Statements, I.C.J. Sales No. 464; vol. V: Oral Statements (concluded) and Correspondence, I.C.J. Sales No. 465. International Court of Justice Yearbook 1980-1981, No. 35, I.C.J. Sales No. 467. International Court of Justice: Reports of Judgments, Advisory Opinions and Orders, Index 1981, I.C.J. Sales No. 474. Bibliography of the International Court of Justice, No. 35 1981, I.C.J. Sales No. 481.

General Assembly decision 36/439

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by Assembly President; agenda Item 13.

Report of the International Court of Justice

At its 103rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1981, the General Assembly took note of the report of the International Court of Justice.

## Chapter II

## Legal aspects of international political relations

During 1981, the General Assembly acted to ensure that work would progress on a number of legal texts designed to improve various aspects of international political relations. It decided that work should continue towards drafting a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations;<sup>(1)</sup> requested finalization of the text known as the draft Manila declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes;<sup>(5)</sup> invited the International Law Commission (ILC) to resume work on the 1954 draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind;<sup>(3)</sup> decided that the drafting of an international convention against mercenaries should continue;<sup>(2)</sup> and recommended that ILC carry on drafting articles on the law of the non-navigational uses of international watercourses (p. 1222).<sup>(6)</sup>

The ongoing issue of international terrorism was also addressed by the Assembly when it re-endorsed recommendations to eliminate the problem.<sup>(4)</sup>

Other aspects of international peace and security were also dealt with by the Assembly in 1981. It adopted a Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States; considered the implementation of the 1970 Declaration on international security and the 1978 Declaration on societies and peace; sought to develop good-neighbourliness between States; and reviewed the Organization's peace-keeping operations (p. 140).

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>36/31, 13 Nov. (p. 1207); <sup>(2)</sup>36/76, 4 Dec. (p. 1218); <sup>(3)</sup>36/106, 10 Dec. (p. 1214); <sup>(4)</sup>36/109, 10 Dec. (p. 1221) <sup>(5)</sup>36/110, 10 Dec. (p. 1211); <sup>(6)</sup>36/114, para. 3 (b) (iii), 10 Dec. (p. 1265).

## Non-use of force

In 1981, the General Assembly decided that its Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations should continue drafting a world treaty on that principle. However, opinions remained divided among Member States regarding the treaty's desirability and on the Committee's mandate.

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.** Responding to a 1980 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(5)</sup> the 35-member Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations-

established in 1977<sup>(4)</sup> to consider suggestions towards drafting a world treaty on that principle-met at United Nations Headquarters from 23 March to 17 April 1981 and submitted a report on its work to the Assembly.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Committee had before it a draft world treaty on the non-use of force submitted in 1976 by the USSR;<sup>(8)</sup> a working paper put forward in 1979 by Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom;<sup>(9)</sup> and a 1980 working paper from 10 non-aligned countries (Benin, Cyprus, Egypt, India, Iraq, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Senegal, Uganda).<sup>(10)</sup> Also before the Committee were comments by Algeria, Brazil, Mexico, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Suriname, submitted in reply to a renewed invitation by the Assembly in 1980 for States' observations.<sup>(5)</sup> These comments, as well as those of Czechoslovakia, were forwarded to the Assembly by the Secretary-General in September 1981.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Committee re-established a Working Group open to all Committee members-which held 12 meetings between 1 and 13 April-to resume consideration of the working paper submitted by the non-aligned States. The Group, which had the same officers as the Committee, discussed the paper and, on 13 April, received a revised text from the same States; many delegations refrained from comment due to time constraints.

The revised text defined the use or threat of force, prohibited its use or threat, listed its various forms and set forth the principle of non-recognition of the consequences that ensued from the use or threat of force. The text also elaborated the responsibilities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and security and the duty of States to assist the Organization; dealt with exceptions where force was justified; and covered the principles needed to create an atmosphere of trust.

According to the sponsors, the revised text dealt with the substance of the issue and left aside, for the time being, the question of the form of the instrument to be prepared. The text was not final, nor intended to replace the two other proposals, but was designed to aid the process of dialogue.

The Committee approved the Working Group's report on 17 April but, since the Committee had not completed its work, it generally



recognized the desirability of further consideration of the questions before it. While the majority favoured renewing the Committee's mandate, some members did not; others thought that it should be reviewed.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 13 November, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(6)</sup> on the Special Committee's report, by which it decided that the Committee should continue work on drafting, as soon as possible, a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations as well as the peaceful settlement of disputes or any other recommendations as it deemed appropriate. The Committee was requested to consider thoroughly all proposals submitted to it for that purpose and invited to report to the Assembly in 1982. The Assembly also invited other comments from Governments.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 113 to 15, with 10 abstentions. On 21 October, the Sixth (Legal) Committee had approved the draft, sponsored by 31 States and introduced by Mongolia, by a recorded vote of 87 to 15, with 9 abstentions.

The non-use of force in international relations was also among the duties of States defined in the Assembly's Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, adopted on 9 December.<sup>(7)</sup> It was defined as the duty of States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any form to violate another State's boundaries, disrupt its political, social or economic order, overthrow or change its political system, cause international tension or deprive peoples of their national identity and cultural heritage.

The Special Committee Chairman, introducing that body's report in the Sixth Committee, said some progress had been achieved in 1981 although the philosophical approaches to the topic had not changed. Some States felt it unnecessary to add to the Charter of the United Nations, since Article 2, paragraph 4, prohibited the use of force in international relations. Others believed that the Charter required further elaboration and that a world treaty on the non-use of force was necessary. Many States had urged focusing on the problem of enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force, without deciding for the time being on the nature of the document to be finalized. In that spirit, a number of non-aligned States had submitted useful proposals in 1980 and 1981 to clarify and develop the Charter's provisions on the subject, the Chairman said.

A number of States explained their opposition to the proposed treaty, with several, including France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy,

the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, pointing out that the prohibition of the use of force already figured in Article 2 (4) of the Charter. These States, together with China, generally saw the revised text submitted by the non-aligned countries as a basis for the Special Committee's future work but were unable to accept all the principles enunciated.

For Canada, the solution to violations of the non-use of force did not lie in restating principles, but in a study of means that could be used to strengthen United Nations machinery for maintenance of peace and security. The Netherlands said Assembly declarations contained sufficient guidance on the non-use of force; it favoured other approaches such as more active United Nations work to reduce tensions. Japan said that, since not all Member States would become parties to the treaty, discrepancies would arise relating to obligations, thereby leading to conflicts. France cautioned that a smaller number of parties would restrict the scope of a Charter rule which it regarded as an obligation valid for all States in all circumstances. Italy said that the text of the proposed treaty overlooked the indissoluble link between the principle of non-use of force and that of peaceful settlement of disputes—a point also stressed by the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan. The United States felt that, if a treaty reproduced Charter provisions, it would undermine the binding nature of existing Charter obligations; if it departed from those provisions, the treaty would create differences of interpretation; and if it differed materially from the Charter, it would be an improper attempt to circumvent provisions relating to Charter amendments. Japan and Sweden spoke in like manner. Sweden added that, although it could support a text on ways to improve collective security and promote peaceful settlement of disputes, it could not accept legalizing armed struggle.

China rejected the 1976 USSR draft as an attempt to cover up that country's illegal use of force.

Those which spoke in favour of elaborating a treaty, including the Eastern European States and several of the draft resolution's sponsors, said the USSR draft and a number of provisions contained in the non-aligned countries' revised working paper provided sufficient basis for preparing a document in accordance with the will of the majority. The USSR said recent developments in international relations, including increased armed conflicts, had rendered more obvious the need to prepare a world treaty based on its draft, taking account of the other papers.

Algeria, Bangladesh, the Congo, Democratic Yemen, Ghana, Nigeria, Suriname, Tunisia,

Yemen, Zaire and Zambia were among those which saw the revised working paper as the foundation for future work in the Special Committee. The Syrian Arab Republic said that paper's definition of the non-use of force was clearer than that contained in the Charter.

Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, Nicaragua, Peru, Viet Nam, Yemen and Zambia believed that a treaty would be a step towards improving the universal political climate and maintaining international peace and security. Uruguay said it supported any initiative which reaffirmed the principles of peaceful coexistence. Argentina and Chile spoke in like manner.

Hungary, Mexico, Suriname, Venezuela and Zaire favoured elaborating Charter Article 2 (4) through codification of the principle of non-use of force in a treaty. Kuwait spoke in similar vein. Somalia said that principle was the corner-stone of international relations which could not, however, stand isolated. Guyana believed a world treaty would not only be a definitive elaboration of Article 2 (4), but would also clarify the application of Article 51 on the right of self-defence. Afghanistan pointed out that Article 13 envisaged progressive development of international law and its codification. The Ukrainian SSR spoke in like manner. Romania believed the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes was closely linked to the non-use of force but, since the two were distinct, they should be codified separately. Bulgaria said it was time for the Special Committee to elaborate a legal instrument. Chile said it would support any such instrument the Committee might adopt provided it was not used as propaganda to achieve contrary objectives. Algeria, Bangladesh and Uganda said a treaty would supplement, not infringe on, Charter provisions. Tunisia believed a treaty would help ensure compliance with Charter principles, while Ecuador said the Charter's effectiveness would be enhanced. Jamaica pointed out that, in the event of a treaty conflicting with the Charter, Article 103 of the latter document stipulated that the Charter would prevail. Madagascar said it was essential, in elaborating a treaty, not to disregard the contribution of the non-aligned countries, which had produced a corpus of the norms and rules of conduct on international relations based on peaceful coexistence.

Mexico, although not opposed to an international treaty, favoured exploring other possibilities, such as a declaration by the General Assembly, a suggestion also supported by Jamaica. For the Congo, a declaration would not be satisfactory since there already existed a Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among

States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

Egypt, joined by Cyprus, India and Morocco in stressing that the working paper was not final, hoped that a synthesis of the other papers would be made. The Bahamas also felt points commanding general agreement should be identified. Brazil believed it would be useful to compile a comparative table showing all papers and Governments' written comments. Such a comparison was also suggested by the Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR and Yugoslavia. Cuba thought the USSR text and that of the non-aligned countries should be analysed and combined. Pakistan called for a study of the replies received from Member States before any decision was taken on whether to finalize a draft treaty. Sierra Leone proposed that all instruments regulating the use of force in international relations should be compiled and examined in the light of contemporary relations.

Several States, including Algeria, Iraq and the Ukrainian SSR, said they could not understand arguments against the proposed instrument and believed that the real problem was a lack of political will.

Opposition to the Special Committee's mandate was expressed by a number of delegations. The member States of the European Community (EC) thought it was not clear. The United Kingdom said it gave too much prominence to a world treaty. Australia and Japan felt the mandate should be changed and the latter suggested deleting the reference to drafting a treaty and limiting the Committee to making recommendations. Albania, speaking in the Assembly and not participating in either vote, said it was against renewing the mandate since no satisfactory results could be achieved because the Special Committee's activities were being hindered by the super-Powers.

Iraq expressed surprise that the Special Committee's mandate continued to be questioned when it represented a compromise, sufficiently flexible to allow the Committee to continue its substantive work. Thailand believed the mandate should be broader and not necessarily limited to culminating in a world treaty. Finland thought it appropriate that the Committee had considered ways of promoting peaceful settlement of disputes. Algeria and Brazil felt the mandate should be more specific. Egypt, the German Democratic Republic and the Syrian Arab Republic also urged its extension so that the draft treaty might be concluded as soon as possible. Speaking similarly, Mongolia pointed out that the majority of Committee members were genuinely interested in fulfilling the mandate. Turkey, not sharing some positions in the non-

aligned countries' paper, felt the mandate should be extended in order to explore the reasons for the frequent use of force in international relations—a point also voiced by Sierra Leone. Argentina, though not opposed to an extension, said it would be surprising if a draft were to be accepted since many Special Committee members lacked the will to accept a text they had not sponsored. Ecuador and Romania said the Committee should be careful not to overlap the work of others.

A large number of States supported extension of the mandate of the Special Committee and efforts to secure observance of the principle of non-use of force but stressed the need to concentrate on substantive work, leaving a decision on the nature of the instrument to be prepared to the future. Such a view was expressed by, among others, Brazil, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Morocco, Nepal, Peru, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

A number of States explained their votes in the Sixth Committee.

Speaking for the 10 members of EC, which had either voted negatively or abstained, the United Kingdom said they could not support the draft because it emphasized the treaty's early conclusion, which would weaken fundamental Charter provisions—a position also voiced by Norway<sup>1</sup> and Spain to explain their negative votes. Israel and Japan, voting against, said that, since there had been no changes of substance in the text, there was no reason to modify their previous positions. The United States saw the draft as of little use and harmful.

China abstained since the text did not sufficiently reflect the need for the Special Committee to base its work on the non-aligned countries' revised working paper. Australia, also abstaining, pointed out that the draft had not changed the Special Committee's mandate.

Tunisia stressed that its vote in favour did not imply support for any political position. Brazil, voting likewise, said the text gave hope that the Committee might attend to positive work.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on non-use of force in international relations, A/36/41; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/415.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>2625(XXV), annex, 24 Oct. 1970 (YUN 1970, 789); <sup>(4)</sup>32/150, 19 Dec. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 118); <sup>(5)</sup>35/50, 4 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 179); <sup>(6)</sup>36/31, 13 Nov. 1981, text following;

<sup>(7)</sup>36/103, annex, para. 2 II (a), 9 Dec. (p. 148).

Yearbook references: <sup>(8)</sup>1976, p. 105; <sup>(9)</sup>1979, p. 153; <sup>(10)</sup>1980, p. 174.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.6/36/L.4/Add.1; 5th Committee report, A/36/656; S-G statements, A/C.5/36/27, A/C.6/36/L.4 Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36SR.2, 7-16, 27-29 (22 Sep.-23 Oct.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.32 (5 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.57 (13 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/31

113-15-10 (recorded vote) Meeting 57 13 November 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/649) by recorded vote (87-15-9), 21 October (meeting 27); 31-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.3/Rev.1); agenda item 116.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, India, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

#### Report of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 31/9 of 8 November 1976, in which it invited Member States to examine further the draft World Treaty on the Non-Use of Force in International Relations, as well as other proposals made during the consideration of this item.

Recalling also its resolution 32/150 of 19 December 1977, by which it established the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations,

Recalling, in particular, its resolutions 33/96 of 16 December 1978, 34/13 of 9 November 1979 and 35/50 of 4 December 1980, in which it decided that the Special Committee should continue its work,

Recalling further the important contribution made by the non-aligned countries to the work of the Special Committee, which resulted in the presentation of their working paper on the subject during the session of the Special Committee in 1981,

Having considered the report of the Special Committee.

Taking into account that the Special Committee has not completed the mandate entrusted to it.

Reaffirming the need for universal and effective application of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations and for assistance by the United Nations in this endeavour,

Expressing the hope that the Special Committee will, on the basis of the proposals before it, complete the mandate entrusted to it as soon as possible,

1. Takes note of the report of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations;

2. Decides that the Special Committee shall continue its work with the goal of drafting, at the earliest possible date, a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations as well as the peaceful settlement of disputes or such other recommendations as the Committee deems appropriate;

3. Requests the Special Committee to consider thoroughly, and to take duly into account, the proposals submitted to it with a view to ensuring a successful completion of its mandate;

4. Requests the Special Committee to take due account of the efforts made by the non-aligned countries during the Committee's session in 1981 to facilitate the organization of the work of the Committee;

5. Invites the Governments that have not yet done so to communicate their comments or suggestions or to bring them up to date, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/9;

6. Requests the Special Committee to be mindful of the importance of reaching general agreement whenever that has significance for the outcome of its work;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Special Committee with the necessary facilities and services;

8. Invites the Special Committee to submit a report on its work to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

9. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Report of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations".

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, China, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Ireland, New Zealand, Samoa, Sweden, Turkey.

### Dispute settlement

Work continued in 1981 on a draft declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes, with first the General Assembly's Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization and then its Sixth Committee formulating parts of the text, elements of which were not finally agreed upon. The Assembly, therefore, requested the Special Committee to finalize the draft and submit it to the Assembly in 1982.

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE CHARTER. The peaceful settlement of international disputes was one of two main questions considered by the 47-member Committee on the Charter at its 1981 session, held at United Nations Headquarters from 17 February to 14 March. The other topic was a list of proposals regarding the maintenance of international peace and security (p. 1235). In May, the Committee submitted its report on these questions to the General Assembly.<sup>(1)</sup>

A Working Group, open to all Committee members and established to consider both questions, had before it several papers which had been submitted to the Committee's 1980 (Manila, Philippines) session but were not examined due to lack of time.<sup>(9)</sup> These documents were: a second revised draft declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes-known as the draft Manila declaration-presented by Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Indonesia, Nigeria, the Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone and Tunisia; a United States working paper containing a questionnaire to Member States on why they were not fully using existing machinery for peaceful settlement; and a proposed outline, by France, of a handbook on the peaceful settlement of disputes which covered a definition of various set-

tlement methods, legal instruments containing commitments to such settlement, advance and ad hoc commitments, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, the enforcement of the award and recourse procedures.

In elaborating the draft Manila declaration, the Working Group based its deliberations on: the 1980 second revised version, taking into account oral suggestions made at the Manila session; the report of the Working Group on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, established by the Assembly's Sixth Committee in 1980 to work towards a declaration; and proposals made in that Committee's 1980 debate.

The Group reached general agreement on the paragraphs on peaceful settlement by regional arrangements or agencies, on the duty to refrain from any action which might aggravate the situation and make peaceful settlement more difficult, and on prohibiting the use or threat of force by parties to a dispute.

Other paragraphs generally agreed upon in principle included those on the duty to settle international disputes by peaceful means, on the principle of free choice of means of peaceful settlement and its relationship with the sovereign equality of States, on the means of such settlement, on referral of the dispute to the Security Council in case of failure of previous peaceful means, and on special agreements or treaty provisions for peaceful settlement.

Although general agreement was also reached on the paragraph on implementing in good faith all aspects of agreed terms of settlement, alternative formulations were proposed.

No agreement was reached on three paragraphs referring to principles to be observed, international tribunals, and liberation movements.

Concerning the principles to be observed in dispute settlement, some States considered it imprudent and irrelevant to list them in a paragraph, while others considered such a paragraph indispensable and called for its improvement by devising appropriate wording for each principle. Still others felt it preferable to replace entirely the enunciation of principles by a reference to those in the 1970 Declaration on friendly relations,<sup>(4)</sup> a reference which, in the view of yet others, should be supplemented by a phrase, "and other pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly".

As to the paragraph stressing the importance of international tribunals as a means of peaceful settlement, some States supported its retention while others maintained that it was incorrect and at odds with the principle of free choice of means. Among those States defending the paragraph, there were also differing views. One proposed new wording to limit its scope to States

parties to treaties establishing such tribunals while others proposed drafting changes.

On the applicability of the declaration to certain peoples exercising their right to self-determination and independence, some States opposed this paragraph; they felt its subject-matter was unrelated to the declaration's purposes since the status of liberation movements and States differed entirely. Others, citing recent history, supported inclusion of the paragraph on the ground that such movements could be involved in a dispute threatening international peace and security; nevertheless, the text should be reworded so as to refer to peoples subjected to colonial or racist domination or apartheid and mentioned in the 1970 Declaration on friendly relations rather than to authentic representatives of a people recognized by the respective regional organization and by the United Nations. It was also proposed that the paragraph cover hegemonism as well as peoples subjected to any other form of alien domination, that it clearly state with regard to the aforementioned category of peoples their inalienable right to participate fully and equally in any process of peaceful settlement of disputes to which they were parties, and that it be drafted in a negative form and refer first to peoples generally and then particularly to those subjected to colonial or racist domination or apartheid.

No general agreement was reached on a proposal aimed at encouraging States to use direct negotiations more frequently to settle disputes peacefully.

In the section on the role of the United Nations, two paragraphs were generally agreed upon in principle: that stressing States' duty to make use of United Nations Charter provisions on pacific settlement of disputes, and that dealing with the attitude of States vis-à-vis recommendations of the General Assembly and the Security Council concerning such settlement.

Although there was also general agreement on retaining the paragraph on the Assembly's role in the peaceful settlement of disputes, broad differences existed as to the paragraph's exact scope. One view maintained that the original text was not fully in line with the Charter's general structure, particularly the relationship between the Assembly and the Council in peaceful dispute settlement. It was held that the text was a political appeal to increase the Assembly's role in settling disputes and should be reformulated in strict accordance with the Charter. Another view was that this paragraph accurately reflected the balance between the powers of the two bodies since the draft declaration followed the Charter's order of reference, which enunciated first in Articles 11, 12 and 14 the Assembly's

role and only afterwards, in Chapter VI, explained the Council's role; changing that order would disregard the Charter's structure. A further viewpoint was that, although the Assembly had residual power or secondary responsibility in peaceful settlement if the Council failed to exercise responsibility, it was not for the Assembly to act.

The remaining paragraphs on the United Nations role were not considered by the Working Group for lack of time. Neither were the preamble and provisions of the section on final clauses, although proposals were presented on those provisions. However, there was general agreement that the text of the paragraph on the principle of exhaustion of local remedies should be included in the preamble and that safeguard clauses on the lawful uses of force in accordance with the Charter and on the rights and duties of States and the functions and powers of United Nations organs under the Charter should be put in the final clauses section.

In view of the progress made on the draft Manila declaration, the Special Committee suggested that the Assembly establish a Working Group to finalize the text.

**SIXTH COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP CONSIDERATION.** Acting on the Special Committee's suggestion, the Assembly's Sixth Committee established a Working Group which held 15 meetings between 1 October and 27 November.<sup>(3)</sup> The Group started where the Special Committee's Working Group had left off.

Concerning the section on the United Nations role, the Group worked out three paragraphs. There was general agreement on the role of the Security Council in dispute settlement. This text stated that Member States should strengthen the Council's role and be fully aware of their obligation to refer to it disputes not settled by other means. It invited them to encourage the Council to review situations likely to endanger international peace and security and to hold informal consultations; to consider making greater use of the Council's fact-finding capacity; to encourage the Council to consider the increased use of observer and other missions with the consent of the State concerned; to bear in mind the Council's power to recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment; and to encourage it to act without delay, particularly in cases where disputes developed into armed conflicts.

Regarding the paragraph dealing with the role of the International Court of Justice, only two subparagraphs were worked out. General agreement was reached on a reference to States' adding to treaties clauses providing for the submission to the Court of disputes arising from the

interpretation or application of such treaties. It was agreed that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred to the Court since it was the United Nations' Principal judicial organ.

In the paragraph dealing with the role of the Secretary-General, the Group agreed on wording referring to his right to bring to the Security Council's attention any matter which, in his opinion, might threaten international peace and security. However, no agreement was reached on language to encourage the Secretary-General to make full use of his office's authority, acquire information, ascertain facts, visit States with their consent and report to the Council or the Assembly on measures thus taken.

On the section on final provisions, the Group worked out and generally agreed on five paragraphs: compliance in good faith with the declaration's provisions, safeguards on Charter provisions and States' rights and duties, safeguards on the rights of peoples under colonial and racist domination, the desirability of a general treaty on peaceful settlement, and the need for further efforts on peaceful settlement codification.

The Group also worked out the declaration's preamble, consisting of 12 paragraphs, three of which were not agreed upon.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 10 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(a)</sup> by which it called again on States to settle their international disputes by peaceful means and requested the Special Committee to finalize the draft Manila declaration for the Assembly's consideration and adoption, and to submit it to the Assembly's 1982 regular session.

The resolution was adopted without vote. On 1 December, the Sixth Committee had approved the draft, sponsored by 41 States and introduced by Romania, in the same manner.

The Assembly reiterated its request to the Special Committee in an 11 December resolution on that body's work<sup>(7)</sup> and also asked the Committee to continue considering proposals it had listed in 1979.<sup>(8)</sup>

The question of dispute settlement was considered by the Sixth Committee concurrently with the Special Committee's report. The Sixth Committee also had before it Venezuela's views on a declaration on the topic,<sup>(2)</sup> submitted in response to a 1980 Assembly request.<sup>(5)</sup> Supporting the concept, Venezuela believed in incorporating "co-operation among States" in the declaration, stressed the Assembly's role as the main United Nations organ in dispute settlement and urged that any reference to the International Court of Justice should be in broad, clear terms if it were to be accepted by countries having constitutional difficulties in agreeing to compulsory submission of disputes to that body.

During the Sixth Committee debate, a number of States, including Algeria, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Italy, Japan, Romania, Sierra Leone, Yugoslavia and Zaire, lamented the Special Committee's slow progress on the draft declaration, with several asserting that the Committee had encountered diversionary tactics and artificial difficulties. Ecuador and the Philippines noted the slow progress despite the draft's being little more than a restatement of Charter principles; the latter added it was contemplating, in conjunction with others, introducing a proposal for more adequate machinery for voluntary use in peaceful dispute settlement.

The United Kingdom felt slow progress was inevitable as there were deep-seated differences of view as to the scope and interpretation of the Charter. The United States said rivalry between those wishing to devote time to dispute settlement and those wishing to study the question of maintenance of international peace and security had hampered progress; a useful declaration could be achieved only if the draft were confined to the subject of peaceful settlement. Italy said the Special Committee's following session should be the final deadline for completion of the draft. However, Argentina cautioned against establishing a time-frame, since the text had to be prepared carefully in order to stand the test of time. Greece shared this viewpoint.

Some States felt there had been progress in the Committee's work. They included Australia, the Bahamas, Ethiopia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Mongolia, New Zealand, the Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Tunisia and Uganda.

Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the USSR and Viet Nam stressed that a declaration should be based on the principle of sovereign equality of States and the free choice of the means of settlement. Depriving States of the right to choose a particular means of dispute settlement was incompatible with Charter provisions, they said. They were also against imposing compulsory means, particularly third-party settlement such as arbitration or jurisdiction by the International Court of Justice. Poland said international arbitrators or judges, despite their commitment to impartiality, were often unable to dissociate themselves from political or other prejudices. Viet Nam said it did not rule out a possible third-party role, however, particularly if it was to be a respected international organization. For those States and Democratic Yemen, direct negotiations between the parties afforded the most important, effective and flexible means of settlement. Peru pointed

out that legislation of the Latin American countries opposed mandatory submission to tribunals outside national jurisdiction.

On the other hand, a number of States favoured referring disputes to other bodies and felt that the principle of free choice of means was secondary and subordinate to the fundamental principle of peaceful settlement.

Greece pointed out that direct negotiation had frequently not resolved international disputes and sometimes had been accompanied by pressures favouring the stronger party; submitting disputes to a third party did not violate the sovereignty of States, since that act was often voluntary. Australia said that, while it attached particular importance to third-party settlement, it was not always the best method. Tunisia recalled one of the first Court judgments in which it was stated that the capacity to enter into international commitments was precisely one of the attributes of State sovereignty. Turkey pointed out that, according to the Court, the obligation to negotiate was simply one particular application of a basic principle in all international relations. Jamaica said those not ready to resort to arbitration or to the Court should be urged to use one of the other means specified in Charter Article 33.

Some delegations, among them Egypt, Romania and Sierra Leone, pointed out that one basic element of the declaration was the commitment to enhance the role of the principal organs of the United Nations, such as the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Secretary-General, in the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Others, including the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said they were opposed to altering the delicate balance of power between the Organization's main organs, in violation of the Charter, since the Security Council was the only organ empowered to investigate disputes and to recommend methods of adjustment or terms of settlement.

Romania believed that the declaration should be only the first step towards the elaboration and adoption of a treaty that would oblige all States to settle their disputes by peaceful means, codify the principles and norms regarding the peaceful settlement of disputes and lay down specific modalities to that end. Ecuador saw the declaration as not only contributing to interpretation of Charter principles, but also as a positive expression of the progressive development of international law. Uruguay said that only those lacking confidence in their own cause feared the rule of international law. New Zealand cautioned that any commentary on Charter provisions should

take into account their subtlety, seek to enrich them and enhance the effectiveness of their practical implementation by United Nations organs; it must avoid the danger of having a restrictive effect.

Several States drew attention to particular provisions in the draft text. Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen and the German Democratic Republic were among those which felt that reference should be made to the right of peoples living under foreign, colonial or racial domination to participate in peaceful settlement of disputes. That view was shared by China which said the principle of equality and mutual benefit, which it saw as indivisible, should be included in that part referring to settling disputes on the basis of sovereign equality and in accordance with free choice of means. Morocco felt the principle of self-defence should be reaffirmed in the substantive part of the declaration. Somalia said the text should take sufficiently into account that dispute settlement between two or more States must necessarily be accepted by all concerned parties if it was to be considered a real peaceful settlement, and should also stipulate the obligation to resort to peaceful means. The United Arab Emirates endorsed the view that the Charter be seen as an obligation.

France announced that it had agreed to postponing discussion on its proposed handbook only in order that the draft Manila declaration could be given priority. However, the idea of a handbook was welcomed by Egypt, Guyana, India, Israel and Sierra Leone. Israel also suggested that consideration be given to combining the handbook with earlier Secretariat surveys on treaty provisions for pacific dispute settlement. Egypt and France were among those also expressing support for the United States proposal on a questionnaire.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Charter and role of United Nations, A/36/33; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/447; <sup>(3)</sup>Working Group, A/C.6/36/L.19.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>2625(XXV), annex, 24 Oct. 1970 (YUN 1970, p.789); <sup>(5)</sup>35/160, para. 6, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p.194); <sup>(6)</sup>36/110, 10 Dec. 1981 text following; <sup>(7)</sup>36/122, paras. 5 & 6, 11 Dec. (p. 1239).

Yearbook references: <sup>(8)</sup>1979,p.160; <sup>(9)</sup>1980,p.189.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36SR.26. 28-35, 37, 38, 57, 59, 64(21 Oct.-1 Dec.); plenary; A/36/PV.92(10Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/110

Adopted without vote Meeting 92 10 December 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/778) without vote. 1 December (meeting 64); 41 -nation draft (A/C.36/L.11); agenda item 118.

Sponsors: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guinea, Indonesia, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Peaceful settlement of disputes between States

The General Assembly,

Having examined the item entitled "Peaceful settlement of disputes between States",

Deeply concerned about the continuation of conflict situations and the emergence of new sources of disputes and tensions in international life, and especially about the growing tendency to resort to force or the threat of force and to intervention in internal affairs, and about the escalation of the arms race, which gravely endanger the independence and security of States, as well as international peace and security,

Taking into account the need to exert utmost efforts in order to settle any situations and disputes between States exclusively by peaceful means and to avoid any military action and hostilities, which can only make more difficult the solution of existing problems.

Also taking into account the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations concerning the peaceful settlement of disputes between States.

Considering that the adoption of a declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes between States could contribute to the elimination of the danger of recourse to force or the threat of force and, therefore, to the strengthening of international peace and security,

Taking note of the reports of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization and of the Working Group on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes,

Taking note also of the progress made in the Special Committee and in the Working Group in the elaboration of the draft Manila declaration on the peaceful settlement of international disputes;

Taking into account the opinions expressed during the examination at its thirty-sixth session of the question of the peaceful settlement of disputes between States,

1. Calls again upon all States to adhere strictly in their international relations to the principle that States shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered;

2. Considers that the question of the peaceful settlement of disputes should represent one of the central concerns for States and that, to this end, the efforts for examining and further developing the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes between States and the means of consolidating its full observance by all States in their international relations should be continued;

3. Considers also that the elaboration, as soon as possible, of a declaration of the General Assembly on the peaceful settlement of international disputes is likely to enhance the observance of the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes and to contribute to the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in preventing conflicts and settling them peacefully;

4. Requests the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization to finalize the draft Manila declaration on the peaceful settlement of international disputes with a view to its consideration and adoption by the General Assembly, and to submit it to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

5. Refers to the Special Committee the report of its Working Group on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, as well as the views expressed at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly on the contents of the declaration;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Peaceful settlement of disputes between States".

#### Draft code of offences against peace and security

In 1981, the General Assembly invited the International Law Commission (ILC) to resume work on the draft Code of Offences against the Peace

and Security of Mankind. Prepared by ILC in 1954<sup>(9)</sup> in response to a 1947 Assembly resolution,<sup>(3)</sup> the draft Code defined offences which were crimes under international law and for which the responsible individual was to be punished. By the same 1947 resolution, ILC had also been directed to formulate the principles of international law recognized in the Charter of the Nürnberg Tribunal and in the judgment of the Tribunal, before which the Nazi war crimes trials were held after the Second World War.

While the majority of Member States favoured resuming work on the Code, differing opinions were expressed as to which forum should be utilized for that purpose, on the priority to be given the topic, on the question of responsibility for offences and on the prospects for agreement on a code.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 10 December 1981, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(8)</sup> by which it invited ILC to resume its work with a view to elaborating the 1954 draft Code and to examine it with the required priority in order to review it, taking into account the results achieved by the progressive development of international law. The Commission was requested to consider the draft Code and to report to the Assembly in 1982 on the priority it accorded the draft and on a possible preliminary report to the Assembly in 1983 bearing, inter alia, on the draft's scope and structure. The Assembly decided to consider the subject in 1982 and requested the Secretary-General to reiterate an invitation to Member States and international intergovernmental organizations to present or update their comments on the draft and report in 1982.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 129 to none, with 17 abstentions. On 4 December, the Sixth Committee had approved the draft, sponsored by 19 countries and introduced by Zaire, by a recorded vote of 89 to none, with 17 abstentions.

The Committee had before it a report by the Secretary-General<sup>(2)</sup> containing the comments of nine Member States and the Council of Europe, received in reply to a request in a 1980 Assembly resolution,<sup>(7)</sup> and an analytical paper, prepared by the Secretary-General<sup>(1)</sup> pursuant to the same resolution, reflecting the oral and written views of States and the comments of international organizations.

Explaining their votes in the Sixth Committee, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom (both abstaining), Bangladesh and Sweden, the latter on behalf of the Nordic States (all in favour), said ILC should not be invited to give the topic priority over its other work. Mexico (in favour) would have preferred



such a reference deleted since it felt it more logical to determine whether the Commission's work programme would be adversely affected. Brazil (in favour) said it was somewhat cryptic to invite ILC to resume work on elaborating the draft Code, while requesting it to consider the question.

Turkey and the United States (both abstaining), together with Bangladesh and Mexico, could not see the purpose of including in the Assembly's 1982 agenda an item already referred to ILC. The United Kingdom also saw no justification for that action, while Italy (abstaining) wondered whether the sponsors' real intention was to upset the Commission's order of priority.

The Netherlands (abstaining) and the United Kingdom saw little prospect for agreement on a draft code since views on its political and legal aspects were too divergent; the former said it was inappropriate to continue legal studies on the question. Italy, questioning the advisability of considering a controversial draft whose purpose was not clearly defined, was joined by Turkey in pointing to the heavy work-load of ILC. In view of that work-load, said Mexico, it would have been better to entrust the subject to a working group at the Assembly's 1982 session.

During the debate in the Sixth Committee, the majority of States favoured resuming substantive work on the draft Code and said the Commission's 1954 text constituted a good basis for this.

Nevertheless, Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, Mongolia, Pakistan, Poland and the USSR considered that the 1954 draft needed to be updated and supplemented in the light of the progressive development of international law since then. They felt that in the final stage of the draft's preparation account should be taken of such documents, among others, as the Assembly's 1970 Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,<sup>(4)</sup> the 1973 International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly's 1974 Definition of Aggression<sup>(6)</sup> and the 1977 Additional Protocols to the 1949 Geneva Conventions concerning respect for human rights in armed conflicts. The USSR urged that the part dealing with breaches of obligations of States concerning disarmament should also reflect provisions of relevant international legal instruments.

The German Democratic Republic and Hungary said a USSR proposal to declare the first use of nuclear weapons the gravest crime against

humanity (p. 42) was of capital importance to future work on the text. This position was also voiced by Bulgaria.

Portugal, expressing doubts about the definition of acts of aggression contained in the draft Code, said it was essential that the nature of offences envisaged be clearly defined. Algeria pointed out that the Code should not be a mere compilation of offences and should be applicable only to internationally unlawful acts of exceptional seriousness causing substantial damage; such as genocide, apartheid aggression and colonialism. Bangladesh hoped the Code would cover hijacking and grave offences against diplomats. Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic said it should prohibit propaganda for war and hatred against other nationalities and races. The Byelorussian SSR stressed that the Code should not impinge on the right of peoples to struggle for their independence against colonialism, aggression, racism and apartheid—a view shared by Yugoslavia, which emphasized that it should prevent the use of force, interference in States' internal affairs and international terrorism, as well as threats to world peace caused by uncontrolled use of scientific and technological advances, particularly for military purposes.

Argentina, Bangladesh, Finland, Greece, Japan, Jordan, Pakistan, Sweden and Uruguay were among those which felt that the Code should provide for its effective enforcement. Pakistan, Uruguay and Venezuela were particularly concerned that it made no reference to the penalties to which offenders would be liable—a position also voiced by Portugal—or to the judicial authority applying its provisions. Some States, including Argentina, Jordan, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Venezuela, favoured establishing an international tribunal, while others, such as Finland and Poland, thought that enforcement should be left to national courts. Cuba held that violations of international law and the corresponding penalties embodied in the future Code could be incorporated in States' internal penal codes, with a view to international co-operation and legislative uniformity.

Difficult conceptual problems were mentioned concerning the responsibility for offences embodied in the future Code. Czechoslovakia felt it should be based on the concept of individual criminal responsibility and proceed from the Charter of the Nürnberg Tribunal. The USSR spoke similarly. Holding individuals responsible should not, however, in the view of the German Democratic Republic, replace the responsibility under international law of a State which organized, committed or supported such crimes. The

Byelorussian SSR agreed but said it was regrettable that some delegations sought to hold States exclusively responsible. Finland pointed out that, whereas it was clear that individuals committing offences should be held responsible and duly convicted for their acts, it was much more difficult to establish State responsibility; in its view, a parallel should be drawn between the draft Code and the Commission's work on State responsibility, especially with regard to attributing to a State an act committed by an individual. Poland felt that, while it was true that acts of aggression, genocide and apartheid were committed by States rather than by individuals, international practice had established the link between State and individual criminal responsibility; awareness of direct criminal responsibility of the individual acting on behalf of the State might prove to be an effective deterrent.

Japan felt that confusion might arise if the Assembly were to begin consideration of individual responsibility before ILC had completed or made further progress on that of States. Argentina said such action might be dangerous. Jordan said there was need for work on the draft to proceed hand in hand with the Commission's work on State responsibility. Pakistan said it might be desirable to know ILC's viewpoint on that topic before considering the draft Code. Zaire, questioning the reluctance to define States' criminal responsibility, said this might indicate that those concerned were contemplating attacking the peace and security of mankind and were reluctant to support a legal instrument condemning such acts. The United Republic of Tanzania saw a close interrelationship between State responsibility and offences against peace and security.

With regard to future procedure, Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland and the USSR considered that, in preparing such important legal instruments, all Member States should participate; consequently the Sixth Committee was the appropriate forum for preparing the final text based on the 1954 ILC draft. The Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR suggested establishing an open-ended working group of the Committee to this end. Mongolia favoured exchanging views in the Committee to formulate guidelines and then referring the topic back to ILC. Bulgaria said that body should be asked if it could accord the subject the necessary priority. The German Democratic Republic spoke similarly.

On the other hand, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Egypt, Finland, Greece, Jordan, Pakistan, Portugal, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and

Zaire thought the need for progressive development of international law justified resubmission of the draft Code to ILC. Yugoslavia, however, felt that that body's work should be constantly reviewed by the Committee. Zaire was against a working group, since all States would wish to participate.

Doubts were expressed on the advisability of considering the substance of the draft Code in the near future. Japan, while understanding the particular need for such a code after the Second World War, doubted whether the same need still existed and believed the drafting of a comprehensive code might call into question principles contained in existing instruments, thus disturbing the carefully achieved balance of interests. The United Kingdom also wondered whether the time was ripe for trying to solve the huge legal and political problems inherent in elaborating the Code, particularly in view of the substantial differences on the means of implementation at the international level.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/535.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/416.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>177(II), 21 Nov. 1947 (YUN 1947-48, p. 215); <sup>(4)</sup>2625(XXV), annex, 24 Oct. 1970 (YUN 1970, p. 789); <sup>(5)</sup>3068(XXVIII), annex, 30 Nov. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 103); <sup>(6)</sup>3314(XXIX), annex, 14 Dec. 1974 (YUN 1974, p. 847); <sup>(7)</sup>35/49, 4 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1147); <sup>(8)</sup>36/106, 10 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(9)</sup>1954, p. 411.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.58, 60-62, 66, 69 (24 Nov.-4 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.92 (10 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/106

129-0-17 (recorded vote) Meeting 92 10 December 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/774) by recorded vote (89-0-17), 4 December (meeting 69); IQ-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.26); agenda item 111.

Sponsors: Algeria, Benin, Burundi, Congo, Cyprus, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Nigeria, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Ukrainian SSR, Zaire, Zambia,

#### Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind

The General Assembly,

Mindful of Article 13, paragraph 1 a. of the Charter of the United Nations, which provides that the General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification,

Recalling its resolution 177(II) of 21 November 1947, by which it requested the International Law Commission to prepare a draft code of offences against the peace and security of mankind,

Having considered the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind prepared by the international Law Commission and submitted to the General Assembly in 1954.

Recalling its belief that the elaboration of a code of offences against the peace and security of mankind could contribute to strengthening international peace and security and thus to promoting and implementing the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations,

Bearing in mind its resolution 33/97 of 16 December 1978, by which it decided to accord priority and the fullest consider-

ation to the item entitled "Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind".

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 35/49 of 4 December 1980,

Considering that the International Law Commission has just accomplished an important part of its work devoted to the succession of States in respect of State property, archives and debts and that the programme of work is thus at present lightened,

Taking into consideration that the membership of the International Law Commission was increased during the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and that it has at its disposal a new mandate of five years to organize its future work,

Taking into account the views expressed during the debate on this item at the current session,

Taking note of paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 36/114 of 10 December 1981 on the report of the international Law Commission,

1. Invites the International Law Commission to resume its work with a view to elaborating the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind and to examine it with the required priority in order to review it, taking duly into account the results achieved by the process of the progressive development of international law;

2. Requests the International Law Commission to consider at its thirty-fourth session the question of the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind in the context of its five-year programme and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the priority it deems advisable to accord to the draft Code, and the possibility of presenting a preliminary report to the Assembly at its thirty-eighth session bearing, *inter alia*, on the scope and the structure of the draft Code;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to reiterate his invitation to Member States and relevant international intergovernmental organizations to present or update their comments and observations on the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind, and to submit a report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the International Law Commission all the necessary documentation, comments and observations presented by Member States and relevant international intergovernmental organizations on the item entitled "Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind";

5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind" and to accord it priority and the fullest possible consideration.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Burma, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

### Draft convention against mercenaries

In 1981, the General Assembly decided that its Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries should continue its work towards that goal. Member States had differing views on the future convention's scope, the definition of the terms "mercenary" and "mercenarism", the responsibilities of individuals and States, and the legal status of mercenaries.

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST MERCENARIES. The Committee against mercenaries, established by the General Assembly in 1980 to elaborate a convention against their recruitment, use, financing and training,<sup>(4)</sup> held its first session at United Nations Headquarters from 20 January to 13 February 1981. The Committee, to be composed of 35 States but of which only 33 were appointed for the 1981 session (see APPENDIX III), created a Working Group of the Whole to draft the text. The Group held eight meetings between 6 and 13 February. The Committee submitted a report to the Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup>

All States taking part in the general debate condemned the use of mercenaries whether on private initiative or with the tacit consent or active support of Governments. Attention was drawn to a 1977 Security Council resolution, adopted by consensus, condemning all forms of external interference in the internal affairs of Member States,<sup>(8)</sup> as well as to the consensus reached on the treatment and status to be accorded mercenaries, at the 1977 session of the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts.<sup>(9)</sup> It was noted that the use of mercenaries could be a threat to the self-determination, stability and independence of States and that interventions by soldiers of fortune should be treated as attacks on the territorial integrity or political independence of any sovereign State in violation of the fundamental principles of the United Nations.

Two approaches were suggested for the Committee's work. The first was to draft an international convention immediately, based on a draft by Nigeria, that would be applied universally and would impose concrete obligations on States, including eradicating activities of mercenaries. The second approach was to make individual mercenaries criminally liable under national legislation through a penal law convention aimed at strengthening international co-

operation among judicial authorities and denying alleged offenders a safe haven.

Aspects of the envisaged convention discussed in either the Committee or the Working Group included the convention's scope, the definition of the term "mercenary", the concept of "mercenarism", individual versus State responsibility and the legal status of mercenaries.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 4 December, the General Assembly adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(6)</sup> by which it decided that the Committee against mercenaries should continue its work to draft as soon as possible an international convention against them and report on its progress to the 1982 Assembly session.

On 24 November, the Sixth Committee had approved the text, sponsored by 59 States and introduced by Nigeria, by consensus.

A number of other actions concerning mercenaries were taken by both the Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights.

The Commission on Human Rights, in a resolution of 6 March on the self-determination of peoples (p. 891),<sup>(3)</sup> and the Assembly, in its 28 October resolution on the same subject,<sup>(5)</sup> reaffirmed that using mercenaries against national liberation movements and sovereign States constituted a criminal act and that the mercenaries themselves were criminals. They called on all Governments to enact legislation declaring the recruitment, financing and training of mercenaries in their territories and the transit of mercenaries through their territories to be punishable offences and prohibiting their nationals from serving as mercenaries, and to report on such legislation to the Secretary-General.

In its Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, adopted on 9 December,<sup>(7)</sup> the Assembly listed among the duties of States, under the principle of non-intervention, the duty to prevent on their territory the training, financing and recruitment of mercenaries, or the sending of them into the territory of another State, and to deny facilities, including financing, for the equipping and transit of mercenaries.

On 17 August, Mongolia addressed a note verbale to the Secretary-General<sup>(1)</sup> containing its comments on drafting a convention and urging the international community to codify the principles and norms of conduct of States concerning mercenaries and "mercenarism",

In the Sixth Committee, following approval of the draft resolution on the Ad Hoc Committee's future work, a number of delegations expressed reservations on the text. Speaking for the members of the European Community (EC), the United Kingdom said they felt that the preamble paragraph asserting that the activities of mer-

cenaries were contrary to fundamental principles of international law was too broad; individual acts could not automatically be imputed to States and should be dealt with through national criminal law according to a new convention, supplemented by increased international co-operation to suppress activities generally agreed to be harmful and unacceptable. Norway (on behalf of the Nordic States) believed such principles applied exclusively to inter-State relations. Austria and Spain held similar views. The United States felt the text would have been more accurate if it had referred to some activities of mercenaries, such as violations of laws governing armed conflicts and the use of mercenaries by States to interfere in the internal affairs of others, and if it had stated that Security Council resolutions condemned the use of mercenaries to destabilize States or to violate their territorial integrity, sovereignty or independence. The EC members also believed that in accomplishing its mandate the Ad Hoc Committee should continue to work by consensus.

During the debate in the Sixth Committee, African States and others, including the Bahamas, Indonesia, Jamaica and Venezuela, said they felt that the text submitted by Nigeria provided a general basis for the Ad Hoc Committee's work. The Bahamas, China, Czechoslovakia, Jamaica, Kenya, Mongolia, Morocco, Somalia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire and Zambia believed the convention should be applied both against mercenaries and against States recruiting, financing, training and using them. Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR and the USSR were among those which felt that a distinction should be made between individual and State responsibility.

Other States favoured making it a criminal offence for individuals to recruit, use, finance and train mercenaries, and harmonizing national penal law of States parties to the convention. The EC members felt a future convention should accent individual responsibility, without denying that questions of State responsibility could arise under international law if State obligations were not fulfilled. Similar views were expressed by Portugal and the United States. Sweden said principles of international law applied only to States and not to individuals; hence, it did not consider that mercenaries' activities could *ipso facto* give rise to State responsibility. New Zealand held that agreement should be reached on what specific activities constituted operations relating to mercenaries and that incorporating such activities into the criminal law of States would generate an international obligation strengthening existing international law.

Numerous references were made to the term "mercenary" contained in article 47 of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, adopted at the 1977 Diplomatic Conference on international humanitarian law, on which the definition contained in the Nigerian draft was based.

A number of States saw the Nigerian definition as not fully satisfactory or too restrictive. It was viewed by Liberia, Paraguay, Portugal and Zaire as over-emphasizing the element of pecuniary motivation. Although that motivation was basic, said China, mercenaries were dispatched for political ends—a position shared by Bulgaria and Zaire. Burundi was concerned that, if the definition were limited to the provisions of article 47, it would be tantamount to exonerating mercenaries fighting against national liberation movements. Mexico said any definition should take into account that providing assistance to a country during an internal conflict could turn that conflict into one which was subject to international law. Mongolia pointed out that mercenaries had been used when there was no armed conflict to destabilize African States. Bulgaria and Yugoslavia stressed that mercenaries could also be used in peace-time. Ghana, too, was concerned about defining a mercenary as one who fights in an armed conflict. Indonesia, Kenya, Somalia and Zambia felt the definition should be amplified to cover other situations. For Venezuela, it should not be confined to nationals of a State but cover all persons; it was also necessary to cover the possibility that a mercenary might be an agent of a country or group of interests. The Syrian Arab Republic believed that a comprehensive definition should also take account of the 1977 Convention for the Elimination of Mercenaries in Africa adopted by the Organization of African Unity, General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and any new proposals by delegations. This viewpoint was shared by Somalia and the Sudan.

Algeria, Australia, Jamaica, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Suriname were among those pointing out that the definition in article 47 was based on an approach appropriate for humanitarian law but inappropriate for a general instrument. Tunisia said it should be remembered that Additional Protocol I related only to international armed conflicts, whereas the convention under consideration was also intended to apply to operations carried out in times of peace. Australia and Jamaica said the Nigerian draft did not define the linkage between mercenary and "mercenarism", Iraq said a convention would not be functional unless it recognized a degree of such interconnection. Viet Nam felt the term "mercenary" should be expanded to en-

compass all types of mercenaries, such as those who were citizens or residents of countries in which they were operating. The Lao People's Democratic Republic pointed out that a new category of mercenary had recently emerged, recruited among unemployed refugees, trained, equipped by foreign agents and sent back to their country of origin to stir up the people against the legal authorities.

Other States, including Afghanistan, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Japan, Pakistan, Poland, Sweden, the Sudan and the EC members, considered that article 47 provided a good basis for defining a mercenary. Italy, sharing this view, said two contemporary definitions of the same term would be undesirable. However, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia and India also stressed that the definition should not be construed in such a way that it could be used against national liberation movements.

The concept of "mercenarism" was viewed by several States as basic to the future convention and correctly highlighted in the Nigerian draft. The Sudan felt it essential to ensure that institutions, States and organizations of States assisting mercenaries did not go unpunished. Jamaica observed that, even if a State or corporate body could not be made criminally liable, it was at least clear that identifiable individuals in the corporate body or the State administration could. Iraq said that, unless certain types of activity were banned, some facets of the use of mercenaries would continue. Morocco thought it would be difficult to characterize as similar crimes the organizing of armed mercenaries and publishing or tolerating the publication of information on that subject.

Others also expressed reservations on the concept of "mercenarism". Australia said the Nigerian definition covered a variety of actions, some more serious than others, and that different actions should not be branded as the same offence. For Australia and Japan the term was a neologism, unlikely to be accepted. The latter believed it unwise to introduce it into a new convention.

On the related question of State responsibility, the German Democratic Republic noted that organizing or encouraging the organizing of bands of mercenaries and their use by or on behalf of a State in order to intrude into another's territory or to use armed force against it—denounced by international law—as well as States permitting their territory to be used for the activities of mercenaries and allowing their nationals to engage in such activities should be covered by the future convention, obliging States not to tolerate them. Similar views were voiced by China, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Poland, Sierra

Leone and Zambia. Togo also felt there should be an appropriate reference to State responsibility. The Ukrainian SSR said that any State failing to adopt measures to end mercenary activities must bear international responsibility. Romania spoke similarly. China added that mercenary activities should be an extraditable crime, while Sierra Leone felt passports should be denied to any national or resident openly engaged in taking human lives or overthrowing a foreign Government.

Many delegations, including China, Cuba, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Paraguay, Yugoslavia and Zaire, shared Tunisia's view that a State could not fulfil all its obligations by merely refraining from being involved in mercenary activities; it was the duty of every State to prevent such activities based in its territory, entailing exercising vigilance and being aware of acts directed from its territory against others, taking into account that it was unlikely that bands of mercenaries, requiring sizeable human and financial resources, could remain unknown to the authorities.

However, some States, such as the EC members, felt that a future convention should accent individual responsibility. The United States similarly believed that trying to deal with State responsibility would complicate the Ad Hoc Committee's work, and cautioned against hasty drafting to cover areas not universally accepted. Italy maintained that the problem of the treatment of mercenaries and that of State responsibility were legally different and should not be dealt with in the same instrument;

On the issue of the legal status of mercenaries, Uganda, Yugoslavia and Zambia were among those welcoming the fact that article 47 of Additional Protocol I had stripped mercenaries of their right to treatment as combatants. Algeria, Burundi, China, Egypt, Ghana, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, Paraguay, Togo and Tunisia, while agreeing that mercenaries should not be accorded prisoner-of-war status, none the less felt that they should be treated humanely and have judicial guarantees ordinarily granted to alleged offenders in the same circumstances. Portugal cautioned that, if the principle embodied in that article were accepted, a crime committed by a mercenary would be considered more condemnable than that of any other participant in an armed conflict. Italy and Spain drew attention to article 75 of Additional Protocol I, which mentioned fundamental guarantees to be granted to all persons, including criminals. Jamaica, Liberia and Zaire stressed that the convention should state that mercenaries were international criminals.

Many States, including Algeria, China, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Jamaica, Kuwait, the

Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia, insisted on distinguishing between mercenaries and freedom fighters and emphasized that a future convention must not impair the effectiveness of international volunteers participating in the struggle of peoples against colonialism, racism, apartheid and other forms of foreign domination.

Note verbale: <sup>(1)</sup>Mongolia, 17 Aug., A/36/438.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on drafting convention against mercenaries, A/36/43.

Resolutions: <sup>(3)</sup>Commission on Human Rights (report, E/1981/25): 14(XXXVII), para. 7, 6 Mar. GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/48, 4 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1145); <sup>(5)</sup>36/9, para. 9, 28 Oct. 1981 (p. 895); <sup>(6)</sup>36/76, 4 Dec., text following; <sup>(7)</sup>36/103, annex, para. 2 II (g), 9 Dec. (p. 148). <sup>(8)</sup>SC: 405(1977), para. 6, 14 Apr. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 215).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(9)</sup>1977, p. 706.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.3/36/L.9/Add.1; 5th Committee report, A/36/734; S-G statements, A/C.5/36/62, A/C.6/36/L.9.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.16-24, 55, 57 (8 Oct.-24 Nov.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.57 (30 Nov.); plenary. A/36/PV.85 (4 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/76

Adopted without vote Meeting 85 4 December 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/727) by consensus, 24 November (meeting 57); 59-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.8); agenda item 115.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Burundi, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Guinea, Guyana, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

#### Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries

The General Assembly,

Bearing in mind the need for strict observance of the principles of sovereign equality, political independence, territorial integrity of States and self-determination of peoples, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and developed in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,

Recalling its resolutions, particularly resolutions 2395 (XXIII) of 29 November 1968, 2465(XXIII) of 20 December 1968, 2548(XXIV) of 11 December 1969, 2708(XXV) of 14 December 1970, 3103(XXVIII) of 12 December 1973 and its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, as well as Security Council resolutions 405(1977) of 14 April 1977 and 419(1977) of 24 November 1977, in which the United Nations denounced the practice of using mercenaries against developing countries and national liberation movements,

Recalling, in particular, its resolution 35/48 of 4 December 1980, by which it established an Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries, composed of thirty-five Member States,

Having considered the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Recognizing that the activities of mercenaries are contrary to fundamental principles of international law, such as non-

interference in the internal affairs of States, territorial integrity and independence, and seriously impede the process of self-determination of peoples struggling against colonialism, racism and apartheid and all forms of foreign domination.

Bearing in mind the pernicious impact that the activities of mercenaries have on International peace and security,

Considering that the progressive development and codification of the rules of international law on mercenaries would contribute immensely to the implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter,

Taking account of the fact that the Ad Hoc Committee has not completed the mandate entrusted to it.

Reaffirming the need for the elaboration at the earliest possible date of an international convention against the recruitment, use, financing and training of mercenaries,

1. Takes note of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries;

2. Decides that the Ad Hoc Committee shall continue its work with the goal of drafting at the earliest possible date an international convention against the recruitment, use, financing and training of mercenaries;

3. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee, in the fulfilment of its mandate, to consider the suggestions and proposals of Member States, bearing in mind the views and comments submitted to the Secretary-General and those expressed at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly during the debate in the Sixth Committee devoted to the consideration of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to make available to the Ad Hoc Committee at its next session the texts of the conventions drafted by international and regional organizations on mercenaries, as well as any other relevant documentation;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Ad Hoc Committee with any assistance and facilities it may require for the performance of its work;

6. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee to submit its report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

7. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries".

### Prevention of terrorism

Deep concern about continuing acts of international terrorism was expressed by the General Assembly when, in 1981, it re-endorsed recommendations to eliminate the problem.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 10 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the prevention of terrorism,<sup>(8)</sup> in which it re-endorsed the 1979 recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism concerning measures for speedily eliminating such terrorism.<sup>(9)</sup> The Assembly called on all States to observe and implement the recommendations, and requested the Secretary-General to follow this up and report to it in 1983. The Assembly reaffirmed the inalienable right to self-determination and independence of all peoples under colonial and racist régimes and upheld the legitimacy of their struggle, particularly that of national liberation movements.

The resolution was adopted without vote. On 4 December, the Sixth Committee had approved by consensus the draft sponsored by Cuba,

Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Niger, Togo, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

In its Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, adopted on 9 December,<sup>(7)</sup> the Assembly listed among the duties of States, under the principle of non-intervention, the duty to refrain from using terrorist practices as State policy against another State or against peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist régimes, and to prevent assistance to or use or tolerance of terrorist groups, saboteurs or subversive agents against third States.

In considering the prevention of terrorism, the Sixth Committee had before it a September report compiled by the Secretary-General<sup>(2)</sup> in response to a 1979 Assembly resolution,<sup>(5)</sup> containing Government observations, material on national legislation dealing with the combating of international terrorism, and, information and other material submitted by international inter-governmental organizations. Annexed to the report was information on the state of signatures, ratifications or accessions, as at 5 August 1981, to international conventions relating to various aspects of the problem.

On 4 December, the Committee was informed that the sponsors of another draft on the subject,<sup>(\*)</sup> Cuba and Mongolia, had decided not to press it to a vote. By this text, the Assembly would also have: condemned continuing repressive and terrorist acts by colonial, racist and alien régimes in denying peoples their right to self-determination; reaffirmed the legitimacy of assisting oppressed peoples, including national liberation movements, to eliminate all such domination; urged all States to seek peaceful solutions to causes underlying such violent acts and to contribute to eliminating the causes, and called on them to fulfil their international obligations to refrain from participating in acts of civil strife in another State, or acquiescing in activities within their territory directed towards that end; appealed to all States that had not done so to become parties to international conventions on terrorism, invited them to eliminate terrorism speedily, and urged them to co-operate more closely by exchanging information, concluding special treaties and incorporating special clauses into bilateral treaties, particularly regarding extradition or prosecution of international terrorists; invited Governments' comments, particularly on the need for additional conventions; and recognized that, in order to eliminate the problem, both the Assembly and the Security Council should pay special attention to all situations, including colonialism, racism and alien occupation, that might give rise to terrorism and endanger international peace and security.

Introducing the nine-nation draft in the Sixth Committee, Yugoslavia said that the absence of an operative paragraph on national liberation movements did not affect the sponsors' view that the struggle of such movements came within the purview of the 1949 Geneva Conventions and the 1977 Additional Protocols thereto, and that that struggle could not be identified with terrorist acts.

A number of delegations explained their positions on the draft text. Most, while condemning all acts of terrorism, irrespective of the motives, voiced reservations on the two preambular paragraphs concerning the right to self-determination. The United Kingdom said references to self-determination were over-emphasized, since the 1970 Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations<sup>(3)</sup> included that right as only one of seven principles. France and the United States saw no need for such references, while Canada said they were superfluous. The Netherlands said the paragraphs were out of place. Mexico understood that they should be read together—that all peoples had the right to self-determination through democratic process where the rule of law prevailed or, where oppressive terrorist régimes were violating the right, through revolutionary armed struggle respecting the humanitarian principles applying to armed conflict. Colombia also felt the two paragraphs should have been linked.

Spain said it had doubts about introducing extraneous elements in the preamble, while the United States stressed that all the rights and duties referred to, and the draft itself, should be understood in the context of the Charter.

Israel objected to the sixth preambular paragraph which, it felt, distorted the nature of the right to self-determination, even within the framework of the Charter. Australia, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Sweden and the United Kingdom understood that the paragraph did not legitimize terrorist acts. Colombia, Italy and the United States stressed that certain forms of terrorism were so brutal that no cause could justify them. Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Indonesia, Thailand and Uruguay understood that the national liberation movements referred to were only those recognized by the United Nations or regional organizations and which acted in conformity with the Charter.

Argentina regretted that there was no call to States to refrain from protecting or training terrorists. Turkey would have preferred a call for more specific measures against international terrorism, as it felt such measures should not be postponed until the advent of a hypothetical in-

ternational order which did not give rise to terrorism. France and Spain had reservations about some aspects of the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations. Israel could not accept that conventions or protocols, subject to ratification and to which a State had not given its assent, should be binding on that State. Viet Nam said it would have preferred the text submitted by Cuba and Mongolia, which it regarded as a better reflection of the current international situation.

Introducing the Secretary-General's report,<sup>(2)</sup> the United Nations Legal Counsel pointed out that it had taken eight years for one third of the Member States to become parties to the 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents,<sup>(4)</sup> and as at 1 December only 16 Member States had become parties to the 1979 International Convention against the Taking of Hostages.<sup>(6)</sup> (The number of States parties to the latter convention stood at 17 as at 31 December 1981.)

The discussion in the Sixth Committee focused on a general approach to the question and on the definition and scope of the concept of terrorism, its underlying causes and the preventive steps to be taken. Most States agreed that the United Nations should continue its work on the topic.

Examining the definition and scope of the concept of terrorism, Albania, Cuba, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the USSR and Viet Nam described State terrorism as one of its gravest forms. Mongolia cited the support given to anti-popular and dictatorial régimes. Czechoslovakia said some States had raised terrorism to the level of national policy. Viet Nam believed that, although progress had been made in preventing individual terrorist acts, not enough attention had been paid to those committed by States. Albania considered that the rhetoric of the United States and the USSR, which endeavoured to prove that their opponents were the main source of international terrorism, was aimed at misleading public opinion by concealing the role they themselves played. Yugoslavia, defining State terrorism as including aggression, various types of force, reprisals, using subversive agents and occupying the territory of other States, suggested that such terrorism be considered at another time and in another forum. The latter view was shared by the United States. Peru said international terrorism could be any violent act endangering or taking innocent lives, threatening fundamental freedoms or affecting more than one State, and was aimed at using coercion to achieve a particular end. Afghanistan said a definition should encompass offences against diplomats and foreigners. Algeria urged that State terrorism



be defined, while Cuba said priority should be given to defining international terrorism.

Opposition to equating terrorism with the right to self-determination through such means as national liberation movements was voiced by the Eastern European socialist States, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, China, Cuba, Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Pakistan, Turkey, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia. China contended that the movements were an effective means of eliminating the root causes of international terrorism. Algeria said failure to distinguish between the two would undermine progress made in international law with regard to the legitimacy of armed struggle in the cause of national self-determination. Yugoslavia pointed out that the Additional Protocols to the 1949 Geneva Conventions stated that liberation movements were covered by the international laws of warfare, and that identifying those movements with international terrorism was not justified. Mongolia noted that some States questioned the legitimacy of support rendered to national liberation movements.

The United States supported the right to self-determination but stressed that that did not require it to condone terrorism; there were acts so barbarous nothing could justify them. Chile and Uruguay also condemned all violent terrorist acts regardless of the circumstances. Paraguay, while not opposed to legitimate liberation movements, felt terrorism could not contribute to advancing their causes and could even be an impediment to recognition by world opinion of a just cause.

As to the causes of terrorist acts, Algeria, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Nigeria, Uganda, the USSR and Viet Nam attributed them to injustice and despair created through colonialism, racism, imperialism, aggression, foreign occupation and other forms of oppression. China shared this view and also cited hegemonism—as did the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya—as a further cause. However, Pakistan felt terrorist acts were primarily based on political motives and, together with Uganda, also blamed the current injustices on the international order. Albania also felt economic problems were a cause. For Argentina, the causes were too varied to explain.

Concerning steps for preventing terrorism, the need for wider adherence to existing international instruments was stressed by Afghanistan, the German Democratic Republic, Pakistan, Uganda, the USSR, the United States, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia. Nigeria said the United Nations should encourage ratification of conventions. Peru felt that such instruments should be strengthened or additional ones concluded. Para-

guay favoured adopting a general convention—a view shared by China—but the German Democratic Republic said that was neither appropriate nor feasible; States should continue identifying and eliminating the causes of international terrorism. Rather than a single all-embracing convention, Pakistan urged a step-by-step approach, each category of violence being prevented by specific, separate treaties. Paraguay and Uruguay were among those supporting any instrument designed to strengthen international co-operation. Argentina supported an instrument explicitly condemning use of terrorist methods as a form of political action, while Chile and Egypt declared that terrorist acts should never be regarded as political crimes. Egypt thought terrorism should be included as a crime in the proposed draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind (p. 1212). Algeria, Argentina and Mongolia believed an in-depth study was needed. Mongolia also suggested that States and the media should not publicize acts of terrorism and not glorify the perpetrators. A similar position was taken by Yugoslavia.

Draft resolution not pressed: (1)Cuba and Mongolia, A/C.6/36/L.28.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/425.

Resolutions: GA: <<sup>3</sup>>2625(XXV), annex, 24 Oct. 1970 (YUN 1970, p. 789); <<sup>4</sup>>3166(XXVIII), annex, 14 Dec. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 775); <<sup>5</sup>>34/145, 17 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1149); <<sup>6</sup>>34/146, annex, 17 Dec. 1979 (ibid., p. 1144); <<sup>7</sup>>36/103, annex, para. 2 II (m), 9 Dec. 1981 (p. 148); <<sup>8</sup>>36/109, 10 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(9)</sup>1979, p. 1146.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.63-68, 70 (1-4 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.92 (10 Dec.).

### General Assembly resolution 36/109

Adopted without vote Meeting 92 10 December 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/777 and Corr.1) by consensus, 4 December (meeting 70); 9-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.30/Rev.D; agenda item 114).

Sponsors: Cuba, Egypt, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Niger, Togo, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

**Measures to prevent international terrorism which endangers or takes innocent human lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms and study of the underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair and which cause some people to sacrifice human lives, including their own, in an attempt to effect radical changes**

The General Assembly,  
Recalling its resolutions 3034(XXVII) of 18 December 1972, 31/102 of 15 December 1976, 32/147 of 16 December 1977 and 34/145 of 17 December 1979,

Recalling also the Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Definition of Aggression and the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949,

Deeply concerned about continuing acts of international terrorism which take a toll of innocent human lives,

Convinced of the importance of international co-operation for dealing with acts of international terrorism,

Reaffirming the principle of self-determination of peoples as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations,

Reaffirming the inalienable right to self-determination and Independence of all peoples under colonial and racist regimes and other forms of alien domination, and upholding the legitimacy of their struggle, In particular the struggle of national liberation movements, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter and of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,

Having re-examined the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session,

Having also examined the report of the Secretary-General,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General;
2. Re-endorses the recommendations submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session relating to practical measures of co-operation for the speedy elimination of the problem of international terrorism;
3. Calls upon all States to observe and implement the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee;
4. Requests the Secretary-General to follow up the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations and to submit a report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session;
5. Decides to include the item in the provisional agenda of its thirty-eighth session.

### Draft articles on non-navigational uses of international watercourses

The International Law Commission (ILC), reporting<sup>(1)</sup> on its May-July 1981 session (p. 1264), informed General Assembly that the Special Rapporteur on the law of the non-navigational uses of international watercourses, Stephen M. Schwebel (United States), had resigned upon his election to the International Court of Justice. Consequently, ILC had been unable to take up the topic, as recommended by the Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> but would proceed to elaborate draft articles based on a future report of a new Special Rapporteur.

In its 10 December resolution on the work of ILC,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly, stressing that a new Special Rapporteur should be appointed at the beginning of the Commission's 1982 session to ensure continuity, recommended that it continue preparing draft articles on the law of the non-navigational uses of international watercourses.

Explaining its position on the text in the Sixth Committee, the USSR questioned the advisability of mentioning the appointment of a new Special Rapporteur, as it felt such emphasis might give the impression of arbitrarily assigning greater or lesser importance to a particular question.

Addressing the Committee, the ILC Chairman explained that the Commission, whose members' terms of office were due to expire at the end of 1981, had decided to wait until its new mem-

bership had been established before appointing a new Special Rapporteur.

During the Committee's discussion of the ILC report, general disappointment was voiced over the fact that it had not dealt with such an important and urgent item.

Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Canada, Colombia, Finland, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Spain, Sri Lanka, the United States, Venezuela and Yugoslavia said the subject required priority treatment. New Zealand feared that the difficult topic had not been easily accepted by ILC, while Hungary said there was a lack of interest in that body. The Netherlands felt some progress should have been made based on the reports of earlier Special Rapporteurs and those articles already provisionally adopted. The Sudan suggested that ILC appoint deputies for each Special Rapporteur in order to avoid repetition of the delay.

Hungary said that, inasmuch as 96 per cent of its river water came from its neighbours, it was deeply interested in the progressive development and codification of the legal provisions of the topic. Bangladesh, urging ILC to sort out the question's legal ambiguities, said it regarded as unsound and self-contradictory the tentative interpretation of the term "international watercourse system" given by ILC in 1980—that the system became international or not according to whether the waters in one State were affected by or affected users of waters in another State; most legal authorities spoke of an "international river basin" as an indivisible unit, regardless of whether it embraced two or more States, and as a basic norm governing international rivers generally. New Zealand regarded these comments as cogent, particularly on the concept of the river basin. India hoped that any differences it had with Bangladesh would be solved peacefully within the framework of a law fair to both.

Pakistan proposed that ILC consider several principles concerning riparian States: equitable apportioning of international river waters; exercising rights within its territory by one not causing ecological or physical changes or damage in another; each taking care to prevent water pollution; obtaining prior consent where water use would affect others; an aggrieved party being compensated for loss or misuse of waters by another; and being legally bound to settle disputes peacefully.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ILC, A/36/10 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/163, para. 4 (e), 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1129); <sup>(3)</sup>36/114, para. 3 (b) (iii), 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1265).

## Chapter III

## States and international law

Efforts continued in 1981 to codify aspects of international law governing diplomatic relations, State succession and State immunities.

Concerned about the safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives, the General Assembly, in November,<sup>(1)</sup> urged States to ensure their protection, prohibit illegal activities against them by persons and groups, and co-operate closely on protective measures. It also expanded the Organization's reporting system for serious violations to cover situations where an alleged offender sought refuge in another country.

The International Law Commission (ILC), at its May-July session (p. 1264), adopted a 39-article final draft on State succession in respect of State property, archives and debts, setting out rules to be followed in regard to these items when a State is created or when one State replaces another in responsibility for the international relations of a territory. Acting on an ILC recommendation, the Assembly, in December, decided to convene in 1983 an international conference of plenipotentiaries to consider the draft articles and to conclude a convention the subject.<sup>(2)</sup>

Further progress was made by ILC on draft articles on the status of the diplomatic courier and the diplomatic bag not accompanied by diplomatic courier (p. 1225), jurisdictional immunities of States and their property (p. 1230), international liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law (p. 1231) and State responsibility for internationally wrongful acts (p. 1232).

Also in 1981, ILC commenced its second reading of draft articles on treaties concluded between States and international organizations or between two or more international organizations (p. 1248).

In December, the Assembly authorized continued work by ILC in 1982 on its unfinished topics (p. 1264).

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>36/33, 13 Nov. (p. 1225); <sup>(2)</sup>36/113, 10 Dec. (p. 1230).

## Diplomatic relations

## Protection of diplomats

Responding to a 1980 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted to

that body in 1981 a report<sup>(1)</sup> containing details, received from States, of serious violations of the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives. The report, submitted in September with later addenda, contained notes verbales: from Turkey about attacks on its diplomats between December 1980 and June 1981 in Australia, Denmark, France, Iran and Switzerland; from Australia, Denmark and France on action taken in connection with those attacks; and from Sweden, concerning an August 1981 occupation of the Iranian Embassy near Stockholm by Iranian students. The report also contained the views of 16 States-Byelorussian SSR, Denmark, Finland, Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Romania, Senegal, Sweden, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela-on measures needed to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives.

As at 31 December 1981, 137 States had become parties to the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations,<sup>(6)</sup> 101 States were parties to the 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations<sup>(7)</sup> and 54 States were parties to the 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents.<sup>(2)</sup>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 13 November,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly urged States to observe international law governing diplomatic and consular relations, and called on States which had not done so to become parties to such instruments as the 1961, 1963 and 1973 Conventions. Recommending that States co-operate closely to protect missions and diplomats and settle disputes peacefully, the Assembly invited all of them to report serious violations to the Secretary-General; States in which a violation occurred or where an alleged offender was present were invited to report on measures taken to bring about justice and to prevent a repetition. The Secretary-General was requested, on receiving a report of a serious violation, to draw the attention of the State where it took place or where the offender was present to the reporting procedures established in 1980.<sup>(3)</sup>

The resolution was adopted without vote. On 5 November, the Sixth (Legal) Committee had similarly approved the 19-nation draft.

Also, in a resolution of 10 December, the Assembly condemned terrorist acts against diplomatic missions accredited to the United Nations and their personnel, and endorsed recommendations made by the Committee on Relations with the Host Country concerning such acts.<sup>(5)</sup>

Introducing the 19-nation draft in the Sixth Committee, Sweden said the text elaborated the importance of local-level co-operation-stressed by many Governments-and expanded the reporting system to cover situations where an alleged offender, having committed a violation in one country, took refuge in another.

Finland, on behalf of the five Nordic countries which had initiated the topic's consideration in 1980,<sup>(8)</sup> hoped the notification system would be maintained since, it said, publishing information on violent acts provided an incentive for States to adopt preventive measures. Many delegations, including Pakistan, Spain and the United Kingdom (for the member States of the European Community (EC)), stressed the value of the reporting procedure. Japan hoped it would be strengthened. Egypt expressed satisfaction that some States had communicated in that regard. Although not enough experience had been acquired, Iraq said, monitoring serious violations should prove effective eventually. Turkey said such reports would show to what extent States, where violations had occurred, had fulfilled their international obligations. The USSR felt the Assembly should continue monitoring compliance with the 1961 and 1963 Vienna Conventions.

For the United States, involving the Secretary-General in monitoring and seeking a solution was a partial answer; a co-ordinated international response should be made involving a reaction against the offending State. The EC States said that when diplomatic or consular personnel were attacked or threatened and another State, especially a host country, aided such acts, that became the concern of all.

Some States were concerned that existing international legislation was not enough to protect diplomats. Chile stated that, instead of elaborating or adapting applicable norms and striving for their acceptance, machinery should be devised for preventing, bringing to trial and punishing those committing terrorist acts against diplomats, through binding law. Egypt, Uruguay and Yugoslavia also felt new international legislation was needed. Iraq thought further measures might be necessary if violations continued. Turkey suggested that a new organ for diplomatic protection be established and that the Secretary-General be authorized to urge States where violations occurred to take punitive and preventive action. However, the EC States

said there was no need for new conventions or treaties as existing instruments contained clear rules on the question. Spain observed that conventions were not enough; political will to comply with them and the co-operation of all were also needed. Nigeria urged that States disseminate knowledge of the relevant conventions in their territories.

Afghanistan, Australia, the Byelorussian SSR, Chile, Ecuador and the Philippines stressed that national measures should be taken to protect diplomatic personnel and property. To that end, the Philippines said, the receiving State should adopt domestic legislation to supplement international law. Argentina and the USSR also stressed the responsibility of the receiving State, as did Czechoslovakia, which said it was particularly important in States where international organizations were headquartered. The Lao People's Democratic Republic said it was the receiver's duty to punish those violating international law and that applied especially to States granting asylum to activists known to be hostile to certain States. Sri Lanka and Uruguay pointed out that the receiving State had an obligation under international law. Equatorial Guinea spoke similarly. Afghanistan and the USSR said most rules in international agreements were derived from customary law, which meant that States must observe them even if they were not party to them.

Spain urged co-operation between receiving and sending States, while Chile said both shared responsibility for fulfilling diplomatic obligations. Pakistan agreed and, with the Lao People's Democratic Republic, stressed that the sender was obliged to respect the laws of the host country and not interfere in its internal affairs, as stated in the Vienna Conventions.

For New Zealand, it was important that States met their duties in the area of prevention; it was the record of sensible precautions which tested compliance with international obligations.

Turkey, citing five attacks in less than a year on its diplomats in France, said France had not complied fully with the 1980 Assembly resolution<sup>(3)</sup> by failing to report on measures taken to prevent repetition; it also regretted the issuing of ministerial statements based on propaganda or groundless preconceptions resulting from distortions of history. Condemning the attacks, France said it would do everything possible to prevent a repetition; the statement in question, however, had been a personal opinion, rather than that of the French Government.

The Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR felt the United States had shown excessive tolerance towards those committing crimes against diplomats and had failed to end hostile campaigns against particular States or

their representatives (p. 1241). The United States said it hoped those States would take the problem seriously enough to allow their diplomats to testify in its courts. The USSR said that, if diplomatic missions allowed their officials to appear in court whenever their privileges and immunities were violated, they would be unable to protect properly their States' interests in the United Nations.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/445 & Corr.1 & Add.1-3.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>3166(XXVIII), annex, 14 Dec. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 775); <sup>(3)</sup>35/168, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1149); <sup>(4)</sup>36/33, 13 Nov. 1981, text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/115, paras. 1 & 2, 10 Dec. (p. 1243).

Yearbook references: <sup>(6)</sup>1961, p. 512; <sup>(7)</sup>1963, p. 510; <sup>(8)</sup>1980, p. 1148.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.22-25, 36, 39, 41 (16 Oct.-5 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.57 (13 Nov.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/33

Adopted without vote Meeting 57 13 November 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/667) without vote. 5 November (meeting 41); 19-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.5); agenda item 124.

Sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of. Iceland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Turkey, Uruguay.

Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General submitted under this item,

Reaffirming its resolution 35/168 of 15 December 1980,

Emphasizing the duty of States to take all appropriate steps to protect the premises of diplomatic and consular missions and prevent any attacks on diplomatic and consular representatives.

Recognizing the necessity to ensure the protection, security and safety of missions and of representatives to international intergovernmental organizations, as well as of officials of such organizations,

Deeply concerned about the continued large number of violations of, and failures to respect, the inviolability of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives,

Noting that only a small number of States have so far, in response to the call by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, become parties to the relevant conventions concerning the inviolability of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives,

Convinced that the reporting procedures established under resolution 35/168 are an important step in the efforts to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives,

Desiring to maintain and strengthen those reporting procedures,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General;

2. Strongly condemns acts of violence against diplomatic and consular missions and representatives as well as against missions and representatives to international intergovernmental organizations and officials of such organizations;

3. Urges States to observe and to implement the principles and rules of international law governing diplomatic and consular relations and, in particular, to take all necessary measures in conformity with their international obligations to ensure effectively the protection, security and safety of all diplomatic and consular missions and representatives officially present in territory under their jurisdiction, including practicable measures to prohibit in their territories illegal activities of persons, groups and organizations that encourage, insti-

gate, organize or engage in the perpetration of acts against the security and safety of such missions and representatives;

4. Recommends that States co-operate closely, inter alia, through contacts between the diplomatic and consular mission and the receiving State, with regard to practical measures designed to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives;

5. Calls anew upon States that have not yet done so to consider becoming parties to the instruments relevant to the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives, inter alia, the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961, the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 1963, and the respective optional protocols thereto, as well as the Convention of 1973 on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents;

6. Calls upon States, in cases where a dispute arises in connection with a violation of the principles and rules of international law concerning the inviolability of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives, to make use of the means for peaceful settlement of disputes, including the good offices of the Secretary-General;

7. Invites all States to report to the Secretary-General serious violations of the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives, invites the State in which the violation took place and, where applicable, the State where the alleged offender is present to report also on measures taken to bring the offender to justice and eventually to communicate, in accordance with its laws, the final outcome of the proceedings against the offender, and further invites the State in which the violation took place to report also on the measures aimed at preventing a repetition of such violations;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to circulate to all States upon receipt the reports received by him pursuant to paragraph 7 above, unless requested otherwise by the reporting State;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to invite States to inform him of their views with respect to any measures needed to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives;

10. Requests the Secretary-General, when a serious violation has been reported to him pursuant to paragraph 7 above, to draw the attention, when appropriate, of the State where the violation occurred and, when applicable, of the State where the alleged offender is present to the reporting procedures established in resolution 35/168 and reaffirmed in paragraph 7 above;

11. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report on the state of ratification of, and accessions to, the instruments referred to in paragraph 5 above, as well as the reports received and views expressed pursuant to paragraphs 7 and 9 above, and invites him to submit any views he may wish to express on these matters;

12. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives: report of the Secretary-General".

#### Status of diplomatic bags and couriers

Responding to a 1980 General Assembly recommendation,<sup>(3)</sup> the International Law Commission (ILC), at its May-July 1981 session, continued considering the status of the diplomatic courier and the diplomatic bag not accompanied by diplomatic courier,<sup>(1)</sup> with a view to elaborating a legal instrument on the subject. It examined a second report<sup>(2)</sup> by the Special Rapport-

teur, Alexander Yankov (Bulgaria), containing six proposed draft articles which constituted part I (general provisions). The articles dealt with: the scope of the articles (article 1); couriers and bags not within such scope (article 2); use of terms (article 3); freedom of communication for all official purposes effected through diplomatic couriers and bags (article 4); duty to respect international laws and those of receiving and transit States (article 5); and non-discrimination and reciprocity (article 6).

ILC requested the Secretariat to update the compilation of provisions of multilateral and bilateral treaties on diplomatic and consular law, and to solicit from States information on national practice regarding treatment of the diplomatic courier and bag. The draft articles were referred to the ILC Drafting Committee which was, however, unable to consider them due to lack of time.

In its 10 December resolution on the work of ILC, the Assembly recommended that the Commission continue preparing the draft articles.<sup>(4)</sup>

Aspects of the subject discussed in the Sixth Committee included whether or not a new set of rules on the subject was needed, the scope of application of the draft articles being considered by ILC and the abuse of privileges.

A number of States, including Austria, Israel, Japan and Venezuela, felt the existing legal framework dealt adequately with the topic and there was no need for a separate convention. The United States asserted that there had been no fundamental problems with existing rules except for some abusive uses of the bag. Australia said developing the subject further would be a waste of the limited time of ILC. The United Kingdom agreed, adding that the envisaged structure of the draft articles was too complex; an empirical study was needed leading to rules dealing with such problems as the abuse of bag privileges. The Federal Republic of Germany felt that existing law should be strengthened but was concerned that one set of rules covering all official communications might detract from protection currently accorded. Yugoslavia thought ILC should concentrate on recent State practice. Nigeria believed an examination of the existing treaties and State practice would enable ILC to decide whether further codification was necessary.

A number of States welcomed the Commission's progress and expressed support for a single convention to incorporate and consolidate the norms of international law, which they viewed as widely dispersed. In that regard, Brazil pointed out that four conventions applied different regimes to communications. Cyprus viewed existing law as inadequate. The Ukrainian SSR believed a single convention would

make it possible to ascertain more accurately the need for new rules. Supporting a single text, the Bahamas stressed that it should not detract from existing law. Afghanistan said a new instrument would close legal loopholes, promote State co-operation and end abuses relating to diplomatic couriers and bags, thereby reducing the risk of conflict. Algeria, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq and Thailand were among those welcoming the Special Rapporteur's report as a basis for further work. The Sudan held a similar view, and Mexico thought the work of ILC was proceeding along the right lines. The Byelorussian SSR and Chile hoped ILC would accord the topic priority. For Egypt, it was important to treat the topic in detail. Bulgaria favoured incorporating into the draft articles the fundamentals of existing international agreements. In drafting the articles, Czechoslovakia observed, account should be taken of experience gained since existing treaties had entered into force.

Comments were made on the scope of the draft articles. Czechoslovakia favoured limiting them to diplomatic couriers used by States. Brazil said it should not apply to communications between different States and between States and international organizations view shared by Mexico. Bulgaria and the United Kingdom said communications of such organizations should not be included. Israel said ILC should keep in mind that those bodies could not guarantee reciprocity. Jamaica found it strange that the scope should be defined in terms of State communications. Bulgaria said communications between missions and delegations situated abroad should be included.

Zaire thought the scope should cover communications between States and international organizations and between such organizations. Algeria and Egypt agreed with the latter point and also favoured including those of national liberation movements. Brazil thought the possibility of including international organizations merited further study, while Mexico said they should not be excluded until the question had been studied in depth. Iraq stressed that such organizations played an increasing role in international relations.

Iraq, Jamaica and Romania believed a balance should be established between the rights and obligations of sending and receiving States, through a specific article. Austria, Brazil and Japan held similar views. Poland and Zaire were among those stressing the importance of preventing abuses of the diplomatic bag and courier. Morocco thought codification of the topic would limit such abuse. Austria suggested that ILC base its work on existing law, providing for the bag to

be opened in certain circumstances. Ethiopia said that any proposed article should not contradict that right. Jamaica, too, was concerned that the draft articles should be consistent with existing law.

On the privileges and immunities of the courier, Mexico said they should cease on re-entering the sending State, unless the return journey was private and included countries other than the receiving or transit State. Israel thought it desirable to strengthen the protection granted to the courier and his bag. The German Democratic Republic and Poland felt that coverage should be given others entrusted with a diplomatic bag, such as the captain of an aircraft or ship.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ILC, A/36/10; <sup>(2)</sup>Special Rapporteur, A/CN.4/347 & Corr.1.2 & Add.1.2.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/163, para. 4 (f), 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1129); <sup>(4)</sup>36/114, para. (b) (v), 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1265).

## State succession in respect of property, archives and debts

In 1981, the General Assembly decided to convene an international conference of plenipotentiaries early in 1983 to consider draft articles on State succession in respect of property, archives and debts and to conclude an international convention on the subject.<sup>(5)</sup> The 39-article draft on this aspect of State succession-the replacement of one State by another in the responsibility for the international relations of a territory- had been finalized by ILC at its May-July session.

ILC CONSIDERATION. At its May-July session, ILC completed its work on the succession of States in respect of matters other than treaties by adopting a final set of draft articles on succession of States in respect of State property, archives and debts. This feature of State succession had been the subject, since 1968, of 13 reports by the Special Rapporteur, Mohammed Bedjaoui (Algeria)-the last of which was submitted in 1981.<sup>(2)</sup> In its report to the Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> ILC pointed out that the draft articles could be regarded as a complement to the 1978 Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of Treaties<sup>(6)</sup> and it would be appropriate to give them the same status.

As recommended by the Assembly in 1980,<sup>(4)</sup> ILC finished, in the light of government comments, its second reading of those draft articles it had provisionally adopted in 1979<sup>(7)</sup> and 1980<sup>(8)</sup> and forwarded the complete set to the Assembly, along with commentaries, with the recommendation that it convene an international conference

of plenipotentiaries to study the draft text and conclude a convention. In drafting the articles, ILC emphasized that it had used the principle of equity not only as a supplementary element throughout, but as part of the material content of specific provisions.

The 39 draft articles were divided into four parts-general provisions, State property, State archives and State debts-with a detailed commentary on each article.

Part I (articles 1 to 6) contained general provisions applicable to the whole text and dealt with the scope of the articles, use of terms, cases of State succession covered, temporal application, succession in respect of other matters, and rights and obligations of natural or juridical persons.

Parts II (articles 7 to 17), III (articles 18 to 29) and IV (articles 30 to 39) dealt with State property, archives and debts, respectively, with each part divided into two sections-an introduction and provisions concerning specific categories of State succession. The articles of the corresponding sections in each of these parts largely paralleled one another.

The first section (introduction) of each part determined the scope, defined the terminology, and dealt with the effects of the passing and date of passing. Further articles in this section of part II corresponded with part III: one on the passing of State property (or archives) without compensation; and another relating to the absence of effect of a succession of States on the property (or archives) of a third State. In addition, the first section of part III contained an article on the preservation of the unity of State archives, while the same section of part IV had an article on the effects of the passing of State debts with regard to creditors.

The second section (provisions concerning specific categories of State succession) of parts II, III and IV covered the transfer of part of a State's territory, newly independent States, uniting of States, separation of part or parts of a State's territory and dissolution of a State.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 10 December,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly decided that an international conference of plenipotentiaries should be convened to consider the draft articles and to embody the results of its work in an international convention and such other instruments as it might deem appropriate. The Secretary-General was requested to convene the United Nations Conference on Succession of States in respect of State Property, Archives and Debts early in 1983 at a place to be determined by the Assembly in 1982 and Member States were invited to submit, before 1 July 1982, their written comments on the draft articles.

The resolution was adopted without vote. On

1 December, the Sixth Committee had approved by consensus the 36-nation draft, introduced by Sierra Leone.

Explaining its position on the draft, the United States said that, had there been a vote, it would have abstained since it did not feel it was justified to agree to a conference merely because other topics had been so handled in the past; the matter could have been considered by the Committee in 1982. The United Kingdom agreed and pointed out that there was a precedent for written comments by Governments on the articles. Israel thought there was not enough time for Governments to reach a decision on a conference. Although in favour of the draft, the USSR felt the envisaged costs were excessive.

Many speakers supported convening a conference of plenipotentiaries, asserting that the draft articles generally provided a sound basis for a convention. A number also welcomed the ILC decision limiting the scope of the text and amending the title (formerly State succession in matters other than treaties). The Bahamas said a convention would consolidate *opinio juris* on the matter. Iraq believed it would provide newly independent States with guiding norms and practical solutions in areas of doubt. India saw a convention as of great practical value, whatever the likelihood of its entering into force. France agreed and thought it could lead to developments in customary law. Italy suggested a final clause be adopted to allow States to accede either to the convention as a whole or to any part, so as to encourage broader participation. Colombia, Hungary, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Venezuela commended including the principle of equity in the draft articles. Spain, however, felt that principle needed defining. Afghanistan, Sri Lanka and Tunisia welcomed the priority given to agreement between predecessor and successor States. Indonesia suggested the draft articles should be an additional protocol to the 1978 Vienna Convention.

However, some delegations, questioning whether a convention was the most effective means of promoting the progressive development and codification of international law on the topic, urged further study. Australia said sensitive economic and political issues as well as complex legal problems were raised. Canada felt that Governments should have the opportunity to submit written comments on the text for the Sixth Committee discussion in 1982. The Federal Republic of Germany spoke similarly. The USSR also favoured such discussion, although it considered that ILC had arrived at an acceptable basis for a convention. Japan stressed that there were several issues on which ILC had not concluded its debate.

Pointing out that decolonization had been substantially completed, the United States said it was disturbed that the draft looked to the past for a model when the future was likely to raise different problems. However, New Zealand thought the text would vindicate United Nations doctrine on decolonization and be a statement of belief in the continuity of State obligation and law and order in a changing international society. Similarly, Czechoslovakia thought a future instrument would facilitate settlement of complex financial issues connected with colonial heritage and safeguard the interests of new States. India considered those interests were protected by provisions contained in the draft and deserved global support.

Canada favoured including a general provision giving preponderance to the relationship between the effects of State succession at the time of succession and special agreements concluded subsequently. The Bahamas, Cyprus, Iraq and Kenya believed there was a need to provide for the settlement of disputes. Hungary felt that ILC should have given a more detailed commentary on the possibility of forms of State succession in matters other than treaties which were of primary importance in State practice.

Several developing countries expressed support for the inclusion of articles confirming the principle of permanent sovereignty of every people over its wealth and natural resources. Romania thought it necessary to exclude from the scope territorial changes resulting from the use or threat of force or from interference in the affairs of other States. China considered that the draft articles effectively denied the legitimacy of a succession occurring as a result of foreign aggression or military occupation.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea and Sri Lanka were among those questioning the appropriateness of defining State property on the basis of the predecessor State's internal law. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya also questioned the definition as applied to State archives. Jamaica and Kenya felt parties should be free not to utilize such law. Egypt thought it more appropriate to consider the general principles of the world's main legal systems so that the successor's rights would not be infringed upon. Sierra Leone thought too much latitude was being accorded to the predecessor State.

Many speakers believed that the transfer of State property and archives should take place by right and without compensation. Egypt said this should be without prejudice to the right of the successor to demand compensation for the exploitation of its wealth and services. Kenya said the predecessor should give full information on



the nature of property or archives; sanctions should be taken against predecessors failing to meet such obligations. Madagascar held a similar view. China remarked that, inasmuch as archives affected the security and vital interests of newly independent States, the draft should stipulate that the predecessor State could not arbitrarily duplicate, damage or destroy archives and must return them promptly to the successor. Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka and Zaïre stressed that archives should be returned to the newly independent State even if they had been removed from its territory.

Concerning State debts, a number of delegations expressed misgivings about the draft articles on this topic. Several regretted that ILC had decided not to include in the definition of State debt a reference to any financial obligation chargeable to a State other than those owed to another State, an international organization or any other subject of international law. Australia, Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and Yugoslavia viewed the definition as too narrow. The Bahamas said that, since an article under general provisions stipulated that debts owed by a State to private creditors, whether natural or juridical persons, were not prejudiced by State succession, an effort must be made to produce a convergence of views. The United States found the omission a puzzling political gesture with no practical application. The Netherlands considered the rules seriously imbalanced since they dealt with only a fraction of State debt; whatever criterion was applied to distinguish between transferable and non-transferable debts, the person or status of the creditor was always irrelevant. Jamaica cautioned that excluding private creditors might make them reluctant to provide credit to developing countries. In Canada's view, debts were defined in such a restrictive manner that a predecessor State could remain a debtor after having signed over the reason for the debt. The Federal Republic of Germany spoke similarly.

Italy said the fact that such questions raised problems increased the need for their codification; safeguarding individual legal relationships had been a basic trend in the international community since adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948.<sup>(3)</sup> While New Zealand believed debts owed to a private creditor must be subject to governing municipal law and to rules of State responsibility, Finland pointed out that including private debts in the scope would, by extending it, involve amending other provisions; further consideration should be given by the conference to controversial questions. In China's opinion, the draft re-

tained the notion of "any other subject of international law" which it felt unnecessary, ambiguous and controversial. Iraq and Zaïre also felt a clarification of that point was needed. Tunisia and Zaïre were among those supporting the non-transferability of State debts. Nigeria felt it should be made clear that the debt of the predecessor State passing to the successor was governed by the internal law of the latter.

A number of speakers, including Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, the German Democratic Republic and Mongolia, declared that the draft articles on debts should not extend privileges to the private creditors of the predecessor State. Bulgaria and the Byelorussian SSR claimed that State debts owed to individual natural and juridical persons did not fall into the category of obligations under international law. The USSR opposed protecting the interests of individual creditors at the risk of undermining the basic principles of such law. Argentina, Bulgaria and Madagascar said that the rights and obligations of private creditors were preserved elsewhere in the draft, and the Ukrainian SSR said the text established that State succession could not in itself affect those rights. Argentina said the ILC commentaries justified the solution opted for as well as the rejection of the broader definition. Afghanistan saw the articles as an improvement over the previous text.

China pointed out that the draft lacked a specific provision on non-transferability of odious debts—a principle of importance to developing countries. The German Democratic Republic also saw this as a shortcoming, while Bulgaria cautioned that excluding such a provision and one concerning war debts might have a negative political impact. Brazil felt further consideration should be given to mentioning odious debts. Egypt endorsed excluding such debts and régime debts which, it said, might be defined as debts involving special political interests. The Federal Republic of Germany warned against including a specific rule on odious debts, noting that the rules formulated for each type of succession might settle the issues raised.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ILC, A/36/10 & Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>Special Rapporteur, A/CN.4/345 & Add.1-3.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>217 A (III), 10 Dec. 1948 (YUN 1948-49, p. 535); <sup>(4)</sup>35/163, para.4 (a), 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1129); <sup>(5)</sup>36/113, 10 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(6)</sup>1978, p. 951; <sup>(7)</sup>1979, p. 1123; <sup>(8)</sup>1980, p. 1124.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/800; S-G statements, A/C.5/36/78, A/C.6/36/L.24.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.36, 38-54, 62, 64 (30 Oct.-1 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.67 (8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.92 (10 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/113

Adopted without vote Meeting 92 10 December 1981  
Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/781) by consensus, 1 December  
(meeting 64): 36-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.15); agenda item 121.

Sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Burundi, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

United Nations Conference on Succession of States In  
respect of State Property, Archives and Debts  
The General Assembly,

Having considered chapter II of the report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirty-third session which contains final draft articles and commentaries on succession of States in respect of State property, archives and debts,

Noting that the International Law Commission at its first session in 1949 listed succession of States and Governments among the topics of international law selected for codification, that at its fourteenth session in 1962, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 1686(XVI) of 18 December 1961, it included the topic on its priority list and that at its fifteenth session in 1963 the Commission endorsed the objective of preparing draft articles on the topic,

Recalling that in its resolutions 1765(XVII) of 20 November 1962, 1902(XVIII) of 18 November 1963, 2045(XX) of 8 December 1965, 2167(XXI) of 5 December 1966, 2272(XXII) of 1 December 1967, 2400(XXIII) of 11 December 1968 and 2501 (XXIV) of 12 December 1969, the General Assembly recommended that the International Law Commission should continue the work of codification and progressive development of succession of States and Governments, taking into account the views expressed in the General Assembly and the comments submitted by Governments with appropriate reference to the views of States which have achieved independence since the Second World War,

Recalling further that, by its resolution 3496(XXX) of 15 December 1975, the General Assembly decided to convene a conference of plenipotentiaries to consider the International Law Commission's draft articles on succession of States in respect of treaties and to embody the results of its work in an international convention and such other instruments as it might deem appropriate,

Noting also that the Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of Treaties was adopted on 23 August 1978,

Noting further that, subsequent to the adoption of General Assembly resolutions 2634(XXV) of 12 November 1970, 2780(XXVI) of 3 December 1971, 2926(XXVII) of 28 November 1972, 3071 (XXVIII) of 30 November 1973, 3315(XXIX) of 14 December 1974, 3495(XXX) of 15 December 1975, 31/97 of 15 December 1976 and 32/151 of 19 December 1977, the International Law Commission, pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 33/139 of 19 December 1978, 34/141 of 17 December 1979 and 35/163 of 15 December 1980, completed at its thirty-third session its draft articles on succession of States in respect of State property, archives and debts,

Recalling that, as stated in paragraph 86 of the report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirty-third session, the Commission decided to recommend that the General Assembly should convene an international conference of plenipotentiaries to study the Commission's draft articles on succession of States in respect of State property, archives and debts and to conclude a convention on the subject,

Mindful of Article 13, paragraph 1 a, of the Charter of the United Nations, which provides that the General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification,

Believing that the successful codification and progressive development of the rules of international law governing suc-

cession of States in respect of State property, archives and debts would contribute to the development of friendly relations and co-operation among States, irrespective of their differing constitutional and social systems, and would assist in promoting and implementing the purposes and principles set forth in Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the International Law Commission for its valuable work on the question of succession of States in respect of State property, archives and debts, and to the Special Rapporteur on the topic for his contribution to this work;

2. Decides that an international conference of plenipotentiaries shall be convened to consider the draft articles on succession of States in respect of State property, archives and debts, and to embody the results of its work in an international convention and such other instruments as it may deem appropriate;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to convene the United Nations Conference on Succession of States in respect of State Property, Archives and Debts early in 1983 at a place to be determined by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

4. Invites Member States to submit, not later than 1 July 1982, their written comments and observations on the final draft articles on succession of States in respect of State property, archives and debts, prepared by the International Law Commission;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to circulate such comments so as to facilitate the discussion on the subject at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item entitled "United Nations Conference on Succession of States in respect of State Property, Archives and Debts".

## State immunities, liability and responsibility

At its May-July 1981 session, ILC continued work on three other aspects of international law concerning States: jurisdictional immunities of States and their property (see below); international liability for injurious consequences arising from acts not prohibited by international law (p. 1231); and State responsibility for internationally wrongful acts (p. 1232).

### State immunities

In 1981, ILC proceeded to prepare draft articles on jurisdictional immunities of States and their property,<sup>(1)</sup> in response to a 1980 General Assembly recommendation.<sup>(3)</sup> The Commission based its work on a third report by the Special Rapporteur, Sompong Sucharitkul (Thailand),<sup>(2)</sup> containing five proposed draft articles, and on material on State practice submitted by Governments in response to a 1979 questionnaire.<sup>(6)</sup> After ILC had discussed the proposed draft articles, the Special Rapporteur revised and reduced them to four—obligation to give effect to State immunity (article 7), consent of State (article 8), expression of consent (article 9) and counter-claims (article 10)—and placed them in part II of the draft dealing with general principles,

together with the text on State immunity (article 6) provisionally approved by ILC in 1980.<sup>(7)</sup> The draft articles were referred to the ILC Drafting Committee, which was unable to consider them due to lack of time.

In its 10 December resolution on the work of ILC, the General Assembly recommended that ILC, continue preparing the draft articles.<sup>(4)</sup>

In the Assembly's Sixth (Legal) Committee, a number of States noted with satisfaction the progress made by ILC. Others reserved judgement, with several indicating that they were awaiting submission by the Special Rapporteur of part III of the draft articles, intended to deal with exceptions to or limitations upon the general principles of State immunity.

Most speakers considered the topic one of the most important in the current work programme of ILC and generally endorsed the inductive approach it had adopted. Opinions differed, however, on the nature and scope of the subject. One view was that the main legal basis for jurisdictional immunities of States was the important principle of respect for national sovereignty, while another held that ILC was faced with a conflict of sovereignties which could, however, be resolved through one giving in to another through consent.

India said ILC had approached the problem practically, but the Byelorussian SSR termed the draft articles unsatisfactory, because of their failure to address the substance or define the scope of jurisdictional immunity, and called on ILC to draw up norms applicable by all States without prejudice to their interests and sovereign rights. Romania felt greater account should have been taken of State practice, of the experience of developed and developing countries, and of trends in treaties on the subject.

Asserting that no State could exercise its sovereignty or jurisdiction against another State without the latter's consent, Sierra Leone suggested that consent be explicitly stated rather than implied. The United Kingdom said the concept that the exercise of jurisdiction in legal proceedings with respect to a foreign State required the consent of that State was unacceptable as a basis for further consideration. The United States asserted that too much importance had been given to the notion of State consent. Spain agreed and said that, when a State decided to grant another immunity, or when it claimed such immunity for itself, it did so not on the basis of consensus but out of its obligation to admit such immunity.

China, Czechoslovakia, Egypt and the German Democratic Republic considered the main legal basis for jurisdictional immunity to be respect for national sovereignty and sovereign

equality of States. Nigeria noted that, since many developed countries had not opted for that theory but had chosen a more restrictive one and wanted to ensure the protection and promotion of friendly relations among States, many developing countries would have to review their State practice and decide whether or not to amend such practices to reflect only the restrictive theory or to allow room for reciprocal treatment between States. Mexico said ILC should view very warily the attempt by certain national courts to extend their jurisdiction, thereby violating other States' sovereignty. Japan believed it important that the text on exceptions to or limitations on the general principles be made available quickly, since it was on this that the division of opinion was greatest.

The Netherlands questioned whether it was possible to draft a complete set of rules suitable for inclusion in a world-wide convention and suggested that ILC formulate reasonably precise rules relating to cases in which every State was ready to recognize the immunity of another, while at the same time trying to formulate similar rules under which every State was prepared not to enjoy immunity.

The Federal Republic of Germany, which viewed business activities of foreign States as falling within the competence of domestic courts, considered unacceptable an approach based on the principle of absolute immunity and from which deviations were possible only with the consent of the State concerned. Iraq believed it important that the draft indicate that it did not seek to enunciate a general exemption for foreign States from the laws of the territorial State. Australia and Venezuela believed a draft entertaining the outmoded notion of absolute and unlimited immunity should be amended or, Venezuela said, refer instead to complete immunity.

Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic had misgivings about the provision on possible counter-claims. Bulgaria said that, although the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations<sup>(5)</sup> provided for counter-claims against a diplomatic agent, applying the same legal régime to States was not warranted.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ILC, A/36/10; <sup>(2)</sup>Special Rapporteur, A/CN.4/340 & Corr.1 & Add.1 & Add.1/Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/163, para. 4 (e), 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1129); <sup>(4)</sup>36/114, para. 3 (b) (iv), 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1265).

Yearbook references: <sup>(5)</sup>1961, p. 512; <sup>(6)</sup>1979, p. 1125; <sup>(7)</sup>1980, p. 1125.

Publication: Materials on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property (ST/LEG/SER.B/20), Sales No. E/F.81.V.10.

#### State liability

Responding to a 1980 General Assembly recommendation,<sup>(3)</sup> ILC continued its work in

1981 on international liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law,<sup>(1)</sup> on the basis of a second report by its Special Rapporteur, Robert Q. Quentin-Baxter (New Zealand).<sup>(2)</sup> The report dealt with the topic's relationship with the régime of State responsibility, the intersection of harm and wrong and the importance of striking a balance of interests in regulating a trans-boundary harm, and proposed a draft article on the scope of the topic.

In its 10 December resolution on the work of ILC, the Assembly recommended that ILC continue preparing draft articles on the subject.<sup>(4)</sup>

During the debate in the Sixth Committee, although most speakers recognized the importance of the topic, some found the content unclear while a few were concerned that it was too close to that of State responsibility for internationally wrongful acts (see below).

India, Italy, Tunisia and the United States considered the two subjects to be distinct and said they needed to be studied independently without overlapping. The United Kingdom felt they were related and thought ILC should not reach a final conclusion on the scope of the topic until further progress had been made on State responsibility. The Federal Republic of Germany urged ILC to continue its cautious approach. Japan regretted the lack of agreement in ILC on its future approach to the work. Brazil spoke similarly and said that, if no prospects existed for developing satisfactory provisions, such work should be discontinued. Pakistan called for caution in considering the topic, as the principle of whether a State could incur liability for an act that was not wrongful remained unresolved in customary international law. Thailand felt the notion of liability was elusive because of the constant evolution of such law, pointing out that an act not prohibited at one time, such as a nuclear test explosion, could be prohibited subsequently. Venezuela did not think it possible to regulate the consequences of lawful activities carried out by a State within its own jurisdiction.

Bulgaria favoured emphasizing reparation rather than theoretical aspects of the origin of responsibility. The United States hoped the rules would combine the need to provide reparation with the need to take preventive measures. That, said Morocco, should not weaken the concept of direct liability and it pointed out that the traditional concept of liability had not kept pace with progress in science and technology. Poland said the draft articles should not only regulate compensation in connection with so-called "liability for risk", but also play a positive role in determining responsibility for damage to the environment.

While the concept of duty of care was found by some States to be insufficiently precise to be capable of general application, others supported its usefulness and felt it an appropriate starting point to formulate rules. Finland considered it inadvisable to use the concept in the context of liability. While not questioning the concept's existence, Brazil did not see how it could be developed into rules of a general nature. The United States observed that, whether the international duty of due care was a substantive obligation or a function of an existing obligation, it could provide a basis for notification and negotiation. New Zealand said it would be wrong to claim, that States had an absolute duty of care; no State could offer absolute guarantees regarding the consequences of its acts in such matters as protecting diplomatic agents. The Byelorussian SSR remarked that duty of care was without foundation in law and not applicable as a norm of international law. The Ukrainian SSR and the USSR spoke in like terms. The latter added that if it did exist it would be a primary rule whose infringement would imply the usual international responsibility. For Venezuela, the concept had moral but not legal value.

Austria said the duty of care and the duty to minimize injurious consequences corresponded to general rules of international law, which had been elaborated progressively. Argentina welcomed the attention given to the concept, as did the Bahamas and Nigeria. Algeria remarked that, in order to ensure a fair balance between the interests involved, responsibility should be grounded both on the concept of duty of care, in a more defined and subtle form, and on the obligation of reparation. One method of balancing interests, Mexico said, was by means of civil liability conventions and compensation funds.

Egypt considered the liability in question as objective or no-fault; criteria such as due diligence and the balancing of interests of States concerned should be applicable only when negligence could be proved.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ILC, A/36/10; <sup>(2)</sup>Special Rapporteur, A/CN.4/346 & Add.1.2.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/163, para. 4 (d), 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, 1129); <sup>(4)</sup>36/114, para. 3 (b) (ii), 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1265).

#### State responsibility

In response to a 1980 General Assembly recommendation,<sup>(3)</sup> ILC continued its work on part II of a set of draft articles on State responsibility for internationally wrongful acts,<sup>(1)</sup> having completed in 1980 its first reading of part I on the origin of international responsibility.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Commission's work on part II was based on a second report by the Special Rapporteur,

Willem Riphagen (Netherlands),<sup>(2)</sup> containing five draft articles-on the content, form and degrees of State responsibility-divided into two chapters. Chapter I dealt with general principles (articles 1 to 3), while chapter II described the obligations of a State guilty of an internationally wrongful act (articles 4 and 5). The five draft articles were referred to the ILC Drafting Committee, which was unable to consider them due to lack of time.

In its 10 December resolution on the work of ILC, the Assembly recommended that ILC continue preparing the draft articles of part II, bearing in mind the need for a second reading of part I.<sup>(4)</sup>

Most delegations speaking in the Sixth Committee felt the topic was the most important under consideration in ILC.

Several speakers, including the Federal Republic of Germany and Thailand, believed that the draft articles were a basis for further work. Spain and the United States were among those which felt it was difficult to consider the draft articles until it was clear how they would relate to one another.

Tunisia said that work done by ILC was an important step forward in codifying the topic. Chile agreed, and was joined by Japan in adding that ILC should complete the draft articles on responsibility for internationally wrongful acts, before drafting those on liability for non-wrongful acts (p. 1231).

A number of speakers emphasized that, in preparing part II of the draft articles, ILC should take due account of the provisions of part I. The Netherlands and the United Kingdom stated that, while in part I it had been possible to formulate abstract secondary rules applying irrespective of the nature of the international obligation breached, 'in part II it would be necessary to have regard to those factors. The German Democratic Republic said that, once an internationally wrongful act had been defined, the point was to define the content of the legal situation generated by such an act. Egypt and Venezuela favoured linking the parts with a statement that an internationally wrongful act of a State gave rise to obligations of that State and to rights of others. Bangladesh thought it might be necessary to re-examine part I in the context of the work on part II. Nigeria said efforts should be made to review the abstract nature of part I.

The Byelorussian SSR said the articles lacked clarity and required extensive redrafting. Yugoslavia believed ILC had yet to establish an appropriate legal framework and basic principles for the topic's future elaboration. Egypt would have preferred an approach basing responsibility on three elements-the author of the injury, the

injury and degree of causality-with compensation based on differentiating between contractual and delictual responsibility.

For the USSR, the correct approach was to affirm the rights of the injured State, rather than to establish new forms of responsibility of the State committing an internationally wrongful act (the author State). The German Democratic Republic and the Ukrainian SSR said ILC should concentrate on international responsibility for international crimes. Zaire believed the draft should contain specific rules on implementation.

Algeria, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia and Poland were among those expressing misgivings about draft articles 1 and 3 which, they felt, gave the impression of safeguarding the rights of the author State and granting it, rather than the injured State, the right of option with regard to the forms of compensation. Brazil, Iraq, Morocco and Romania suggested that the articles be combined, and Venezuela pointed to possibilities for their re-examination and adjustment. Disagreeing, Mexico said international law should protect the author State, so as to prevent counter-measures from becoming reprisals. India said the provisions were not intended to protect the author, but to introduce the element of proportionality between a wrongful act and the response thereto.

Differing reservations were voiced on draft articles 4 and 5. The Byelorussian SSR said the obligations of a State committing a wrongful act should be seen from the standpoint of the rights of the injured State and those of all others, rather than from the perspective of the rights of the author State. Australia was concerned that some provisions gave the impression that the internal law of a State influenced the extent of its obligations under international law. In Brazil's view, draft article 5 would authorize a State to breach an international obligation for the price of compensation and that State, having failed to perform its obligation, could free itself from that duty through payment to the injured State. Mexico wondered rhetorically if, in the case of a breach involving the wrongful occupation of a territory, the author State might be allowed to choose between withdrawing or paying a sum of money, as implied by the option recognized in the article. The Federal Republic of Germany hoped the article's wording could be clarified. Poland could not support extending the scope of State responsibility to include relations with alien natural or juridical persons, while Iraq questioned the value of a special regime for that subject. Nigeria felt the provisions of both articles required further review, while the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya felt they should also specify the

measures which could be taken by an injured State.

China said that, since an internationally wrongful State act did not necessarily create a new legal relationship with a third State, it was important to stipulate the specific circumstances under which the wrongful act affected a third State, in order to prevent countries from deliberately seeking pretexts for unlawful interference in the disputes of others. Finland said the system of responsibility should be made sufficiently effective to eliminate the need for the injured State to resort to actions endangering the maintenance of peace; sanctions or punitive measures should not be left to the discretion of injured States, and applying such measures should, unless otherwise agreed, be the international community's responsibility. Although opposed to approaches leading to conflicts and disregard

for international law in settling disputes, Bulgaria did not reject all legitimate State countermeasures and, with Egypt and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, believed the sanction should always be in proportion to the violation. China spoke similarly. Pakistan held that the articles should embody the general principle of law and equity and that a State could not be held liable for the acts of its enemies. Poland shared the view of ILC that eliminating or limiting wrongfulness did not prejudice the question of proper compensation; thus a State causing damage was properly held to be liable, even when it had acted out of distress or necessity.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ILC, A/36/10; <sup>(2)</sup>Special Rapporteur, A/CN.4/344 & Corr.1,2.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/163, para. 4 (c), 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1129); <sup>(4)</sup>36/114, para. 3 (b) (i), 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1265).

Yearbook reference: (5)1980, p. 1124.

## Chapter IV

# International organizations and international law

The role of the United Nations in the contemporary world continued to be the focus during 1981 of work by the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization. At its February/March session, the Committee studied proposals on ways to maintain and consolidate international peace and security. (1) The General Assembly, in December, decided that the Committee should accord priority to such proposals in 1982, including suggestions relating to the functioning of the Security Council.(4) The Committee also began considering ways to rationalize United Nations procedures.

In December, the Assembly asked the Secretary-General to give high priority to preparing and publishing supplements updating the Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council and the Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs.(5)

The Committee on Relations with the Host Country, in November, made a number of recommendations<sup>(2)</sup>—endorsed by the Assembly in December<sup>(3)</sup>—aimed mainly at improving the security and safety of missions accredited to the United Nations in New York. The Assembly also dealt with the protection of diplomatic and consular missions generally (p. 1223).

During the year, China, Cuba and Uruguay extended their application of the 1947 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies to several additional organizations (p. 1243).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Charter, A/36/33; <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on host country relations, A/36/26.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>36/115, 10 Dec. (p. 1242); <sup>(4)</sup>36/122 (p. 1239), <sup>(5)</sup>36/123 (p. 1240), 11 Dec.

## Strengthening the role of the United Nations

In 1981, the Committee on the Charter continued working on a list of proposals concerning the maintenance of peace and security and the Assembly decided that the Committee should give priority to that work in 1982. Although a large majority of Member States favoured this course of action, differing views were expressed on several aspects of the Committee's work, including whether it should be empowered to make recommendations involving amendments to the Charter, its consideration of proposals concerning the functioning of the Security Council and its use of consensus in making decisions. Opinions also differed over a possible increase in the Council's membership and on reviewing or revising the Charter. In related action, the Committee began studying rationalization of the Organization's procedures.

Concern at delays in publishing the Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs—voiced by both the Committee and the Assembly and the latter requested that the Repertory and the Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council be speedily updated (p. 1239).

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE CHARTER. The 47-member Committee on the Charter held its 1981 session at United Nations Headquarters from 17 February to 14 March.<sup>(2)</sup> In accordance with a 1980 Assembly decision,<sup>(3)</sup> the Committee continued studying Member States' proposals on maintaining peace and security. This aspect of the Committee's work was one of two main items considered by it in 1981 -the other being a draft declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes (p. 1208). To consider both items, the Committee established an open-ended Working Group with the same officers as the Committee. Meeting from 20 February to 13 March, the Group based its work on a 1980 informal compilation of 74 proposals, divided into seven sections-submitted by Member States at annual Committee sessions from 1976 to 1980.<sup>(7)</sup> In addition, the Group had before it two draft recommendations: the first proposed by Egypt; and the second presented by Egypt on behalf of Committee members belonging to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. Both drafts would have had the Committee recommend that urgent efforts be made to enhance the Security Council's effectiveness. However, due to lack of time, no action was taken on the texts.

In the Working Group there were diverging views on the weight to be attached to the informal compilation as well as on how best to organize its discussion. Because of time constraints, examination of sections V to VII was not completed. On 13 March, the Chairman presented a document reflecting his assessment of the degree of progress made in the Working Group. He summarized the proposals on which general agreement was possible, those awakening special interest but needing further examination, and those on which agreement did not seem possible.

Also in accordance with a 1980 Assembly request<sup>(4)</sup> by which the Committee on the Charter was to consider Member States' proposals concerning the rationalization of existing United Nations procedures, the Group heard William B. Buffum, Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs, review the Assembly's activities in that regard. He pointed to the work of the Committee on Conferences in investigating ways of reducing the volume of United Nations documentation (p. 1371) and to the continuous increase in the number of agenda items as an area requiring study. Various suggestions were made in the Working Group on the need to avoid having different aspects of the same item discussed in different committees, the role of the Assembly's General Committee in streamlining the agenda, the involvement of the Sixth (Legal) Committee in drafting treaties and conventions (p. 1245), the need to ensure absolute equality

among working languages, computerization, control of documentation, and the burden placed on United Nations facilities by meetings of bodies not directly connected with the Organization or its work.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 11 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(5)</sup> by which it decided that the Committee on the Charter at its 1982 session should continue examining current and future proposals with a view to according priority to those on which agreement seemed possible, and make recommendations thereon. The Committee was asked to give priority to proposals on maintaining international peace and security, including those relating to the functioning of the Security Council, and to consider suggestions by Member States on the rationalization of existing United Nations procedures. The Assembly reminded the Committee of the importance of reaching general agreement whenever that had significance for the outcome of its work, and decided that it should allow observers of Member States to participate in its meetings. The Secretary-General was asked to prepare for the 1982 session of the Committee an informal analysis of statements made in 1981 in the Assembly's Sixth Committee.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 122 to 15, with 3 abstentions. On 1 December, the Sixth Committee had approved the 40-nation draft by a recorded vote, requested by the Philippines, of 100 to none, with 14 abstentions. This action was preceded by two separate Committee votes, also requested by the Philippines, on the draft's wording: by a recorded vote of 89 to 15, with 6 abstentions, the words "and to make recommendations thereon" contained in paragraph 2 (b) were retained; and by a recorded vote of 81 to 16, with 14 abstentions, paragraph 4 (a) was retained.

Another draft resolution was submitted to the Sixth Committee by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Mauritania.<sup>(1)</sup> By this draft, the Committee on the Charter would have been asked to examine what the sponsors called abuse of the unanimity rule by the Security Council's permanent members in adopting non-procedural decisions, namely, those on the inalienable rights of peoples struggling against racism, including apartheid, and other forms of foreign domination. This draft was approved by the Sixth Committee on 1 December by a recorded vote, requested by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, of 34 to 33, with 43 abstentions. On 11 December, however, the Assembly, at Finland's suggestion, decided by a recorded vote of 62 to 32, with 35 abstentions, to take no decision on the matter.

Speaking in the Assembly, Finland, pointing out that the majority of the Sixth Committee

had been unable to support the two-nation draft, said the text's adoption would contradict the mandate of the Special Committee on the Charter and would jeopardize its work. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said some States were threatening to withdraw from that body if the draft were adopted; the permanent members of the Council—all but China—preferred to maintain the Committee in its current form so that it would be unable to take any positive action. Sierra Leone, which voted in favour of the draft in the Sixth Committee and abstained on the Assembly's decision, said it hoped the Council, particularly the permanent members, would be put on notice that using the veto would no longer be accepted with equanimity.

A number of States explained their votes in the Sixth Committee on the 40-nation draft. Several explained their negative votes on the words "and to make recommendations thereon". The USSR feared their inclusion would upset the balance of the Committee on the Charter's terms of reference and adversely affect its work. The United States characterized the words as provocative and unjustified. The German Democratic Republic said attempts had been made in that Committee to secure adoption of what it viewed as one-sided recommendations. France pointed out that those words and paragraph 4 (a) ran counter to the spirit underlying the Committee's work as reflected in the Assembly's reminder about the importance of reaching general agreement, and urged that all proposals be dealt with equally.

Several other States also explained their negative positions on paragraph 4 (a). The USSR saw that text as an attempt to create an atmosphere of confrontation in the Committee on the Charter and to undermine Charter principles, especially the unanimity rule among the Security Council's permanent members (Article 27 of the Charter). The German Democratic Republic spoke likewise and pointed out that the text was incompatible with paragraph 2 (b) according to which priority should be accorded to proposals on which agreement seemed possible; experience had shown that the question of the functioning of the Council was not one on which agreement seemed possible. The United States said the provision relating to the Council was unnecessary, since the Committee on the Charter would be failing to fulfil its mandate if it did not examine all proposals.

Reasons for abstaining on the draft as a whole were explained by several delegations. Poland felt it would adversely affect the work of the Committee on the Charter. France and the USSR said their lack of support was because the provisions to which they had objected had been

retained. The German Democratic Republic stated that, while it did not believe the draft would hamper the Committee's work, it did not contain sufficient guarantees against renewed attacks on the Charter.

The United States, although voting for the draft as a whole, considered the provisions on observers unwise and felt the financial estimates for the Committee's 1982 session needed re-examination—a view shared by the USSR. France regretted the proliferation of documentation inherent in the requests in paragraphs 11 and 12, while Sierra Leone, though voting in favour, questioned the usefulness of the proposed analysis since the Sixth Committee summary records met the needs of the Committee on the Charter.

The question of strengthening the role of the United Nations was discussed in the Sixth Committee concurrently with that of the peaceful settlement of international disputes (p. 1208).

Introducing the 40-nation draft, the Philippines stressed that the request for the analytical summary was intended to be an informal guide with special attention given to proposals made at the current Assembly session; and that the Committee on the Charter was to give priority to recommendations submitted during its 1981 session or thereafter, particularly those presented on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Committee Chairman's paper.

A large number of developing countries objected to the unanimity rule, or right of veto, in the Security Council, which they saw as contradicting the principle of sovereign equality of States. Several believed world peace no longer depended on the Council's permanent members and that the large number of emerging countries and the expanding United Nations membership should be taken into account. Some, including Kenya, Uganda and Venezuela, asserted that the veto had been used to further national interests rather than to maintain international peace and security. Burundi felt it had introduced an element of rigidity which raised doubts about the Council's ability to act in complex international situations. The Congo and Zaire believed nothing could justify maintaining privileges originating in a bipolarized world emerging after the Second World War. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya termed the Council a dictatorial body where resolutions were adopted by the permanent members, with the presence of other members used to lend a democratic facade. Costa Rica considered the veto dictatorial and contrary to moral standards and international law. Bahrain said it should apply only to substantive Council resolutions, while Mali, the Niger, Nigeria and Sierra Leone called for limiting its use. Guyana



and Somalia supported examining areas not requiring unanimity.

Mexico pointed out that all the permanent members had at some time, for transitory reasons of national interest, been in favour of amending the unanimity rule, and hence most Member States held little sympathy for the claim that Council procedures were sacrosanct. Egypt stressed the need for amendments to the Council's rules of procedure. Nepal attributed the Council's ineffectiveness to the complex relationship of its permanent members. Morocco called the proposal a theoretical exercise, since those empowered under Charter Article 108 to change the right of veto were the very ones who enjoyed it.

Upholding the unanimity rule as the cornerstone of the Organization, several Eastern European States and others, including the Byelorussian SSR, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, claimed that, given the differing socio-economic systems in the world, the principle of unanimity reflected political realities and guaranteed fulfilment by the Council of collective goals. Czechoslovakia was among those which said the veto did not violate States' sovereign equality. Hungary added that Member States had voluntarily conferred powers on the Council and its permanent members by accepting the Charter. Mongolia said the veto had been used against the will of the majority of States not because its existence was contrary to that will, but because of misuse in self-interest.

France stressed that Council decisions must be agreed to by those having special Charter responsibilities if such decisions were not to be dangerous or ineffective. The Netherlands said proposals to abolish or limit the right of veto entailed risking confrontation between the Organization and one or more major Powers. Poland feared its curtailment might lead to the settlement outside the United Nations of important matters relating to international peace and security, thus weakening the Organization. While not insensitive to reviewing the unanimity rule, the United Kingdom felt a more cautious approach should be adopted, as it had suggested previously.<sup>(6)</sup>

Several developing countries, Guyana and Venezuela among them, favoured increasing the Council's membership because of the increase in United Nations membership and the principle of equitable geographical distribution. For Nigeria and Togo, it was unjust that the African continent had no permanent Council member.

Some Eastern European countries, such as Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian SSR, considered change unwise, asserting that the mem-

bership was sufficiently balanced and reflected the world power structure, and that an enlargement would destroy that balance. If that were done, argued the Byelorussian SSR and Poland, the Council's efficiency and ability to act quickly would be reduced. However, a number of States, including Austria, Hungary, Iraq, Mongolia, Pakistan, the USSR and Venezuela, supported holding either a special session or periodic high-level meetings of the Council to review the international situation.

Among those advocating review or revision of the Charter, many developing countries, such as Algeria, Bahrain, Colombia, the Congo, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela, believed the Organization could no longer remain impervious to changes in international relations or be unwilling to adapt to current realities. Burundi said the crisis could be resolved only by substantial readjustments. Tunisia called for greater democratization. The Bahamas said it was complacent and cynical to see the Charter in its current form as perfectly balanced and reflecting the international political situation. Rwanda felt it was not a sacrosanct document. Zaire said opposition to modification was part of the great Powers' policy of exploitation. China asserted that strengthening the Organization would require overcoming obstacles created by those Powers. For Bangladesh and Uganda, any amendment should include making Member States fully committed to resolutions adopted unanimously or by consensus. Yugoslavia spoke similarly. While supporting Charter revision, Chile and Pakistan cautioned against changing its basic principles. Morocco believed in reviving the collective spirit, rather than revising texts or improving procedures.

Among those opposing revision of the Charter, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland and Hungary asserted that it had fully withstood the test of time and had proved its ability to respond to changing circumstances. That there had been no world war since the United Nations began, said Afghanistan, attested to the Charter's value. The Netherlands also felt the Organization had an impressive record on peace-keeping. For Austria, the Charter adequately took into account the legitimate interests of all. Belgium stressed that its provisions formed a balanced whole; any change would have to be prepared carefully to harmonize with that whole. Czechoslovakia and Mongolia also advised caution in introducing changes, while Poland urged fuller utilization of existing capacities. Many States, including Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Ethiopia, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Turkey, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and Viet Nam, believed the

Organization's ineffectiveness stemmed not from Charter defects but from lack of political will to abide by its provisions. Though not rejecting amendment, Cyprus, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Arab Emirates spoke in like manner.

In relation to rationalizing existing United Nations procedures, Colombia emphasized the need to ensure absolute equality among the working languages. Some States also called for a review of the Charter. The Syrian Arab Republic said such a review could achieve a fairer balance among United Nations organs. Yugoslavia favoured making the Assembly a democratic negotiating mechanism. The Congo, Kenya and the Niger supported enhancing its role in maintaining international peace. Bangladesh suggested conferring secondary responsibility on the Assembly where threats to peace were apparent. Austria supported enlarging the Assembly's role provided such enlargement remained within the Charter's framework. Sierra Leone said involving all States in dispute settlement should be seen as a general effort to make international relations democratic rather than as an attempt to increase the Assembly's competence at the expense of the Council. Jamaica favoured making Assembly decisions on peace and security binding on States. Spain observed that the Charter did not give the Security Council primary responsibility for settling disputes, but provided that it should take the necessary action to safeguard international peace. Argentina stressed the need to leave the door open for change.

Indonesia saw merit in rationalizing structures and procedures, as did Austria, which suggested that each main organ undertake such a process for its own field of responsibility. The Netherlands and the United Kingdom said institutional development was best achieved by evolutionary processes preserving the integrity of particular institutions while gradually adapting them to meet new challenges.

A number of States, including Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, France, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Poland, stressed the importance of not upsetting the balance between the powers of the Assembly and the Council. Similarly, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR and the USSR did not agree with broadening-at the Council's expense-the roles of the Assembly, the International Court of Justice or the Secretary-General for settling disputes between States.

Differing views were voiced about the Committee on the Charter's practice of using consensus in its decision-making process. Austria, Bulgaria, France, the German Democratic Republic and Hungary favoured continuing that practice.

Czechoslovakia said it was ideal for achieving positive results while safeguarding the interests of all. New Zealand said consensus encouraged moderation. However, Burundi feared it had disadvantages when used akin to a right of veto. The Philippines said consensus was the major stumbling-block, while Zaire saw it as an artificial measure turning into a veiled veto.

Sierra Leone blamed the Committee's lack of progress on rigidity. Algeria said that body gave a semblance of normalcy to the Organization's shortcomings by conducting sterile academic discussions. Romania said the Committee, in its six years of existence, had not produced any recommendation aimed at strengthening the United Nations. Belgium and Italy urged the Committee to concentrate on improving United Nations procedures, not on Charter amendments. The USSR said the Committee's efforts should be based on strict adherence to that document.

Among those urging renewal of the mandate of the Committee on the Charter were: Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Guyana, Iraq, Jamaica, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Rwanda, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Romania said the mandate should be clarified and the Committee should become a permanent Assembly organ, examining and making recommendations on all Charter questions. Cyprus hoped the mandate would become more action-oriented, particularly with regard to peace and security. That topic should be given priority, China urged. Argentina said the Committee should have sufficient latitude to work without undue pressure. The Federal Republic of Germany felt rationalization of procedures should be excluded from the mandate so that the Committee could concentrate on its principal task. Kenya hoped the Committee's future recommendations on maintaining peace and security would allow the views of the majority to be registered.

Draft resolution not acted upon: <sup>(1)</sup>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Mauritania, A/C.6/36/L.12 & Corr.1.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on Charter, A/36/33.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/164 para. 3 (a). 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 188); <sup>(4)</sup>ibid, para. 3 (b); <sup>(5)</sup>36/122, 11 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references: 1980, <sup>(6)</sup>p. 183, <sup>(7)</sup>p. 185.

Financial implications: Committee on Conferences observations, A/C.6/36/L.14/Add.1; 5th Committee report, A/36/817: S-G statements. A/C.5/36/98, A/C.6/36/L.14.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.26, 28-35, 37, 38, 56, 59, 62-64 (21 Oct.-1 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.70 (10 Dec.); plenary. A/36/PV.94 (11 Dec.).

## General Assembly resolution 36/122

122-15-3 (recorded vote) Meeting 94 11 December 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/782) by recorded vote (100-0-14). 1 December (meeting 64): 40-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.10); agenda item 122.

Sponsors: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Germany, Federal Republic of, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia,.

Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming its support for the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations,

Recalling its resolutions 686(VII) of 5 December 1952, 992(X) of 21 November 1955, 2285(XXII) of 5 December 1967, 2552(XXIV) of 12 December 1969, 2697(XXV) of 11 December 1970, 2968(XXVII) of 14 December 1972 and 3349(XXIX) of 17 December 1974,

Recalling also its resolutions 2925(XXVII) of 27 November 1972, 3073(XXVIII) of 30 November 1973 and 3282(XXIX) of 12 December 1974 on the strengthening of the role of the United Nations,

Recalling especially its resolution 3499(XXX) of 15 December 1975, by which it established the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization, and its resolutions 31/28 of 29 November 1976, 32/45 of 8 December 1977, 33/94 of 16 December 1978, 34/147 of 17 December 1979 and 35/164 of 15 December 1980,

Having considered the report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization on the work of the session it held in 1981,

Noting that significant progress has been made in fulfilling the mandate of the Special Committee,

Noting a/s/o the progress of the debate held during the thirty-sixth session on the item entitled "Peaceful settlement of disputes between States", included in the agenda in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 35/164, especially concerning the consideration of the draft Manila declaration on the peaceful settlement of international disputes,

Noting the importance that pre-session consultations among the members of the Special Committee and other interested States may have in facilitating the fulfilment of the Committee's task,

Considering that the Special Committee has not yet completed the mandate entrusted to it,

1. Takes note of the report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization;

2. Decides that the Special Committee should continue its work in pursuance of the following tasks with which it is entrusted:

(a) To list the proposals which have been made or will be made in the Committee and to identify those which have awakened special interest;

(b) To examine proposals which have been made or will be made in the Committee with a view to according priority to the consideration of those on which agreement seems possible and to make recommendations thereon;

3. Also decides that the Special Committee shall convene its next session from 22 February to 19 March 1982;

4. Requests the Special Committee at its next session:

(a) To accord priority to its work on the proposals regarding the question of the maintenance of international peace and security, including those relating to the functioning of the Security Council, with a view to continuing its examination of the compilation of proposals contained in its report on the

work of the session it held in 1980 and to considering the recommendations and proposals submitted during its session in 1981 or thereafter;

(b) To consider proposals made by Member States on the question of rationalization of existing procedures of the United Nations and, subsequently, any proposals under other topics;

5. Also requests the Special Committee to finalize the draft Manila declaration on the peaceful settlement of international disputes with a view to its consideration and adoption by the General Assembly, and to submit it to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

6. Further requests the Special Committee, in the light of the progress it has achieved concerning the question of the peaceful settlement of disputes, to continue its work on this question by considering the remaining proposals contained in the list prepared by the Committee in accordance with General Assembly resolution 33/94;

7. Requests the Special Committee to be mindful of the importance of reaching general agreement whenever that has significance for the outcome of its work;

8. Urges members of the Special Committee to participate fully in its work in fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to it;

9. Decides that the special Committee shall accept the participation in its meetings of observers of Member States and, paying due regard to its efficiency and the time at its disposal, allow their participation in the meetings of its working groups;

10. Invites Governments to submit or to bring up to date, if they deem it necessary, their observations and proposals in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3499(XXX);

11. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare an informal working paper containing an analytical summary of the statements made on the item in the Sixth Committee during the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, and to submit it to the Special Committee at its next session;

12. Requests the Secretary-General to render all assistance to the Special Committee, including the provision of summary records;

13. Requests the Special Committee to submit a report on its work to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

14. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia,

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Cuba, Seychelles.

## Updating Repertories of Practice

Concerned about delays in preparing and publishing the Repertory of Practice of United Nations

Organs, a number of members of the Committee on the Charter, at its February/March 1981 session,<sup>11</sup> called on the Office of Legal Affairs to update the Repertory quickly, as requested by the General Assembly in 1980,<sup>12</sup> and to publish existing volumes or reprint out-of-stock issues in appropriate languages.

Responding to the same Assembly request, the Secretary-General, in an October 1981 report<sup>13</sup> on both the Repertory and the Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council, noted that with regard to the latter publication the seventh supplement, covering 1972-1974, had been published in English and that work on the eighth, covering 1975-1978, had begun. As to the Repertory, the report indicated that the original English version had been completely reprinted in 1980; a reprint of Supplement No. 1 was expected in 1982; and reprints in French and Spanish of the original and Supplement No. 1 were also projected for 1982. French and Spanish versions of Supplement No. 3 were scheduled for 1982 and 1983, but work had not started on the table of contents and subject index. The English version of volume I (Charter Articles 1-54) of Supplement No. 4 (covering 1 September 1966 to 31 December 1969) was being printed and volume II (Articles 55-111) was anticipated in late 1982 or early 1983. Work had also started on Supplement No. 5 (estimated at three volumes, covering 1 January 1970 to 31 December 1978).

The report stated that, since most Secretariat departments responsible for preparatory work lacked specialized research staff, work was periodically postponed in favour of more urgent tasks and, being residual in nature, was being done by personnel released from other duties. Annexed to the report were complete tabulations of the published volumes of the Repertoire and Repertory, as well as their supplements and translations.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 11 December 1981, the General Assembly adopted without vote a resolution<sup>14</sup> requesting the Secretary-General to give high priority to preparing and publishing the supplements updating both publications and to report on progress in 1982.

On 1 December, the Sixth Committee had similarly approved the draft, sponsored by 15 nations and introduced by Mexico.

Most speakers in the Committee, including Brazil, France, India, Japan, Pakistan, Spain and the Ukrainian SSR, supported updating the publications. Austria, Finland and Iraq urged that resources be allocated for that purpose, while Egypt believed a separate specialized unit should be established. Argentina spoke similarly.

Support for updating the Repertory was voiced by the Bahamas, Bulgaria, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guyana, Morocco and

Sierra Leone. Bangladesh, Colombia, Nigeria and the United Kingdom felt the Office of Legal Affairs should continue co-ordinating its publication. Belgium said documentation should be kept within reasonable proportions. Israel and Italy were concerned that the work was characterized as residual, thus increasing delays. New Zealand stressed that the updating was directly related to the work of the Committee on the Charter and was no less important than any of its other tasks. The United States was dissatisfied with the Secretariat's response.

Reports: <sup>11</sup>Committee on Charter, A/36/33; <sup>12</sup>S-G, A/C.6/36/2.

Resolutions: GA: (3)35/164, para. 10, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 189); <>36/123, 11 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.26, 28-35, 37, 38, 56, 59, 62-64 (21 Oct.-1 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.94(11 Dec.).

### **General Assembly resolution 36/123**

Adopted without vote Meeting 94 11 December 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/782) without vote, 1 December (meeting 64); 15-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.18), orally revised; agenda item 122.

Sponsors: Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Italy, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Venezuela.

#### **Updating of the Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council and the Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs**

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 602(VI) of 1 February 1952 and 686(VII) of 5 December 1952 concerning the preparation and publication of the Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 796(VIII) of 27 November 1953 and 992(X) of 21 November 1955 concerning the preparation and publication of the Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs,

Recalling also its resolution 2482(XXIII) of 21 December 1968 on the budget for the financial year 1969 which provided new posts for the continuing work on the repertoires relating to the Charter of the United Nations, the practice of United Nations organs and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, to be undertaken by the General Legal Division of the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat,

Recalling further its resolution 35/164 of 15 December 1980 concerning the preparation and publication of the supplements to the Repertoire and the Repertory,

Taking note of paragraph 13 of the report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization on the work of the session it held in 1981,

Taking note also of the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the preparation and publication of the Repertoire and the Repertory,

Recognizing the importance and usefulness of the Repertoire and the Repertory as the principal sources of records for the analytical studies of the application and interpretation of the provisions of the Charter and of the rules of procedure made thereunder,

Requests the Secretary-General to give high priority to the preparation and publication of the supplements to the Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council and the Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs in order to bring those publications up to date as quickly as possible and to submit a progress report on the matter to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

## Host country relations

Concern over acts of violence against certain missions accredited to the United Nations and their personnel was expressed during 1981 in the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, and the General Assembly endorsed that body's recommendations to improve the situation and other aspects of relations with the host country-the United States.

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON HOST COUNTRY RELATIONS. The Committee on host country relations held six meetings in 1981.<sup>(4)</sup> At its first, on 28 January, the 15-member Committee abolished the Working Group established in 1972 and decided that matters within the Group's mandate would be considered by the Bureau-Chairman, Rapporteur, three Vice-Chairmen and ex-officio representatives of the host country.

On the security of Member States' missions and the safety of their personnel, the Committee considered a number of complaints, summarized in its report, by the USSR and one by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

The USSR informed the Committee that on 14 November shots had been fired at the residence of its Permanent Representative at Glen Cove, New York, while diplomats and their families were inside. The USSR said it expected full information from the host country on the prosecution and punishment of the culprits. Expressing its sincere regret over the incident, the United States stated that two persons had been arrested and charged; additional security precautions had been taken to prevent recurrence of such terrorist acts.

The USSR also advised the Committee of the discovery in May of an incendiary device within its Mission's housing complex at Riverdale, New York, and of three others near the Mission's summer house at Oyster Bay, New York. In September, explosive devices had been found beneath two vehicles belonging to the Byelorussian SSR and USSR Missions. The United States assured that effective preventive police measures had been instituted and stated that attempts to fire-bomb cars had ceased since the arrest of an individual charged with a similar incident involving another Member State.

The Committee was also informed by the USSR of numerous acts of violence and harassment, including provocative telephone calls containing threats, gross abuse and insults-310 of which were received during a 24-hour period on 24 March-and of demonstrations impeding the Mission's normal functioning. Stating that the campaign emanated from Zionist organizations,

the USSR called the host country's security measures inadequate. The United States said it condemned irresponsible acts by its citizens against USSR personnel and their families, adding that it had reinforced the protection of the Mission and related establishments and that investigations had been undertaken. It rejected suggestions that the conduct of United States authorities was inadequate and stressed the need for timely reporting of incidents as well as the importance of full co-operation with law enforcement authorities in investigating crimes and prosecuting those responsible.

Annexed to the Committee's report were a 20 November press release by the USSR listing what it said were the most outrageous attacks against its Mission since 1971, and the response thereto by the United States, dated 30 November.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya informed the Committee that on 30 July an intrusion into its Mission had taken place and accused the host country authorities of collusion with the perpetrators.<sup>(1)</sup> Reaffirming its strong condemnation of all such acts, the United States denied the allegation and said the authorities had ended the occupation quickly.

Among other matters considered by the Committee were diplomatic status and traffic and parking regulations, as well as visa questions.

Several members complained about the policy of the City of New York concerning the towing away of diplomatic vehicles, which had been instituted in December 1980 before consulting the United States Mission. Bulgaria, Costa Rica, France, Honduras, Spain and the USSR maintained that the practice conflicted with the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations,<sup>(7)</sup> prohibiting towing except in emergencies. The United Kingdom suggested that the host country justify each instance. The United States considered the practice compatible with the Convention and defended towing in cases where there were safety hazards; it assured that it would continue assisting all missions to conduct their business without disruption and that additional parking spaces had been requested.

The Committee also discussed requirements for issuing visas to private servants and to service staff employed in the United States by diplomatic and consular staff and by staff of international organizations; and listed in its report a compilation of treaties, local laws and regulations in force in the host country and of particular interest to the United Nations diplomatic community in New York, prepared by the United States at Mongolia's request.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Committee also had before it a letter from Morocco on behalf of the Arab Group,<sup>(2)</sup> pro-

testing at slanderous and insulting comments made by Edward Koch, New York City Mayor, during a Middle East trip, and calling on him to apologize and retract remarks approving the annexation of Jerusalem and establishment of Israeli settlements, and his charge that the United Nations yielded to blackmail.

By recommendations approved on 30 November, the Committee:

- expressed concern over terrorist acts against diplomatic missions, condemned all such acts and called on the host country to ensure that urgent measures were taken to apprehend and punish those responsible;

- noted assurances given and actions taken by the host country and urged it to continue taking measures to prevent acts violating the security of missions and the safety of their personnel or the inviolability of their property, and to ensure normal conditions for their functioning;

- called on missions to co-operate fully with Federal and local United States authorities in cases affecting mission security;

- expressed the hope that the host country's international obligations relating to Member States' privileges and immunities would continue to be met effectively;

- appealed to the host country to review measures regarding the parking of diplomatic vehicles and to consider terminating the serving of summonses on diplomats;

- welcomed the diplomatic community's readiness to co-operate in solving traffic problems;

- expressed the hope that efforts would be continued to acquaint the people of New York City with the importance of the international functions performed by mission personnel and their corresponding privileges and immunities;

- suggested that the Secretariat and others work together to solve difficulties concerning the unpaid bills of certain missions and diplomats;

- expressed appreciation to the New York City Commission for the United Nations and the Consular Corps and those contributing to its efforts to help the diplomatic community, provide hospitality and promote mutual understanding between that community and the local population; and

- considered that its meetings should be organized both at the request of Member States and as necessary to fulfil its mandate.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 10 December, the General Assembly adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(6)</sup> endorsing the Committee's recommendations and requesting it to continue its

work. The Assembly strongly condemned acts of terrorism against missions accredited to the United Nations and their personnel and requested the Secretary-General to remain active in all aspects of relations with the host country and to continue stressing to it the importance of effective measures to avoid such violent acts.

On 4 December, the Sixth Committee had approved by consensus the draft sponsored by 10 nations and introduced by Czechoslovakia.

In the Sixth Committee, several States, including Afghanistan, Mongolia and the USSR, considered that the host country had not taken sufficient measures to ensure the protection of missions and their personnel. The Byelorussian SSR spoke similarly. Cuba added that there had been no arrests or punishment of criminals involved in more than 40 violations against its mission since 1962, including the murder of a diplomat, and contended that the 1947 Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations<sup>(5)</sup> was applied by the host country to suit its own interests, including when issuing visas to officials travelling to United Nations meetings.

Nigeria commended the host country for coping well with the problems of missions, but urged that measures be taken to strengthen their protection and that of their personnel. Egypt also welcomed the host country's efforts to prevent affronts and humiliation.

Condemning all terrorist acts, the United States noted that, considering the prevalence of world-wide violence, living conditions for almost all the diplomatic community in such a large cosmopolitan city as New York were as calm as possible.

Letters and note verbale (nv): <sup>(1)</sup>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 31 July A/36/414; <sup>(2)</sup>Morocco, 5 Feb., A/36/94-S/14365; United States, 23 Apr., A/AC.154/212 (nv). Report: <sup>(4)</sup>Committee on host country relations, A/36/26. Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>169(II), 31 Oct. 1947 (YUN 1947-48, p. 199); <sup>(6)</sup>36/115 10 Dec. 1981, text following. Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1961, p. 512. Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.69, 70 (4 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.92 (10 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 38/115

Adopted without vote Meeting 92 10 December 1981  
Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/783) by consensus. 4 December (meeting 70); 10-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.291); agenda item 123.

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country  
The General Assembly,  
Having considered the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country,

5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of Its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country".

## United Nations

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 1139.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 179(II), annex, 21 Nov. 1947 (YUN 1947-48, p. 190).

## Agencies in respect of which Convention is applicable

[illegible]

Agencies In respect of which Convention is applicable														
States parties	ILO	FAO	UNESCO	WHO	World Bank	IFC	IDA	IMF	ICA0	UPU	ITU	WMO	MC0	W/PO IFAD
German Democratic Republic	x		x	x						x	x	x	x	
Germany, Federal Republic of	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ghana	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x		x
Greece	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Guatemala	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		
Guinea	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Guyana	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Haiti	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	
Hungary	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x	x	
India	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		
Indonesia	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Iran	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Iraq	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x		
Ireland	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Ivory Coast	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Jamaica	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x		
Japan	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Jordan		x	x	x					x	x	x	x		
Kenya	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Kuwait	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	
Lesotho	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	x	x	x	x	x			x	x		x	x		
Luxembourg	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x		
Madagascar	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	
Malawi	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Malaysia	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x		
Maldives				x						x	x		x	
Mali	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x		
Malta	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Mauritius	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x	x	
Mongolia	x	x	x	x						x	x	x		
Morocco	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Nepal		x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x			
Netherlands	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
New Zealand	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x	x	
Nicaragua	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x		
Niger	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		
Nigeria	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x	x	
Norway	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	
Pakistan	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Philippines	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x			x		
Poland	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x	x	
Republic of Korea		x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x		
Romania	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	
Rwanda	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		
Senegal	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Sierra Leone	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x	x	
Singapore	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x		
Spain	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Sweden	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Thailand	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x			
Togo				x						x				
Tonga	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x	x	
Trinidad and Tobago	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	
Tunisia	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x		
Ukrainian SSR	x		x							x	x	x		
USSR	x		x	x					x	x	x	x	x	
United Kingdom	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x	x	
United Republic of Tanzania	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x		
upper Volta	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	
Uruguay	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x		
Yugoslavia	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	
Zaire	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Zambia	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x	x	



## Chapter V

## Treaties and agreements

Questions related to treaties and other international agreements continued to be studied by several United Nations bodies during 1981 and were the subject of decisions by the General Assembly.

In December,<sup>(2)</sup> the Assembly decided to establish in 1982 a working group of the Sixth (Legal) Committee to assess the multilateral treaty-making process and requested the updating of two publications related to that process: the Handbook of Final Clauses and the Summary of the Practice of the Secretary-General as Depositary of Multilateral Agreements.

Also in December, the Assembly recommended that the International Law Commission complete in 1982 its second reading- begun in 1981<sup>(1)</sup>-of draft articles on treaties concluded between States and international organizations or between two or more such organizations.

Throughout the year, international agreements and information about adherence to them continued to be received by the Secretariat for registration or filing and recording, and there were a number of ex-officio registrations (p. 1250). Multilateral treaties were also concluded under United Nations auspices and a number, for which the Secretary-General acts as depositary, came into force (p. 1250).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ILC, A/36/10 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA, 10 Dec.: <sup>(2)</sup>36/112 (p. 1247), <sup>(3)</sup>36/114 (p. 1265).

## Drafting process of multilateral treaties

Responding to a 1980 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted to the Assembly in October 1981 a report, with later addenda,<sup>(1)</sup> containing the observations of 12 Governments and 7 international organizations on his 1980 report<sup>(5)</sup> which had set out a series of questions to be considered in examining the multilateral treaty-making process within the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations. The 1981 report summarized the Sixth Committee's 1980 discussion of the topic, suggested questions that the Committee might address and contained information about material received pursuant to the review of the multilateral treaty-making process, with a view to its possible publication. The report suggested that the material be published as a volume of the United Nations Legislative Series, proposed an out-

line of its contents and estimated the cost at \$33,132. In response to a 1980 Assembly request<sup>(3)</sup> for new editions of the 1957 Handbook of Final Clauses and the 1959 Summary of the Practice of the Secretary-General as Depositary of Multilateral Agreements, it was pointed out that additional temporary staff at a cost of \$36,000 would be required to make possible their publication.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 10 December 1981, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(4)</sup> inviting Governments and international organizations to submit by 30 June 1982 their observations on the Secretary-General's two reports, taking into account the specific questions contained in that of 1981, as well as their comments on any other aspect of the subject. The Secretary-General was requested to submit the replies to the Assembly in 1982, and to prepare and publish as soon as possible new editions of the Handbook and the Summary. The Assembly decided to establish at its 1982 session a Sixth Committee working group to consider the questions raised in the 1981 report, to assess the efficiency, economy and effectiveness of the United Nations multilateral treaty-making process and to make recommendations. The Secretary-General was further asked to prepare for 1982 a provisional volume of the Legislative Series containing the material listed in his 1981 report, as well as an analysis of the observations received.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 128 to none, with 18 abstentions. On 1 December, the Sixth Committee had approved the draft, sponsored by 17 nations, by 94 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

Several delegations explained their votes in the Committee. Brazil, the German Democratic Republic and the USSR abstained, questioning the need for the subject's further analysis and for establishing a working group. The USSR added that the sponsors had failed to carry out consultations and had rejected a compromise to incorporate the majority view.

Although voting in favour, Algeria and Zaire doubted that a working group was the best method for dealing with the topic. Bahrain voted positively but withdrew its sponsorship as it had hoped the text would be approved by consensus.

Introducing the draft, Australia said closer study of the multilateral treaty-making process was urgently needed and would benefit all

Member States, particularly those developing countries lacking resources to participate effectively; the proposed open-ended working group should make speedy progress in view of the subject's politically non-controversial nature.

In addition to those sponsors who spoke in the Committee, support for establishing the group was voiced by Chile, France, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Pakistan and the United Kingdom. The Netherlands envisaged a small group also including international organizations, and Indonesia favoured limiting its size. Egypt preferred the group to be open-ended to allow participation of all Member States wishing to do so. Israel said the group's terms of reference should not be too broad and theoretical considerations should be avoided. Trinidad and Tobago, however, favoured establishing a special committee, while Sweden felt an inter-sessional committee, meeting for a few weeks, was preferable. Irrespective of the forum, the United States said, the need to examine the matter was evident. Although supporting the group's establishment, Greece cautioned that the work was likely to be of limited value apart from its academic interest.

A number of States saw no justification for the working group, as they saw no need to continue discussing the question. Afghanistan said it had been considered exhaustively. The Byelorussian SSR and Czechoslovakia agreed, citing the small number of replies received from Governments over a four-year period as indicating lack of interest. The German Democratic Republic and the Ukrainian SSR thought the group would distract the Sixth Committee from more pressing matters. Brazil and Spain also doubted the group's usefulness, while the USSR pointed out that its establishment would involve additional expenditure.

Concern over the problems caused by the abundance of multilateral treaties was expressed by several delegations. For Australia and Bangladesh, this factor and decentralizing the treaty-making process had led to lack of comprehensive and accessible information about legal provisions in particular subject areas. The United Kingdom wondered whether the United Nations system was generating treaties at a pace which strained States' capacity to cope with them. China, which considered the quality of some treaties to be questionable, was joined by France and Trinidad and Tobago in stating that it was essential to assess actual needs before drafting began. Argentina felt the need for a new treaty should be considered in the Sixth Committee, irrespective of the treaty's origin or the drafting agency's relationship to the United Nations.

According to Canada, Egypt and Sri Lanka, rationalizing the multilateral treaty-making pro-

cess would be time well spent. Yugoslavia spoke in like manner, while Spain pointed out that improving the process would particularly benefit developing countries. Nigeria said machinery to reduce the diversity of practice was urgently needed in view of the Organization's increased membership.

Afghanistan, China, Czechoslovakia, France, the German Democratic Republic, Italy, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and Yugoslavia were among those which considered it neither feasible nor appropriate to devise uniform and universally applicable multilateral treaty-making procedures, contending that such a move would restrict the flexibility necessary to meet the particular needs of the envisaged treaty. The USSR doubted that the effectiveness of the process could be improved by artificially limiting the number of instruments elaborated. The Byelorussian SSR considered such attempts as an affront to the sovereign right of States to solve questions regarding their treaty obligations. Afghanistan, the German Democratic Republic and the Ukrainian SSR saw no need to establish an international treaty-drafting bureau, and the USSR considered it unrealistic to establish rigid and universal rules determining the body responsible for preparation, or limiting the number of such bodies or the selection of procedures.

Zaire supported existing procedures. Uruguay thought they had proved effective, although improvement was possible. For Greece, the increased number of treaties indicated the diversity of the treaty-making process, and hence less likelihood of agreement on procedures. Argentina said the major difficulty in rationalization lay in the diversity of treaty-making methods; States and international organizations should be free to choose the methods most suited to their needs.

China, Greece, Italy, Trinidad and Tobago, and the USSR felt no one had the right to intervene in the ratification or accession process. Spain and the Ukrainian SSR said States should not be required to explain their non-accession, and the latter added that no attempt should be made to ensure a treaty's automatic entry into force. Romania rejected as contravening national sovereignty the idea of restricting the right to make reservations to particular treaty provisions. Nevertheless, Zaire felt the Assembly should encourage ratification or accession. Jamaica believed regional associations could help to accelerate ratification by urging States to ratify. For the United States, a request to consider ratification or to give reasons for not doing so did not violate a right. Trinidad and Tobago spoke similarly.

Regarding the United Nations role, Mexico said the General Assembly could co-ordinate

and formulate recommendations on suitable topics for codification, while Zaire thought it should supervise the conclusion of treaties, including regional ones. Yugoslavia said the Assembly should influence the process through decisions and recommendations. Canada and France opposed making the Assembly responsible for the treaty-making activities of the entire United Nations system. Trinidad and Tobago and the Ukrainian SSR felt its role concerning treaties elaborated in other intergovernmental organizations should be limited to collecting and disseminating information.

Afghanistan, the German Democratic Republic and the USSR were among those which considered that the Sixth Committee could, in some cases, complete draft treaties elaborated by such bodies as the International Law Commission for subsequent Assembly adoption, thereby rendering it unnecessary to spend money on an international conference. Similarly, the Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR and Zaire said final elaboration and adoption should take place in the Assembly or through one of its Main Committees, with a plenipotentiary conference reserved for exceptional cases. France, however, believed that such conferences should take care of all final negotiations.

Sweden suggested that thought be given to whether decisions should be taken by consensus or by majority vote, as a treaty adopted by consensus risked being deprived of substance. Zaire opposed making consensus the sole basis for decision-making, lest that should lead to use of a veto. Spain did not believe that adoption by consensus guaranteed a convention's success.

Stressing the usefulness of travaux préparatoires in ensuring better understanding of a treaty, China, Romania and Sweden suggested that records be kept. Canada added that a manual of drafting guidelines should be prepared—a view supported by Argentina and Zaire.

Updating the Handbook of Final Clauses and the Summary of the Practice of the Secretary-General as Depositary of Multilateral Agreements was urged by Argentina, Egypt, Greece, Italy, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Spain, the United Kingdom and Zaire. Israel also considered that new classified bibliographies on the law of treaties would be helpful. Trinidad and Tobago said a special committee could update the Handbook and also prepare a manual on treaty-making techniques.

While not opposing updating the Handbook, the USSR doubted that the results would justify the expenditure and effort. The Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR said the update could be worth while if paid for from existing appropriations.

On other matters, Israel saw possibilities for a more detailed study of the technical problems connected with multilingual drafting, especially the practice of drafting conventions in six authentic texts. Chile warned against including provisions in an international instrument that were not relevant to its purpose.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/553 & Add.1.2.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/162, para. 2, 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1142); <sup>(3)</sup>ibid., para. 5; <sup>(4)</sup>36/12, 10 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 1139.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/796; S-G statements, A/C.5/36/74, A/C.6/36/L.22.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.54-58, 61, 63, 64 (19 Nov.-1 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.66 (8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.92 (10 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/112

128-0-18 (recorded vote) Meeting 92 10 December 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/780) by vote (94-0-17), 1 December (meeting 64): 17-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.13/Rev.1); agenda item 120.

Sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, Egypt, Fiji, Indonesia, Kenya, Mali, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Philippines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Uruguay.

Review of the multilateral treaty-making process

The General Assembly,  
Bearing in mind that multilateral treaties are an important primary source of international law,

Conscious, therefore, that the process of elaboration of multilateral treaties, directed towards the progressive development of international law and its codification, forms an important part of the work of the United Nations and of the international community in general,

Recalling its resolution 35/162 of 15 December 1980, in which it invited Governments and international organizations to submit their observations on the report of the Secretary-General submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, as well as their comments on any other aspect of the subject,

Aware of the heavy burden which active involvement in the process of multilateral treaty-making places upon Governments,

Convinced that the most rational use should be made of the finite resources available for the elaboration of multilateral treaties,

Taking into account statements made at the current session during the debate on this item in the Sixth Committee,

1. Takes note of the reports of the Secretary-General submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth sessions, including the replies and observations made by Governments and international organizations on the review of the multilateral treaty-making process;

2. Decides, in the light of statements made on this item at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, to establish at the thirty-seventh session a working group of the Sixth Committee:

(a) To consider the questions raised in annex I of the report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session and any other relevant material submitted by Governments and International organizations;

(b) To assess the methods of multilateral treaty-making used in the United Nations and in conferences convened under its auspices to determine whether the current methods of multilateral treaty-making are as efficient, economical and effective as they could be to meet the needs of the Member States;

(c) To make recommendations on the basis of the above-mentioned assessment;

3. Invites Governments and international organizations to submit by 30 June 1982 their observations on the reports submitted by the Secretary-General, taking into account the specific questions contained in annex I of the report submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, as well as their comments on any other aspect of the subject, as they consider desirable;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report containing the observations and comments received pursuant to paragraph 3 above;

5. Also requests the Secretary-General to prepare documentation containing the material and information listed in annex II of the report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, in the form of a provisional version of a volume in the Legislative Series, as well as a topical analysis of the observations and replies received, in time for use by the working group referred to in paragraph 2 above;

6. Further requests the Secretary-General to prepare and publish as soon as possible new editions of the Handbook of Final Clauses and the Summary of the Practice of the Secretary-General as Depositary of Multilateral Agreements, taking into account relevant new developments and practices in that respect;

7. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Review of the multilateral treaty-making process".

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Poland, Seychelles, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

#### Treaties involving international organizations

As recommended by the General Assembly in 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> the International Law Commission (ILC), at its May-July 1981 session (p. 1264), commenced its second reading of 80 draft articles on treaties concluded between States and international organizations or between two or more international organizations.<sup>(1)</sup> The Commission based its work on the tenth report of its Special Rapporteur, Paul Reuter (France),<sup>(2)</sup> containing observations by Governments and a review of articles 1 to 41, provisionally adopted by ILC in first reading between 1974 and 1979. These articles were referred in 1981 to the Commission's

Drafting Committee, which completed consideration of articles 1 to 26 except for a subparagraph of article 2, on use of terms. Thereafter, ILC gave its final approval to draft articles 1 to 26 (excluding the subparagraph), together with commentaries.

The adopted articles comprised: part I (articles 1 to 5), constituting an introduction; part II, divided into three sections—section 1 (articles 6 to 18), on the conclusion of treaties, section 2 (articles 19 to 23), dealing with reservations, and section 3 (articles 24 and 25), on entry into force and provisional application; and article 26 in section 1, on observance, of part III.

Stressing the relationship with the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties,<sup>(5)</sup> concerning treaties between States, ILC pointed out that the new draft dealt with the same questions but from the standpoint of their applicability to international organizations. At the same time, the text could stand on its own, independent of that Convention.

The Commission also pointed out that it had tried to simplify the draft's wording, retaining terms such as "ratification" and "full powers" for use in connection with States and "act of formal confirmation" and "powers" for international organizations. It also retained the rule that the capacity of an organization to conclude treaties was governed by its own rules, and that every treaty in force was binding on the contracting parties and must be performed by them in good faith. Changes of substance introduced in second reading included a provision concerning treaties constituting international organizations and treaties adopted within such an organization, and articles assimilating them to States in respect of their capacity to formulate reservations to treaty provisions.

In its 10 December resolution on the work of ILC,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly recommended that ILC complete in 1982 the second reading of the draft articles, taking into account the written comments of principal international organizations.

During the Sixth Committee's debate, many delegations expressed satisfaction that ILC had started the second reading of the draft articles and, while others voiced regret that it had not completed the first 60 articles, most said that those which it had approved were largely acceptable and an improvement over the first reading.

Many States, including Algeria, Bangladesh, Chile, the Federal Republic of Germany, Indonesia, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Morocco, New Zealand and Uruguay, supported the approach of ILC in maintaining a close parallel between the draft articles and the 1969 Vienna Convention, while making the

draft articles stand on their own. Poland and Romania believed that the new rules should be the subject of an autonomous instrument, rather than mere reiteration of the provisions of that Convention.

Spain, however, considered that desirable simplification had been inhibited by drafting certain articles without reference to the Convention. The United Kingdom, referring to its suggestion that the draft articles be simplified by using the technique of *renvoi* (reference) to the articles of the Vienna Convention, did not regard as decisive the ILC argument that that technique had not been used previously in codifying conventions; it thought the legal difficulties hinted at by ILC seemed exaggerated.

A number of States stressed that international organizations could not be equated with States. Afghanistan, China, Colombia and Egypt pointed out that the capacity of organizations to conclude treaties differed since they were limited by their statutes and by their member States' decisions. Czechoslovakia and Mongolia said a sovereign State was the sole original subject of international public law. The Ukrainian SSR and Zaire felt different rules should apply concerning reservations while, for Romania, the draft limited States' rights in that respect. Uruguay considered ILC right in removing from the draft powers which the Vienna Convention accorded to States and in defining rules whose flexibility was in order for them only.

Spain considered that international organizations and States should be equated as far as possible, since they were equal subjects of international law. The United States questioned the need for some of the distinctions drawn by ILC between organizations and States. The Netherlands, however, cited a number of problems that could arise in applying the Vienna Convention's rules to organizations, such as the question of whether a treaty could create rights and obligations for an organization in respect of only some of its member States.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan and Romania believed there was a need for a more precise definition of international organizations in order to determine their specific legal personality. Argentina endorsed the ILC definition, which it felt accorded with that of the Vienna Convention, and urged ILC to tackle the question of so-called international public institutions. Nigeria suggested that differentiation be made among international organizations which, unlike States, were not all equal under international law. Algeria was surprised that national liberation movements had not been identified as entities capable of entering into obligations.

On the matter of time-limits within which parties to an agreement could object to reservations

made by an organization to individual provisions, many States, including Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR and Czechoslovakia, opposed a clause in the draft text which envisaged tacit acceptance of reservations made by an international organization in the absence of objection within 12 months. The Ukrainian SSR and the USSR added that the competent bodies of the organizations met at different intervals and, therefore, no uniform time-limit would apply; together with the Byelorussian SSR, they suggested that the issue was best resolved by the parties to a treaty. Poland voiced similar doubts, while Tunisia urged that the question be considered more closely.

Welcoming the ILC decision to retain the wording of the Vienna Convention on reservations, the United Kingdom, for the European Community members, said the question of whether international organizations should be granted a longer time period than States could be resolved by evolving practice. Argentina and Spain welcomed the Commission's solution to the question, which for Uruguay was simple and legally viable. Jamaica believed the same rule should govern both States and organizations. The Federal Republic of Germany said the provisions no longer discriminated against organizations. Brazil favoured prohibiting organizations from formulating reservations when their participation was considered essential to the objectives of a treaty.

Morocco thought the draft provided only a partial response to the possible incompatibility of commitments made on the same subject by States as such and by an international organization on behalf of its member States. India was among those believing that the draft articles might need to be modified to ensure that changes in an organization's capacity and competence after the conclusion of a treaty did not affect the scope of the treaty relations between parties without their express consent. Canada suggested that international organizations wishing to become parties to treaties should submit either extracts of their statutes or a statement describing the established practice regarding their competence and procedures.

Uruguay pointed out that the draft did not include a provision on the invalidity of treaties. The Philippines urged ILC to reassess the use or definition of certain terms in the draft articles, adding that the progressive development of international law should not imply violating existing precepts.

While acknowledging that the draft articles had provided useful reference material for decision makers at both the national and international levels, France expressed the view that little

progress had been made and prospects remained uncertain for a diplomatic conference for adoption of a convention despite the priority accorded to the topic by the General Assembly since 1969. Israel thought that, rather than incorporating the ILC work in a convention which might have an unwelcome impact on the Vienna Convention by changes in wording or interpretation, the articles should be reduced to general guidelines for the process by which organizations could become parties to multilateral treaties.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ILC, A/36/10 & Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>Special Rapporteur, A/CN.4/341 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/163, para. 4 (b), 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1129); <sup>(4)</sup>36/114, para. 3 (a), 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1265).

Yearbook reference <sup>(5)</sup>1969, p. 734.

#### Registration and publication of treaties by the United Nations

During 1981, some 1,452 international agreements and 607 subsequent actions were received by the Secretariat for registration or filing and recording. In addition, there were 265 registrations for agreements and certified statements for which the Secretary-General performed depositary functions.

The texts of international agreements registered or filed and recorded are published in the United Nations Treaty Series in the original languages with translations into English and French where necessary. In 1981, 27 volumes of the Treaty Series covering treaties registered or filed and recorded in 1973 and 1974 were issued.<sup>(1)</sup>

In his October report, on registration and publication of treaties and international agreements carried out under Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General reviewed the results achieved during the biennium 1980-1981 towards eliminating the backlog in publishing the Treaty Series. The report indicated that the backlog in registration, which had been steadily increasing until 1978, would be practically eliminated by the end of 1981, and that in the case of the monthly statements of treaties and international agreements registered or filed and recorded with the Secretariat,<sup>(2)</sup> the backlog was expected to be eliminated in 1982. A plan to eliminate the backlog in publication of the Treaty Series had been implemented only partially, due to recruiting and training difficulties.

To ensure gradual elimination of delays in issuing cumulative indexes to the Treaty Series, responsibility for them, which since 1956 had been entrusted to the Dag Hammarskjöld Library, had been taken over by the Treaty Section of the Office of Legal Affairs.

In addition, the report indicated that, as at 31 August 1981, 23 States, 8 specialized agencies

and 5 intergovernmental organizations had replied to a 1979 questionnaire concerning activities in the matter of international agreements,<sup>(4)</sup> with a view to a possible modification of General Assembly regulations. Taking into account various factors such as the lack of response from Governments which were depositaries of important multilateral agreements, the Secretary-General felt it premature to submit a detailed report in 1981.

On 4 December, in a decision adopted without vote,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly took note of the report. On 19 November, the Sixth Committee had likewise approved the draft, as orally proposed by its Chairman.

Publications: <sup>(1)</sup>United Nations Treaty Series, vols. 882, 889/890, 891/892, 893, 894, 896, 898, 903/904, 905/906, 909/910, 913/914, 915, 916, 917, 918/919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 927/928, 929/930, 933/934, 939, 946, 947, 948, issued in 1981, covering treaties registered or filed and recorded in 1973 & 1974. <sup>(2)</sup>Statement of Treaties and International Agreements, registered or filed and recorded with the Secretariat during 1981 (ST/LEG/SER.A/407-418) (monthly).

Report: <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/570.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(4)</sup>GA. 34/149, para. 3, 17 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1138). Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>GA, 36/425, 4 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.53 (19 Nov.); plenary. A/36/PV.85 (4 Dec.).

#### General Assembly decision 36/425

Adopted without vote

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/715) without vote, 19 November (meeting 53); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 126.

Registration and publication of treaties and international agreements pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations

At its 85th plenary meeting, on 4 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Sixth Committee, took note of the report of the Secretary-General.

#### Multilateral treaties

##### New multilateral treaties

concluded under UN auspices

The following treaties, concluded under United Nations auspices, were deposited with the Secretary-General during 1981:

Regulation No. 45: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of headlight cleaners for power-driven vehicles and the approval of vehicles with regard to headlight cleaners; (2) Regulation No. 46: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of rear-view mirrors, and of motor vehicles with regard to the installation of rear-view mirrors;<sup>(3)</sup> Regulation No. 47: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of mopeds equipped with a positive-ignition engine with regard to the emission of gaseous pollutants by the engine; (4) Regulation No. 48: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the installation of lighting and light-signalling devices;<sup>(5)</sup> Regulation No. 49: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of diesel engines with regard to the emission of gaseous pollutants;<sup>(6)</sup> and Regulation No. 50: Uniform provisions con-

cerning the approval of front position lights, rear position lights, stop lights, direction indicators and rear-registration-plate illuminating devices for mopeds, motor cycles and vehicles treated as such;<sup>(7)</sup> all annexed to the Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Conditions of Approval and Reciprocal Recognition of Approval for Motor Vehicle Equipment and Parts, done at Geneva on 20 March 1958.

International Tin Agreement, 1981.<sup>(9)</sup> Concluded at Geneva on 26 June 1981.

Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, with annexed Protocols:<sup>(8)</sup> Protocol on Non-Detectable Fragments (Protocol I); Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II); and Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Incendiary Weapons (Protocol III). Concluded at Geneva on 10 October 1980

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General, Status as at 31 December 1981 (ST/LEG/SER.E/1), Sales No. E.81.V.9.

Treaty texts: Agreement on motor vehicle equipment and parts: <sup>(2)</sup>Regulation 45, E/ECE/324/Rev.1/Add.44; <sup>(3)</sup>Regulation 46, E/ECE/324/Rev.1/Add.45; <sup>(4)</sup>Regulation 47, E/ECE/324/Rev.1/Add.46; <sup>(5)</sup>Regulation 48, E/ECE/324/Rev.1/Add.47; <sup>(6)</sup>Regulation 49, E/ECE/324/Rev.1/Add.48; <sup>(7)</sup>Regulation 50, E/ECE/324/Rev.1/Add.49. <sup>(8)</sup>Convention on restrictions on conventional weapons, A/CONF.95/15 & Corr.1-5. <sup>(9)</sup>Tin agreement, TD/TIN.6/14.

#### Multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General

The number of multilateral treaties for which the Secretary-General performed depositary functions stood at 317 at the end of 1981. During the year, 208 signatures were affixed to treaties for which the Secretary-General performed depositary functions and 437 instruments of ratification, accession, acceptance and approval or notifications were transmitted to him. In addition, the Secretary-General received 125 communications from States expressing observations

on declarations and reservations made by certain States at the time of signature, ratification or accession.

The following multilateral treaties,<sup>(1)</sup> in respect of which the Secretary-General acts as depositary, came into force during 1981:

International Agreement for the Establishment of the University for Peace and Charter of the University for Peace. Adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 5 December 1980; entered into force on 7 April 1981

International Cocoa Agreement, 1980. Concluded at Geneva on 19 November 1980; entered into force provisionally on 1 August 1981

Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. Adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 18 December 1979; entered into force on 3 September 1981

Regulation No. 43: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of safety glazing and glazing materials for installation on power-driven vehicles and their trailers (entered into force on 15 February 1981); Regulation No. 44: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of restraining devices for child occupants of power-driven vehicles (child restraints) (entered into force on 1 February 1981); Regulation No. 45: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of headlight cleaners for power-driven vehicles and the approval of vehicles with regard to headlight cleaners (entered into force on 1 July 1981); Regulation No. 46: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of rear-view mirrors, and of motor vehicles with regard to the installation of rear-view mirrors (entered into force on 1 September 1981); and Regulation No. 47: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of mopeds equipped with a positive-ignition engine with regard to the emission of gaseous pollutants by the engine (entered into force on 1 November 1981); all annexed to the Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Conditions of Approval and Reciprocal Recognition of Approval for Motor Vehicle Equipment and Parts, done at Geneva on 20 March 1958

Publication: <sup>(1)</sup>Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General, Status as at 31 December 1981 (ST/LEG/SER.E/1), Sales No. E.81.V.9.

## Chapter VI

### International economic law

The United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), composed of 36 Member States, at its annual session held at Vienna, Austria, from 19 to 26 June 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> considered a number of items on its work programme, including international commercial arbitration (p. 1253), international payments (p. 1254), uniform rules on liquidated damages and penalty clauses (p. 1256), the legal aspects of the new international economic order

(p. 1260) and co-ordination of trade law activities (p. 1257). The Commission's Working Group on International Negotiable Instruments adopted the complete texts of a draft Convention on International Cheques and a draft Convention on International Bills of Exchange and International Promissory Notes (p. 1254).

The 1981 report of UNCITRAL was considered and taken note of, on 29 September, by the Trade and Development Board of the United

Nations Conference on Trade and Development<sup>(2)</sup> as the Secretary-General informed the General Assembly on 2 November.<sup>(1)</sup>

By a resolution of 13 November,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly took note of the UNCITRAL report, welcomed its decision to draft a legal guide on contracts for the construction of large factories (p. 1260), reaffirmed its mandate to co-ordinate legal activities relating to international trade law, and stressed the importance of bringing into effect the conventions emanating from its work for the global unification and harmonization of international trade law. The Assembly also reaffirmed the importance, in particular for the developing countries, of training and assistance in international trade law (p. 1259). The resolution was adopted without vote, following its approval by consensus by the Sixth (Legal) Committee on 6 November. Introducing the 35-nation text, Austria expressed the hope that the work of UNCITRAL would continue as fruitfully as it had in the past.

On 10 December, the Assembly requested the United Nations Institute for Training and Research to prepare and complete by the 1982 Assembly session an analytical study on the progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order.<sup>(5)</sup>

Under another resolution of the same date, the Assembly invited Member States, United Nations organs and intergovernmental organizations to comment on the draft articles on most-favoured-nation clauses, as adopted by the International Law Commission.<sup>(6)</sup>

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.6/36/L.6.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>TDB, A/36/15 & Corr.1; <sup>(3)</sup>UNCITRAL, A/36/17.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/32, 13 Nov., text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/107, 10 Dec. (p. 1263); (6)36/111, 10 Dec. (p. 1259).

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.3-7, 42 (23-29 Sep. & 6 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.57 (13 Nov.).

Publication: United Nations Commission on International Trade Law yearbook, vol. XII: 1981 (A/CN.9/SER.A/1981), Sales No. E.82.V.6.

General Assembly resolution 36/32

Adopted without vote Meeting 57 13 November 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/669) by consensus. 6 November (meeting 42); 35-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.7): agenda item 117.

Sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, India, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

#### Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its fourteenth session,

Recalling that the object of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law is the promotion of the progressive harmonization and unification of international trade law,

Recalling, in this regard, its resolutions 2205(XXI) of 17 December 1966, by which it established the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law and defined the object and terms of reference of the Commission, 3108(XXVIII) of 12 December 1973, by which it increased the membership of the Commission, 31/99 of 15 December 1976, by which Governments of Member States not members of the Commission were entitled to attend the sessions of the Commission and its Working Groups as observers, and 34/142 of 17 December 1979, by which the co-ordinating function of the Commission in the field of international trade law was emphasized, as well as its previous resolutions concerning the reports of the Commission on the work of its annual sessions,

Recalling a/s/o its resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974 and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975,

Reaffirming its conviction that the progressive harmonization and unification of international trade law, in reducing or removing legal obstacles to the flow of international trade, especially those affecting the developing countries, would significantly contribute to universal economic co-operation among all States on a basis of equality, equity and common interests and to the elimination of discrimination in International trade and, thereby, to the well-being of all peoples,

Having regard for the need to take into account the different social and legal systems in harmonizing the rules of international trade law,

Stressing the usefulness and importance of organizing symposia for promoting better knowledge and understanding of international trade law and, especially, for the training of young lawyers from developing countries in this field.

1. Takes note with appreciation of the report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its fourteenth session;

2. Commends the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law for the progress made in its work and for its efforts to enhance the efficiency of its working methods;

3. Calls upon the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, in particular its Working Group on the New International Economic Order, to continue to take account of the relevant provisions of the resolutions concerning the new international economic order, as adopted by the General Assembly at its sixth and seventh special sessions;

4. Welcomes the decision of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, upon the recommendation of the Working Group on the New International Economic Order, to commence its work in the field of the new international economic order with the drafting of a legal guide identifying the legal issues involved in contracts for the supply and construction of large industrial works and suggesting possible solutions to assist parties, in particular from developing countries, in their negotiations;

5. Reaffirms the mandate of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law to co-ordinate legal activities in the field of international trade law in order to avoid duplication of efforts and waste of resources and, in this connection:

(a) Expresses its appreciation to all bodies within and without the United Nations system that responded to the request from the Commission for information on their current activities relating to international trade law, for the purpose of the preparation of a report which formed the basis for the recommendation of steps to be taken by the Commission to strengthen co-ordination;

(b) Endorses the various methods suggested by the Commission to implement further its co-ordinating role in the field of international trade law;

(c) Recommends that the Commission should maintain close collaboration with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the International Law Commission, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and the Commission on Transnational Corporations and continue to collaborate with other international organizations active in the field of international trade law;



(d) Calls upon Governments to ensure co-ordination in respect of the work programmes of the various international organizations in which they are represented;

(e) Welcomes the invitation by the Hague Conference on Private International Law to all States to participate in the extraordinary session to be held in 1985 to revise the 1955 Hague Convention on the Law Applicable to International Sales of Goods, and also to States members of the Commission to attend a session, to be held in 1982, of the Special Commission which will consider the preparatory work for the revision;

(i) Welcomes the invitation by the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law to States members of the Commission that are not members of the Institute to participate in its Committee of Governmental Experts which considered a draft Uniform Law on Agency of an International Character In the International Sale of Goods at a meeting held from 2 to 13 November 1981;

6. Reaffirms the Importance, in particular for the developing countries, of the work of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law concerned with training and assistance in the field of international trade law and, in this connection:

(a) Expresses its appreciation to the States which contributed to fellowships for participants from developing countries at the Second Symposium on International Trade Law, held by the Commission from 22 to 26 June 1981, and to the Commission for the success of the Symposium;

(b) Stresses the desirability of the Commission sponsoring symposia and seminars, including those organized on a regional basis, to promote training and assistance in the field of international trade law, and recommends that the Commission should continue to sponsor such symposia and seminars;

(c) Welcomes the initiatives being undertaken to sponsor regional seminars jointly with regional organizations, such as the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee and the Inter-American Juridical Committee;

(d) Invites Governments, relevant United Nations organs, organizations, institutions and individuals to assist the secretariat of the Commission in financing and organizing symposia and seminars;

7. Stresses the importance of bringing into effect the conventions emanating from the work of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law for the global unification and harmonization of international trade law;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to bring the Convention on the Limitation Period in the International Sale of Goods, of 12 June 1974, the Protocol amending the Convention on the Limitation Period in the International Sale of Goods, of 10 April 1980, the United Nations Convention on the Carriage of Goods by Sea, of 30 March 1978, and the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, of 10 April 1980, to the notice of all States that have not ratified or acceded to them, and to provide those States with appropriate information as to the mode of their entry into force and the current status of ratifications and accessions, and to draw the attention of those States to the views of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law contained in its decision of 22 June 1981, in which the Commission emphasized that an early entry into force and a wide acceptance of the instruments mentioned would be of great value for the unification of international trade law;

9. Affirms the importance of the participation of observers from all States and interested international organizations at sessions of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law and its Working Groups;

10. Recommends that the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law should continue its work on the topics included in its programme of work;

11. Reaffirms the importance of the programme of work of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law and of the increased role of the International Trade Law

Branch of the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat as the substantive secretariat of the Commission;

12. Requests the Secretary-General to forward to the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law the records of the discussion at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly relating to the report of the Commission on the work of its fourteenth session.

## International trade law

### Unification of trade law

#### International commercial arbitration

##### Draft model law

On 24 June 1981,(1) UNCITRAL decided to prepare a model law on international commercial arbitration, taking into account the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (New York, 1958) and the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (p. 1254), and entrusted the work to its Working Group on International Contract Practices.

In the UNCITRAL debate, the drafting of a model law was deemed desirable in view of the manifold problems encountered in current arbitration practice and of the need for a legal framework for equitable and rational settlement procedures for disputes arising out of international trade transactions. It was also stated that a model law could be of great value to all States, irrespective of their legal or economic system.

During the discussion of the UNCITRAL report in the General Assembly's Sixth Committee, a number of speakers, among them Austria, the Bahamas, Brazil, China, Colombia, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, Pakistan, the Philippines, Spain, Sri Lanka, Venezuela and Zaire, expressed support for the drafting of a model law.

The Bahamas and Brazil believed that a model law would be of greatest assistance to Governments and could only advance the application of commercial arbitration. In Sri Lanka's opinion, a model law would constitute an indispensable guide to policy-makers, particularly in developing countries. Japan thought a model law would be useful in modernizing the arbitration laws of some States. Pakistan and Venezuela believed it would reduce legal obstacles, and Austria said it could contribute greatly to overcoming the difficulties of current arbitration practice. The Philippines hoped UNCITRAL would give priority to the preparation of the model law.

France considered it essential that, in preparing the model law, the Working Group adhere strictly to its term of reference and confine itself to the commercial sphere. The United States expressed confidence that, in preparing the studies

and drafts for the model law, the United Nations Secretariat would follow the suggestions of UNCITRAL.

Italy said the preparatory studies should be conducted carefully and with the assistance of experts from countries representing the broadest spectrum of legal systems so as to avoid taking a single system of law as a model; therefore, the composition of the Working Group should be re-examined and enlarged to make it more representative. The view that the model law should take account of the different legal systems was endorsed by others, among them China, Colombia and Venezuela. China said the model law should be based on principles of mutual respect for sovereignty, equality and mutual benefit, and Spain stated that account must be taken of the principle of equity between the parties. In order to become a useful international instrument, China thought the model law should avoid imposing restrictions on the arbitration institutions in the various States.

Japan said the model law must be of a practical nature and sufficient attention should be paid to the use of terms.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCITRAL, A/36/17.

#### UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules

By a decision of 23 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> UNCITRAL agreed on the desirability of issuing guidelines in the form of recommendations to arbitral institutions and other relevant bodies, such as chambers of commerce, in order to assist them in adopting procedures for their acting as appointing authority or providing administrative services in cases to be conducted under the 1976 UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules.<sup>(2)</sup> In this light, it requested the Secretary-General to submit in 1982 a revised text of the draft guidelines prepared by the Commission's secretariat.

The discussion in UNCITRAL revealed a divergence of opinion regarding efforts to discourage institutions from adopting administrative procedures which could modify the Arbitration Rules. Under one view, the guidelines should attempt to ensure, for the sake of uniform application and certainty of parties, that the Rules be left unchanged to the extent possible; under another, the guidelines should not prevent institutions from adopting procedures which modified the Rules according to their specific needs. It was agreed that the guidelines, whatever their final stand on the issue of modifications, should contain a recommendation to identify clearly any such modification by way of a reference to the modified provision of the Rules.

During the Sixth Committee debate on the UNCITRAL report, several countries, including Italy, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri

Lanka and Zaire, endorsed the preparation of guidelines. The United States held it important in drafting them to ensure some uniformity, so that parties would know precisely what procedure would be applied to them when they accepted arbitration.

The Bahamas and Spain believed that the guidelines should be sufficiently flexible, and Brazil cautioned against the risk of producing guidelines that were too stringent. Though supporting the publication of guidelines, France stated that arbitral authorities should continue to be free to use the Rules as they saw fit. Zaire felt that the guidelines should not prevent arbitral institutions from adopting subsidiary procedures modifying the Rules, should the need arise. Sri Lanka saw the guidelines as a supplement to those used by Governments and chambers of commerce.

Expressing regret that the guidelines had not been completed, Japan hoped the secretariat would re-examine the draft carefully in the light of the various points raised at the 1981 UNCITRAL session.

Report. <sup>(1)</sup>UNCITRAL, A/36/17.  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1976, p. 823.

#### International payments

Draft Conventions on bills of exchange and promissory notes, and on international cheques

On 19 June 1981, UNCITRAL decided that its Working Group on International Negotiable Instruments should draw up as separate texts the draft Convention on International Bills of Exchange and International Promissory Notes, and the Uniform Rules on International Cheques.<sup>(1)</sup> It also requested the Secretary-General to circulate the texts, upon completion, to all Governments and interested international organizations for comments.

The decision was based on a recommendation made by the Working Group at the first of its two sessions held in 1981 (Vienna, Austria, 5-16 January; New York, 3-14 August). At that time, the Group noted that, despite considerable similarity between the law governing bills of exchange and promissory notes on the one hand and cheques on the other, there were inherent in the use of cheques special features which distinguished those instruments from bills of exchange and promissory notes.<sup>(2)</sup> One important feature was that the bill of exchange and the promissory note were primarily credit instruments, while the cheque was essentially a payment instrument. Further, in civil law countries the bill of exchange and the promissory note were seen as different from the cheque, and thus governed by separate legal texts.

When the Working Group met again in August, it decided to change the title of the draft Uniform Rules to 'Draft Convention on International Cheques' and adopted, with some modifications, the complete texts of both draft Conventions.<sup>(3)</sup>

During the Sixth Committee discussion of the UNCITRAL report, Austria, Italy, the Netherlands, the Niger, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, the United States and others noted with satisfaction the progress made in drawing up the two instruments. Canada said it had followed their elaboration with interest.

Austria believed agreement on the two draft Conventions would be an important step towards the unification of international law. Italy said the drafts should not be underestimated, for their aim was to replace the 1930 Geneva Convention providing a Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes and the 1931 Geneva Convention providing a Uniform Law for Cheques, and to reconcile civil law and common law systems.

The UNCITRAL decision to prepare two separate texts was endorsed by a number of States, among them the Bahamas, Cyprus, France, Israel, the Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Spain, the Sudan, Venezuela and Zaire. Sierra Leone said it would wait for the final result before deciding whether there should be a single convention or two separate texts.

Different opinions were voiced on the procedure to be followed for adoption of the draft Conventions. Some countries, such as Cyprus, the Niger and the Sudan, favoured their adoption at a conference of plenipotentiaries, as suggested by UNCITRAL; others, including Brazil and Nigeria, thought the final texts should be submitted to the General Assembly.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCITRAL, A/36/17; Working Group on International Negotiable Instruments, <sup>(2)</sup>A/CN.9.196, <sup>(3)</sup>A/CN.9/210.

#### Electronic funds transfer

On 22 June 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> UNCITRAL took note of a note by the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> where it was stated that the Study Group on International Payments—entrusted by UNCITRAL in 1979 with consideration of the legal problems arising out of electronic funds transfer, an item included by UNCITRAL in its programme for the first time in 1978<sup>(3)</sup>—had not met between the Commission's 1980 and 1981 sessions. Therefore, the secretariat was unable to submit any new information that would aid UNCITRAL in giving directives on the scope of further work; it would request the Study Group to recommend, in time for the Commission's 1982 session, whether UNCITRAL should undertake substantive work

in the field at the current time and, if so, what the nature of the work might be.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/CN.9/199.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNCITRAL, A/36/17.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1978, p. 958.

#### Universal unit of account

At its 1981 session,<sup>(2)</sup> UNCITRAL again discussed a proposal to determine a universal unit of account of constant value, which would serve as a point of reference in international conventions for expressing amounts in monetary terms. Divergent views were expressed on the nature of such an automatic adjustment mechanism which might be used to solve the problem, generally recognized to be serious, of the erosion of the purchasing value of the maximum compensation recoverable under conventions which specified a limit of liability.

The Commission also considered a report of the Secretary-General, reflecting the view of the UNCITRAL Study Group on International Payments that the most desirable approach was to combine the use of the special drawing right (SDR)—the SDR being a unit of account whose value, calculated daily, was based on a "basket" of international currency—with a suitable index which would preserve over time the purchasing power of the monetary values set forth in international conventions.<sup>(1)</sup>

UNCITRAL agreed to request its Working Group on International Negotiable Instruments to consider various possibilities with regard to the formulation of a unit of account and to prepare a text, if possible. The Secretary-General was asked to conduct such studies as deemed desirable in the light of the Commission's 1981 discussion, and to submit them to the Working Group.

During the debate on the UNCITRAL report in the General Assembly's Sixth (Legal) Committee, several speakers, including the Netherlands and Pakistan, expressed interest in and welcomed the idea of establishing a universal unit of account, which was regarded as very important by others, among them Sierra Leone and the United States.

A number of countries, however, voiced reservations or called for further studies. Italy said the question was of less importance and it shared the doubts expressed by others concerning the usefulness of such an endeavour. Stating that consideration of the question was still at a preliminary stage, Brazil welcomed the caution shown by UNCITRAL in that regard. Venezuela preferred to wait for the Working Group's report and the Secretary-General's studies before giving its view. Zaire reserved its final position until sufficient progress was made.

The Philippines held it desirable that the Working Group prepare a text that would enable UNCITRAL to consider the question in more depth in 1982. Expressing keen interest in the studies, France said while the financial interests of the parties to a convention should be protected, it was desirable not to open the way to an excessive indexing which would have inflationary effects, thereby aggravating the financial situation of those States to be protected; further, the idea that the unit, designed to serve as a reference in international conventions, would also be used in certain international contracts raised some difficulties.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/CN.9/200; <sup>(2)</sup>UNCITRAL, A/36/17.

#### International trade contracts

##### Draft uniform rules

The UNCITRAL Working Group on International Contract Practices, meeting in New York from 13 to 17 April 1981, completed preparation of a set of draft uniform rules on liquidated damages and penalty clauses.<sup>(2)</sup> The five draft rules, on which the Group began work in 1979,<sup>(3)</sup> specified the circumstances and conditions under which a party to an international contract was entitled to recover or forfeit an agreed sum of money in the event of failure to perform or delay in performance. The rules would apply to both liquidated damages (where a contract sought to pre-estimate compensation payable on its breach) and penalty clauses.

When the Commission took up the question in June 1981, discussion focused on the possible form of the draft rules, with the greatest support expressed for a model law. Some support was also expressed for a convention or a recommendation. The Commission deferred a decision on this aspect to a later session.

On 19 June,<sup>(1)</sup> UNCITRAL requested the Secretary-General: to incorporate in the draft uniform rules such supplementary provisions as might be required if the rules took the form of a convention or a model law; to prepare a commentary on the draft rules; and to circulate them to Governments and international organizations for comments. The Commission also decided that, if those procedures were completed in time, it would consider the draft rules in 1982.

During the Sixth Committee discussion on UNCITRAL, several States, including Brazil, France and Spain, welcomed the Commission's decision to defer consideration of the draft rules.

With regard to the form the rules should take, Austria, Nigeria and Zaire favoured a convention, while others, including Italy, the Niger and Pakistan, supported a model law. Italy thought the scope of the draft rules seemed too limited to

be the subject of a convention. The form of recommendations was preferred by Sierra Leone, which added that if they proved useful they could later be embodied in a convention.

Others declared they could not yet decide on the final form of the rules. France believed that the question of form had not come to maturity. Japan was not in a position to state whether it preferred a model law or recommendations; the question of form posed problems because of its possible relation to the peremptory norms of each State. Cyprus and Venezuela said they would give their views when the draft rules were circulated to Governments; Spain believed that the replies of Governments and international organizations should shed light on the advantages and drawbacks of different forms. China felt it would be difficult to decide without study of the rules by Governments. The Bahamas thought it appropriate that the Sixth Committee consider the draft rules as well as their final form.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCITRAL, A/36/17; <sup>(2)</sup>Working Group on International Contract Practices, A/CN.9/197. Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1979, p. 1128.

##### Draft clauses against effects of currency fluctuations

Also in 1981, UNCITRAL continued consideration of protection clauses against the effects of currency fluctuations and agreed that its secretariat should continue to study the question and report at a future session.<sup>(1)</sup>

The importance of such draft clauses to protect parties to international trade contracts was stressed in the Sixth Committee by a number of States, in particular developing countries, among them the Bahamas, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Sudan, Venezuela and Zaire. Venezuela believed that their study should be pursued in greater depth, and Pakistan said they should be given priority at the Commission's 1982 session. Nigeria wondered whether it would be possible to regulate their content on a world-wide basis in order to eliminate the monetary risks involved in long-term contracts.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCITRAL, A/36/17.

##### Trade law conventions

UNCITRAL continued in 1981 to stress the importance for the unification of international trade law of the entry into force at an early date, and the wide acceptance, of the Convention on the Limitation Period in the International Sale of Goods (New York, 1974);<sup>(3)</sup> the Protocol amending that Convention (Vienna, Austria, 1980);<sup>(6)</sup> the United Nations Convention on the Carriage of Goods by Sea, 1978 (Hamburg, Federal Republic of Germany);<sup>(4)</sup> and the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (Vienna, 1980).<sup>(5)</sup>

Acting on a 22 June decision of the Commission,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly, in its 13 November resolution on UNCITRAL, requested the Secretary-General to bring those Conventions to the notice of all States that had not ratified or acceded to them, along with information on the mode of their entry into force and the status of ratifications and accessions.<sup>(2)</sup>

UNCITRAL had also recommended that the Secretary-General be authorized to invite States to supply information on steps taken with regard to ratification or accession.

Reservations on the UNCITRAL recommendations were voiced by several speakers in the Sixth Committee. Brazil, Colombia and Pakistan considered them outside the Commission's terms of reference and said they gave the Secretary-General powers not in conformity with his normal functions. France also expressed doubts, while the United States and Venezuela declared their support.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCITRAL, A/36/17.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/32, paras. 7&8, 13 Nov. (p. 1253).

Yearbook references: <sup>(3)</sup>1974, p. 853; <sup>(4)</sup>1978, p. 955; <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 1131; <sup>(6)</sup> *ibid.*, p. 1132.

#### Co-ordination of trade law activities

During the UNCITRAL debate in 1981 on co-ordination of international trade law activities,<sup>(2)</sup> it was suggested that further efforts be made to strengthen co-operation with other competent bodies so as to avoid a duplication of work and the adoption of conflicting regional conventions. Noting the usefulness in ascertaining developments in the field of a report by the Secretary-General on current activities of other organizations,<sup>(1)</sup> UNCITRAL considered that its secretariat might select a particular legal area for intensive consideration, including the identification of specific parts of that area which had been or could be the subject of unification and the most suitable body to undertake that unification.

Reaffirming the Commission's mandate to co-ordinate legal activities in the field of international trade law, the General Assembly<sup>(3)</sup> recommended on 13 November that UNCITRAL maintain close collaboration with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the International Law Commission (ILC), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the Commission on Transnational Corporations, and continue to collaborate with other international organizations active in the field of international trade law. The Assembly also welcomed the invitations to UNCITRAL members by the Hague Conference on Private International Law and by the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law

(UNIDROIT) to participate in their work.

By the same resolution, the Assembly expressed its appreciation to all bodies that had responded to the Commission's request for information on their activities in international trade law; endorsed the methods suggested by UNCITRAL to implement further its co-ordinating role; and called on Governments to ensure co-ordination of the work programmes of the various international organizations in which they were represented.

The importance of the Commission's co-ordinating role was stressed by a number of speakers in the Sixth Committee, among them the Bahamas, Colombia, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, the Niger, the United States and Yugoslavia. The importance of its co-operation with various bodies and organizations, such as the Hague Conference, UNIDROIT and UNIDO, was noted in particular by the Bahamas, Colombia, Italy, the Netherlands, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. With regard to the unification and harmonization of international trade law, Yugoslavia called for greater authority to be accorded to UNCITRAL, to encompass all activities connected with international trade law, including international private law; alternatively, serious consideration should be given to other means of ensuring efficient co-ordination of the growing number of activities in that sphere.

France expressed regret at the inadequate co-ordination between activities of UNCITRAL and other bodies, welcomed efforts to remedy the situation and considered it useful to increase contacts between the secretariats of various bodies dealing with international trade law. Chile, supported by Colombia, suggested that UNCITRAL co-ordinate its work with international or regional bodies outside the United Nations system, such as the Inter-American Juridical Committee. Israel also called for the strengthening of formal contacts between UNCITRAL and international regional organizations in the field. Zaïre suggested that the exchange of information and reports be strengthened.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/CN.9/202 & Add.1-4; <sup>(2)</sup>UNCITRAL, A/36/17.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/32, para. 5, 13 Nov. (p. 1252).

#### Most-favoured-nation clauses

On 10 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly decided to seek comments on a set of draft articles on the scope and application of most-favoured-nation clauses in international agreements, adopted by ILC in 1978.<sup>(5)</sup> By a resolution adopted without vote, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General again to invite Member States, such United Nations organs as the regional commissions and UNCITRAL, as well as intergovernmental organizations, to submit or

update comments and observations. States were also requested to comment on the ILC recommendation that the draft articles be recommended to Member States with a view to the conclusion of a convention. The Assembly decided to consider the substance of the draft articles, together with any amendments, at its 1983 session with a view to taking a decision. The Sixth Committee approved the resolution by consensus on 1 December 1981.

In connection with the Assembly's consideration of the question, the Secretary-General submitted in September a report containing comments and observations received from Governments, United Nations organs and intergovernmental organizations,<sup>(2)</sup> as well as a note containing an updated analytical compilation of those comments and observations.<sup>(1)</sup>

Introducing in the Committee the resolution co-sponsored by Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia and the USSR, Hungary said the sponsors had taken into account the views expressed in the Committee debate and decided not to insist that UNCITRAL alone examine the draft articles. However, the text contained explicit reference to UNCITRAL and the regional commissions in view of the particular competence of those bodies. Further, the text left open the option for either convening a diplomatic conference for the conclusion of a convention or having the Assembly finalize the draft articles. In reply to those who felt that UNCITRAL was not the proper place to deal with the question, Hungary asserted that nothing in the 1966 Assembly resolution which had established UNCITRAL and its mandate<sup>(3)</sup> restricted that body's competence to matters of private international law; further, the traditional distinction between public and private international law was becoming increasingly blurred both in State practice and in theory.

In explanation of position on behalf of the 10 member States of the Economic Community (EC), the United Kingdom expressed reservations regarding the competence accorded to UNCITRAL in paragraph 1 of the resolution, which invited that body to submit observations on most-favoured-nation clauses. The United States, which maintained that UNCITRAL was devoted exclusively to private law and not to trade policy or public law, joined the consensus because the wording of that paragraph allowed the recipients of the request to decline to reply, for instance for lack of competence.

During the debate, some countries, including Afghanistan, the German Democratic Republic and Romania, considered the proposed agreement on the most-favoured-nation clauses to be aimed at combating protectionism and constitut-

ing an important part of the legal foundations for a new international economic order. In a similar vein, Pakistan declared that the final text should fully accommodate the claim of the developing countries for preferential treatment in the field of international trade and economic relations. China asserted that the draft articles should define more clearly the links between most-favoured-nation clauses and the principles of equality and mutual advantage. The Ukrainian SSR considered that some States were trying to place unacceptable conditions, particularly political conditions, on the granting of most-favoured-nation treatment to other States.

The United States, on the other hand, said most-favoured-nation clauses should not be considered a means of solving the problems of developing countries or of making progress in the North-South dialogue. In Argentina's view, the question of the clauses was no longer of prime importance in economic relations.

While several Eastern European and other countries, including Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, believed the draft articles should be submitted to UNCITRAL for consideration, the EC members, Spain and the United States questioned the value or appropriateness of such action.

The elaboration and adoption of an international convention was favoured by Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Portugal, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and Zaire; the EC members and the United States considered it more appropriate to adopt the text in the form of guidelines annexed to an Assembly resolution. The United Kingdom, on behalf of the EC members, asserted that articles 28 and 29 (according to which the convention would apply only to treaties concluded after the convention's entry into force and would be subject to the terms of each particular treaty) indicated that the draft articles as a whole were intended to serve more as guidelines than as inflexible rules.

China had no preconceived opinion as to the final form the draft should take; however, in view of the existing difference of opinions on legal and political issues involved, it suggested giving the question more time. Chile and Portugal also considered that the subject required more thorough study, and Argentina, Nigeria and the United States supported inviting Member States to submit or update comments on the subject.

Commenting on individual articles, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Hungary, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR expressed fear

that articles 12 and 13, dealing with the "conditions of compensation" and the "conditions of reciprocity", were inconducive to the favourable development of international trade relations and might even promote protectionism or constitute a serious obstacle to implementation of the principle of most-favoured-nation treatment. Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia and Poland suggested deletion of these articles.

Portugal asserted the need for inclusion of effective provisions for the settlement of disputes. Need for precision in definition of terms was pointed out by some, and Spain believed the scope of articles 23, 24 and 25 on exceptions to the application of most-favoured-nation clauses should be more clearly defined. In addition, Argentina, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom, the last on behalf of the EC members, were of the view that the draft should contain a further exception meeting the needs of customs unions, free trade areas and similar arrangements of economic integration, as provided for under article XXIV of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/146.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/145.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>2205(XXI), 17 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 920); <sup>(4)</sup>36/111 10 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1978, p. 945.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.54-56, 58-60, 63, 64 (19 Nov.-1 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.92 (10 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/111

Adopted without vote Meeting 92 10 December 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/779) by consensus. 1 December (meeting 64): 6-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.20/Rev.1); agenda item 119.

Sponsors: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, USSR.

Consideration of the draft articles  
on most-favoured-nation clauses

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 33/139 of 19 December 1978 relating to the report of the international Law Commission on the work of its thirtieth session, in particular section II of the resolution,

Recalling also its resolution 35/161 of 15 December 1980, entitled "Consideration of the draft articles on most-favoured-nation clauses".

Reaffirming its appreciation of the high quality of the work done by the international Law Commission in elaborating a series of draft articles on most-favoured-nation clauses,

Bearing in mind the importance of facilitating international trade and development of economic co-operation among all States on the basis of equality, mutual advantage and non-discrimination in the establishment of the new international economic order,

Having considered the item entitled "Consideration of the draft articles on most-favoured-nation clauses", including the report of the Secretary-General and the analytical compilation of comments and observations from Governments, organs of the United Nations which have competence in the subject-matter and interested intergovernmental organizations, submitted pursuant to paragraphs 3 and 4 of General Assembly resolution 35/161,

Taking note of the comments and observations submitted, in particular those relating to outstanding issues,

Aware of the fact that more replies from States and interested intergovernmental agencies are needed,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to reiterate his invitation to Member States, relevant organs of the United Nations, such as the regional commissions and the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, as well as interested intergovernmental organizations, to submit or bring up to date, not later than 30 June 1983, any written comments and observations which they deem appropriate on chapter II of the report of the international Law Commission on the work of its thirtieth session, in particular on:

(a) The draft articles on most-favoured-nation clauses adopted by the International Law Commission;

(b) Those provisions relating to such clauses on which the International Law Commission was unable to take a decision;

and also requests States to comment on the recommendation of the international Law Commission that those draft articles should be recommended to Member States with a view to the conclusion of a convention on the subject;

2. Decides to consider the substance of the draft articles on most-favoured-nation clauses, together with any amendments thereto, at its thirty-eighth session with a view to taking a decision thereon;

3. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-eighth session the item entitled "Consideration of the draft articles on most-favoured-nation clauses" and to consider it as a matter of priority.

### Training programmes in trade law

The Second UNCITRAL Symposium on International Trade Law was held at Vienna, Austria, from 22 to 26 June 1981, on the occasion of the Commission's annual session.<sup>(1)</sup> It drew a total of 58 participants, 15 of whom were awarded fellowships provided by contributions from nine Governments.

The Symposium dealt with issues on the past or current work programme of UNCITRAL—the international sale of goods, international payments (p. 1254), carriage of goods by sea, international commercial arbitration (p. 1253) and legal aspects of the new international economic order (p. 1260).

In UNCITRAL, there was agreement that it should continue to support symposia and seminars; that it was desirable for those events to be organized on a regional basis, possibly under joint sponsorship with regional organizations; and that its secretariat should make such arrangements as it found desirable in that regard. However, UNCITRAL noted the serious problems caused by uncertainty in regard to the programme's funding.

In its resolution of 13 November on the work of UNCITRAL,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly reaffirmed the importance of training and assistance in international trade law; welcomed regional initiatives; and invited Governments, United Nations organs, organizations, institutions and individuals to assist in financing and organizing symposia and seminars.

In the Assembly's Sixth Committee, a number of speakers, including Argentina, the Bahamas, Italy, Kenya, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Yugoslavia, expressed satisfaction at the success of the Vienna Symposium and hoped that a third symposium could be held as soon as possible. Some States, among them the Netherlands and Yugoslavia, thought such symposia should become a regular activity. Cyprus and Nigeria regarded them as very useful and important for young jurists, and the Bahamas hoped that an increasing number of individuals from developing countries would participate. Pakistan, the Philippines and Sri Lanka regarded the UNCITRAL training and assistance programme as vitally important to developing countries.

The suggestion that regional seminars be organized found the support of several countries, including Canada, the Niger, Pakistan, the Sudan and Zaire.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNCITRAL, A/36/17.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/32, para. 6, 13 Nov. (p. 1253).

## Legal aspects of the new international economic order

Consideration of legal aspects of the new international economic order continued in 1981 in UNCITRAL<sup>(3)</sup> and in the General Assembly's Sixth Committee.

UNCITRAL WORKING GROUP ACTION. Meeting at Vienna from 9 to 18 June, the UNCITRAL Working Group on the New International Economic Order<sup>(4)</sup> considered 12 out of the 18 chapters of a study prepared by the Secretary-General on clauses related to contracts for the supply and construction of large industrial works, and noted that some 30 clauses remained to be studied by the Commission's secretariat. There was general agreement that the formulation of a detailed legal guide covering turnkey and semi-turnkey contracts (involving the provision of factories and equipment ready for operation) as well as their variants would be a first practical step in the direction of assisting developing countries in meeting their needs and aspirations.

On 24 June, UNCITRAL, at the suggestion of its Working Group, requested the Secretary-General to continue and complete the study, and entrusted him with the drafting of a legal guide identifying the legal issues involved and suggesting possible solutions to assist parties, particularly from developing countries, in their negotiations. It also requested him to submit, after preparation of the legal guide, a preliminary study on specific features of industrial co-operation contracts (p. 590).

The Commission's decision was welcomed by the General Assembly in its 13 November resolution on the UNCITRAL report.<sup>(8)</sup> The Assembly also called on the Commission and its Working Group to continue to take account of the relevant provisions of Assembly resolutions on the new international economic order.

During the debate on the UNCITRAL report in the Sixth Committee, a number of speakers, including France, Italy, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, welcomed the preparation of a legal guide. Several countries, among them Argentina, the Bahamas, Indonesia, the Philippines and the United States, regarded the guide as of great help especially to developing countries and as a contribution to the development of international trade by facilitating trade relations between States.

Sierra Leone suggested that UNCITRAL seek the co-operation of other organizations engaged in similar projects. In the view of the USSR, it was very important to co-ordinate UNCITRAL activities in the field with those of other competent bodies and organizations, in particular the United Nations Industrial Development Organization. Cyprus, Indonesia and Sri Lanka urged that the guide be completed as soon as possible. Zaire held it essential for the Secretariat to submit to UNCITRAL, if possible in 1982, a preliminary study on specific features of industrial co-operation contracts; it would be naive to think that the new international economic order could be established without intergovernmental agreements closely connected to it. The Netherlands, on the other hand, reiterated its position that UNCITRAL should limit itself to the private international law aspects of industrial and technological co-operation; issues of public international law and trade policy should be left to other United Nations bodies which were more qualified to deal with them.

Most countries, among them Canada and Indonesia, agreed that the drafting of clauses be postponed until the legal guide had been prepared. The Netherlands hoped that, based on the legal guide, the Working Group would eventually draft the clauses.

Italy and Japan were pleased that the Working Group had concentrated on a concrete study rather than on futile theoretical debate. A similar view was expressed by the United States. China, however, cautioned that the drafting of a legal guide should not exclude further steps towards the realization of the new international economic order. Pakistan felt that little concrete work had been done with regard to the establishment of the new international economic order; UNCITRAL should keep abreast of the latest trends in international negotiations without re-



stricting its activities to the consideration of trade issues of a technical nature.

While agreeing with UNCITRAL that it would be too ambitious to attempt to deal immediately with all aspects of international trade law related to the new international economic order, Brazil expressed disappointment that so little progress had been made. Spain said the Commission's wish for more time to study all relevant questions must be granted. Venezuela called for further studies of topics related to the establishment of the new international economic order, while France held it inadvisable to entrust the Working Group with new studies before it completed its current task. Canada believed that the Working Group should avoid questions concerning international public law and should limit its efforts to the realm of international private law.

UNITAR STUDY. The General Assembly considered in 1981 a report of the Secretary-General containing a list, prepared by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), of the existing and evolving principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order concerning the economic relations among States, international organizations and other entities of public international law, and the activities of transnational corporations.<sup>(2)</sup> The report also contained information received from Member States with respect to a UNITAR study in that field.

The UNITAR compendium,<sup>(1)</sup> a list of references to provisions of international conventions and resolutions of international bodies, organized by topic, covered international trade and monetary issues, international development assistance, debt, technology, foreign direct investment and transnational corporations, and global commons. UNITAR considered this to represent the first stage of the study, requested by the Assembly in 1980,<sup>(7)</sup> and declared that no attempt had been made to evaluate the extent to which principles and norms contained in various instruments had been implemented in the actual practice of States. According to UNITAR, what had been prepared in phase I constituted the first systematic attempt to draw together the dispersed mass of international sources into a schematic compendium; phase II would deal with the progressive development of the principles and norms of international law by examining the decisions actually taken by competent bodies and organs. UNITAR had learned that, while States might agree on the fundamental objectives of the new international economic order, there were definite and serious differences as to implementation which could not be ignored; it remained convinced, however, that political differences could be narrowed, or that the negotia-

tion of differences could be expedited, by more complete data presented in usable form.

Taking note of the compendium, the Assembly, by a resolution of 10 December on the progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order,<sup>(9)</sup> requested UNITAR to prepare an analytical study on the subject for Assembly consideration in 1982. Member States were urged to submit relevant information, and United Nations organs as well as intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations active in the field were requested to co-operate.

The Assembly adopted the resolution by a recorded vote of 113 to none, with 32 abstentions. It was approved by the Sixth Committee on 2 December, by a recorded vote of 77 to 1 (Cuba), with 32 abstentions. Cuba ascribed its negative vote to technical error and requested that the summary record of the meeting reflect its support of the resolution.

Introducing the lo-nation text and stating that it dealt essentially with procedural matters, the Philippines made a few oral revisions. In the final preambular paragraph, the word "urgent" was deleted so that the Assembly simply recognized the need for the development of the principles of international law relating to the new international economic order. In operative paragraph 1, the Assembly took note of, rather than welcomed, the UNITAR study. The original paragraph 5, which would have had the Assembly request the Secretary-General to waive control and limitation of documentation rules on the study, was later deleted at the suggestion of the Secretariat, which said it was preferable not to raise the question of document control in the substantive part of the resolution.

Only those States abstaining in the vote explained their positions in the Committee.

Speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR said the most appropriate body to carry out the study was UNCITRAL, not UNITAR, as the latter was not composed of State representatives and was therefore not empowered to make value judgements on matters which required consultations among States; the UNITAR report, however, contained such judgements. Further, the text would create an unusual situation in that UNITAR, financed from voluntary contributions, would be entrusted with a study financed from the United Nations regular budget; it would be more appropriate to entrust that study to UNCITRAL, which would have the added advantage of involving no financial implications. Also, the instruments mentioned in the second preambular

paragraph-such as the 1974 Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order<sup>(5)</sup> and the 1974 Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States<sup>(6)</sup>—were only recommendations, and the question of deciding whether those should become binding rules could be settled only after a complete analysis of their application.

Spain abstained because of the reference in the second and third preambular paragraphs to Assembly resolutions on which it had abstained.

In the view of the United States, the level of political agreement on the nature of a new international economic order was not high enough to permit useful discussion of the so-called progressive development of the relevant principles and norms. The Federal Republic of Germany considered it unwise to try to establish a new international economic order by drafting rules not based on general practice accepted as law. Although concerned by the lack of a legal instrument to promote the establishment of a new international economic order, Argentina felt that such a shortcoming was preferable to an unsatisfactory text. Italy believed that legal evolution should follow and not precede socio-economic evolution and, since the socio-economic framework of the new international economic order was not currently very clear, the UNITAR study was premature.

France considered it untimely and premature to fix and crystallize negotiations that were taking place in other United Nations committees and bodies, while Belgium believed that codification and progressive development of the principles and norms of international economic law should be based on the principle of interdependence, rather than those benefiting chiefly the developing countries.

Chile and Uruguay had reservations on certain aspects of the UNITAR study, and the Federal Republic of Germany considered that the study had failed to make distinctions between existing norms and principles and those that were evolving; when there was neither a generally recognized law nor a practice accepted as law, there was a risk of politicizing the matter. The United Kingdom voiced reservations related to the list of subjects dealt with in the completed portion of the study; it hoped UNITAR would continue to use rigorous scientific criteria in completing its study and would show the utmost sobriety and realism.

Belgium and Italy also expressed doubts as to whether UNITAR could carry out within the brief deadlines such a difficult and ambitious study.

In the Committee debate, the USSR charged the imperialist countries with seeking to delay the advent of the new international economic order. Emphasizing the importance it attached

to the establishment of such an order, Romania declared its support of the recommendations contained in the resolution.

Zaire asserted that the new international economic order presupposed the abolition of all forms of domination resulting from colonialism, hegemonism, neo-colonialism or racism, including Zionism; the drafting of a legal instrument within the context of the new order would have the advantage of laying down uniform standards to which States could refer in concluding trade agreements. Tunisia remarked that the unpredictable nature of international trade necessitated the identification and codification of principles and norms in the field, and that the fulfilment of the needs and aspirations of developing countries should be regarded as a legal obligation.

In Sri Lanka's view, no one had contended that the new international economic order represented legal norms; at the current stage, it represented the common goal of the rich and the poor nations in an increasingly interdependent world. Austria considered that a review of the progressive development of new principles and norms should not be interpreted as a preparation for codification, since those principles and norms existed primarily at the level of soft law.

Austria and the Netherlands felt the UNITAR compendium provided a useful basis 'for the future analytical study; the latter welcomed the Institute's intention to seek guidance from experts from various geographical regions representing the main legal systems. In Egypt's view, the study should not be too ample, should leave nothing vague and should elicit general principles on such topics as the protection of sources of natural wealth, the transfer of technology, co-ordination of economic operation and the law of the financing of development. Sri Lanka suggested that the study focus on the various principles and norms contained in international legal instruments that did not fully conform to' the principles and norms underlying the new international economic order.

While Nigeria and the Sudan regretted the availability of the UNITAR study in only one language, Egypt defended the situation for economic reasons.

Compendium: <sup>(1)</sup>UNITAR/DS/4.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/143 & Add.1.2; <sup>(3)</sup>UNCITRAL, A/36/17; <sup>(4)</sup>Working Group, A/CN.9/198.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(5)</sup>3201(S-VI), 1 May 1974 (YUN 1974, 324); <sup>(6)</sup>3281 (XXIX) 12 Dec. 1974 (ibid. p. 403); <sup>(7)</sup>35/166 15 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 532); <sup>(8)</sup>36/32, paras. 3 & 4, 13 Nov. 1981 (p. 1252); <sup>(9)</sup>36/107, 10 Dec., text following.

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/799; S-G statements, A/C.5/36/77, A/C.6/36/L.23.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.62-65 (30 Nov.-2 Dec.); 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.66, 67 (8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.92 (10 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/107

113-0-32 (recorded vote) Meeting 92 10 December 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/775) by recorded vote (77-1-32), 2 December (meeting 65): 10-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.17), orally revised: agenda item 112.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Ecuador, Egypt, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Sri Lanka, Venezuela.

Progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new International economic order

The General Assembly,

Bearing in mind that, In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the General Assembly is called upon to initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification,

Recalling its resolutions 3201(S-VI) and 3202(S-VI) of 1 May 1974, containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, 3281(XXIX) of 12 December 1974, containing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and 3362(S-VII) of 16 September 1975 on development and international economic co-operation,

Recalling its resolutions 34/150 of 17 December 1979 and 35/166 of 15 December 1980, entitled "Consolidation and progressive development of the principles and norms of international economic law relating in particular to the legal aspects of the new International economic order",

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General and the study prepared by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research entitled "List of existing and evolving principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order concerning the economic relations among States, international organizations and other entities of public international law, and the activities of transnational corporations" and its compendium and of the views submitted by some States in response to General Assembly resolution 35/166,

Taking note, in particular, of the recommendation that the United Nations Institute for Training and Research should complete the study by preparing the analytical study on the progressive development of the principles and norms of International law relating to the new international economic order, in accordance with paragraph 1 (b) of resolution 35/166,

Recognizing the need for a systematic and progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order,

1. Takes note of the study prepared by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research;

2. Requests the United Nations Institute for Training and Research to prepare the study referred to in the fifth preambular paragraph above and to complete it in time for the Secretary-General to submit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

3. Urges Member States to submit relevant information with respect to the study not later than 31 July 1982;

4. Requests the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the regional commissions, the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations and other relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations active in this field, as determined by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research, to submit relevant information and to co-operate fully with the Institute in the implementation of the present resolution;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a report on the study made by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research for its consideration, on a priority basis, under the item entitled "Progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order" to be included in the provisional agenda of that session.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, **Burma**, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Mongolia, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

## Chapter VII

### Other legal questions

Recognizing the substantial increase in United Nations membership since that of the International Law Commission (ILC) was previously expanded in 1961, the General Assembly in November 1981 enlarged the ILC membership from 25 to 34.<sup>(2)</sup> In December, the Assembly endorsed the Commission's intention to establish in 1982 objectives and priorities to guide its work programme within the five-year term of its members.<sup>(4)</sup>

During the year, activities under the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law included the granting of fellowships and the holding of seminars, lectures and training and refresher courses. In December, the Assembly authorized further activities for 1982 and 1983.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee, celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary

in 1981, was congratulated by the Assembly in November for its work in support of inter-regional and international co-operation.<sup>(1)</sup>

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>36/38 (p. 1269), <sup>(2)</sup>36/39 (p. 1266), 18 Nov.; <sup>(3)</sup>36/108 (p. 1268), <sup>(4)</sup>36/114 (p. 1265), 10 Dec.

## International Law Commission

The thirty-third session of the International Law Commission (ILC) was held at Geneva from 4 May to 24 July 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> during which further progress was made in developing and codifying international law. Draft articles were finalized on State succession in respect of property, archives and debts (p. 1227) and ILC started its second reading of draft articles on treaties concluded between States and international organizations or between two or more international organizations (p. 1248); both drafts were transmitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General.<sup>(1)</sup> Work also continued on draft articles on: the status of the diplomatic courier and diplomatic bag not accompanied by courier (p. 1225); jurisdictional immunities of States and their property (p. 1230); international liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law (p. 1231); and State responsibility for internationally wrongful acts (p. 1232). To ensure continuity of its future work, ILC arrived at several conclusions (see below).

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/428.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>ILC, A/36/10 & Corr.1.

### ILC work programme

At its 1981 session,<sup>(1)</sup> ILC reached several conclusions concerning its 1982 work programme to ensure the programme's continuity, taking into account that the 1981 session was the last within the five-year term of the ILC members. The Commission stated its intention to give primary attention, in 1982, to treaties concluded between States and international organizations or between two or more such organizations, aimed at completing the second reading of the remaining articles of the draft and the annex. Concerning other topics, ILC intended to pursue work on State responsibility; and to continue studying State liability, State immunity, and the status of the diplomatic courier and bag, elaborating draft articles on each topic. At future sessions, ILC would work out draft articles on the law of non-navigational uses of international watercourses (p. 1222) and consider the second part of relations between States and international organizations. As to its long-term work programme, ILC anticipated that at its 1982 session- the first within the term of office of its

new members-it would consider establishing general objectives and priorities to guide its study of topics on its 1981 programme for future sessions during a term of membership or longer.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 10 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(2)</sup> on the work of ILC endorsing its intentions regarding the work programme. The Assembly recommended that ILC complete in 1982 the second reading of draft articles on treaties involving States and international organizations; continue preparing draft articles on State responsibility, State liability, State immunity, the status of diplomatic bags and couriers, and the law of non-navigational uses of international watercourses; and continue studying relations between States and international organizations.

The resolution was adopted without vote. On 2 December, the Sixth (Legal) Committee had approved the 34-nation draft, introduced by Venezuela, by consensus.

During the Committee's discussion, many States, including Colombia, Iraq, the Sudan, Tunisia and Yugoslavia, saw the need for ILC to plan its work based on the five-year term of its members. Egypt called for a phased, cohesive programme, while the Bahamas and Cyprus urged realistic targets. The United Kingdom said the programme should leave room for new, narrowly framed items to be completed at one or two sessions. The German Democratic Republic felt provision should be made for the short-term treatment of topical political subjects. Australia, Bulgaria, Canada and Iraq believed that the number of topics at any one session should be limited. Israel, the United States and Zaire stressed that ILC should determine its own work methods freely.

The need for ILC to receive a clear mandate was voiced by many, among them Australia, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, the Philippines, the Sudan and the United Kingdom.

A number of States, including the Bahamas, Brazil, the Byelorussian SSR, China, Cyprus, Iraq, Sierra Leone, the United Kingdom and the USSR, urged ILC to be more responsive to the current needs of the international community. New areas of activity should be addressed, said Australia and the Federal Republic of Germany. Romania hoped to see a contribution towards establishing a new economic order. Afghanistan, Algeria and Egypt called on ILC to adapt international law to contemporary realities, and the Philippines considered it appropriate to reassess every five years the role ILC played in that regard. New Zealand favoured regular reviews of ILC topics in the light of current requirements.

Hungary believed ILC should concentrate on general multilateral treaty-making. The Ukrai-

nian SSR hoped it would continue promoting the progressive development and codification of international law. To that end, the Federal Republic of Germany, urging that the basic approach developed by ILC be retained, thought it should study important accessible topics and avoid intruding into speculative definitions of new rules. Sierra Leone hoped for reversal of what it saw as an ILC trend-encouraging the impression that certain topics were too political for its consideration.

Ethiopia and the German Democratic Republic were among those expressing general support for the conclusions reached by ILC on its future work. Asserting that it had responded efficiently to the international community's increased demands, Greece said that, if ILC was not working on new topics, the fault lay with the Assembly, the Sixth Committee and Member States. For Venezuela, the work of ILC had proved effective and no changes were necessary. The Philippines felt it had exceeded expectations, considering that it was not in session throughout the year, its members were not full time and it considered several questions simultaneously. Australia spoke similarly and said making ILC a full-time body would be counter-productive. Egypt thought it should continue meeting part of the year, with the special rapporteurs working full time. Thailand said the growing number of substantive items assigned to ILC and the Committee reflected the Assembly's confidence in those bodies. Morocco saw the Commission's work as satisfactory despite the many pressing, and not always mutually compatible, Assembly recommendations. The Sudan suggested that ILC continue its work on all agenda items under all circumstances, even in the absence of a special rapporteur.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ILC, A/36/10 & Corr.1.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/114, 10 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.36, 38-54, 62, 64, 65 (30 Oct.-2 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.92 (10 Dec.).

Publications: Yearbook of the International Law Commission 1981, vol. I: Summary Records of the Meetings of the Thirty-third Session, 4 May-24 July 1981 (A/CN.4/SER.A/1981), Sales No. E.82.V.3; vol. II, Part One; Documents of the Thirty-third Session (Excluding the Report of the Commission to the General Assembly) & vol. II, Part Two: Report of the Commission to the General Assembly on the Work of Its Thirty-third Session (A/CN.4/SER.A/1981/Add.1, Parts I, II), Sales No. E.82.V.4 (Parts I, II).

General Assembly resolution 36/114

Adopted without vote Meeting 92 10 December 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/781) by consensus, 2 December (meeting 65); 34-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.21); agenda item 121.

Sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Italy, Japan, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Paraguay, Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Turkey, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

#### Report of the International Law Commission

The General Assembly.

Having considered the report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirty-third session.

Emphasizing the need for the progressive development of international law and its codification in order to make it a more effective means of implementing the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and to give increased importance to its role in relations among States,

Noting with appreciation that at its thirty-third session the International Law Commission, pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 34/141 of 17 December 1979 and 35/163 of 15 December 1980, completed the second reading of the draft articles on succession of States in respect of State property, archives and debts, and commenced the second reading of the draft articles on treaties concluded between States and international organizations or between international organizations,

Noting further with appreciation the progress made at that session by the International Law Commission on State responsibility, international liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law, jurisdictional immunities of States and their property and the status of the diplomatic courier and the diplomatic bag not accompanied by diplomatic courier,

Taking note of the intention of the International Law Commission to appoint a new Special Rapporteur on the topic "The law of the non-navigational uses of international watercourses" and stressing the desirability of the Commission doing so at the commencement of its thirty-fourth session, thus ensuring continuity of its work on the topic,

Recognizing the importance of referring legal and drafting questions to the Sixth Committee, including topics which might be submitted to the International Law Commission, thus enabling the Commission further to enhance its contribution to the progressive development of international law and its codification,

1. Takes note of the report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirty-third session;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the International Law Commission for the work accomplished at that session;

3. Recommends that, taking into account the written comments of Governments as well as views expressed in debates in the General Assembly, the International Law Commission should:

(a) Complete at its thirty-fourth session the second reading of the draft articles on treaties concluded between States and international organizations or between international organizations, adopted at its twenty-sixth, twenty-seventh and twenty-ninth to thirty-second sessions, also taking into account the written comments of principal international organizations;

(b) Continue its work aimed at the preparation of draft articles on:

(i) Part two of the draft on responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts, bearing in mind the need for a second reading of the draft articles constituting part one of the draft;

(ii) International liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law;

(iii) The law of the non-navigational uses of international watercourses;

(iv) Jurisdictional immunities of States and their property;

(v) The status of the diplomatic courier and the diplomatic bag not accompanied by diplomatic courier;

(c) Continue its study of the second part of the topic of relations between States and international organizations;

4. Endorses the conclusion reached by the International Law Commission regarding the establishment, at its thirty-fourth session, of general objectives and priorities which

would guide its study of the topics on its programme of work within the term of office of Commission members elected at the current session of the General Assembly;

5. Expresses its satisfaction with the conclusion of the International Law Commission that it will continue to keep under review the possibility of improving further its present procedures and methods with a view to the timely and effective fulfilment of the tasks entrusted to it;

6. Reaffirms its previous decisions concerning research projects and studies required by the work of the International Law Commission and the increased role of the Codification Division of the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat, as well as those concerning the need for continuing provision of summary records of the Commission's meetings;

7. Urges Governments to respond as fully and expeditiously as possible to the requests of the International Law Commission for comments and observations on its draft articles and questionnaires and for materials on topics on its programme of work;

8. Reaffirms its wish that the International Law Commission will continue to enhance its co-operation with the legal organs of intergovernmental organizations whose work is of interest for the progressive development of international law and its codification;

9. Expresses the wish that seminars will continue to be held in conjunction with sessions of the International Law Commission and that an increasing number of participants from developing countries will be given the opportunity to attend those seminars;

10. Requests the Secretary-General to forward to the International Law Commission, for its attention, the records of the debate on the report of the Commission at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and to prepare and distribute a topical summary of the debate.

#### Increase in ILC membership

The question of ILC membership was taken up by the General Assembly in 1981 at the request of the African, Asian and Latin American Groups at the United Nations.<sup>(2)</sup> In addition, the regional groups representing Africa,<sup>(1)</sup> Latin America,<sup>(4)</sup> and Western European and other States<sup>(3)</sup> communicated to the Assembly their concept of equitable allocation of seats in the Commission.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 18 November, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(7)</sup> enlarging the ILC membership to 34 and amending articles 2 and 9 of that body's Statute.<sup>(5)</sup> The Assembly also established a pattern of seat distribution, specifying the number of members to be elected from each of five regional groups, including two seats to be allocated among four groups on a rotational basis.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 122 to 21, with 2 abstentions. The text was sponsored by Benin, Mexico and Pakistan in their capacity as the November 1981 Chairmen of the African, Latin American and Asian Groups, respectively.

Introducing the text, Pakistan, pointing out that the membership had last been increased to 25—in 1961,<sup>(6)</sup> stressed that since then the Organization had expanded considerably and that there was growing interest in the work of ILC,

particularly by the third world; the proposed increase would ensure a balanced and equitable representation of different juridical systems.

Explaining the negative votes of the Group of Western European and other States, Finland (November Chairman) said the Group had agreed to a consensus designed to enlarge ILC to 32 with a view to providing equitable representation and eliminating so-called shared or floating seats, but further negotiations had disregarded that understanding, expanded the figure to 34 and increased the number of floating seats; and the draft had been submitted without the Group's knowledge. Also objecting to floating seats, Israel, which abstained, said membership could not be proscribed simply by virtue of membership in one or other of the existing regional groups, and added that those groups should try to include among their candidates qualified women jurists.

Subsequently, on 23 November, the Assembly elected 34 ILC members for a five-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 (see APPENDIX III).

Letters: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, 29 Sep., A/36/565; <sup>(2)</sup>Angola, Jamaica, Nepal, 26 Oct., A/36/244 & Add.1; <sup>(3)</sup>Denmark, 23 Sep., A/36/554; <sup>(4)</sup>Honduras, 12 Sep., A/36/499.

Publication: <sup>(5)</sup>Statute of the International Law Commission (A/CN.4/4/Rev.2), Sales No. E.82.V.8.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(6)</sup>1647(XVI), 6 Nov. 1961 (YUN 1961, p. 527); <sup>(7)</sup>36/39, 18 Nov. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.42 (16 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.63 (18 Nov.).

Financial implications: 5th Committee report, A/36/686; S-G statement, A/C.5/36/42.

#### General Assembly resolution 36/39

122-21-2 (recorded vote) Meeting 63 18 November 1981  
3-nation draft (A/36/L.16/Rev.1); agenda item 137.

Sponsors: Benin, Mexico, Pakistan.

Enlargement of the International Law Commission: amendments to articles 2 and 9 of the Statute of the Commission

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming the importance of the International Law Commission as the main permanent subsidiary organ of the General Assembly entrusted with the promotion of the progressive development of international law and its codification,

Recalling its resolution 1647(XVI) of 6 November 1961, by which the membership of the International Law Commission was established at twenty-five members,

Noting that the membership of the United Nations has grown substantially since the adoption of that resolution,

Conscious of the increased interest shown by Member States, particularly those admitted to membership in the Organization since 1961, in the Commission's work on the progressive development of international law and its codification,

1. Decides to amend article 2, paragraph 1, of the Statute of the International Law Commission to read as follows:

"The Commission shall consist of thirty-four members who shall be persons of recognized competence in international law";

2. Also decides to amend article 9, paragraph 1, of the said Statute to read as follows:

"Those candidates, up to the maximum number prescribed for each regional group, who obtain the greatest number of votes and not less than a majority of the votes of the Members present and voting shall be elected";

3. Decides further that the thirty-four members of the International Law Commission shall be elected according to the following pattern:

- (a) Eight nationals from African States;
- (b) Seven nationals from Asian States;
- (c) Three nationals from Eastern European States;
- (d) Six nationals from Latin American States;
- (e) Eight nationals from Western European or other States;
- (f) One national from African States or Eastern European States in rotation, with the seat being allocated to a national of an African State in the first election held after the adoption of the present resolution;

(g) One national from Asian States or Latin American States in rotation, with the seat being allocated to a national of an Asian State in the first election held after the adoption of the present resolution:

4. Decides, by way of exception and in consequence of the enlargement of the Commission, to request the Secretary-General to include in the list of candidates for the election to be held at the current session, in addition to the nominations already received, such names as shall have been communicated to him in writing before 21 November 1981.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Israel, Turkey.

## UN Programme for the teaching and study of international law

The 1981 activities of the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law were outlined by the Secretary-General in a report<sup>(1)</sup> submitted to the General Assembly in accordance with its 1979 request.<sup>(2)</sup> Among its contributions to the Programme, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization developed teaching materials for universities, held expert seminars and meetings, granted fellowships, trained young lawyers, conducted feasibility studies and assisted non-governmental organizations.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/633.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 34/144, para. 12, 17 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1158).

Publications: United Nations Juridical Yearbook 1980 (ST/LEG/SER.C/18), Sales No. E.83.V.1; 1981 (ST/LEG/SER.C/19), Sales No. E.84.V.1.

### Fellowships

In 1981, the joint fellowship programme of the United Nations and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) continued to be administered by UNITAR. Under the 1981 scheme,<sup>(1)</sup> aimed at middle-grade government legal officers and young teachers of international law, 17 fellows participated. They were from Angola, Barbados, Cuba, Egypt, Guatemala, Indonesia, Lesotho, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Viet Nam, Yemen and Yugoslavia. The fellows attended law courses at the Hague Academy of International Law (The Hague, Netherlands); participated in lectures, seminars and courses organized by UNITAR; and some received practical training at legal offices of the United Nations and related organizations.

In its 9 December resolution on the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, the General Assembly invited States, universities, philanthropic foundations and other organizations to contribute to the Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe Fellowship on the Law of the Sea (p. 139).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/633.

### Seminars

The seventeenth session of the International Law Seminar was held at Geneva between 1 and 19 June 1981 with 23 advanced students or junior government officials participating.<sup>(\*)</sup> Austria, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands and Norway gave fellowships to participants from developing countries, and a private body, the Dana Fund for International and Comparative Legal Studies (United States), also made funds available.

In its 10 December resolution on the work of the International Law Commission (ILC),<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly expressed the wish that seminars would continue to be held in conjunction with ILC sessions and that an increasing number of participants from developing countries would be given the opportunity to attend.

Training in international economic law also continued to be offered in 1981 with the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law holding its Second Symposium on International Trade Law in June (p. 1259).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ILC, A/36/10.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/114, para. 9, 10 Dec. (p. 1266).

### Other activities

Under the assistance Programme for the teaching and study of international law,<sup>(1)</sup> the

Secretary-General and the International Court of Justice continued in 1981 to provide copies of their respective legal publications to requesting institutions in developing countries, or to those institutions serving as library depository for United Nations publications.

The United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) organized and financed a regional training and refresher course in international law for Africa from 28 February to 13 March at Cairo, Egypt, with 20 participants from: Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Somalia, Swaziland, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Zaire. Also attending were 15 persons from various ministries of the Egyptian Government.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.** The Advisory Committee on the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law met twice in 1981—on 13 January and 26 October—and discussed various aspects of Programme implementation in 1980-1981 and the Secretary-General's recommendations for 1982-1983, including the possibility of increasing the number of annual scholarships awarded to United Nations/UNITAR fellows, the selection of lecturers at joint seminars and financing.<sup>(1)</sup> The Committee also endorsed the Secretary-General's recommendation to establish the Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe memorial fellowship (p. 139).

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 10 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(2)</sup> authorizing the Secretary-General to carry out, in 1982 and 1983, the activities he had specified, including the provision of a minimum of 15 fellowships each year, a minimum of one scholarship each year under the Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe memorial fellowship, and a travel grant for one participant from each developing country to be invited to regional courses during the period. The Assembly thanked all contributors to the Programme and requested the Secretary-General to continue publicizing it and asking for voluntary financing.

The resolution was adopted without vote. On 4 December, the Sixth (Legal) Committee had approved by consensus the draft introduced by Ghana on behalf also of the Bahamas, Cyprus, Egypt, Madagascar, the Netherlands, Sierra Leone, Somalia and the Upper Volta.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/633.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/108, 10 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 6th Committee, A/C.6/36/SR.63, 66-69 (1-4 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.92 (10 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/108

Adopted without vote Meeting 92 10 December 1981

Approved by Sixth Committee (A/36/776) by consensus, 4 December (meeting 69); 9-nation draft (A/C.6/36/L.25/Rev.1); agenda item 113.

Sponsors: Bahamas, Cyprus, Egypt, Ghana, Madagascar, Netherlands, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Upper Volta.

United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law  
The General Assembly,

Noting with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law and the recommendations made to the Secretary-General by the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law, which are contained in that report,

Considering that international law should occupy an appropriate place in the teaching of legal disciplines at all universities,

Noting with appreciation the efforts made by States at the bilateral level to provide assistance in the teaching and study of international law,

Convinced, nevertheless, that States, international organizations and institutions should be encouraged to give further support to the Programme and to increase their activities to promote the teaching, study, dissemination and wider appreciation of international law, in particular those activities which are of special benefit to persons from developing countries,

Recalling that, in the conduct of the Programme, it is desirable to use as far as possible the resources and facilities made available by Member States, international organizations and others,

1. Authorises the Secretary-General to carry out in 1982 and 1983 the activities specified in his report, including the provision of:

(a) A minimum of fifteen fellowships each in 1982 and 1983, at the request of Governments of developing countries;

(b) A minimum of one scholarship each in 1982 and 1983 under the Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe Fellowship on the Law of the Sea, to be financed by the voluntary contributions specifically made for the endowment of the Fellowship as a result of the requests set out in paragraphs 9 and 10 below;

(c) Assistance in the form of a travel grant for one participant from each developing country who will be invited to the regional courses to be organized in 1982 and 1983; and to finance the above activities from provisions in the regular budget and also voluntary financial contributions which would be received as a result of the requests set out in paragraphs 9 and 10 below;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his constructive efforts to promote training and assistance in international law within the framework of the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law in 1980 and 1981;

3. Expresses its appreciation to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization for its participation in the Programme, in particular for the efforts made to support the teaching of international law;

4. Expresses its appreciation to the United Nations Institute for Training and Research for its participation in the Programme, particularly in the organization of regional courses and in the conduct of the fellowship programme in international law sponsored jointly by the United Nations and the Institute;

5. Expresses its appreciation to the Government of Egypt for providing host facilities for the regional training and refresher courses held at Cairo in 1981;

6. Expresses its appreciation to the Hague Academy of International Law for its valuable contributions to the Pro-



gramme by enabling international law fellows under the sponsorship of the United Nations and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research to attend its annual international law courses and providing facilities for seminars organized by the Institute in conjunction with the Academy courses;

7. Notes with appreciation the contributions made by the Hague Academy of International Law to the teaching, study, dissemination and wider appreciation of international law and calls upon Member States and interested organizations to give favourable consideration to the appeal of the Academy for adequate assistance to solve its financial problems;

8. Urges all Governments to encourage the inclusion of courses on international law in the programmes of legal studies offered at Institutions of higher learning;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to publicize the Programme and to invite periodically Member States, universities, philanthropic foundations and other interested national and international institutions and organizations, as well as individuals, to make voluntary contributions towards the financing of the Programme or otherwise assisting in its implementation and possible expansion;

10. Reiterates its request to Member States and to interested organizations and individuals to make voluntary contributions towards the financing of the Programme and expresses its appreciation to those Member States which have made voluntary contributions for this purpose;

11. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session on the implementation of the Programme during 1982 and 1983 and, following consultations with the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law, to submit recommendations regarding the execution of the Programme in subsequent years;

12. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-eighth session the item entitled "United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law".

## Other matters

Observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee

On 18 November 1981, the General Assembly adopted a resolution congratulating the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee (AALCC) on its twenty-fifth anniversary (14 November) for promoting interregional and international co-operation supportive of United Nations efforts in that regard. The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to carry out consultations with the AALCC Secretary-General to strengthen further the co-operation between the two organizations.

The resolution was adopted without vote. The text, introduced by Sri Lanka, was sponsored by 27 nations. Inclusion of the item in the Assembly's agenda had been requested by 25 States, mostly African and Asian.<sup>(1)</sup>

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Bangladesh, Botswana, Cyprus, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, 4 Aug., A/36/191 & Add.1,2.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/38, 18 Nov., text following.

Meeting record: GA, A/36/PV.63(18 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/38

Adopted without vote Meeting 83 18 November 1981  
27-nation draft (A/36/L.17 and Add.1); agenda item 127.

Sponsors: Australia, Bangladesh, Botswana, Cyprus, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Mauritius, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen.

Twenty-fifth anniversary of the Asian-African  
Legal Consultative Committee

The General Assembly,

Noting with appreciation the contribution of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee in the field of progressive development and codification of international law,

Considering that the co-operation during the last twenty-five years between the United Nations and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee has been highly fruitful,

Desiring to strengthen further and to widen the scope of this mutually beneficial relationship between the two organizations.

1. Extends its congratulations to the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee on its twenty-fifth anniversary for its highly commendable work in promoting interregional as well as international co-operation supportive of the efforts of the United Nations in this regard;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to carry out consultations with the Secretary-General of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee with a view to further strengthening the co-operation between the two organizations and widening the scope of this co-operation;

3. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item entitled "Co-operation between the United Nations and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee".

Proposal for a UN Day for International Law

In December 1981, a draft resolution,<sup>(1)</sup> sponsored by 10 States, proposing a United Nations Day for International Law was circulated in the General Assembly's Sixth (Legal) Committee.

The text would have had the Assembly: proclaim 8 April 1983 as the Day; invite all States to give special attention on that day, or any that month, to the role of international law; and call on world organizations to develop in 1983 special programmes relating to the role of such law in realizing the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Speaking in the Sixth Committee, the Netherlands pointed out that April 1983 marked the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of Hugo Grotius, the Dutch statesman and jurist, whose legal thinking had left an impact on the teaching, study, dissemination and wider appreciation of international law; although the draft had been supported by delegations of various regional groups, it was being withdrawn in view of the need for further consultation on its specific wording.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Netherlands, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone. A/C.6/36/L.27.

# Administrative and budgetary questions

## Chapter I

### United Nations finances

In December 1981, the General Assembly voted gross appropriations in the amount of \$1,506,241,800 to meet the expenses of the United Nations under the regular budget for the biennium 1982-1983.<sup>(15)</sup> It also approved income estimates totalling \$284,553,000, largely derived from staff assessment on salaries and wages.<sup>(16)</sup> The difference between the two figures resulted in a net budget of \$1,221,688,800. After adjustments, Member States were to be assessed a net total of \$604,916,600 for 1982.<sup>(17)</sup>

The budget was based on initial expenditure estimates proposed by the Secretary-General totalling \$1,535,989,000 (p. 1272). In the foreword to his budget presentation,<sup>(4)</sup> the Secretary-General noted that, for the first time since 1954, the proposed budget did not provide for any growth in real terms. Largely on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ),<sup>(1)</sup> the Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee approved expenditure estimates that were \$29,747,200 less than the Secretary-General had originally requested. The final appropriation figure included \$25,455,600 covering the financial implications of decisions taken by the Assembly and other organs in 1981, partly offset by revised estimates that showed a \$10,262,500 reduction due to favourable currency exchange rates (p. 1273). The resulting budget reflected a real growth rate of 1.8 per cent in United Nations programmes, as calculated by the Secretariat in the final budget document<sup>(5)</sup> to eliminate the effects of inflation and currency rate changes.

The Assembly also gave its customary authorization to the Secretary-General to meet unforeseen and extraordinary expenses during 1982-1983<sup>(18)</sup>—including, for the first time, up to \$300,000 for interorganizational security measures (p. 1383).

Also in December 1981, the General Assembly approved final appropriations totalling \$1,341,704,300 for 1980-1981,<sup>(13)</sup> together with income estimates of \$246,814,000.<sup>(14)</sup> This repre-

sented a \$2,553,100 increase in appropriations (p. 1283) over the sum approved for this period in December 1980, more than offset by an \$8,480,900 rise in estimates of income other than assessments on Member States (p. 1285).

The Fifth Committee received a proposal to provide new guidelines for budget formulation, presentation, review and approval, and obtained Assembly authorization to continue its consideration of the question during a resumed Assembly session in 1982 (p. 1286).

After considering a report by the Committee on Contributions concerning the budgetary assessment of Member States,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly decided in December to modify some of the criteria used for calculating assessment rates, with the aim of benefiting the less affluent States.<sup>(11)</sup> On the Committee's recommendation, the rates of the two States admitted to United Nations membership in 1980, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Zimbabwe, were set at 0.01 and 0.02 per cent, respectively.<sup>(12)</sup> At the end of 1981, \$145 million in assessments for the regular budget remained unpaid (p. 1293).

In another December action, the Assembly decided to put aside in a special account the balance of the assessed contributions due from China for peace-keeping operations since 1971, and welcomed China's announced intention to begin contributing to the two Middle East peace-keeping forces as from 1 January 1982.<sup>(8)</sup>

After receiving a report from the Secretary-General stating that the United Nations deficit was expected to rise to \$274.8 million by 31 December 1981,<sup>(6)</sup> the Assembly decided in December to increase the level of the Working Capital Fund (a reserve account) from \$40 million to \$100 million<sup>(19)</sup> and to suspend financial regulations providing for the return of unspent appropriations to Member States.<sup>(9)</sup>

Expressing concern at the persistence of inflation and monetary instability, the Assembly requested in December a study of their impact on the United Nations budget.<sup>(10)</sup>

In November, the Assembly accepted the 1980 financial reports and accounts of six United

Nations programmes dependent on voluntary financing, as well as related reports of the Board of Auditors,<sup>(2)</sup> and requested remedial action required by the Board's comments.<sup>(7)</sup> It also decided to keep under review the question of the Board's organization and practices (p. 1302).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ A/36/7 & Add.1-21; <sup>(2)</sup>Board of Auditors, A/36/5/Add.1 & Add.1/Corr.1, Add.2-5 & Add.7; <sup>(3)</sup>Committee on Contributions, A/36/11 & Add.1 & Add.1/Corr.1; S-G, <sup>(4)</sup>A/36/6 & Corr.1, <sup>(5)</sup>A/36/6/Add.1, <sup>(6)</sup>A.C.5/36/28 & Corr.1-3.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(7)</sup>36/65, 30 Nov. (p. 1302); <sup>(8)</sup>36/116 A (p. 1299), <sup>(9)</sup>36/116 B (p. 1298), 10 Dec.; <sup>(10)</sup>36/230 (p. 1301) <sup>(11)</sup>36/231 A (p. 1292), <sup>(12)</sup>36/231 B (p. 1292), <sup>(13)</sup>36/234 A (p. 1283), <sup>(14)</sup>36/234 B (p. 1286), <sup>(15)</sup>36/240 A (p. 1278), <sup>(16)</sup>36/240 B (p. 1280), <sup>(17)</sup>38/240 C (p. 1279) <sup>(18)</sup>36/241 (p. 1280), <sup>(19)</sup>36/242 (p. 1282), 18 Dec.

## UN regular budget

### Programme budget for 1982-1983

The approved 1982-1983 appropriations amounting to \$1,506,241,800 for expenditures (p. 1275) and income estimates of \$284,553,000 (p. 1279) were the final result of a budget process that began with the Secretary-General's submission in mid-1981 of a proposed programme budget calling for gross expenditures of \$1,535,989,000 and income estimates of \$284,606,900 (see below), or a net requirement of \$1,251,382,100.<sup>(1)</sup> Prior to the General Assembly session, these initial requests were reviewed by ACABQ which recommended reductions totalling \$45,853,700 in expenditures and \$2,145,900 in income estimates.<sup>(3)</sup>

Following a general debate in October 1981 on the budget and related matters, the Fifth Committee examined these initial requests and recommendations section by section in a first reading of the proposed programme budget.<sup>(5)</sup> The result of the first reading was to reduce the Secretary-General's initial expenditure estimates by \$44,940,300 and his income estimates by \$1,988,000, leaving both figures slightly above the levels recommended by ACABQ.

During a second reading, the Committee added \$25,455,600 in appropriations and \$2,277,400 to the income estimates to cover the financial implications of 1981 decisions by the Assembly and other organs, partially offset by a \$10,262,500 reduction in appropriations and a \$343,300 reduction in income estimates as a consequence of revised estimates for items not included in the initial estimates (p. 1273).<sup>(2)</sup>

The following table shows expenditure and income figures at various stages of the budget process.

	Expenditures	Income
Secretary-General's Initial estimates	1,535,969,000	264,606,900
Secretary-General's revised estimates	225,500	965,500
Financial Implications estimates	29,701,400	2,793,500
Subtotal estimates	1,565,915,900	286,365,900
Initial ACABQ recommendations	(45,653,700)	(2,145,900)
Items reinstated by Fifth Committee	913,400	157,900
Revised estimates not approved	(10,488,000)	(1,306,600)
Financial implications not approved	(4,245,600)	(516,100)
Subtotal net reductions	(59,674,100)	(3,612,900)
Total approved budget	1,506,241,800	264,553,000

Recommendations concerning programme aspects of the 1982-1983 budget, made by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination at its May/June 1981 session,<sup>(4)</sup> were taken into account by the General Assembly in the context of revised budget estimates (p. 1273).

Programme budget: S-G: <sup>(1)</sup>proposed, A/36/6, vols. I, II & Corr.1; approved, A/36/6/Add.1.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>ACABQ A/36/7; <sup>(4)</sup>CPC, A/36/38; <sup>(5)</sup>5th Committee, A/36/845.

### Budget estimates and policy

In the foreword to his proposed programme budget for 1982-1983,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General outlined his general budget policy and the main features of the proposed budget. His proposals entailed gross expenditures of \$1,535,989,000; with income estimated at \$284,606,900 from sources other than assessments on Member States, net requirements were estimated at \$1,251,382,100.

The Secretary-General noted that, for the first time since 1954, the proposed budget did not provide for any growth in real terms, taking account of the efforts of Member States to contain their own public spending. In preparing the budget, emphasis had been given to the need to enhance the coherence and to achieve greater harmonization of the planning, programming and budgetary process.

In terms of real growth, the Secretary-General stated, the recurrent expenditures proposed for 1982-1983 (for activities likely to be carried forward into future budgets) involved a reduction of \$3,450,500. Non-recurrent expenditures—mainly special conferences and construction projects—showed a decline from \$78,798,000 in 1980-1981 to \$38,684,800 proposed for 1982-1983.

The overall budgetary effect of inflation forecasts was an increase of somewhat under 12 per cent over the 1982-1983 estimates costed at 1981 rates, averaging approximately 8 per cent for each of the years 1982 and 1983. The Secretary-General's proposed appropriations included \$161,165,900 in respect of anticipated inflation in 1982 and 1983.

In its first report to the General Assembly on the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983,<sup>(2)</sup> ACABQ recommended reductions totalling \$45,853,700 in the initial expenditure estimates and a net reduction of \$2,145,900 in the income estimates. Of the proposed expenditure reductions, ACABQ said that \$32,876,700 was accounted for by provisional deletions pending the Secretary-General's submission of more up-to-date estimates; \$5,870,300 was due to a recalculation of staff costs in units that had experienced above-average vacancy rates, on the assumption that more than the usual number of posts would go unfilled; and the remaining \$7,106,700 was the result of "real" reductions. Of the 61 new posts requested by the Secretary-General, ACABQ recommended approval of 55.

Programme budget: <sup>(1)</sup>S-C, proposed, A/36/6, vol. I.  
Report: <sup>(2)</sup>ACABQ A/36/7.

#### Revised estimates and financial implications

Revised estimates submitted by the Secretary-General subsequent to his initial budget presentation for 1982-1983 called for a net addition of \$225,500 to expenditures. This figure was composed of additional expenditures estimated at \$36,700,700, largely offset by a \$36,475,200 reduction resulting from adjustments in foreign exchange rates. The additions were presented in 14 reports detailing the costs of specific activities not provided for in the initial estimates. The reduction was due to the higher value of the United States dollar-the currency used for budget calculations-in relation to several other currencies in which the United Nations makes its expenditures.<sup>(9)</sup>

Mainly on the recommendations of ACABQ the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee<sup>(2)</sup> approved revised estimates that were \$10,488,000 below the Secretary-General's proposals, resulting in a \$10,262,500 net reduction in the budget. Of this reduction, \$9,700,000 was due to the ACABQ recommendation, accepted by the Fifth Committee, that the most recent exchange rates-more favourable than those used in the Secretary-General's revised estimates- be used in calculating 1982-1983 costs.

Among the 14 items for which additional funds were appropriated, four exceeded \$1 million (gross) each: construction of United Nations premises at Nairobi, Kenya (p. 1380), \$19,135,800;<sup>(8)</sup> Arabic language services (p. 1369), \$11,633,400 (partly offset by income of \$1,667,900);<sup>(10)</sup> preparations for the Common Fund for Commodities (p. 550), \$1,271,000 (offset by reimbursements of \$1,847,000);<sup>(11)</sup> and the regional work programme of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habi-

tat) (p. 845), \$1,225,800.<sup>(12)</sup> The Fifth Committee reduced the Secretary-General's estimates for Arabic language services by \$231,600 to the amount shown above and approved the three other items as proposed.

Included in the revised estimates was a \$31,100 reduction resulting from a recommendation of the Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC) relating to a meeting on shared natural resources (p. 1274).

In addition to these revised estimates, the financial implications of decisions taken by the General Assembly and other major bodies during 1981, not included in the initial budget estimates, added \$25,455,600 to the 1982-1983 gross appropriations. This was \$4,245,800 less than the Secretary-General had estimated, the difference being due largely to reductions recommended by ACABQ and accepted by the Fifth Committee.

Among the 40 items on which the Secretary-General submitted financial implications papers, six resulted in appropriations exceeding \$1 million (gross) each: conference-servicing costs for meetings added to the 1982-1983 calendar (p. 1368), \$11,300,000 (less \$1,300,000 in income, mainly from staff assessment); activities relating to Namibia, including a \$1 million subvention to the United Nations Fund for Namibia (p. 1172), \$2,747,100; the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (p. 130), \$2,324,700; implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries (p. 408), \$1,645,500; the Palestine question, mainly for strengthening the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights (p. 272), \$1,086,600; and United Nations public information activities (p. 362), \$1,011,200.

The approved amounts for these six items were those proposed by the Secretary-General except in two cases: the Fifth Committee cut conference-servicing costs by \$2,384,800 and funds relating to the Namibia question by \$126,000. In approving the sum for public information activities, the Committee decided not to follow an ACABQ recommendation for a \$365,600 reduction.

Voting on these items took place as follows: The financial implications of an Assembly resolution of 10 December 1981 on the Palestine question,<sup>(3)</sup> involving additional resources for the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights in the amount of \$1,031,600 (\$998,000 net), were approved on 8 December by a recorded vote of 75 to 4, with 18 abstentions. The financial implications (\$2,747,100 gross, \$2,681,100 net) of six resolutions on the Namibia question, also adopted on 10 December,<sup>(4)</sup> were approved by the Committee on 9 December by a recorded vote of

87 to 5, with 8 abstentions, after the Committee approved \$1 million for the United Nations Fund for Namibia by a recorded vote of 92 to 5, with 4 abstentions. The financial implications (\$1,011,200 gross, \$912,600 net) of a 16 December resolution on United Nations public information activities<sup>(5)</sup> were approved on 14 December by 74 votes to 22, with 8 abstentions.

Also among the financial implications was an addition of \$296,400 gross (\$283,800 net) to implement resolutions and decisions of the Economic and Social Council adopted during 1981 (p. 1092).

**CPC ACTION.** At its May/June 1981 session,<sup>(\*)</sup> in addition to proposals on programme planning and budgeting procedures (p. 1304), CPC made a number of recommendations relating to 17 of the 32 sections in the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983. Most of them called for consolidation or elimination of specific programme activities.

Endorsing the conclusions and recommendations of CPC while taking account of reservations and comments by Council members, the Economic and Social Council, on 23 July 1981, decided to transmit the CPC report to the Assembly.<sup>(7)</sup>

In a resolution of 18 December on questions relating to the 1982-1983 budget,<sup>(6)</sup> the Assembly decided not to endorse four CPC recommendations, which would have involved the deletion of programme elements on conventional disarmament, welfare of migrant workers, corrupt practices of transnational corporations (TNCs) and substantive servicing of meetings on codification of international law. The Assembly also decided that the programme element on environmental law should be retained.

The Assembly adopted this section of the resolution, without vote, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, which approved it on 16 and 17 December without objection. The text was based on oral proposals by the Chairman, made following consultations.

A CPC recommendation to delete an allocation for an ad hoc expert group on shared natural resources, which had already completed its work, resulted in a \$31,100 reduction in the 1982-1983 budget.

In the Fifth Committee's discussion of the proposal not to endorse four CPC recommendations, the United Republic of Cameroon said it would have abstained if there had been a vote, as it thought it highly unorthodox for part of the CPC report to be amended in negotiations among Fifth Committee members.

The proposal not to endorse the CPC recommendation for deletion of the programme element on corrupt practices of TNCs was made by

Egypt, supported by New Zealand, and was approved by the Fifth Committee without objection, with reservations by Japan. Deletion of the programme element on welfare of migrant workers, as recommended by CPC, was favoured by the United States and Yugoslavia, while Algeria and Pakistan spoke against its elimination. Retention of the programme element on environmental law was favoured by Canada, Kenya, Sweden and the United States, while Brazil and Yugoslavia spoke for the CPC recommendation to delete it.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>CPC, A/36/38; <sup>(2)</sup>5th Committee, A/36/845.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>36/120 B, 10 Dec. (p. 273);

<sup>(4)</sup>36/121 A-F, 10 Dec.; <sup>(5)</sup>36/149 B, 16 Dec. (p. 363);

<sup>(6)</sup>36/235, sect. XVIII, 18 Dec., text following.

Decision: <sup>(7)</sup>ESC: 1981/180, 23 July (p. 1076).

Revised estimates—reports of S-G (A/C.5/36/-) and ACABQ (A/36/7/Add.-):

Over \$1 million: <sup>(8)</sup>Accommodation at Nairobi, A/C.5/36/57, A/36/7/Add.14; <sup>(9)</sup>Adjustment for currency rate changes, A/C.5/36/79 & Corr.1; <sup>(10)</sup>Arabic language services, A/C.5/36/54 & Corr.1,2, A/36/7/Add.11; <sup>(11)</sup>Common Fund for Commodities, A/C.5/36/37; <sup>(12)</sup>UNCHS regional work programme, A/C.5/36/15, A/36/7/Add.4.

Others: Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus, A/C.5/36/91 & Corr.1,2; Conference-servicing costs, A/C.5/36/105; Convention on discrimination against women, A/C.5/36/90 & Corr.1, A/36/7/Add.21; Development Forum, A/C.5/36/52; ESC resolutions and decisions, A/C.5/36/33 & Corr.1, A/36/7/Add.10; ICSC, A/C.5/36/30 & Corr.1, A/C.5/36/66, A/36/7/Add.99; International Computing Centre, A/C.5/36/44; International Conference on Population (1984), A/C.5/36/33/Add.1; IOB, A/C.5/36/38; TDB resolutions and decisions, A/C.5/36/45; Treaty registration and publication, A/C.5/36/25, A/36/7/Add.5; World Assembly on Aging, A/C.5/36/36 & Corr.1 & Add.1, A/36/7/Add.12

Financial implications: S-G statement on CPC report, A/C.5/36/40 & Add.1.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.14, 26, 32, 39, 41, 42, 46, 47, 50, 52, 53, 57, 58, 63, 64-70, 73, 74, 76-80, 82, 83 (19 Oct.-18 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section XVIII

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without Objection, 16 and 17 December (meetings 80 and 82); oral proposals by Chairman; agenda item 100.

Administrative and financial Implications of the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination In paragraphs 477 to 514 of its report on its twenty-first session

The General Assembly ...]

Having considered the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on its twenty-first session,

1. Decides not to endorse the recommendations contained in paragraphs 479, 483, 489 (a) and 509 of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination;

2. further decides that, with regard to paragraph 501 (d) of the report of the Committee, programme element 9.1 (Environmental law) of subprogramme 9 (Environmental management including environmental law) should be retained, with the exception of two meetings on international rivers, which should be deleted;

...

### Appropriations

In a resolution of 18 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly set out \$1,506,241,800 as the gross total of appropriations for 1982-1983, divided into 32 budget sections. As in previous appropriation resolutions, the Secretary-General was authorized to transfer credits between sections with the concurrence of ACABQ all contractual (external) printing costs were to be administered as a unit under the direction of the United Nations Publications Board, and certain financial obligations in connection with the regular programme of technical co-operation were to remain valid beyond the budget period.

The resolution was adopted, by a recorded vote of 120 to 15, with 6 abstentions, following the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, which approved the appropriations on the same day by a recorded vote, requested by the USSR, of 85 to 14, with 5 abstentions.

The budget total was \$164,537,500, or 12.3 per cent, above the revised appropriations for 1980-1981, approved on the same day (p. 1283). According to calculations by the United Nations Secretariat, contained in the 1982-1983 programme budget document,<sup>(1)</sup> the real growth rate between the two budgets-discounting the effects of inflation and non-recurrent costs-was 1.8 per cent.

Among States which voted against the appropriations, the Federal Republic of Germany felt that the budget was not a fair reflection of the world's financial and economic problems. Japan said the fact that the approved expenditure estimates remained within the original estimates was due primarily to favourable exchange rates rather than to a concern for economy, absorption, greater productivity and rationalization.

Also voting against, the USSR stated that the financial contributions of Member States continued to be spent ineffectively, uneconomically and, very often, for purposes inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations, as exemplified by the financing of the 1961 United Nations bond issue<sup>(3)</sup> and the inclusion of technical co-operation activities in the regular budget; the budgetary growth rate far exceeded the growth rates of Member States.

Explaining why it was voting against a new United Nations budget for the first time, the United Kingdom expressed profound dissatisfaction at the Assembly's failure to redeploy resources so as to avoid new appropriations; it added that a period of rational and controlled slimming would greatly improve United Nations efficiency. The United States, also casting a first-time negative vote, reiterated its support for the concept of zero net-programme growth and said the international community must learn to live

with shrinking resources; the United States particularly opposed appropriations for activities of national liberation movements and the Palestine Liberation Organization, and did not believe that technical assistance programmes belonged in the regular budget.

Belgium voiced disapproval of several Assembly decisions which had increased appropriations and regretted that there would be almost no transfer of resources between programmes during 1982-1983; however, in recognition of efforts by ACABQ the Secretary-General and the Office of Financial Services to contain budgetary growth, it would abstain rather than vote against. France, which also abstained, said the budgetary growth rate, although well below that for the two previous budgets, was still much too high; it also stated reservations concerning the failure of the Assembly's other Main Committees to take sufficient account of the financial implications of their recommendations. Italy said it would abstain in the vote to encourage the Secretariat's efforts to keep the budget within the limits of low growth; new activities should be financed from resources released by redeployment.

Among those voting for the budget, Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries, said the Group regarded the concept of zero real growth to be arbitrarily imposed and as having no legal basis; the debate had become frozen in positions of principle, even though the Group had made many efforts to co-operate with other delegations.

Though sceptical about the allowance made in the budget for inflation, and concerned about certain aspects of the budget and the Committee's review of it, Australia said it would vote in favour to show support for the Secretary-General's efforts for a budget approaching zero real growth, in the hope that that policy would be reinforced by maximum fiscal restraint. Canada said its positive vote showed willingness to support programmes for the developing countries; in turn, it looked to them for co-operation in holding down expenditures. New Zealand endorsed Australia's and Canada's comments as well as the appeal for efficiency and economy.

Denmark, speaking for the Nordic States, said they continued to support a policy of financial restraint as the starting-point for the budget but felt that the administration and financing of United Nations activities should be seen in a wider context; nevertheless, greater effort should be made to cover new activities by funds released from obsolete, marginally useful or ineffective ones. Ireland hoped that future budgets would tend towards the elimination of obsolete or marginal activities in order to focus on truly important programmes. The Netherlands

explained that it had voted for the budget only in appreciation of the Secretary-General's efforts to present a zero-growth budget and on the understanding that the Secretariat would continue to make strenuous efforts to establish priorities and evaluate programme activities in the light of that principle.

The United Republic of Cameroon remarked that, if all Member States demonstrated the will to

initiate global negotiations on economic co-operation, bring about disarmament and reduce tension, the budget could be reduced in those areas.

The view that too little attention had been paid to ACABQ recommendations was expressed by Australia, France, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States. Algeria, on the other hand, said some countries had taken shelter behind ACABQ in order to cut the budget.

### UNITED NATIONS PROGRAMME BUDGETS, 1980-1981 AND 1982-1983 (in thousands of US dollars)

PART/SECTION/SUBSECTION	1980-1981			1982-1983			
	Appropriations	Established posts	Initial estimates	Appropriations	Established posts	Real growth	Vote
PART I. Overall policy-making, direction and co-ordination							
1. Overall policy-making, direction and co-ordination	28,114.7	175	33,787.7	34,175.0	176	1.9%	93-2-6
A . Policy-making organs	13,872.7	46	15,769.4	14,773.8	47	-3.1%	-
B . Executive direction and management	14,242.0	129	18,018.3	19,401.2	129	6.3%	-
PART II. Political and Security Council affairs; peace-keeping activities							
2. Political and Security Council affairs; peace-keeping activities	66,912.6	785	72,423.8	72,862.0	785	-0.4%	no obj.
A . Policy-making organs	558.7	-	604.6	596.0	-	-4.0%	-
B . Department of Political and Security Council Affairs	14,986.7	138	16,815.2	16,694.6	138	-1.3%	-
C . Secretariat of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea	2,925.7	-	-	1,715.9	-	-	-
D . Special missions	38,530.5	559	42,850.5	42,652.8	559	0.0%	-
E . United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East	9,911.0	88	12,153.5	11,202.7	88	-0.4%	-
PART III. Political affairs, trusteeship and decolonization							
3. Political affairs, trusteeship and decolonization	14,855.6	121	15,908.1	18,774.2	125	4.9%	98-1-2
A . Policy-making organs	1,917.8	-	1,595.6	2,180.9	-	4.1%	-
B . Department of Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization	4,917.1	64	5,766.1	5,841.2	62	-2.9%	-
C . Namibia	5,738.9	26	5,518.1	7,656.6	26	14.7%	-
D . Centre against Apartheid	2,281.8	31	3,028.3	3,095.5	37	3.0%	-
PART IV. Economic, social and humanitarian activities							
4. Policy-making organs (economic and social activities)	8,320.8	-	1,816.5	1,992.4	-	-4.2%	no obj.
A . Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions end committees and other recurrent meetings	1,223.2	-	1,417.2	1,288.6	-	-4.7%	-
B . Special conferences	7,097.6	-	399.3	703.8	-	3.7%	-
5A. Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation	2,526.5	25	3,026.1	3,228.9	25	7.0%	no obj.
5B. Centre for Science and Technology for Development	3,065.3	32	3,719.5	3,658.1	32	-2.7%	96-0-7
6. Department of International Economic and Social Affairs	40,489.2	509	46,658.5	44,112.1	511	0.0%	91-0-11
7. Department of Technical Co-operation for Development	13,680.4	199	16,433.4	16,030.3	199	0.0%	91-0-11
8. Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters	2,586.3	36	3,184.4	3,232.5	36	1.5%	no obj.
9. Transnational corporations	7,589.6	78	9,164.2	9,029.7	81	-0.3%	93-0-10
10. Economic Commission for Europe	25,603.0	233	26,888.4	26,178.8	233	0.0%	no obj.
11. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific	26,120.5	528	32,438.1	28,166.4	555	2.2%	94-0-10
12. Economic Commission for Latin America	42,217.8	577	61,227.4	60,365.3	581	0.3%	93-0-10
13. Economic Commission for Africa	29,701.3	576	36,012.6	35,945.7	587	1.8%	97-0-8
14. Economic Commission for Western Asia'	14,451.5	246	16,795.6	16,283.1	250	1.1%	93-1-9
15. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development	54,960.6	416	57,256.5	57,168.8	448	8.1%	84-10-10
16. International Trade Centre	8,866.3	-	9,429.3	9,246.2	-	0.0%	no obj.
17. United Nations Industrial Development Organization	75,369.3	746	83,350.2	72,942.2	742	1.5%	92-0-13
18. United Nations Environment Programme	11,224.7	111	13,148.6	10,235.4	113	2.6%	no obj.
19. United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)	8,138.3	76	9,705.5	8,312.2	88	0.8%	91-9-3
20. International drug Control	6,204.4	59	6,822.0	6,141.6	59	0.0%	92-10-0
21. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	27,302.8	297	30,670.3	30,270.7	297	0.0%	93-10-1
22. Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator	4,830.1	34	5,251.3	5,136.7	34	-0.5%	94-9-1
23. Human rights	10,431.0	81	10,249.0	10,517.3	81	0.0%	no obj.
24. Regular programme of technical co-operation	28,034.8	-	32,258.5	30,995.4	-	0.0%	87-12-5

## United Nations finances

1277

PART/SECTION/SUBSECTION	1980-1981			1982-1983			Vote
	Appropriations	Established posts	Initial estimates	Appropriations	Established posts	Real growth	
PART V. International justice and law							
25. International Court of Justice	8,945.9	37	9,755.2	8,675.3	39	-1.8%	no obj.
26. Legal activities	10,639.3	105	12,864.6	13,145.9	108	2.6%	no obj.
A. Policy-making organs	1,540.2	2	1,770.2	1,949.9	2	11.8%	-
B. Special meetings and conferences	130.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. Office of Legal Affairs	8,968.3	103	11,094.4	11,196.0	106	1.1%	-
PART VI. Public Information							
27. Public Information	48,818.6	690	61,247.7	63,156.1	703	1.7%	81-10-12
A. Headquarters	30,106.9	286	37,584.0	39,401.1	301	2.6%	-
B. Geneva	3,676.4	35	4,059.7	4,020.8	35	4.5%	-
C. Information centres	15,035.3	369	19,604.0	19,734.2	367	-0.7%	-
PART VII. Common support services							
28. Administration, management and general services	245,038.0	2,042	283,892.9	274,557.9	2,074	-0.4%	81-0-22
A. Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management	658.5	8	806.1	844.0	8	0.0%	-
B. Office of Financial Services	11,088.2	173	13,528.4	13,495.3	173	-0.3%	-
C. Office of Personnel Services	11,135.2	163	14,287.2	14,302.3	168	0.3%	-
D. Office of General Services, Headquarters	89,172.9	795	108,417.2	107,961.4	789	-0.2%	-
E. Administrative Management Service	1,683.1	20	2,021.6	2,008.7	20	-2.0%	-
F. Internal Audit Division	3,294.6	42	3,891.0	3,854.9	42	0.0%	-
G. Electronic Data Processing and Information Systems Division	12,024.3	57	14,607.0	14,235.5	57	-0.1%	-
H. Division of Administration, Geneva	11,048.3	107	12,053.5	11,725.3	107	0.6%	-
I. General Services Division, Geneva	48,950.2	355	51,904.3	50,369.5	374	-1.0%	-
J. Staff training activities (Headquarters, Geneva, and the regional commissions)	5,588.6	40	7,060.4	6,973.6	43	-1.0%	-
K. Miscellaneous expenses	6,676.6	-	3,773.0	3,773.0	-	0.0%	-
L. Jointly financed administrative activities	8,784.8	62	10,353.9	10,594.7	70	5.2%	-
M. Administrative Services, Vienna	34,932.7	220	41,189.3	34,419.7	223	-2.5%	-
29. Conference and library services	202,642.5	2,368	237,884.5	247,970.3	2,418	5.9%	86-0-16
A. Department of Conference Services	102,163.9	1,403	125,754.7	128,854.4	1,437	2.3%	-
B. Conference Services, Geneva	86,125.0	766	91,929.7	95,677.0	781	6.9%	-
C. Conference Services, Vienna	262.6	-	3,549.8	6,990.5	-	131.7%	-
D. Library, Headquarters	9,248.7	151	11,111.3	11,135.2	152	0.2%	-
E. Library, Geneva	4,529.6	48	4,900.1	4,765.1	48	0.0%	-
F. Library, Vienna	312.7	-	638.9	548.1	-	5.2%	-
PART VIII. Special expenses							
30. United Nations bond issue	17,056.0	-	17,220.3	17,220.3	-	0.9%	88-13-0
PART IX. Staff assessment							
31. Staff assessment	190,367.6	-	229,946.6	229,525.5	-	2.2%	no obj.
PART X. Capital expenditures							
32. Construction, alteration, improvement and major maintenance of premises	53,740.2	-	45,551.7	36,989.5	-	-13.3%	89-10-4
PART XI. Special grants							
33. United Nations Institute for Training and Research	305.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS (gross)	1,339,151.2	11,181	1,535,989.0	1,506,241.8	11,380	1.8%	85-14-5
INCOME SECTION	Approved income estimates	Established posts	Initial income estimates	Approved income estimates	Established posts	Real growth	Vote
1. Income from staff assessment	193,897.5	-	233,876.3	233,396.8	-	-	no obj.
2. General income	29,073.4	-	34,521.6	33,871.6	-	-	no obj.
3. Revenue-producing activities	15,362.2	190	16,209.0	17,284.6	202	-	no obj.
TOTAL INCOME ESTIMATES	238,333.1	-	284,606.9	284,553.0	-	-	
GRAND TOTAL NET BUDGET	1,100,818.1	11,371	1,251,382.1	1,221,688.8	11,582	-	

NOTES: 1980-1981: Appropriations: Approved by the General Assembly on 17 December 1980 (resolution 35/226 A) (no breakdown of the budget figures as revised in 1981 has been published). Approved income estimates: Approved by the General Assembly on 17 December 1980 (resolution 35/226 B). Established posts: Number of established (non-temporary) staff posts authorized under the 1980-1981 regular budget.

1982-1983: Initial estimates: Contained in the Secretary-General's proposed programme budget. Appropriations: Approved by the General Assembly on 18 December 1981 (resolution 36/240 A). Approved income estimates: Approved by the General Assembly on 18 December 1981 (resolution 36/240 B). Established posts: Number of established (non-temporary) staff posts authorized under the 1982-1983 regular budget. Real growth: Percentage increase (or decrease) in appropriations from 1980-1981 to 1982-1983, excluding inflation and non-recurrent items, as calculated by the United Nations Secretariat (dash signifies not applicable). Vote: Totals of recorded section-by-section votes (in favour-against-abstaining) in the Fifth Committee during the second reading of the budget, 18 December 1981; the vote in the Assembly on the appropriation resolution was 120-15-6.



Programme budget: <sup>(1)</sup>Approved, A/36/6/Add.1.  
 Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/240 A, 18 Dec., text following.  
 Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1961, p. 566.  
 Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.8, 10, 12-35, 37-39, 41-47, 62, 64, 65, 83 (8 Oct.-18 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/240 A

120-15-6 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845, draft resolution VI A) by recorded vote (85-14-5), 18 December (meeting 83); agenda item 100.

Budget appropriations for the biennium 1982-1983

The General Assembly

Resolves that for the biennium 1982-1983:

1. Appropriations totalling \$US 1,506,241,800 are hereby voted for the following purposes:

Section	(US dollars)
<b>PART I. Overall policy-making, direction and co-ordination</b>	
1. Overall policy-making, direction and co-ordination	34,175,000
<b>Total, PART I</b>	<b>34,175,000</b>
<b>PART II. Political and Security Council affairs; peace-keeping activities</b>	
2. Political and Security Council affairs; peace-keeping activities	72,862,000
<b>Total, PART II</b>	<b>72,862,000</b>
<b>PART III. Political affairs, trusteeship and decolonization</b>	
3. Political affairs, trusteeship and decolonization	18,774,200
<b>Total, PART III</b>	<b>18,774,200</b>
<b>PART IV. Economic, social and humanitarian activities</b>	
4. Policy-making organs (economic and social activities)	1,992,400
5A. Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation	3,228,900
5B. Centre for Science and Technology for Development	3,658,100
6. Department of International Economic and Social Affairs	44,112,100
7. Department of Technical Co-operation for Development	16,030,300
8. Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters	3,232,500
9. Transnational corporations	9,029,700
10. Economic Commission for Europe	26,178,800
11. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific	28,166,400
12. Economic Commission for Latin America	60,365,300
13. Economic Commission for Africa	35,945,700
14. Economic Commission for Western Asia	16,283,100
15. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development	57,168,800
16. International Trade Centre	9,246,200
17. United Nations Industrial Development Organization	72,942,200
18. United Nations Environment Programme	10,235,400
19. United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)	8,312,200

Section	(US dollars)
20. International drug control	6,141,600
21. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	30,270,700
22. Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator	5,136,700
23. Human rights	10,517,300
24. Regular programme of technical co-operation	30,995,400
<b>Total, PART IV</b>	<b>489,189,800</b>
<b>PART V. International justice and law</b>	
25. International Court of Justice	8,675,300
26. Legal activities	13,145,900
<b>Total, PART V</b>	<b>21,821,200</b>
<b>PART VI. Public information</b>	
27. Public information	63,156,100
<b>Total, PART VI</b>	<b>63,156,100</b>
<b>PART VII. Common support services</b>	
28. Administration, finance and management	274,557,900
29. Conference and library services	247,970,300
<b>Total, PART VII</b>	<b>522,528,200</b>
<b>PART VIII. Special expenses</b>	
30. United Nations bond issue	17,220,300
<b>Total, PART VIII</b>	<b>17,220,300</b>
<b>PART IX. Staff assessment</b>	
31. Staff assessment	229,525,500
<b>Total, PART IX</b>	<b>229,525,500</b>
<b>PART X. Capital expenditures</b>	
32. Construction, alteration, improvement and major maintenance of premises	36,989,500
<b>Total, PART X</b>	<b>36,989,500</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>1,506,241,800</b>

2 The Secretary-General shall be authorized to transfer credits between sections of the budget with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;

3 The total net provision made under the various sections of the budget for contractual printing shall be administered as a unit under the direction of the United Nations Publications Board;

4 The appropriations for the regular programme of technical co-operation under part IV, section 24, shall be administered in accordance with the Financial Regulations of the United Nations, except that the definition of obligations and the period of validity of obligations shall be subject to the following procedures:

(a) Obligations for personal services established in the current biennium shall be valid for the succeeding biennium, provided that appointments of the experts concerned are effected by the end of the current biennium and that the total period to be covered by obligations established for these purposes against the resources of the current biennium shall not exceed twenty-four work-months;

(b) Obligations established in the current biennium for fellowships shall remain valid until liquidated, provided that the

fellow has been nominated by the requesting Government and accepted by the Organization and that a formal letter of award has been issued to the requesting Government;

(c) Obligations in respect of contracts or purchase orders for supplies or equipment recorded in the current biennium will remain valid until payment is effected to the contractor or vendor, unless they are cancelled;

5. In addition to the appropriations voted under paragraph 1 above, an amount of \$19,000 is appropriated for each year of the biennium 1982-1983 from accumulated income of the Library Endowment Fund for the purchase of books, periodicals, maps and library equipment and for such other expenses of the Library at the Palais des Nations as are in accordance with the objects and provisions of the endowment.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Solomon Islands, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Romania.

#### Financing of appropriations

By a resolution of 18 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly specified how the \$755,674,000 in appropriations for 1982-consisting of half of the gross budget for 1982-1983 (p. 1275) and the \$2,553,100 in supplementary appropriations for 1980-1981 (p. 1283) -were to be financed: \$721,642,946 from assessments on Member States, \$25,578,100 from income other than staff assessment (see below) (half of the approved income estimates from these sources for 1982-1983), \$8,264,500 from the increase in income estimates (other than staff assessment) for 1980-1981 (p. 1285) and \$188,454 from the assessed contributions of new Member States for 1980 and 1981. The gross assessment on Members was to be partly offset by \$116,914,800, representing their share in the Tax Equalization Fund (financed from staff assessment and used in part to reimburse staff members who paid national income tax). Consequently, net assessment on Member States totalled \$604,916,600 for 1982.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 124 to 14, with 3 abstentions. The Fifth Committee approved the draft on 18 December by a recorded vote, requested by the USSR, of 89 to 13, with 2 abstentions.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/240 C, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.83 (18 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/240 C

124-14-3 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845, draft resolution VI C) by recorded vote (89-13-2), 18 December (meeting 83); agenda item 100.

#### Financing of appropriations for the year 1982

The General Assembly

Resolves that for the year 1982:

1. Budget appropriations totalling \$US 755,674,000 consisting of \$US 753,120,900, being one half of the appropriations approved for the biennium 1982-1983 under resolution A above, together with supplementary appropriations for 1980-1981 increased by \$US 2,553,100 shall be financed in accordance with regulations 5.1 and 5.2 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations as follows:

(a) \$25,578,100 being half of the estimated income other than staff assessment approved for the biennium 1982-1983 under resolution B above;

(b) \$8,264,500 being the increase in the revised income other than staff assessment for the biennium 1980-1981;

(c) \$188,454 being contributions of new Member States for 1980 and 1981;

(d) \$721,642,946 being the assessment on Member States in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 34/6 A of 25 October 1979 and 35/11 A of 3 November 1980 on the scale of assessments for the years 1980, 1981 and 1982;

2. There shall be set off against the assessment on Member States, in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 973(X) of 15 December 1955, their respective share in the Tax Equalization Fund in the total amount of \$US 116,914,800 consisting of:

(a) \$116,698,400 being half of the estimated staff assessment income approved for the biennium 1982-1983 under resolution B above;

(b) \$216,400 being the increase in the revised income from staff assessment for the biennium 1980-1981.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Solomon Islands, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Israel, Romania.

#### Income estimates

On 18 December 1981, the General Assembly approved revised estimates of income for 1982-1983-other than assessments on Member States-in the amount of \$284,553,000, including \$233,396,800 to be derived from staff assess-

ment (a kind of internal income tax paid by United Nations staff members on salaries and wages).<sup>(4)</sup>

The resolution was adopted without vote, following its approval without objection by the Fifth Committee on the same day.

Income estimates submitted by the Secretary-General in his proposed programme budget amounted to \$284,606,900.<sup>(1)</sup> The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) recommended a net reduction of \$2,145,900, consisting mainly of a \$3.2 million cut in income from staff assessment—the effect of recommended staff reductions—partly offset by a \$1.8 million increase in estimates of income from revenue-producing activities.<sup>(2)</sup> Approving more staff posts than had been recommended by ACABQ the Fifth Committee, consequently, approved slightly higher income estimates of \$282,618,900 on first reading.<sup>(3)</sup>

Subsequent to his initial estimates, the Secretary-General submitted revised estimates which would have added \$965,500 to the income side, and estimates of financial implications of 1981 Assembly decisions involving additional income of \$2,793,500. The total income estimates approved by the Fifth Committee and the Assembly were \$3,812,900 less than the Secretary-General had proposed (see table on p. 1272).

Programme budget: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, proposed, A/36/6, .vols. I, II & Corr. I.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ACABQ A/36/7; <sup>(3)</sup>5th Committee, A/36/845.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/240 B, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.46, 65, 83 (18 Nov.-18 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/240 B

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845, draft resolution VI B) without objection, 18 December (meeting 83); agenda item 100.

#### Income estimates for the biennium 1982-1983

##### The General Assembly

Resolves that for the biennium 1982-1983:

1. Estimates of income other than assessments on Member States totalling \$US 284,553,000 are approved as follows:

Income section	(US dollars)
<b>PART I. Income from staff assessment</b>	
1. Income from staff assessment	233,396,800
<b>Total, PART I</b>	<b>233,396,800</b>
<b>PART II. Other income</b>	
2. General income	33,871,600
3. Revenue-producing activities	17,284,600
<b>Total, PART II</b>	<b>51,156,200</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>284,553,000</b>

2. The income from staff assessment shall be credited to the Tax Equalization Fund in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 973(X) of 15 December 1955;

3. Direct expenses of the United Nations Postal Administration, services to visitors, catering and related services, garage operations, television services and the sale of publications, not provided for under the budget appropriations, shall be charged against the income derived from those activities.

#### Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses

The General Assembly, on 18 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments to meet unforeseen and extraordinary expenses during 1982-1983. Such commitments would require the prior concurrence of ACABQ except for three categories of items on which the Secretary-General would only have to report to that Committee: commitments not exceeding \$2 million per year for the maintenance of peace and security, certain expenses of the International Court of Justice up to \$638,000 for the biennium and commitments up to \$300,000 for interorganizational security measures (p. 1383). As in previous years, the Assembly decided that, if a Security Council decision resulted while the Assembly was not in session in commitments exceeding \$10 million for the maintenance of peace and security, a special session would be convened.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 127 to 9, with 2 abstentions, following its approval by the Fifth Committee on 18 December by a recorded vote, requested by the USSR, of 89 to 10, with 1 abstention.

Explaining its negative vote, the USSR said expenditures for international peace and security came exclusively within the purview of the Security Council, and it was a violation of the Charter of the United Nations to accord the Secretariat authority in such matters.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/241, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.83 (18 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/241

127-9-2 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845, draft resolution VII) by recorded vote (89-10-1), 18 December (meeting 83); agenda item 100.

#### Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 1982-1983

##### The General Assembly

1. Authorizes the Secretary-General, with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and subject to the Financial Regulations of the United Nations and the provisions of paragraph 3 below, to enter into commitments in the biennium 1982-1983 to meet unforeseen and extraordinary expenses arising either during or subsequent to that biennium, provided that the concurrence of the Advisory Committee shall not be necessary for:

(a) Such commitments, not exceeding a total of \$US 2 million in any one year of the biennium 1982-1983, as the Secretary-General certifies relate to the maintenance of peace and security;

(b) Such commitments as the President of the International Court of Justice certifies relate to expenses occasioned by:

- (i) The designation of ad hoc judges (Statute of the Court, Article 31), not exceeding a total of \$150,000;
- (ii) The appointment of assessors (Statute, Article 30), or the calling of witnesses and the appointment of experts (Statute, Article 50), not exceeding a total of \$50,000;
- (iii) The maintenance in office of judges who have not been re-elected (Statute, Article 13, paragraph 3), not exceeding a total of \$150,000 in 1982;
- (iv) The payment of pensions and travel and removal expenses of retiring judges, and travel and removal expenses of new members of the Court, not exceeding a total of \$157,000 in 1982, and the payment of pensions of retiring judges, not exceeding a total of \$131,000 in 1983;

(c) Such commitments, in an amount not exceeding \$300,000, in the biennium 1982-1983, as the Secretary-General certifies are required for interorganizational security measures pursuant to section IV of General Assembly resolution 36/235 of 18 December 1981;

2. Resolves that the Secretary-General shall report to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth sessions all commitments made under the provisions of the present resolution, together with the circumstances relating thereto, and shall submit supplementary estimates to the Assembly in respect of such commitments;

3. Decides that if, as a result of a decision of the Security Council, commitments relating to the maintenance of peace and security should arise in an estimated total exceeding \$10 million either before the thirty-seventh session or between the thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly, a special session of the Assembly shall be convened by the Secretary-General to consider the matter.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic-Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR.

Abstaining: Israel, Romania.

#### Working Capital Fund

In December 1981, the General Assembly decided to increase from \$40 million to \$100 million the level of the Working Capital Fund, established in 1946 as a source of liquidity to enable the Secretary-General to advance sums necessary to finance budget appropriations pending the receipt of contributions from Member States. The last previous increase had been authorized by the Assembly in 1962, with effect from 1963.<sup>(3)</sup> A 1975 proposal by the Secretary-

General to raise the Fund to \$80 million was not approved.<sup>(7)</sup>

The decision to establish the Fund for 1982-1983 in the amount of \$100 million was initially taken by the Assembly on 10 December 1981 as one of two measures to alleviate the United Nations financial situation.<sup>(4)</sup> The action had been proposed by the Secretary-General and endorsed by ACABQ.

Arrangements for the enlarged Fund were fixed in a resolution of 18 December.<sup>(6)</sup> As in the past, the Fund was to be financed by advances from Member States in accordance with their assessments for the regular budget (p. 1287). In addition to advances for budgetary appropriations, the Fund could be used to finance unforeseen and extraordinary expenses (p. 1280), miscellaneous self-liquidating purchases and activities under a \$200,000 revolving fund, advance insurance premiums, and sums necessary to enable the Tax Equalization Fund to meet current commitments. Should the \$100 million be inadequate, the Secretary-General was authorized to utilize cash from special funds and accounts in his custody, or the proceeds of loans if the Assembly were to authorize them.

The Assembly adopted this resolution by a recorded vote of 117 to 19, with 4 abstentions, after the Fifth Committee approved it on 18 December by a recorded vote, requested by the USSR, of 81 to 18, with 3 abstentions.

In a resolution of the same date on the assessment of new Member States, the Assembly decided that the advances to the Working Capital Fund of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and of Zimbabwe, admitted to the United Nations in 1980, should be calculated by applying their respective rates of assessment of 0.01 and 0.02 per cent.<sup>(5)</sup>

The increase in the Fund to \$100 million—corresponding to two months of net expenditure—had been suggested by the Secretary-General in a report<sup>(2)</sup> on the financial situation (p. 1295). To avoid the risk of having the Organization drift into insolvency, the Secretary-General held it necessary to increase the Fund even further over the following few years, to between \$150 million and \$200 million. ACABQ concurred with the proposal for a \$100-million Fund on the ground that its level had remained unchanged since 1963, when the Fund was equal to 43.1 per cent of the annual budget, whereas in 1981 it corresponded to only 6 per cent.<sup>(1)</sup>

Opposing the increase in the Fifth Committee, the United States said the action condoned the withholding of contributions, which it regarded as the basic cause of the financial emergency; if those countries withholding significant portions of their contributions ceased to do so, there

would be no need to increase the Fund. Making a similar point, Japan objected to the measure as a palliative intended to make up for withholdings and reserved its position on the additional payments required for the Fund. Disapproval of the increase was also voiced by France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, the USSR and the United Kingdom.

Voting in favour, Ireland said it regarded the increase as unavoidable. Yugoslavia supported the increase on the understanding that the Fund's resources would be used solely for current Secretariat expenses.

During the Fifth Committee debate on the financial situation, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya expressed the view that the Fund should be increased to \$100 million as an absolute minimum and should preferably be restored to a level equal to four months of net disbursements. Pakistan contended that the request to raise the level of the Fund was justified on purely technical grounds, since the current level of \$40 million had been established at a time when the budget had amounted to \$92.8 million.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/701; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/28 & Corr.1-3.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>1863 A (XVII), para. 1, 20 Dec. 1962 (YUN 1962, p. 534); <sup>(4)</sup>36/116 B, para. 1 (a), 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1298); <sup>(5)</sup>36/231 B, para. 5, 18 Dec. (p. 1293); <sup>(6)</sup>36/242, 18 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1975, p. 954.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.83 (18 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/242

117-19-4 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981  
Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845, draft resolution VIII) by recorded vote (81-18-3), 18 December (meeting 83); agenda item 100.

Working Capital Fund for the biennium 1982-1983

The General Assembly

Resolves that:

1. The Working Capital Fund shall be established for the biennium 1982-1983 in the amount of \$US 100 million;

2. Member States shall make advances to the Working Capital Fund in accordance with the scale adopted by the General Assembly for contributions of Member States to the budget for the year 1982;

3. There shall be set off against this allocation of advances:

(a) Credits to Member States resulting from transfers made in 1959 and 1960 from surplus account to the Working Capital Fund in an adjusted amount of \$1,025,092;

(b) Cash advances paid by Member States to the Working Capital Fund for the biennium 1980-1981 under General Assembly resolutions 34/232 of 20 December 1979 and 35/11 A of 3 November 1980;

4. Should the credits and advances paid by any Member State to the Working Capital Fund for the biennium 1980-1981 exceed the amount of that Member State's advance under the provisions of paragraph 2 above, the excess shall be set off against the amount of the contributions payable by the Member State in respect of the biennium 1982-1983;

5. The Secretary-General is authorized to advance from the Working Capital Fund:

(a) Such sums as may be necessary to finance budgetary appropriations pending the receipt of contributions: sums so advanced shall be reimbursed as soon as receipts from contributions are available for the purpose;

(b) Such sums as may be necessary to finance commitments which may be duly authorized under the provisions of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, in particular resolution 36/241 of 18 December 1981 relating to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses; the Secretary-General shall make provision in the budget estimates for reimbursing the Working Capital Fund;

(c) Such sums as, together with net sums outstanding for the same purpose, do not exceed \$200,000, to continue the revolving fund to finance miscellaneous self-liquidating purchases and activities: advances in excess of the total of \$200,000 may be made with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;

(d) With the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, such sums as may be required to finance payments of advance insurance premiums where the period of insurance extends beyond the end of the biennium in which payment is made; the Secretary-General shall make provision in the budget estimates of each biennium, during the life of the related policies, to cover the charges applicable to each biennium;

(e) Such sums as may be necessary to enable the Tax Equalization Fund to meet current commitments pending the accumulation of credits; such advances shall be repaid as soon as credits are available in the Tax Equalization Fund;

6. Should the provision in paragraph 1 above prove inadequate to meet the purposes normally related to the Working Capital Fund, the Secretary-General is authorized to utilize, in the biennium 1982-1983, cash from special funds and accounts in his custody, under the conditions approved in General Assembly resolution 1341 (XIII) of 13 December 1958, or the proceeds of loans authorized by the Assembly.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Poland, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Australia, Israel, Netherlands, Portugal.

### Programme budget for 1980-1981

On 18 December 1981, the General Assembly approved the second and final revision of the programme budget for 1980-1981, originally adopted in 1979 and initially revised in December 1980. The resulting net budget, totalling \$1,094,890,300, was \$68,440,300 above the initial

level but \$5,927,800 below the 1980 revision. Appropriations rose by \$2,553,100 compared to the total approved in 1980 (see below) while income estimates rose by \$8,480,900 (p. 1285).

#### Final appropriations

By the adoption on 18 December 1981 of final budget appropriations for 1980-1981 in the amount of \$1,341,704,300,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly increased by \$2,553,100 the sum of \$1,339,151,200 appropriated in December 1980<sup>(4)</sup> under the United Nations programme budget for the biennium.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 120 to 16, with 4 abstentions. The Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee recommended this action on 17 December by a recorded vote, requested by the USSR, of 64 to 14, with 5 abstentions.

The increase was based largely on a December 1981 report by the Secretary-General on programme budget performance, estimating that appropriations would have to be raised by \$2,944,400 to meet higher costs due to inflation and other unanticipated factors.<sup>(2)</sup> To this amount, which had the concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ),<sup>(1)</sup> the Assembly added a \$352,600 grant, approved by the Fifth Committee on 9 December by a recorded vote, to cover the estimated deficit of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research in 1981 (p. 807). In accordance with a Fifth Committee decision of 9 December not to approve funds for a proposed salary increase for General Service staff at Geneva (p. 1340), the sum of \$743,900 was deleted from the Secretary-General's estimates.

The action on the final appropriations was the second increase approved for the 1980-1981 budget, initially fixed in 1979 at a level of \$1,247,793,200.<sup>(3)</sup>

The final net budget-essentially the amount met by assessments on Member States- totalled \$1,094,890,300. This was \$5,927,800, or 0.5 per cent, less than the net amount approved in 1980. The decrease was due to the fact that, although appropriations were increased by \$2,553,100, or 0.2 per cent, estimated income rose by \$8,480,900, or 3.6 per cent (p. 1285).

The expenditure increase was attributed mainly to inflation, other changes and decisions of policy-making organs; however, these were largely offset by variations in currency exchange rates and by above-average staff vacancy rates for the Secretariat as a whole. Inflation accounted for additional expenditures of \$26,403,400, other changes were responsible for a \$12,526,200 in-

crease and decisions of policy-making organs for \$1,008,200, while savings due to depreciation against the United States dollar of currencies used by major United Nations offices away from Headquarters allowed for a saving of \$37,384,700. The net effect of these four factors resulted in the \$2,553,100 increase in appropriations.

The \$12.5-million figure for "other changes" was a net amount that included increases of \$11 million for conference and library services at Geneva and at Vienna, Austria; \$4.3 million for administration, finance and management, due largely to higher consumption of utilities; \$2.9 million for political affairs and peace-keeping activities, notably higher staff and travel costs for the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine; and \$1.4 million for the United Nations Industrial Development Organization. These and other increases were partly offset by decreases of \$2.1 million for the Economic Commission for Latin America, \$1.7 million for the Economic Commission for Western Asia, \$1.4 million for the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, \$1.3 million for the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and \$1.3 million for the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs-all attributed in part to an above-average staff vacancy rate in those units.

Casting a negative vote, the USSR said the budget surplus reported for 1980-1981 was in fact illusory; the revised expenditure estimates were more than \$2 million above the revised budget approved in 1980. The United States voted against in view of cost increases due to inflation and programme growth, and because it had voted against the revised budget in 1980.

Though voting in favour, Chile expressed reservations concerning the appropriations for human rights activities.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/821; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/75 & Add.1-4, Add.5 (Parts I, II), Add.6-24 & Add.24/Corr.1, Add.25-28 & Add.28/Corr.1 & Add.29-34.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>34/230 A, 20 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1192); <sup>(4)</sup>35/226 A, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1206); <sup>(5)</sup>36/234 A, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.68, 69, 82 (9, 17 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/234 A

120-16-4 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/844) by recorded vote (64-14-5) on revised appropriations and revised income estimates together, 17 December (meeting 82); ACABQ recommendations (A/36/821); agenda item 99.

Final budget appropriations for the biennium 1980-1981

The General Assembly

Resolves that for the biennium 1980-1981:

1. The amount of \$US 1,339,151,200 appropriated by its resolution 35/226 A of 17 December 1980 shall be increased by \$US 2,553,100 as follows:

Section	Amount appropriated by resolution 35/226 A	Increase or (decrease)	Final appropriation
(US dollars)			
PART I. Overall policy-making, direction and co-ordination			
1. Overall policy-making, direction and co-ordination	28,114,700	181,500	28,296,200
Total, PART I	28,114,700	181,500	28,296,200
PART II. Political and Security Council affairs; peace-keeping activities			
2. Political and Security Council affairs: peace-keeping activities	66,912,600	8,912,800	75,825,400
Total, PART II	66,912,600	8,912,800	75,825,400
PART III. Political affairs, trusteeship and decolonization			
3. Political affairs, trusteeship and decolonization	14,855,600	(716,300)	14,139,300
Total, PART III	14,855,600	(716,300)	14,139,300
PART IV. Economic, social and humanitarian activities			
4. Policy-making organs (economic and social activities)	8,320,800	15,200	8,336,000
5A. Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation	2,526,500	(491,300)	2,035,200
5B. Centre for Science and Technology for Development	3,065,300	16,500	3,081,800
6. Department of International Economic and Social Affairs	40,489,200	(1,593,200)	38,896,000
7. Department of Technical Co-operation for Development	13,680,400	180,500	13,499,900
8. Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters	2,586,300	78,700	2,665,000
9. Transnational corporations	7,589,600	(295,000)	7,294,600
10. Economic Commission for Europe	25,603,000	(862,600)	24,740,400
11. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific	26,120,500	23,400	26,143,900
12. Economic Commission for Latin America	42,217,800	(787,200)	41,430,600
13. Economic Commission for Africa	29,701,300	(54,300)	29,647,000
14. Economic Commission for Western Asia	14,451,500	(525,100)	13,926,400
15. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development	54,960,600	(4,190,200)	50,770,400
16. International Trade Centre	8,866,300	(614,000)	8,252,300
17. United Nations Industrial Development Organization	75,369,300	(2,520,200)	72,849,100
18. United Nations Environment Programme	11,224,700	(59,300)	11,165,400
19. United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)	8,138,300	(28,600)	8,109,700
20. International drug control	6,204,400	(671,800)	5,532,600
21. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	* 27,302,800	(904,700)	26,398,100
22. Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator	4,830,100	(347,600)	4,482,500
23. Human rights	10,431,000	31,100	10,462,100
24. Regular programme of technical co-operation	28,034,800	(511,200)	27,523,600
Total, PART IV	451,714,500	(14,471,900)	437,242,600
PART V. International justice and law			
25. International Court of Justice	8,945,900	(146,000)	8,799,900
26. Legal activities	10,639,300	(281,700)	10,357,600
Total, PART V	19,585,200	(427,700)	19,157,500
PART VI. Public information			
27. Public information	48,818,600	423,700	49,242,300
Total, PART VI	48,818,600	423,700	49,242,300
PART VII. Common support services			
28. Administration, management and general services	245,038,000	569,100	245,607,100
29. Conference and library services	202,642,500	7,683,300	210,325,800
Total, PART VII	447,680,500	8,252,400	455,932,900
PART VIII. Special expenses			
30. United Nations bond issue	17,056,000	161,000	17,217,000
Total, PART VIII	17,056,000	161,000	17,217,000

Section	Amount appropriated by resolution 35/226 A	Increase (decrease)  (US dollars)	Final appropriation
PART IX. Staff assessment			
31. Staff assessment	190,367,600	210,100	190,577,700
Total, PART IX	190,367,600	210,100	190,577,700
PART X. Capital expenditures			
32. Construction, alteration, improvement and major maintenance of premises	53,740,200	(325,100)	53,415,100
Total, PART X	53,740,200	(325,100)	53,415,100
PART XI. Special grants			
33. Grant-in-aid to the United Nations Institute for Training and Research	305,700	352,600	658,300
Total, PART XI	305,700	352,600	658,300
GRAND TOTAL	1,339,151,200	2,553,100	1,341,704,300

2. The Secretary-General shall be authorized to transfer credits between sections of the budget with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions:

3. The total net provision made under the various sections of the budget for contractual printing shall be administered as a unit under the direction of the United Nations Publications Board:

4. The appropriations for technical co-operation programmes under section 24 shall be administered in accordance with the Financial Regulations of the United Nations, except that the definition of obligations and the period of validity of obligations shall be subject to the following procedures:

(a) Obligations for personal services established in the current biennium shall be valid for the succeeding biennium, provided that appointments of the experts concerned are effected by the end of the current biennium and that the total period to be covered by obligations established for these purposes against the resources of the current biennium shall not exceed twenty-four work-months:

(b) Obligations established in the current biennium for fellowships shall remain valid until liquidated, provided that the fellow has been nominated by the requesting Government and accepted by the Organization and that a formal letter of award has been issued to the requesting Government:

(c) Obligations in respect of contracts or purchase orders for supplies or equipment recorded in the current biennium will remain valid until payment is effected to the contractor or vendor, unless they are cancelled:

5. In addition to the appropriations voted under paragraph 1 above, an amount of \$19,000 is appropriated for each year of the biennium 1980-1981 from the accumulated income of the Library Endowment Fund for the purchase of books, periodicals, maps and library equipment and for such other expenses of the Library at the Palais des Nations as are in accordance with the objects and provisions of the endowment.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria,

Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Luxembourg, Romania.

#### Final income estimates

On the recommendation of the Secretary-General<sup>(2)</sup> and ACABQ,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly, by a resolution of 18 December 1981, decided that the estimates of income for 1980-1981 other than assessments on Member States, approved in December 1980,<sup>(4)</sup> should be increased by \$8,480,900, from \$238,333,100 to \$246,814,000.<sup>(5)</sup> This was the second increase since the initial income estimates for the biennium were fixed in 1979 at \$221,343,200.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Assembly adopted the income estimates, by a recorded vote of 127 to 1, with 1 abstention, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, which approved them on 17 December together with the final appropriations for 1980-1981 (p. 1283).

The Secretary-General, in his report on programme budget performance for 1980-1981, had proposed that the income estimates be increased by \$8,470,000.<sup>(2)</sup> Those estimates were raised by a further \$10,900, following a decision by the Fifth Committee on 9 December not to approve funds for an intended salary increase for General Service staff members at Geneva (p. 1340).

Of the estimated increase, \$2,578,400 was attributed to general income and \$5,686,100 to revenue-producing activities. The increased



income from revenue-producing activities resulted from greatly improved sales of postage stamps, which were expected to generate net income \$7.6 million higher than the \$13.1 million previously projected. At the same time, other revenue estimates fell, notably that from food and beverage catering services at United Nations Headquarters, for which expenses were \$1 million more than had been anticipated, reducing net revenue from that source. Factors involved in the increase of general income included rises of \$1.6 million in anticipated bank interest and \$1.1 million in miscellaneous income.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ A/36/821; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/75 & Add.34.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>34/230 B, 20 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1193); <sup>(4)</sup>35/226 B, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1208); <sup>(5)</sup>36/234 B, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.69, 82 (9, 17 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/234 B

127-1-1 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/844) by recorded vote (64-14-5) on revised appropriations and revised income estimates together, 17 December (meeting 82): ACABQ recommendations (A/36/821); agenda item 99.

Final income estimates for the biennium 1980-1981

The General Assembly

Resolves that for the biennium 1980-1981:

1. The estimates of income other than assessments on Member States approved by its resolution 35/226 B of 17 December 1980 shall be increased by \$US 8,480,900 as follows:

Income section	Amount approved by resolution 35/226 B	Increase (decrease)	Final estimates
		(US dollars)	
PART I. Income from staff assessment			
1. Income from staff assessment	193,897,500	216,400	194,113,900
Total. PART I	193,897,500	216,400	194,113,900
PART II. Other Income			
2. General Income	29,073,400	2,578,400	31,651,800
3. Revenue-producing activities	15,362,200	5,686,100	21,048,300
Total. PART II	44,435,600	8,264,500	52,700,100
GRAND TOTAL	238,333,100	8,480,900	246,814,000

2. The income from staff assessment shall be credited to the Tax Equalization Fund in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 973(X) of 15 December 1955;

3. Direct expenses of the United Nations Postal Administration, services to visitors, catering and related services, garage operations, television services and the sale of publications, not provided for under the budget appropriations, shall be charged against the income derived from those activities.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape

Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States.

Abstaining: Bulgaria.

#### Budget formulation, presentation, review and approval

On 17 December 1981, the General Assembly's Fifth Committee received a draft resolution by Algeria, on behalf of the Group of 77 developing countries, on the formulation, presentation, review and approval of programme budgets.<sup>(1)</sup>

The eight-section draft, as orally revised by its sponsors, would have the Assembly reaffirm directives and guidelines on the preparation of future budgets, including the following: the medium-term plan should be the framework for formulation of the programme budget; budgeted activities, including administrative and support activities, should be programmed, with clear descriptions and completion dates of expected outputs; and no arbitrary ceiling or floor would be applied to the budget as a whole but administrative costs and outlays on non-substantive activities should not grow in real terms.

With regard to administrative practices affecting the budget, the Secretary-General would be requested to ensure close co-operation and co-ordination among Secretariat units in the preparation of budget proposals, and to limit upgradings of posts by redeploying staff wherever possible and desirable. The draft suggested steps to bring about closer co-operation between the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) and ACABQ in reviewing statements of financial implications and programme budget proposals within their respective spheres of competence. Finally, several Secretariat studies would be called for, including one on the relationship between regular budget and extrabudgetary resources.

The oral revisions to this draft included addition of the phrase "unless the General Assembly decides otherwise" to the provision stating that all budgeted activities should be programmed, and addition of the predictability of extrabudgetary resources to the list of matters on which the Secretary-General would be requested to submit

studies. The revised draft resolution was based on an earlier text by Algeria, the Bahamas, Egypt, India and Yugoslavia.

The Assembly, by a section of its resolution on miscellaneous matters relating to the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983, adopted on 18 December, decided without vote to authorize the Fifth Committee to continue consideration of the question in the event that the Assembly resumed its 1981 session in 1982.<sup>(2)</sup> Later that day the Assembly decided to hold a resumed session in 1982 and listed the question of budget formulation, presentation, review and approval among the items for consideration.<sup>(3)</sup>

The Assembly acted on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, which on 17 December approved the text, proposed orally by the Chairman on Algeria's suggestion, by consensus.

Introducing the revised draft in the Committee, Algeria explained that its basis was the concept of zero budgetary growth, since the Group of 77 rejected in principle the imposition of any particular growth rate in advance. Particular attention should be paid to the last preambular paragraph, which referred to the need to ensure coherence, co-ordination and efficient management of all activities financed by the regular budget and by extrabudgetary resources.

Recommendations on priority setting in relation to the programme and budget process were made by CPC at its May/June 1981 session (p. 1304).

Draft resolution deferred: <sup>(1)</sup>Algeria, for Group of 77, A/C.5/36/L.41/Rev.1.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/235, sect. XX, 18 Dec., text following. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/461, item 100, 18 Dec. (p. 350).

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 82 (12-22 Oct. & 17 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section XX

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) by consensus. 17 December (meeting 82); oral proposal by Chairman on suggestion by Algeria; agenda item 100.

Formulation, presentation, review and approval of programme budgets

[The General Assembly...]

Decides, in the event of a resumption of its thirty-sixth session in 1982, to authorize the Fifth Committee to meet in order to continue its consideration of the question of the formulation, presentation, review and approval of programme budgets.

## Assessment of contributions

The Committee on Contributions, at its forty-first session, held in New York from 16 June to 2 July 1981, explored issues affecting the measurement of Member States' capacity to

pay but recommended no changes in the existing system.<sup>(1)</sup> After considering the Committee's report, the Assembly, in December, modified some of the criteria used for calculating assessment rates with the aim of benefiting the less affluent countries (p. 1288).

Also in December, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Zimbabwe, admitted to United Nations membership in 1980, had their assessment rates set at 0.01 and 0.02 per cent, respectively (p. 1292).

The total of contributions Member States were to pay in 1981 was \$710,594,836, of which \$595,883,631 was assessed for 1981 in accordance with the scale of assessments adopted in 1979 for the years 1980-1982<sup>(2)</sup> and \$114,711,205 was payable for prior years (p. 1293). Of this total, \$564,979,129 was collected and \$145,615,703 remained outstanding as at 31 December 1981 (see table on p. 1294). Nine non-member States were assessed a total of \$1,522,942 for 1981 expenses of United Nations activities and organizations in which they participated (see table on p. 1295).

Under a General Assembly resolution of 18 December on the financing of appropriations for 1982, Member States were to be assessed \$721,642,946, less their respective share in the Tax Equalization Fund, for their 1982 contributions to the United Nations regular budget.<sup>(3)</sup> After \$29,266,029 was set aside from that Fund to meet charges for tax refunds to staff members paying national income taxes on their United Nations earnings, an estimated \$87,648,771 was to be available for credit to Member States. Thus, the net assessment payable by Member States for 1982 totalled \$633,994,175. Member States were assessed an extra \$60 million for the enlarged Working Capital Fund (p. 1281).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Contributions, A/36/11.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>34/6 A, 25 Oct. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1208); <sup>(3)</sup>36/240 C, paras. 1 (d) and 2, 18 Dec. 1981 (p. 1279).

## Scale of assessments

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS. In response to a 1979 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee on Contributions, at its June/July 1981 session,<sup>(1)</sup> explored issues affecting the measurement of Member States' capacity to pay towards the United Nations budget, in anticipation of the next revision of the scale in 1982. It examined: methods to avoid excessive variations of individual assessment rates between two successive scales; economic and social indicators, including national wealth, which might supplement national income as measures of capacity to pay; application of the low per capita income allowance formula, used to reduce the rates of the poorest States; comparability of the two systems of

national accounts used by the market-economy and the centrally planned countries; price changes and their effects on the comparability of national income statistics; and the effects of altering the statistical base period (range of calendar years) used in calculating the scale of assessments.

The Committee considered again the possible application of percentage limits or percentage point limits to the scale of assessments as a method for avoiding excessive variations of individual rates between two successive scales. Two distinct schools of thought continued to be expressed. Most members believed that setting a percentage limit would be too mechanistic and arbitrary and would depart from the principle of capacity to pay. Others were of the opinion that the introduction of limits would lead to greater fairness and equity in the scale of assessments, since national income would still be used as the sole indicator of relative capacity to pay. As the Committee was unable to agree on criteria for defining excessive or extreme variations in rates of assessment between successive scales, it decided to review the question further in 1982.

With respect to economic and social indicators, the Committee reviewed seven leading indicators—share of manufacturing output in gross domestic product, share of manufactures in total exports, economically active population outside agriculture, per capita energy consumption, number of telephones in use in relation to population, literacy ratio and life expectancy—selected by the Committee for Development Planning to supplement per capita national income for purposes of identifying the least developed countries (p. 411). The Committee noted that certain indicators were not available for certain countries or were not comparable between countries because of differing statistical systems, concepts, scopes, coverages or definitions. It further noted that the comparison of the countries' relative rankings based on per capita national income or on a composite indicator of all eight indicators revealed that the rankings were remarkably consistent for most countries. While those indicators could be useful in the review of individual cases, the Committee concluded that, currently, they could not systematically be used to measure capacity to pay.

The Committee studied the effects of applying different variants of the low per capita income allowance formula, which under the current scale reduced the rates of countries with per capita annual incomes below \$1,800 by amounts of up to 75 per cent. Some members observed that an upward adjustment of the formula—by raising the dollar limit so that it would apply to more countries or by increasing the reduction

percentage—would lessen the assessment burden of middle-income countries, whereas the benefit should go more heavily to low-income countries. Other members favoured an adjustment of the formula, stating that the upper limit of \$1,800 fixed in 1976 no longer reflected the situation. As members were divided on this issue, the Committee deferred a decision to 1982, when it would undertake a general review of the scale of assessments.

Another matter of concern was the effect of widely varying changes in prices and exchange rates on the relative level of assessment of individual countries. The Committee noted that domestic inflation, uncompensated by exchange rate adjustments, could produce misleading national income data. However, in view of the complexities involved, it reaffirmed its previous conclusion that currently no systematic method could be developed to take those changes into consideration in determining the scale of assessments.

The Committee recalled its previously expressed view that a nation's accumulated wealth as well as its current national income could be viewed as influencing its capacity to pay. However, an analysis of data on national wealth and its components, covering 60 countries, had revealed that, owing to discrepancies in coverage, meaningful comparable national wealth estimates would not be available for some time.

The Committee studied the effects of altering the statistical base period for the national income figures used in formulating the scale of assessments. Divergent views were expressed with respect to the appropriate base period, currently seven years. Several members continued to believe that a shorter period would best reflect economic realities and observed that sharp deteriorations in the economic situation of countries could not be reflected if extended base periods were used. Others contended that a base period of 11 to 15 years would lead to greater fairness and equity, particularly while national and per capita income remained the only measures of capacity to pay.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 18 December 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly listed seven factors other than national and per capita income to be taken into account in measuring capacity to pay: particular consideration to least developed countries, economic disparities between developed and developing countries, conditions adversely affecting capacity to pay, heavy dependence on one or a few products, ability to secure foreign currency, accumulated national wealth, and different methods of national accounting. The Committee on Contributions was requested to study alternative

methods to assess capacity to pay. Pending completion of that study, the statistical base period was to be increased from 7 to 10 years, the upper limit of the low per capita income allowance formula was to be raised from \$1,800 to \$2,100 and the maximum percentage reduction from 75 to 85 per cent, efforts were to be made to limit to a reasonable level the increase of individual rates, and the rates of the least developed countries were not to exceed the current level.

The Assembly adopted the resolution, by a recorded vote of 118 to 22, on the recommendation of the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, which approved on 10 December, by a recorded vote of 79 to 19, the draft submitted by Algeria for the Group of 77.

Indonesia, as Chairman of an informal contact group on the subject which met over the course of five weeks, stated that agreement had been reached on all provisions except paragraph 4, specifying revised criteria for reviewing the scale of assessments.

Introducing the text, Algeria said the provision that efforts be made to limit the increase of individual rates of assessment to a reasonable level and that special measures be taken in favour of countries whose rates had already been increased (paragraph 4 (c)) had not been completely satisfactory to the Group of 77; a number of Group members had noted that their rates had shown successive increases and had considered that a more just and equitable basis should be found.

Explaining its negative vote, Australia objected in principle to the extension of the statistical base period, the increase in the low per capita income allowance formula and measures to limit excessive variations of rates between scales. A lengthening of the base period was also opposed by Canada, which also believed that mitigation of increases in individual rates should be permitted only when a country was genuinely in economic difficulties and might not be able to pay its assessment.

Expressing procedural and substantive reservations, Japan considered the changes in the low per capita income formula to be excessive and had reservations on the call for limiting the increase of individual rates, which it viewed as a departure from the long-standing concept of establishing a range of variations between scales, positive and negative; however, it favoured the extension of the base period to 10 years as a transitional measure until a new formula was established. Similar reservations, as well as reservations on the paragraph stating that rates of least developed countries should not exceed the current level, were voiced by Spain, which also felt

that the text did not reflect the need to prevent extreme and excessive increases between scales.

Sweden voted against the text on the ground that the specific criteria for reviewing the scale of assessments, as set out in paragraph 4, encroached on the prerogatives of the Committee on Contributions; also, it was not convinced that the least developed countries would benefit from the proposed changes and said it would have preferred a mechanism which took greater account of their capacity to pay. Austria cast a negative vote for the same reasons.

On behalf of the European Community (EC) members, the United Kingdom declared opposition to any resolution laying down criteria and parameters on which the Committee on Contributions had not submitted advice, and reaffirmed strong opposition to any further lengthening of the statistical base period and to any limit on variations in assessment rates between successive scales. France, joined by the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy, added that a longer statistical period would heighten the feeling of injustice of some States whose assessments might be increased because of past economic success even though their economies had since suffered a recession. Emphasizing the need for a reasonable and realistic statistical base period, the United States said the Committee on Contributions should act as arbiter in regard to the scale of assessments.

Though voting in favour, Poland said it was not happy with the extension of the statistical base period but supported the higher per capita income limit. The USSR voted for the resolution with several reservations: it regarded abrupt changes in the statistical base period as undesirable; it did not agree with the idea of regular increases in relief to countries with low per capita income; it considered the imposition of a limit on variations in individual rates incompatible with the principle of relative capacity to pay and a serious financial burden on some States; and it found paragraph 1 (setting out elements for measuring capacity to pay) unsatisfactory and said the established method based on national income was both rational and fair. The German Democratic Republic voted in favour on the understanding that the 10-year base period was to be an absolute ceiling; any further extension could jeopardize the principle of relative capacity to pay.

During the debate in the Fifth Committee, several countries, among them Brazil, Iraq and Venezuela, expressed disappointment at the inability of the Committee on Contributions to reach conclusions and to come up with definitive recommendations for changes in the system of assessing capacity to pay. They considered that

the methodology currently used tended to penalize developing countries for their efforts to achieve greater economic and social well-being, and they called on the Fifth Committee to lay down precise criteria for drawing up the next scale of assessments.

Others, such as Uganda and the United States, regarded the criticism of the Committee on Contributions unjustified. Canada and the United States felt that the current framework was reasonably adequate for assessing contributions and that it was not appropriate or productive for the Fifth Committee to place technical limitations on the work of an expert group or to establish specific criteria for a new assessment formula. Stating that the establishment of the scale of assessments should remain the responsibility of the Committee on Contributions, Australia added that the contributions mechanism was not designed to be a means of redistributing wealth but rather a procedural means of determining Member States' financial obligations; the developed countries were already shouldering some 90 per cent of the Organization's budget, and the real issue was whether part of the burden could be shifted to the developing countries.

A number of industrialized countries as well as those with centrally planned economies were of the view that national income remained the only internationally acceptable and objective statistical indicator of relative capacity to pay, especially as other economic and social data were neither comparable nor comprehensive on a global scale. A similar point was also made by Sierra Leone, which said it was unlikely to be able to provide the necessary statistics in the foreseeable future.

On the other hand, developing countries, among them Algeria, the Bahamas, India, Indonesia, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Sudan, Uganda and Yugoslavia, stated that socio-economic indicators, the disparities between developing and developed countries marked in particular by the accumulated wealth of the latter, and other conditions or circumstances which adversely affected Member States' capacity to pay should be taken into account in determining a country's rate of assessment. In the view of Trinidad and Tobago, the fact that many developing countries were unable to develop statistical data owing to other priorities was no justification for indefinitely deferring the use of such indicators.

Countries with centrally planned economies felt that special consideration should be given to such problems as difficulties in obtaining convertible currencies, changes in terms of trade, and dependence on a small number of export commodities and on imports for all essential

commodities, all of which had an important bearing on capacity to pay. Emphasizing accumulated wealth as an important element in the calculation of real ability to contribute, Japan believed that, if enough data were available to compare the accumulated wealth of a substantial number of States, such indicators ought to be introduced as supplements, even if not immediately for all countries, to rectify the existing system.

Ethiopia believed that, while special consideration should be given to countries whose external debt burden had become intolerable as a result of continuing balance-of-payments deficits, a high degree of indebtedness did not necessarily indicate lack of capacity to pay.

Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom (for the EC members) and the countries of Eastern Europe felt that the establishment of percentage limits as a means of avoiding excessive variations of individual assessment rates between successive scales would distort the principle of capacity to pay. They argued that such a mechanistic device would undermine the scale's objectivity by ignoring the dynamic nature of national income and would lead to an over-assessment of some States while others would pay less than their fair share. The German Democratic Republic pointed out that the imposition of a ceiling on variations in individual rates would result in relatively higher contributions by States which had made little economic progress during the base period as compared to those which had made extraordinary economic advances. Similarly, the United States suggested that the device might initially benefit nations that had experienced economic growth but would do little to alleviate the burden of those affected by economic decline.

Other States, among them Argentina, Brazil, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Mexico, Nigeria and the Syrian Arab Republic, favoured the setting of some restrictions on excessive increases in assessed contributions from one scale to the next. They regretted that the Committee on Contributions had failed to reach an agreement and they disputed the contention that setting a limit would be arbitrary and would distort the capacity to pay. Several countries favoured setting a percentage limit on increases, and Nigeria thought that 13 per cent would be fair. Also in this context, Spain remarked that the ceiling and floor rates for the highest and lowest contributors (0.01 and 25 per cent) were no less arbitrary as they represented rigid constraints in construction of the scale and departed from the capacity-to-pay principle.

Uganda thought that a sudden increase in a country's rate of assessment was not necessarily

excessive if it was based on an equivalent percentage increase in national income.

With regard to the low per capita income allowance formula used to reduce the rates of the poorest nations, middle-income countries, such as Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Trinidad and Tobago, and Yugoslavia, considered that the \$1,800 per capita income limit (below which the rate reduction formula takes effect) was no longer valid in view of the substantial depreciation of purchasing power due to inflation. They felt that, although the upper limit and the formula had been revised a number of times, the revisions had been too modest and had not kept pace with inflation. They suggested various revisions of the limit, ranging from \$2,000 to \$2,800. Brazil argued that, if developing countries were to be divided into artificial categories based on differing capacity to pay, the same should be done for developed countries by establishing a reserve of percentage points in the scale, to be distributed among the wealthiest.

The German Democratic Republic and the USSR opposed an increase in the low per capita income limit, stating that the way to reduce the financial obligations of Member States was not to shift the burden from one group of States to another but to reduce excessive budget increases. Other developed countries, such as Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, the last on behalf of the EC members, as well as Afghanistan, declared that any modifications in the low per capita income allowance formula should seek to reduce the burden of low-income rather than middle-income countries; several of them favoured granting further relief to countries with per capita income below \$900 by increasing the maximum relief from 75 to 90 per cent. The United States said an increase in the limit could require fewer States to finance a greater share of the budget, divorcing responsibility for voting for programmes from the necessity of paying for them.

Referring to the length of the base period for the national income and other statistics used to calculate ability to pay, Canada, Nigeria and Poland believed that a three- or five-year period would produce a more realistic and equitable scale of assessments. New Zealand, the United Kingdom (on behalf of EC members) and countries with centrally planned economies, such as Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Romania and the Ukrainian SSR, considered that the seven-year base period currently employed should be sufficient warranty against sharp changes in individual assessment rates, and Australia regarded the period as a fair com-

promise. For the EC members, the United Kingdom doubted that a longer base period would be in the long-term interest of countries whose assessments would remain high while their income from the export of certain non-renewable commodities was falling.

Others, among them Algeria, Brazil, Ghana, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Mauritania and Spain, contended that a further extension of the base period—some suggested up to 12 or 15 years—would reflect more accurately the level of economic and social development of Member States.

Japan found it unfair to determine capacity to pay in the same way for countries with different national accounts systems, and Spain wondered whether the decrease in the assessments of the centrally planned economies had anything to do with the differences between the two systems of national accounts; both felt that a better methodology for comparing the two systems should be worked out.

Referring to the assessed contributions of the five permanent members of the Security Council, a number of States, among them Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco and Spain, questioned whether countries which derived great advantage from their status should be allowed any further reduction in their individual rates of assessment. Spain suggested that thought be given to recommending a minimum assessment commensurate with their importance and responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations.

Ethiopia, Nigeria, the Syrian Arab Republic and others favoured continuation of the practice of enabling States to contribute in currencies other than the United States dollar when the United Nations could make use of them.

The Eastern European countries reiterated their view that Article 19 of the Charter (stating that Member States in arrears in payment of financial contributions should have no vote in the Assembly) was not applicable to contributions for peace-keeping activities. Japan, on the other hand, considered that the interpretation of Article 19 should be as strict as possible.

Some countries reiterated reservations about their assessment rates as contained in the current scale. Poland recalled its objection to the method used to convert its national income data into United States dollars and expressed hope that the Committee on Contributions, in 1982, would take account of Poland's current socioeconomic situation, which adversely affected its capacity to pay. This position was supported by the USSR.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Contributions, A/36/11.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>34/6 B, 25 Oct. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1209); <sup>(3)</sup>36/231 A, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.5-7, 9-11, 13, 70 (5-16 Oct. & 10 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/231 A

118-22 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/833) by recorded vote (79-19), 10 December (meeting 70); draft by Algeria, for Group of 77 (A/C.5/36/L.33); agenda item 106.

The General Assembly,

Having examined the report of the Committee on Contributions,

Recalling its resolutions 14(I) of 13 February 1946, 1927(XVIII) of 11 December 1963, 2118(XX) of 21 December 1965, 2961 C and D (XXVII) of 13 December 1972, 31/95 A and B of 14 December 1976 and 34/6 B of 25 October 1979,

Bearing in mind that the real capacity of Member States to pay is the fundamental criterion on which the scales of assessments are based,

Taking into account the difficult and even critical economic and financial situation of developing countries,

Mindful of the obligations of each Member State towards the Organization,

Recognizing once again the need for an improved methodology to assess the real capacity of Member States to pay, In order to increase the fairness and equity of the scale of assessments,

Considering the need to prevent extreme and excessive variations of individual rates of assessments between two successive scales,

Noting the views expressed in the Fifth Committee during the debate on the report of the Committee on Contributions,

1. Reaffirms its previous decisions that, in the measurement of the capacity of Member States to pay, the following elements should be taken into account, in order to prevent anomalous assessments resulting from the sole use of estimates of national income:

(a) Due consideration to developing countries, in general, and to the countries with the lowest per capita income, including the least developed countries, in particular, in view of their special economic and financial problems;

(b) The continuing disparities between the economies of developed and developing countries;

(c) Conditions or circumstances which adversely affect the capacity of Member States to pay;

(d) The particular situation of Member States whose earnings depend heavily on one or a few products;

(e) The ability of Member States to secure foreign currency;

(f) The concept of accumulated national wealth;

(g) The existence of different methods of national accounting of Member States, including the level of different inflation rates and their effects on the comparability of national income statistics;

2. Requests the Committee on Contributions to prepare a set of guidelines for the collection and presentation of data by Member States, in order to ensure that adequate data and statistical information are submitted to the Committee on a uniform and comparable basis;

3. Requests the Committee on Contributions to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session a thorough study on alternative methods to assess the real capacity of Member States to pay that takes fully into account Assembly resolution 34/6 B, all the elements listed in paragraph 1 above, including a new statistical base period, a revised upper limit of the low per capita income allowance formula and a limit for increases between two successive scales of assessments;

4. Decides that, pending fulfilment by the Committee on Contributions of the directives set out in paragraph 3 above, the following criteria will be observed in the subsequent review of the scale of assessments:

(a) The statistical base period should be ten years;

(b) The upper limit of the low per capita income allowance formula will be raised from \$US 1,800 to \$US 2,100 and the gradient of the relief granted will be raised from 75 per cent to 85 per cent, so as to compensate at least partially for the effects of world inflation since the last revision of the values of the formula;

(c) Efforts should be made to limit the increase of individual rates of assessments to a reasonable level, and, in this context, special measures should be taken in favour of countries whose rates of assessments have already been increased at the previous review of the scale of assessments;

(d) In view of the extremely serious economic situation of the least developed countries, their individual rates of assessment should not in any way exceed the present level.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia,

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

#### Assessment of new Member States

On the recommendation of the Committee on Contributions,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly, by a resolution adopted without vote on 18 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> decided that the two States admitted to United Nations membership in 1980—Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Zimbabwe—would be assessed at the rates of 0.01 and 0.02 per cent, respectively, of the total assessed budget, beginning in 1981. For the year of their admission, the rates were to be one ninth of the regular rates. The new Members were also subject to assessments for the financing of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force and the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (p. 295), as well as for the Working Capital Fund (p. 1281).

The Assembly action was recommended by the Fifth Committee on 10 December, also without vote.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Contributions, A/36/11

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/231 B, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.5-7, 9-11, 13, 70 (5-16 Oct. & 10 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/231 B

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/833) without vote, 10 December (meeting 70); draft by Committee on Contributions (A/36/11); agenda item 106.

The General Assembly

Resolves that:

1. The rates of assessment for the following States, admitted to membership in the United Nations on 25 August and 16 September 1980, respectively, shall be as follows:

Member State	Per cent
Zimbabwe	0.02
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.01

For 1982, these rates shall be added to the scale of assessments established under General Assembly resolution 34/6 A of 25 October 1979;

2. For the year 1980, Zimbabwe and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines shall contribute at the rate of one ninth of 0.02 and 0.01 per cent, respectively, such contributions to be taken into account as miscellaneous income under regulation 5.2 (c) of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations;

3. For the year 1981, Zimbabwe and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines shall contribute at the rate of 0.02 and .001 per cent, respectively, such contributions also to be taken into account as miscellaneous income under regulation 5.2 (c) of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations;

4. The contributions of Zimbabwe and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines for 1980 and 1981 shall be applied to the same basis of assessment as for other Member States, except that in the case of appropriations or apportionments approved under General Assembly resolutions 34/7 C of 3 December 1979 and 35/45 A of 1 December 1980 for the financing of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, and resolution 35/115 A of 10 December 1980 for the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, the contributions of those States, as determined by the group of contributors to which they may be assigned by the Assembly, shall be calculated in proportion to the calendar year;

5. The advances of Zimbabwe and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to the Working Capital Fund, under regulation 5.8 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations, shall be calculated by the application of the rates of assessment of 0.02 and 0.01 per cent, respectively, to the authorized level of the Fund, such advances to be added to the Fund pending the incorporation of the new Members' rates of assessment in a 100 per cent scale.

### Status of contributions

Of the \$710.6 million in contributions to the United Nations regular budget payable by Member States as at 1 January 1981, \$565 million was collected during the year, leaving \$145.6 million in amounts outstanding as at the end of 1981 (see table on p. 1294).<sup>(13)</sup> Net assessments for 1982 due at the start of the year, totalled \$634 million.<sup>(1)</sup> In addition, nine non-member States were assessed a total of \$1.5 million for their share of United Nations activities in which they participated (see table on p. 1295).<sup>(2)</sup> Assessments of Members and non-members were in accordance with scales for 1980-1982 approved by the General Assembly in 1979.<sup>(11)</sup>

At various times during 1981, several Member States were more than two years in arrears in the payment of their financial contributions to the regular United Nations budget. Under Article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations, a Member in arrears to the extent of contributions due for the preceding two full years shall have no vote in the Assembly but the Assembly can permit such a Member to vote if it is satisfied

that failure to pay was due to conditions beyond the State's control.

By a letter of 15 January 1981 to the Assembly President, as the Assembly was about to resume its 1980 session, the Secretary-General announced that eight Member States were in arrears.<sup>(3)</sup> Four of them- the Dominican Republic, Grenada, Mauritania and Senegal-made the necessary payments the following day to reduce their arrears below the two-year level.<sup>(4)</sup> Chad and the Comoros did likewise prior to 2 March.<sup>(5)</sup> The two remaining countries were the Central African Republic and South Africa.

By a letter of 26 February, transmitted to the President by the Secretary-General on 2 March, the Central African Republic, citing its economic difficulties (p. 502), requested that an exception be made to permit it to participate in Assembly voting throughout 1981.<sup>(6)</sup> This request was referred to the Committee on Contributions, which, at its June/July session, stated that, taking into account similar economic situations faced by several States in Africa and Central America in recent years and in view of the relatively small amount the Central African Republic was required to pay, it could not support the contention that the non-payment of arrears below the two-year limit could be considered as due to conditions beyond the country's control.<sup>(9)</sup>

By a letter of 3 September, the Secretary-General informed the Assembly President that the Central African Republic and South Africa remained in arrears.<sup>(7)</sup> However, by a letter of 15 September, he informed the President that only South Africa remained in arrears, to the extent of \$9,230,000 for 1979 and 1980.<sup>(8)</sup>

During debate in the Fifth Committee on the scale of assessments, the Central African Republic said its arrears problem should be regarded as on the way to settlement, since the Government established in September 1981 had undertaken to continue, to the best of its ability, to pay its United Nations contributions.

The Secretary-General, in an October report to the Assembly<sup>(10)</sup> on the United Nations financial situation (p. 1295), stressed the importance of prompt and full payment of assessed contributions. He noted that, in spite of appeals to Member States, not only did contributions continue to be paid late but there was also a disquieting trend to pay them later each year. He suggested that the Assembly consider requiring payment of interest on outstanding contributions after a set date each year, such as 31 March.

In a 10 December resolution on the financial situation, the Assembly urged Member States to review their pattern of payment of contributions with a view to paying future contributions in good time.<sup>(12)</sup>

(notes on p. 1295)



STATUS OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS REGULAR BUDGET  
(amounts in US dollars)

Member State	1980-82 scale of assess- ments (per cent)	Collections in 1981	Contributions Outstanding as at 31 Dec. 1981	Assessment for 1982	Member State	1980-82 scale of assess- ments (per cent)	Collections in 1981	Contributions outstanding as at 31 Dec. 1981	Assessment for 1982
Afghanistan	0.01	-	108,334	60,449	Iraq	0.12	685,535	-	725,384
Albania	0.01	75,988	45,289	60,449	Ireland	0.16	914,047	-	967,179
Algeria	0.12	1,300,004	-	725,384	Israel	0.25	1,095,121	2,708,342	1,511,216
Angola	0.01	58,712	45,622	60,449	Italy	3.45	19,709,147	-	20,854,778
Argentina	0.78	3,779,559	676,422	4,714,993	Ivory coast	0.03	146,551	102,325	181,346
Australia	1.83	10,454,418	-	11,062,099	Jamaica	0.02	114,256	-	120,897
Austria	0.71	4,056,086	-	4,291,852	Japan	9.58	54,728,589	-	57,909,791
Bahamas	0.01	57,128	-	60,449	Jordan	0.01	57,128	-	60,449
Bahrain	0.01	57,128	-	60,449	Kenya	0.01	55,837	1,813	60,449
Bangladesh	0.04	228,511	-	241,794	Kuwait	0.20	1,142,560	-	1,208,972
Barbados	0.01	57,128	-	60,449	Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.01	57,128	-	60,449
Belgium	1.22	6,270,687	1,465,531	7,374,732	Lebanon	0.03	-	475,418	181,346
Benin	0.01	-	108,334	60,449	Lesotho	0.01	-	57,128	60,449
Bhutan	0.01	57,128	-	60,449	Liberia	0.01	10,072	47,056	60,449
Bolivia	0.01	57,128	35,486	60,449	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.23	1,313,943	-	1,390,319
Botswana	0.01	57,128	-	60,449	Luxembourg	0.05	285,639	-	302,243
Brazil	1.27	7,151,130	5,254,895	7,676,975	Madagascar	0.01	-	57,128	60,449
Bulgaria	0.16	1,603,252	936,991	967,179	Malawi	0.01	57,128	-	60,449
Burma	0.01	57,128	-	60,449	Malaysia	0.09	514,151	-	544,038
Burundi	0.01	57,128	-	60,449	Maldives	0.01	51,206	57,128	60,449
Byelorussian S S R	0.39	2,123,518	1,672,725	2,357,497	Mali	0.01	-	57,128	60,449
Canada	3.28	18,737,973	-	19,860,095	Malta	0.01	57,128	-	60,449
Cape Verde	0.01	-	108,334	60,449	Mauritania	0.01	163,492	92,027	60,449
Central African Republic	0.01	57,128	148,126	60,449	Mauritius	0.01	57,128	-	60,449
Chad	0.01	114,000	164,585	60,449	Mexico	0.76	2,189,258	2,160,828	4,594,095
Chile	0.07	399,896	-	423,141	Mongolia	0.01	55,422	54,228	60,449
China	1.62	9,116,576	3,963,839	9,792,678	Morocco	0.05	285,639	-	302,243
Colombia	0.11	634,568	-	664,935	Mozambique	0.01	28,564	26,564	60,449
Comoros	0.01	120,669	97,791	60,449	Nepal	0.01	57,128	-	60,449
Congo	0.01	49,229	52,880	60,449	Netherlands	1.63	9,311,858	-	9,853,126
Costa Rica	0.02	70,000	102,416	120,897	New Zealand	0.27	1,542,455	-	1,632,113
Cuba	0.11	1,189,740	-	664,935	Nicaragua	0.01	48,500	172,049	60,449
Cyprus	0.01	57,128	-	60,449	Niger	0.01	97,074	15,405	60,449
Czechoslovakia	0.83	8,310,527	2,186,106	5,017,236	Nigeria	0.16	51,640	862,407	967,179
Democratic Kampuchea	0.01	50,440	104,414	60,449	Norway	0.50	2,856,398	-	3,022,431
Democratic Yemen	0.01	-	57,128	60,449	Oman	0.01	57,128	-	60,449
Denmark	0.74	4,227,469	-	4,473,198	Pakistan	0.07	358,444	58,974	423,141
Djibouti	0.01	57,128	51,206	60,449	Panama	0.02	190,747	11,845	120,897
Dominica	0.01	44,658	115,767	60,449	Papua New Guinea	0.01	57,128	-	60,449
Dominican Republic	0.03	197,093	307,186	181,346	Paraguay	0.01	-	99,732	60,449
Ecuador	0.02	126,426	57,022	120,897	Peru	0.06	310,459	628,451	362,692
Egypt	0.07	598,047	247,596	423,141	Philippines	0.10	532,639	38,640	604,486
El Salvador	0.01	-	108,334	60,449	Poland	1.24	1,500,000	13,111,931	7,495,630
Equatorial Guinea	0.01	57,099	47,643	60,449	Portugal	0.19	2,705,341	49,696	1,148,524
Ethiopia	0.01	57,128	-	60,449	Qatar	0.03	171,384	-	181,346
Fiji	0.01	28,564	28,564	60,449	Romania	0.21	700,000	1,367,297	1,269,422
Finland	0.48	2,742,142	-	2,901,534	Rwanda	0.01	57,128	-	60,449
France	6.26	35,692,991	4,876,272	37,840,845	Saint Lucia	0.01	112,624	1,000	60,449
Gabon	0.02	-	207,919	120,897	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.01	-	-	60,449
Gambia	0.01	-	87,691	60,449	Samoa	0.01	3,565	57,128	60,449
German Democratic Republic	1.39	7,000,000	2,827,703	8,402,360	Sao Tome and Principe	0.01	57,128	-	60,449
Germany, Federal Republic of	8.31	47,473,338	-	50,232,815	Saudi Arabia	0.58	3,313,422	-	3,506,020
Ghana	0.03	171,384	-	181,346	Senegal	0.01	181,527	4,120	60,449
Greece	0.35	1,999,479	-	2,115,702	Seychelles	0.01	57,128	-	60,449
Grenada	0.01	46,000	166,823	60,449	Sierra Leone	0.01	28,500	163,744	60,449
Guatemala	0.02	135,798	-	120,897	Singapore	0.08	457,023	-	483,589
Guinea	0.01	-	126,688	60,449	Solomon Islands	0.01	98,820	57,128	60,449
Guinea-Bissau	0.01	-	108,334	60,449	Somalia	0.01	-	57,128	60,449
Guyana	0.01	108,334	22,038	60,449	South Africa	0.42	-	14,171,335	2,538,842
Haiti	0.01	22,769	108,269	60,449	Spain	1.70	8,704,970	1,006,784	10,276,267
Honduras	0.01	57,128	-	60,449	Sri Lanka	0.02	114,256	-	120,897
Hungary	0.33	1,748,329	1,073,532	1,994,805	Sudan	0.01	57,108	49,319	60,449
Iceland	0.03	171,384	-	181,346	Suriname	0.01	57,128	-	60,449
India	0.60	6,454,447	-	3,626,917	Swaziland	0.01	-	57,128	60,449
Indonesia	0.16	1,723,035	-	967,179	Sweden	1.31	8,391,205	-	7,918,770
Iran	0.65	1,499,585	7,395,461	3,929,160	Syrian Arab Republic	0.03	171,384	-	181,346

## STATUS OF CONTRIBUTIONS (cont.)

Member State	1980-82 scale of assess- ments (per cent)	Collections in 1981	Contri- butions outstanding as at 31 Dec. 1981	Assessment for 1982
Thailand	0.10	571,279	-	604,486
Togo	0.01	89,536	92,539	60,449
Trinidad and Tobago	0.03	171,384	-	181,346
Tunisia	0.03	171,384	12,256	181,346
Turkey	0.30	2,999,241	245,327	1,821,980
Uganda	0.01	109,080	-	60,558
Ukrainian SSR	1.46	7,949,575	5,245,497	8,825,500
USSR	11.10	60,938,555	38,834,496	67,097,985
United Arab Emirates	0.10	571,279	-	604,486
United Kingdom	4.46	25,479,071	-	26,960,090
United Republic of Cameroon	0.01	-	57,128	60,449
United Republic of Tanzania	0.01	64,530	63,766	65,651
United States	25.00	143,330,776	24,208,458	180,338,601
Upper Volta	0.01	116,109	309	60,449
Uruguay	0.04	228,511	-	241,794
Venezuela	0.50	5,401,125	-	3,022,431
Viet Nam	0.03	80,000	245,001	181,346
Yemen	0.01	93,424	-	60,449
Yugoslavia	0.42	1,410,316	3,151,698	2,538,842
Zaire	0.02	111,529	99,083	123,137
Zambia	0.02	-	120,497	120,897
Zimbabwe	0.02	-	-	120,897
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.04</b>	<b>564,979,129</b>	<b>145,615,703</b>	<b>633,994,175</b>

## ASSESSMENT OF NON-MEMBER STATES FOR 1981 EXPENSES OF UNITED NATIONS ACTIVITIES IN WHICH THEY PARTICIPATED

(amounts in US dollars)

Non-member State	Rate of assessment	Amount
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.05	18,641
Holy See	0.01	4,083
Liechtenstein	0.01	8,847
Monaco	0.01	8,353
Nauru	0.01	198
Republic of Korea	0.15	155,871
San Marino	0.01	4,222
Switzerland	1.05	1,318,842
Tonga	0.01	3,885
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,522,942</b>

NOTE: Activities and organizations for which non-member States were assessed were: the International Court of Justice, the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, the Economic Commission for Europe, international drug control, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the United Nations Environment Programme, transnational corporations, the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, and the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy.

(notes to p. 1293)

Assessments: <sup>(1)</sup>ST/ADM/SER.B/258, <sup>(2)</sup>ST/ADM/SER.B/261.

Letters: S-G: <sup>(3)</sup>15 Jan., A/35/792; <sup>(4)</sup>16 Jan., A/35/792/Add.1; <sup>(5)</sup>2 Mar., A/35/792/Add.2; <sup>(6)</sup>12 Mar., A/35/792/Add.3; <sup>(7)</sup>3 Sep., A/ES-815; <sup>(8)</sup>15 Sep., A/36/502. Reports: <sup>(9)</sup>Committee on Contributions. A/36/11 & Add.1 & Add.1Corr.1; <sup>(10)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/28.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(11)</sup>34/6 A, 25 Oct. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1208); <sup>(12)</sup>36/116 B, para. 3, 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1298).

Status Of contributions: <sup>(13)</sup>ST/ADM/SER.B/259.

Meeting records: GA: A/35/PV. 104 (3 Mar.), A/ES-8/PV.1 (3 Sep.), A/36/PV.1 (15 Sep.).

## UN financial situation

The Secretary-General reported to the General Assembly in October 1981 that, during much of the year, the financial situation of the United Nations had been particularly precarious. The estimated deficit, projected to 31 December 1981, was \$274.8 million. The Secretary-General submitted several proposals to alleviate the situation, two of which—an increase in the Working Capital Fund to \$100 million and the suspension of certain financial regulations to permit the retention of unspent appropriations—were approved by the Assembly in December (p. 1296).

In another December action, the Assembly welcomed China's decision to pay its share of assessments for the two Middle East peace-keeping operations beginning in 1982 and decided that its unpaid assessments for that purpose since October 1971 would not be counted as arrears (p. 1298). The Assembly also requested a study on the impact of inflation and monetary instability on the United Nations budget (p. 1300).

## Financial emergency

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. As requested by the General Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(6)</sup> the Secretary-General presented in October 1981 to the Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee a progress report on the issuance of special revenue-producing postage stamps (p. 1387) and details on the extent, rate of increase and composition of the Organization's deficit.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Secretary-General stated that, during much of 1981, the financial situation had been particularly precarious. The Organization's deficit, projected to 31 December, was estimated at \$274.8 million, roughly a third of net annual expenditures under the regular budget and for peace-keeping operations. During the year, the total would have increased by \$36.1 million, or more than 15 per cent, over 1980, due principally to non-payment of contributions for the two Middle East peace-keeping operations currently financed by assessments—the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) (p. 294).

The \$40-million Working Capital Fund, as well as a special account established to receive voluntary contributions called for by the Assembly in 1965<sup>(3)</sup> and 1972,<sup>(4)</sup> had been almost entirely depleted to meet the deficit caused by withholdings of contributions (see table on p. 1296) and delays in payment. Whereas the \$95.6-million

deficit under the regular budget had been met by using those accounts, the \$235.2 million in liabilities for peace-keeping operations represented unpaid debts to States which had participated in the operations without receiving the reimbursement for services provided for in their agreements with the United Nations. No additional voluntary contributions had been received in 1981.

The Secretary-General set out seven options of varying cost and effectiveness to alleviate the situation. First, prompt payment of assessed contributions would result in the lowest cost to Member States, but repeated appeals to that end had not met with much success. Next in order of cost to Members would be an increase in the Working Capital Fund (p. 1281) or the issuance of long-term bonds, either of which would preserve the equity of States in the funds contributed. Borrowing in the open market or from Member States would be an emergency solution at best and repayment terms might be costly. The suspension of certain provisions of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations, which currently required that unspent appropriations be returned to Member States, could be of immediate assistance but would constitute only a partial solution, since the amounts involved were minor compared to the deficit. A final option, authorizing the United Nations to withhold such credits due to Member States until their assessments were fully paid, would also be of limited help.

In conclusion, the Secretary-General suggested three steps: an increase in the Working Capital Fund, the imposition of interest charges on late payments, and suspension of the financial regulations on the return of unobligated funds to Member States.

ACABQ RECOMMENDATIONS. Commenting on the Secretary-General's report, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ)<sup>(1)</sup> stated that it was not in favour of borrowings or the issuance of long-term bonds because, apart from difficulties that might arise owing to considerations of principle held by certain States, the payment of interest could be substantial, thereby imposing 'additional burdens on all Members.

With regard to the option of prompt payment of contributions, ACABQ recommended that the General Assembly invite Members to re-examine their payment arrangements so as to ensure more timely payments. However, it expressed reservations about the suggestion to charge interest on outstanding contributions, stating that this would be onerous for States which delayed their payment because of genuine financial or administrative difficulties. To ease the cash flow

problem, ACABQ recommended the suspension through 1983 of the financial regulations requiring the return of unspent appropriations to Member States and an increase in the level of the Working Capital Fund from \$40 million to \$100 million as from 1982, equivalent to about two months of expenditures.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 10 December 1981 on the financial emergency of the United Nations,<sup>(7)</sup> the General Assembly accepted the ACABQ recommendations for a \$100-million Working Capital Fund for 1982-1983 and for suspension of financial regulations in respect of unspent appropriations arising at the end of 1980-1981 and 1982-1983. The Assembly urged Member States to review their pattern of payment with a view to paying in good time and requested the Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations (established in 1975<sup>(5)</sup>) but inactive since it last

CUMULATIVE WITHHOLDINGS OF ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS  
BY MEMBER STATES

(estimated as at end of 1981 financial periods;  
in thousands of US dollars)

Member State	Regular budget	UNEF/ UNDOF	UNIFIL
Albania	45.3	19.6	9.7
Algeria	-	-	108.6
Benin	-	9.6	4.6
Bulgaria	537.3	27.5	147.9
Byelorussian SSR	1,657.1	558.1	1,954.3
China	3,963.6	35,935.8	19,455.1
Cuba	37.8	-	107.6
Czechoslovakia	1,688.0	397.7	4,087.0
Democratic Kampuchea	70.6	19.6	-
Democratic Yemen	-	4.3	4.6
France	4,367.6	-	-
German Democratic Republic	2,250.7	1,223.7	6,674.6
Hungary	940.1	-	323.1
India	47.5	-	-
Iraq	-	84.4	99.9
Lao People's Democratic Republic	-	-	4.6
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	-	173.9	194.2
Mongolia	53.3	8.1	9.7
Poland	2,450.0	-	6,405.0
Portugal	49.7	-	-
Romania	867.7	-	-
South Africa	14,179.3	2,587.5	2,056.9
Syrian Arab Republic	-	25.2	24.9
Ukrainian SSR	5,185.2	2,084.4	7,305.3
USSR	40,046.5	18,447.2	65,852.4
United States	383.5	-	-
Viet Nam	-	8.8	29.3
Yemen	-	9.2	-
Total	78,820.8	61,624.6	114,859.3

NOTES: Estimated withholdings from the regular budget, projected to 31 December 1981, consisted of \$40,002,500 relating to the 1961 United Nations bond issue, \$18,406,900 relating to the regular programme of technical assistance and \$20,411,400 relating to other budget items. Estimated withholdings in regard to the Middle East peace-keeping forces, declared by the States concerned to be for reasons of principle, related to (1) the second United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) from its inception in 1973 through its liquidation in 1979 and the inception of UNDOF in 1974 to 30 November 1981; and (2) the inception of UNIFIL in 1978 to 18 December 1981.

met in 1976<sup>(9)</sup>) to keep the financial situation under review and to report to the Assembly in 1982. The Secretary-General was requested to submit in 1982 a progress report on the status of the issuance of special postage stamps, as well as details on the extent, rate of increase and composition of the deficit and on voluntary contributions.

The Assembly adopted the resolution by a recorded vote of 103 to 23, with 5 abstentions, following its approval by the Fifth Committee on 4 December by a recorded vote of 69 to 19, with 6 abstentions. The sponsors were Ecuador, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Pakistan, Panama and Peru.

Introducing the text in the Committee, Panama explained that it was intended to lay the foundations for a solution to the financial problem. It would enable the United Nations to continue its work of maintaining international peace and security and at the same time ensure that no Charter provision was violated. The Assembly must rapidly find a solution to the cash flow problem, which otherwise threatened to paralyse the Organization.

Explaining its negative vote, France said the resolution meant that all Members would pay for the withholding or late payment of contributions by certain countries; suspension of the financial regulations on the return of unspent appropriations would not solve the question and would amount to giving a blank cheque to the Secretariat. The Federal Republic of Germany and Japan objected to the proposed increase of the Working Capital Fund, though the former endorsed the suspension of the financial regulations while the latter said it would have abstained if there had been a separate vote on the regulations since the implication was that the budgetary surplus which would normally accrue to Member States would be used to make up the deficit.

The United Kingdom thought the situation could be resolved if all contributions were paid early in the year and if States which had withheld contributions paid them. The United States objected to the increase of the Working Capital Fund, stating that the financial emergency was basically caused by the withholding of contributions to the regular budget and in respect of peace-keeping operations; however, it agreed to the suspension of financial regulations.

Australia abstained on the ground that it could not support an increase in the Fund and that Member States which discharged their obligations should not be expected to shoulder the resulting burden. Also abstaining, the Netherlands felt that the solution proposed would not solve the problem; nor was it right for all

Member States to pay for the illegitimate actions of some. Romania said some of the items included in the budget, such as financing for the 1961 United Nations bond issue,<sup>(8)</sup> were not in accordance with the Charter.

Canada declared that it would have voted against had the question been solely one of principle, since there was no reason why States which met their obligations should pay for those which did not; but it had voted in favour, as a sound financial and administrative case had been made for the measures proposed. Denmark, also speaking for Finland, Norway and Sweden, said they had voted in favour as they attached importance to the collective responsibility of Member States for financing the budget and peace-keeping operations. Although voting in favour, New Zealand regretted the need to increase the Fund and stated that withheld contributions should be paid and all Members should forward their contributions on time.

Egypt said the draft represented an attempt to solve the Organization's financial problems and appealed to States which had withheld contributions to cease doing so, regardless of political considerations. Tunisia regarded as valid the steps proposed in the resolution to deal with the deteriorating financial situation, pending a more permanent solution. A similar position was taken by Algeria and Morocco. India said it had voted in favour for pragmatic reasons.

Speaking during the Committee debate, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya agreed with the reservations of ACABQ about certain of the proposed options for dealing with the financial emergency and said it did not believe that peace-keeping forces should be financed by assessment. Pakistan observed that, if all Members paid their contributions in full each February, the United Nations could earn up to \$30 million a year in interest, enough to pay the interest and repay the principal on the 1961 bond issue.

Ghana hoped that States which had refused to contribute to peace-keeping operations on political grounds would review their position. Rwanda, while respecting the positions of principle taken by those States, believed they should co-operate so as to spare the United Nations from financial disaster.

Ireland stated that the proposed measures would only temporarily alleviate the financial problems; withholding undermined the United Nations peace-keeping role, by placing a disproportionate burden on other Members, especially those participating in such operations. Sweden, speaking also for Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway, endorsed the ACABQ recommendations and said the problem stemmed from the unwillingness of some States to meet their collective

responsibility for sharing the financial burden of all United Nations activities.

Czechoslovakia and the USSR reiterated their position that the principal causes of the financial difficulties were not late payment of contributions but the inclusion of illegitimate items in the budget, outlays occasioned by Israeli aggression against Lebanon, the financing of technical co-operation through the regular budget rather than by voluntary contributions, and rapid budgetary growth. Also, the USSR could not agree to the suspension of the financial regulations governing repayments to Member States.

Ghana and Rwanda objected to the suggestion that interest be charged on late contributions, stating that some Members delayed their payments because of genuine administrative and financial difficulties; however, the Netherlands hoped ACABQ would consider the idea further.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ A/36/701; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/28 & Corr.1-3.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>2053 A (XX), para. 4, 15 Dec. 1965 (YUN 1965, p. 25); <sup>(4)</sup>3049 A (XXVII), paras. 3 & 4, 19 Dec. 1972 (YUN 1972, p. 711); <sup>(5)</sup>3538 (Xxx), 17 Dec. 1975 (YUN 1975, p. 957); <sup>(6)</sup>35/113, para. 7, 10 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1220); <sup>(7)</sup>36/116 B, 10 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook references: <sup>(8)</sup>1961, p. 566; <sup>(9)</sup>1976, p. 889.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.56-58, 63,64 (27 Nov.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.93 (10 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/116 B

103-23-5 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/772) by recorded vote (69-19-6).  
4 December (meeting 63); B-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.17); agenda item 102.

Sponsors: Ecuador, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Pakistan, Panama, Peru.

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the analysis of the financial situation of the United Nations, as well as the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions,

Recalling its resolutions 3049 (XXVII) of 19 December 1972, 3538 (XXX) of 17 December 1975, 32/104 of 14 December 1977 and 35/113 of 10 December 1980,

Noting with concern the continuing increase in the short-term deficit of the Organization,

Bearing in mind that a partial or interim solution of parts of the problem could enhance the liquidity of the Organization and might facilitate the achievement of further progress towards a comprehensive settlement, which is desired by all Member States,

Concerned that delays in the payment of assessed contributions by Member States exacerbate the financial difficulties of the Organization,

Reaffirming the resolve of Member States to achieve a comprehensive and lasting solution to the financial problems of the Organization,

Convinced that in the circumstances an appropriate increase in the level of the Working Capital Fund is required to assure the Organization's ability to meet on a current basis the expenditure needs of the regular budget,

1. Decides to accept the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions that:

(a) The Working Capital Fund for the biennium 1982-1983 be established in the amount of \$100 million:

(b) The provisions of regulations 5.2 (d), 4.3 and 4.4 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations be suspended in respect of the surpluses arising at the end of the 1980-1981 and 1982-1983 bienniums;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to give effect to the decision in paragraph 1 above in the formulation of the relevant draft resolutions to be submitted under the agenda item on the programme budget;

3. Urges all Member States to review their pattern of payment of contributions to the regular budget of the United Nations with a view to paying future contributions in good time in accordance with regulation 5.4 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations;

4. Requests the Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations to keep the financial situation of the Organization under review and to report, as appropriate, to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

5. Further requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session:

(a) A progress report on the status of the project on the issuance of the special postage stamps;

(b) Detailed information relating to the extent, rate of increase and composition of the deficit of the Organization and to voluntary contributions received from Member States and other sources;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled Financial emergency of the United Nations: report of the Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands,<sup>a</sup> New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Poland, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Australia, Congo, Dominican Republic, Portugal, Romania.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

#### Assessed contributions of China

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 10 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to transfer to a special account the balance of the assessed contributions due from China for peace-keeping operations between 25 October 1971 (when the Assembly decided to seat representatives of the People's Republic of China<sup>(1)</sup>) and 31 December 1981. The Assembly welcomed the understanding that China would contribute to UNDOF and UNIFIL as from 1 January 1982, and noted that its assessment rate between 1971 and 1979 had been more than twice that established from 1980 after national income and other data had become available. The As-

sembly decided that, in the light of the special circumstances, the applicability of Article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations (determining that United Nations Members more than two years in arrears in the payment of their financial contributions should have no vote in the Assembly) would not be raised.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 115 to 13, following approval of the 14-nation draft by the Fifth Committee on 30 November by a recorded vote of 94 to 12, with 2 abstentions.

(Prior to this action, the Secretary-General's October 1981 report on the financial situation of the United Nations (p. 1295) listed unpaid assessments of China for peace-keeping operations in a total amount of \$55.4 million, projected to the end of 1981.)

Introducing the resolution, Pakistan expressed the conviction that China's decision to pay in future its share of expenses for the peace-keeping operations was a major development in favour of international peace and security, and it was hoped that other countries withholding their share might emulate China's example. Since 1971 China had been assessed at a rate substantially in excess of its relative capacity to pay. If its rate had been at the current level of 1.62 per cent all along, it would have paid to the regular budget \$88 million less, which far exceeded the \$55 million it had withheld from peace-keeping operations.

China said it had always fulfilled its obligations towards the United Nations and had long contributed far beyond its real capacity to pay. In view of changes in the international situation and the evolution of the role of United Nations peace-keeping operations, it was prepared henceforth to adopt a flexible attitude, on a case-by-case basis, and would support future operations established in strict conformity with Charter purposes and principles. As a developing country, it could not extend as much financial support to the Organization as it might wish; however, as its economic development gathered momentum, it would be able to increase its contribution.

Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the USSR expressed strong opposition to the draft, saying it established an unwarranted connection between arrears in contributions for peace-keeping operations and the application of Article 19, and would legitimize attempts to impose a financial burden on Member States for illegal expenditures.

Though welcoming China's decision to make a voluntary contribution, Spain abstained in the Committee vote (though voting affirmatively in the Assembly) on the ground that Article 19 had been waived for the first time.

India explained that its affirmative vote had been cast on the understanding that the resolution did not affect the application of Article 19

and that it would not be cited as a precedent for waiving that Article. In New Zealand's view, the special circumstances pertaining to China justified the measures contained in the resolution, which in no way established a precedent regarding the arrears of other countries. The United States said the resolution could not be construed as amending the Charter; the arrangement with China was unique and did not modify the principle of collective financial responsibility. A similar view was expressed by Canada and the United Kingdom, the latter speaking for the European Community (EC) members.

Voting in favour, Canada, Ghana, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, the last on behalf of the EC members, welcomed China's decision to contribute to the cost of peace-keeping operations and reaffirmed that financial responsibility for those operations should be borne by all Members as apportioned by the Assembly. Brazil said it had voted in favour in appreciation of China's efforts to help solve the difficulties facing UNDOF and UNIFIL.

Support for the resolution was also expressed by several others, among them Morocco, Uganda, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

Stating that special political circumstances had made peace-keeping forces necessary and special political means must be found for dealing with the growing deficit, Peru expressed hope that other States withholding their contributions would follow China's example. Australia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Japan, Sweden (speaking for the Nordic States) and the United Republic of Cameroon also hoped the resolution would provide an incentive to other States.

Though supporting the text, Indonesia expressed concern over paragraph 1, noting China's over-assessment; in Indonesia's opinion, China's rate of assessment had been determined in accordance with its own will, so that there had been no question of over-assessment.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>2758(XXVI), 25 Oct. 1971 (YUN 1971.p. 136); <sup>(2)</sup>36/116A, 10 Dec. 1981, text following.  
Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.56, 57, 63 (27 Nov.-4 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.93 (10 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/116 A

115-13 (recorded vote) Meeting 93 10 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/772) by recorded vote (94-12-2), 30 November (meeting 57); 14-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.14/Rev.1); agenda item 102.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Colombia, Comoros, Djibouti, Mauritania, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Zaire.

The General Assembly,

Recalling the consensus of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations adopted by the General Assembly on 1 September 1965.

Reaffirming the collective responsibility of Member States for the financial security of the United Nations,

1. Notes that the rate of assessment of China for the period from 25 October 1971 to 31 December 1973 had been established at 4 per cent and for the period 1974 to 1979 inclusive at 5.5 per cent, whereas after national income and related data became available, the rate was established at 1.62 per cent for 1980-1982;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to compute and transfer to a special account the balance of the assessed contributions due from China between 25 October 1971 and 31 December 1981 in respect of peace-keeping operations;

3. Welcomes the understanding that as from 1 January 1982 China will contribute its share of assessed expenses for the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force and the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon;

4. Decides, in the light of the special circumstances, that the question of the applicability of Article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations in respect of the unpaid assessment referred to in paragraph 2 above shall not be raised.

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

### Impact of inflation and monetary instability

Expressing concern at the persistence of inflation and monetary instability, the General Assembly, by a resolution of 18 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to prepare for it in 1982 a detailed study on their impact on the United Nations budget. The study was to include amounts which, over the last three budget bienniums, had resulted from inflation and monetary instability in the developed countries where United Nations organizations had their headquarters.

The Assembly adopted the text by 97 votes to 21, with 18 abstentions. The Fifth Committee approved the Cuban-sponsored draft on 9 December by 44 votes to 19, with 25 abstentions.

Amendments by the United Kingdom on behalf of EC member States<sup>(1)</sup> were rejected by 42 votes to 20, with 27 abstentions, after the Committee rejected, by 42 votes to 23, with 17 abstentions, a United Kingdom motion, opposed by Cuba, to vote on the amendments paragraph by paragraph. The amendments proposed the deletion of the second and third preambular paragraphs (expressing concern at the persis-

tence of inflation and monetary instability in those developed countries in which the United Nations made its expenditures, and stating the need for an additional procedure to help meet the resulting budgetary costs) and of operative paragraph 2 (requesting that the Secretary-General's study include the amounts resulting from those factors). The United Kingdom characterized those paragraphs as divisive and based on confused economic theory.

Introducing the resolution, Cuba said the result of the failure to curb inflation in capitalist countries had been to oblige Member States to pay increased contributions to the United Nations to correct a situation for which they were not responsible. Extensive consultations had been held to produce a text which would be more acceptable than the one which Cuba had proposed in 1978<sup>(3)</sup> but its purpose remained the same-to foster a clearer understanding of the unfair burden which inflation placed on so many countries. Rejecting the amendments, Cuba said its proposal simply asked for a technical study, without going into political considerations and without involving commitments by any country.

In support of the resolution, the USSR said international organizations had a right to expect that host countries where their offices were located would bear a special responsibility for the increasing United Nations expenditure caused by inflation and currency fluctuations.

Several States, including Algeria, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia, expressed support for the idea of a study. Others, such as Austria, the Bahamas, Egypt, Greece, Japan, Morocco, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, stated that, while they did not object to a study, they felt that the text lacked objectivity and appeared to prejudge the results. Uruguay remarked that the causes of inflation must not be attributed to the economic systems of particular countries.

Expressing support for the amendments, Australia could not accept the implication that States in which United Nations organizations had their headquarters were primarily responsible for inflation. Austria stated that it could not accept the one-sided, simplistic view of the causes of inflation; the resolution also ignored the considerable efforts that host countries made in providing facilities for the United Nations. Canada and the United States rejected the notion that the developed countries bore exclusive responsibility for inflation.

Abstaining on both the amendments and the resolution, the United Republic of Cameroon thought that some paragraphs were obscure or had connotations outside the Committee's competence.

Algeria, supported by Iraq, opposed the amendments, stating that inflation was essentially a phenomenon of developed countries and that the developing countries experienced imported inflation.

Amendments rejected: <sup>(1)</sup>United Kingdom, for EC members, A/C.5/36/L.32.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/230, 18 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1978, p. 1035.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.55, 60, 62, 65, 69 (25 Nov.-9 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/230

97-21-18 Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/838) by vote (44-19-25). 9 December (meeting 69); draft by Cuba (A/C.5/36/L.24); agenda item 103 (c).

##### Impact of inflation and monetary instability

The General Assembly,

Deeply concerned at the increased cost of inflation, which is seriously affecting the budget of the United Nations and the budget of the United Nations system as a whole,

Concerned also at the persistence of inflation and monetary instability in those developed countries in which the United Nations makes its expenditures, which affects Member States that are not responsible for the losses experienced,

Considering that, in order to cover the substantial losses caused by inflation and monetary instability, there is a need for an additional procedure that would help meet the costs they account for in the regular budget of the United Nations,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare a detailed study on the impact of inflation and monetary instability on the regular budget of the United Nations and to submit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

2. Also requests that the above-mentioned study should include the amounts which, over the last three bienniums, have resulted from inflation and monetary instability in the developed countries where United Nations organizations have their headquarters.

## Accounts and auditing

### Accounts for 1980

By a resolution of 30 November 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly accepted the financial reports and accounts for the year ended 31 December 1980, as well as the audit opinions of the Board of Auditors,<sup>(1)</sup> for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (p. 450), the United Nations Children's Fund (p. 1008), the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (p. 331), the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (p. 808), the voluntary funds administered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (p. 1038) and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (p. 785). The Assembly concurred with observations and comments by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ),<sup>(2)</sup> and requested the Board of Auditors as well as ACABQ to continue to give greater attention to areas on which

they had made observations and comments. The executive heads of the organizations and programmes concerned were requested to take remedial action in areas within their competence as might be required by the Board's comments.

The resolution was adopted without vote, following similar approval by the Fifth Committee on 7 October. The draft, submitted by the Committee Chairman, was orally amended following consultations to add two elements: a preambular paragraph by which the Assembly took into account the views expressed during the Committee's debate, and the phrase "in areas falling within their competence" in the request for remedial action by heads of organizations and programmes.

Explaining its position in the Committee, the USSR said it considered the latter addition to be important, since in some instances the Board had exceeded its mandate, as when it had overlooked the fact that payment of contributions to UNDP in non-convertible currencies (p. 456) was consistent with the Financial Rules and Regulations of the United Nations. Though accepting the amendments, the United States said it would have been prepared to adopt the original text; the resolution protected the independent character of the Board and implied that it should continue to make factual suggestions to the Assembly and to organization heads.

General comments on the Board's practices were made by several countries. Ghana and Nigeria said the Board had contributed towards efficient and effective administration of United Nations programmes and control of resources; nevertheless, there was room for improvement in such areas as cash management, procurement systems and budgetary control. In the opinion of the Philippines, there appeared to be both overlapping and gaps between the systems-based auditing by the Board and the coverage by the Secretariat's Internal Audit Division; it wondered whether the Board might instead favour a comprehensive audit covering not only economy and efficiency but also programme results. The United States held the Board's work essential in the effort to ensure that limited resources were used effectively and in full compliance with the Financial Rules and Regulations.

The USSR supported efforts to enhance the Board's role in promoting financial discipline and sound management but remarked that the lack of uniformity in the presentation of accounts for the various organizations made it virtually impossible to assess accurately their financial situation and activities. A representative of the Board responded by describing steps being taken to harmonize financial statements and said the Board was pleased with the progress achieved.



Financial reports, audited financial statements and Board of Auditors reports: <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/5/Add.1 & Add. 1/Corr.1, Add.2-5 & Add.7.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>ACABQ A/36/480.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/65, 30 Nov., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.3-7 (28 Sep.-7 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.77 (30 Nov.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/65

Adopted without vote Meeting 77 30 November 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/618) without vote, 7 October (meeting 7); draft by Chairman (A/C.5/36/L.3), orally amended following Consultations: agenda item 98.

#### Financial reports and accounts, and reports of the Board of Auditors

The General Assembly.

Having considered the financial reports and accounts for the year ended 31 December 1980 of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, the United Nations Institute for Training and Research, the voluntary funds administered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, the audit opinions of the Board of Auditors and the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

Taking into account the views expressed by delegations during the debate in the Fifth Committee,

1. Accepts the financial reports and accounts and the audit opinions of the Board of Auditors;
2. Concurs with the observations and comments made by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in its report;
3. Requests the Board of Auditors and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to continue to give greater attention to areas regarding which they have made observations and comments;
4. Requests the executive heads of the organizations and programmes concerned to take such remedial action in areas failing within their competence as may be required by the comments and observations made by the Board of Auditors in its reports.

#### Organization and practices of the Board of Auditors

In 1981, the General Assembly again considered a proposal, initially submitted by Canada in 1979,<sup>(8)</sup> to improve the organization and practices of the Board of Auditors. The proposal called for the appointment by the Assembly of a United Nations Auditor-General, whose staff would be responsible for the external audit of all United Nations accounts; also, the Board of Auditors would be expanded and made responsible for reviewing the audit and audit procedures.

In accordance with a 1979 Assembly decision,<sup>(1)</sup> the Board of Auditors, the Panel of External Auditors, the Secretary-General and ACABQ submitted their views on the subject to the Assembly. The Assembly decided in November 1981 to keep the question under review.

REPORTS TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. In April, the Secretary-General transmitted a report on the organization and professional practices of the Board of Auditors prepared by the Panel of External Auditors of the United

Nations, the Specialized Agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency.<sup>(5)</sup>

After reviewing the 1979 Canadian proposal, the Panel observed that the consultants' report which had led to it contained only limited evidence of the Board's recent practices. There had been considerable improvement in the audit standard since 1976 (when the Board had decided to set up an Audit Operations Committee to plan the audit work on a unified and integrated basis and to review all audits, prepare reports and establish common auditing standards<sup>(7)</sup>). On the assumption that the Board would continue to consist of experienced auditors-general with adequate staff support, the Panel saw no reason why further progress should not be made along the lines begun in 1976; on the other hand, most Panel members thought the Canadian proposal would provide a unified and continuing audit organization, although undue emphasis on the training of auditors from developing countries might detract from its effectiveness.

The Panel set out several factors for the Assembly's consideration: The rules and regulations did not appear to restrict further development of the existing system; it was important to avoid too many changes in Board membership within a short period; any arrangements for establishing an Auditor-General would need to ensure his independence; the appointment of a permanent Auditor-General would depart from the practice of entrusting the audit of most United Nations organizations to national auditors of member States; and the probable cost of the proposed system should be evaluated, along with the implications for other United Nations committees, such as ACABQ of establishing an audit committee.

In June, the Secretary-General transmitted a report of the Board of Auditors which reviewed the improvements in the Board's organizational structure and arrangements for auditing, as well as the changes proposed by Canada.<sup>(4)</sup>

Finding nothing fundamentally lacking in its current organization or professional practices, the Board concluded that the current arrangement for external audit should remain unchanged; however, it did not want to preclude future self-evaluation by the Board, if necessary. In the Board's opinion, the appointment of a permanent Auditor-General would deprive the United Nations of the freshness and impartiality which the Board members had brought to their work over the past 34 years. The Board also expressed the view that the cost of external audit would increase considerably if the proposed changes were implemented and that ACABQ rather than the audit committee envisaged by Canada should continue to review the Board's reports to the Assembly.

In a September report,<sup>(6)</sup> the Secretary-General reviewed the changes introduced by the Board during the past several years, including the extension of audit from the traditional approach, concerned with accounts and financial statements, to a systems-based approach that examined management and administrative areas of the audited organizations. In addition, a degree of rotation and continuity in composition had been achieved. In view of those improvements, the Secretary-General concluded that there did not appear to be any sufficiently demonstrated need for fundamental change in the Board's organizational and professional practices. The Canadian proposal was annexed to the report.

In a report submitted in October,<sup>(3)</sup> ACABQ expressed agreement with the premise underlying the Canadian proposal, namely that the United Nations needed an effective external audit in which both the Member States and the Secretariat had confidence. However, it concluded that the Board could provide such an audit without far-reaching and potentially expensive reforms. It was confident that the Board would continue to give particular attention to ways of adapting the audit to changing requirements.

Noting that the Panel of External Auditors, the Board and the Secretary-General agreed on the value of the systems-based audit, ACABQ believed it could be extended, as needed, in the context of current arrangements.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 30 November, the General Assembly took note with appreciation of the four reports and decided to keep under review the question of the organization and professional practices of the Board of Auditors.<sup>(2)</sup> The Assembly took this decision without vote, following similar approval by the Fifth Committee on 13 October of a draft by Canada and New Zealand.

Introducing the draft in the Committee, Canada said it would serve simply to recognize the possibility for future consideration of the Board's organization and professional practices.

Canada would not press its original proposal in view of indications that the suggested changes would be premature for the time being, but it continued to believe they had merit.

Commending the draft, Australia said the Canadian initiative had led to an important self-examination by those most concerned with United Nations audit practices; it was vital that those proposals, perhaps in an amended form, be looked at again in conjunction with a re-examination of the adequacy of the audit system. Also in favour of the decision, Ghana said it supported all measures to enhance the Board's capacity to conduct audits worthy of confidence. Endorsing the decision as well as the original Canadian proposals, Sweden said the question was important enough to warrant constant review.

Japan endorsed the ACABQ conclusions and thought the time had not come to adopt the Canadian proposals.

Decisions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>34/403, 25 Oct. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1232); <sup>(2)</sup>36/420, 30 Nov. 1981, text following.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/581; <sup>(4)</sup>Board of Auditors, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/175; <sup>(5)</sup>Panel of External Auditors, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/174; <sup>(6)</sup>S-G, A/36/176.

Yearbook references: <sup>(7)</sup>1976, P. 924; <sup>(8)</sup>1979, p. 1231.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.12 (13 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.77 (30 Nov.).

General Assembly decision 36/420

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/618) without vote. 13 October (meeting 12): 2-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.4); agenda Item 98 (g).

Sponsors: Canada, New Zealand.

#### Organization and professional practices of the Board of Auditors

At its 77th plenary meeting, on 30 November 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee:

(a) Took note with appreciation of the reports of the Panel of External Auditors, the Board of Auditors, the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions concerning the proposal by Canada for changes in the institutional arrangements for auditing in the United Nations;

(b) Decided to keep the question of the organization and professional practices of the Board of Auditors under review.

## Chapter II

### United Nations programmes

In 1981, three United Nations bodies and the Secretary-General dealt extensively with issues concerning the Organization's programmes, such as planning methods, review and evaluation, priority setting, identifying non-essential activities, and programme aspects of the

budget. These bodies-the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC), the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ)-and the Secretary-General issued reports and made recommendations. In Decem-

ber, the General Assembly adopted four resolutions on these subjects.

In a comprehensive resolution on programme planning,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly endorsed CPC recommendations<sup>(2)</sup> on guidelines for establishing an order of priority among programmes and urged that a central Secretariat unit monitor programme implementation. In a related action, the Assembly suggested ways in which the United Nations could strengthen its system for internal evaluation of the effectiveness of its activities.

Taking note of a special Secretariat review of the United Nations work programme, completed during 1981 and identifying obsolete and low-priority activities,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly requested CPC to consider its programme implications and ACABQ to examine the administrative and financial implications.<sup>(7)</sup>

During 1981, JIU issued 15 reports on various matters related to the efficiency of operations in the United Nations system, with continued emphasis on management and administration (p. 1312).

An ACABQ report on administrative and budgetary co-ordination in the United Nations system put the total contributions by member States to these organizations at \$3.8 billion in 1980.<sup>(1)</sup> The Assembly asked that the comments and observations in this report be referred to those organizations.<sup>(6)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/641; <sup>(2)</sup>CPC, A/36/38; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/658.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/228 A (p. 1308), <sup>(5)</sup>36/228 B (p. 1312), <sup>(6)</sup>36/229 (p. 1315), <sup>(7)</sup>36/239 (p. 1310), 18 Dec.

## Programme planning

Measures and guidelines for determining an order of priority among United Nations programmes were adopted in December 1981 by the General Assembly. This action, based on recommendations by CPC, took into account a report of JIU on the setting of priorities and the identification of obsolete activities in the United Nations and a report of the Secretary-General on setting explicit priorities among United Nations programmes. The key United Nations planning document, its medium-term plan for 1984-1989, was under preparation during 1981.

REPORTS. The March report of JIU on priority setting and the identification of obsolete activities,<sup>(2)</sup> prepared by Inspector Maurice Bertrand, discussed conceivable types of solutions and focused on two aspects where current practices were found wanting: machinery for diagnosis culminating in recommendations for the transfer of resources, and intergovernmental

decision-making to ensure that recommendations on priorities were carried out. In the view of JIU, what was at stake in setting priorities was finding out whether resources could be transferred, by eliminating obsolete or marginal activities, to activities that were useful and effective.

In order to supplement the progress already made in setting up structures and in the methodology of planning, programming, budgeting and evaluation, JIU made 16 recommendations. It proposed that regulations on planning and programming be made official by having them adopted by the General Assembly and that certain changes be studied, including a division of authority according to which the Secretariat would be given certain flexibility in deviating from the programme up to a certain point, beyond which intergovernmental approval would be needed. Several new procedures and methods were recommended, including: transmittal of the medium-term plan to all the Assembly's Main Committees so that they might consider and approve the parts which concerned them, as well as procedures for reducing appropriations for inadequately implemented sub-programmes, for rejecting portions of sub-programmes during reviews of the medium-term plan, and for systematic and regular review of on-going activities. Three criteria were suggested for classifying priorities: importance of objective, capacity of the Organization and effectiveness of Secretariat units.

In order to carry out priority setting, JIU proposed several new functions and mechanisms, including a priorities-analysis function in the Secretariat, diagnostic teams of outside consultants to submit comments on programmes to Member States and a Secretariat committee to draw conclusions on evaluation reports. Two other possibilities were suggested: a single intergovernmental committee to review plans, programmes and budgets, and a special session of the Economic and Social Council or the General Assembly on the problem of priorities.

Commenting on the JIU report in October, the Secretary-General agreed in general with the substance of its recommendations but raised several points concerning methods of implementation, mentioned similar steps already initiated by the Secretariat and discussed possible technical complications. He also drew attention to two issues raised by regional commission secretariats, namely: (a) the report's analyses did not take sufficiently into account the commissions' responsibilities in setting regional priorities and the need to introduce regional dimensions in the central priority-setting process; and (b) in certain programme areas, extrabudgetary resources made up a high proportion of overall resources and the

rate of programme implementation was closely linked to the availability of those resources. In addition, the Secretary-General commented on a CPC proposal for the establishment of a monitoring unit (p. 1306).

The Secretary-General's April report to the Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee on setting explicit priorities among United Nations programmes,<sup>(4)</sup> after describing the background and current situation, dealt with the conceptual issues of purposes, scope and level of explicit priority setting as well as the criteria to be followed, and drew conclusions and made recommendations. A set of possible criteria was annexed.

Reiterating that the purpose of priority setting was to ensure that high-priority activities received proportionately larger resources, the report suggested that long-term priorities could be determined by the appropriate committee of the General Assembly. In substantive areas, the determination would be based on CPC proposals as to which programmes and subprogrammes should be given high and low priority, taking into account any recommendations of specialized intergovernmental bodies. Priority setting for conference and administrative services would be done by the Fifth Committee, on recommendations of the Committee on Conferences and ACABQ and based on a report of the Secretary-General that would propose alternative levels of high- and low-priority services. The Assembly's long-term priorities would be used by the Secretary-General to formulate, in his proposed programme budget, suggestions for a more adequate proportion of resources for high-priority programmes and for financing any additional resource requirements from redeployment within the Secretariat.

The report proposed a phased introduction of the priority-setting system over two and a half years.

A September report by the Secretary-General<sup>(5)</sup> on Secretariat arrangements in regard to the ongoing restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system (p. 1092) included a summary of the results of the first meeting of the consultative arrangements on policy issues pertaining to economic and social activities and on planning, programming, budgeting and evaluation, held at Geneva on 2 July under the chairmanship of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation and with the participation of the heads of departments, organs and programmes. In regard to programme planning, the meeting recognized that the introduction to the 1984-1989 medium-term plan should be a key integral element of the planning process,

highlight the main policy orientation of the United Nations, and indicate medium-term objectives, strategies and trends responding to the priorities set by intergovernmental organs. The meeting also reviewed the progress of a special review of the Organization's work programme (p. 1309).

The Secretary-General emphasized the importance he attached to the effective functioning of these arrangements, which he believed would prove useful in identifying objectives common to various Secretariat units and in maximizing the Organization's responsiveness to the agreed policy directives of Member States, particularly the developing countries.

**CPC ACTION.** In considering the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983 (p. 1274) at its twenty-first session, held in New York from 4 to 29 May and on 8 and 9 June 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> CPC made recommendations on criteria and methods in setting programme priorities. It agreed that there was no necessary relationship between the priority of activities and the amount of resources required to conduct them, but stated that the practical purpose of establishing priorities was to indicate which activities should have first claim on resources and which could be curtailed or terminated.

The Committee recommended that priorities be set at three levels. At the broadest level, the introduction to the medium-term plan- to be approved by the General Assembly-would highlight objectives and policy orientations and indicate trends. In addition, subprogrammes would be reviewed for acceptability, after which priorities could be set among the acceptable subprogrammes. Obsolete and marginal activities would continue to be eliminated, and the budget document should continue to identify the highest- and lowest-priority elements in each subprogramme.

The Committee agreed that priority setting should apply to all substantive and service activities covered by budgetary procedures. Activities that could be eliminated, as well as funds to be redistributed to high-priority activities, would be identified. Priorities established by the General Assembly should, in principle, guide the allocation of all United Nations resources, including extrabudgetary (voluntary) funds, although the formulation of individual country programmes, such as those of the United Nations Development Programme, would remain the prerogative of individual recipient countries.

The Committee recommended that the Assembly adopt official rules and regulations governing programme planning, programme aspects of the budget, performance monitoring and evaluation procedures. It requested the Secretary-General

to submit proposals for these in 1982, through CPC. It recommended that a central and independent Secretariat unit monitor and report on actual programme delivery in all activities covered by the programme budget. At the same time, units responsible for implementing programmes should have limited discretion to modify programme elements where necessary, reporting changes to intergovernmental bodies.

It was agreed that programme review of proposed budgets by CPC must precede administrative and financial review by ACABQ and that the Secretary-General would study the timing and other practical problems that might arise in implementing such arrangements. CPC also recommended that each chapter of the proposed medium-term plan be submitted to the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly before the plan as a whole was adopted by the Assembly, and that a report on the operation of the new system of setting priorities should be submitted to the Assembly, through CPC, in 1984.

CPC also concluded that: the Assembly should renew its instruction that the highest- and lowest-priority elements be identified within each programme; the Assembly should be given a statement of the programme implications of proposed new activities along with the traditional statement of financial implications; in future proposed budgets, each section should show a detailed publications programme; and the foreword to the budget document should include a table showing resource distribution in both dollar and percentage terms.

On other programme matters, CPC made recommendations on United Nations activities to promote regional economic and social co-operation (p. 608). The remainder of its 1981 session was taken up with questions of co-ordination in the 'United Nations system (p. 1076).

The Economic and Social Council, on 23 July, endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of CPC, taking into account reservations and comments concerning modifications by members of CPC and of the Council.<sup>(7)</sup>

The CPC recommendation for a programme monitoring unit in the Secretariat was discussed by the Secretary-General in his October comments to the General Assembly on priority setting and the identification of obsolete activities (p. 1304). While agreeing in principle with the need to augment the monitoring function, he believed that more consideration of the proposal was needed, since such functions were being carried out by two existing Secretariat units in the Office of Financial Services and the Office for Programme Planning and Co-ordination.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION.** On 18 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution setting out measures and guidelines for determining an order of priority among programmes, as a guide for preparing the programme budget and allocating all budgetary and extrabudgetary resources.<sup>(6)</sup> Priority setting, it said, should be based mainly on the importance of an objective to Member States, the Organization's capacity to achieve it, and the effectiveness and usefulness of the results. On activities that had been completed or were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective, the Assembly reaffirmed the need to integrate their identification into planning, programming, budget evaluation and management. It requested proposals from the Secretary-General enabling the Assembly to adopt rules and regulations on programme planning, programme aspects of the budget, monitoring of implementation and methods of evaluation. It urged that a central Secretariat unit monitor programme implementation, and it called for improved evaluation (p. 1312).

The resolution was adopted, without vote, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, which similarly approved it on 7 December. The text was sponsored by Algeria, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Romania, the United Republic of Cameroon and Yugoslavia, and was approved with minor oral revisions. This was the first of two resolutions on programme planning adopted on 18 December, the other being concerned with evaluation.

Addressing the Fifth Committee, the Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination explained that the new priority-setting system would replace the former system, which provided for the setting of relative priorities among major programmes.

The United Republic of Cameroon, introducing the draft resolution, expressed hope that its recommendations could serve as guidelines in the preparation of the next programme budget.

Ethiopia, supported by Guinea and Yugoslavia, proposed orally that regional plans that were integral parts of global strategies be listed among the instruments to be taken into account in setting overall priorities. However, it withdrew the proposal after the United States objected that such plans were adopted by regional organizations in which not all United Nations Members were represented.

The United States also expressed reservations about the other instruments listed in this provision, on the ground that neither the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade<sup>(5)</sup> nor resolutions on a new international economic order could be defined as authoritative for the purpose of pri-

ority setting. Japan and the United Kingdom voiced similar reservations.

In the Committee's debate, a number of speakers stressed the importance of priority setting as a means of enabling Member States to direct United Nations activities into areas of their choice. Iraq said priority setting should involve States and intergovernmental, regional and sectoral organizations, and medium-term planning should be co-ordinated with international, regional and national plans. Japan suggested several steps to improve programming, including an overall review of existing programmes by intergovernmental bodies, convening CPC to examine the programme implications of draft resolutions before they were adopted, and the imposition of time-limits on mandates for Secretariat activity so that they would cease to be operative unless renewed by an intergovernmental body. Tunisia said the formulation of the medium-term plan would provide an opportunity for extensive debate by the main United Nations bodies, resulting in swifter and more effective establishment of priorities.

Speaking on behalf of the Nordic States, Norway identified three requirements for programme planning: better information, improved administrative and management performance, and changes in machinery and structures to accommodate the new planning system. Speaking on behalf of the European Community countries, the United Kingdom said the primary purpose of programme planning should be to allow Member States and the Secretariat to decide how the objectives laid down in resolutions should be translated into programmes for maximum effect on the problems they were designed to solve; the major gap in programme planning was the absence of a precise priority-setting system and the new procedures would represent a major advance towards completion of a comprehensive planning system. Yugoslavia stressed the importance of setting time-limited objectives for the accomplishment of programmed tasks, so that both the progress and quality of work could be measured.

Several States were critical of current programme planning practices. Australia said there was considerable evidence that sections of the Secretariat were reluctant to set priorities or to take planning seriously. Expressing support for the CPC recommendations on priority setting, Austria pointed out that there was no overall document giving a general view of expenditures, the budget or the medium-term plan. The Byelorussian SSR said that the only practical effect of current medium-term planning was to confirm the lack of a clear planning system; the quickest way to arrive at clear planning would be for both

legislative and executive bodies to recognize the limited nature of the Organization's resources. The USSR believed a strict order of priorities should be observed and that all activities unrelated to the principal objectives of the United Nations should be financed from resources released by changes in programmes and increased productivity.

India said it was hard to accept the notion that programmes should be constrained by a predetermined and arbitrary limit on budgetary growth. The United Republic of Cameroon said that, unlike JIU, it viewed priority setting not as a transfer of resources but as a way to rationalize activities; identification of low-priority items must not lead to their systematic elimination.

Many speakers stressed the need to identify obsolete or marginal activities so that they could be eliminated and the resources used for higher-priority work. In the view of the Ukrainian SSR, new programmes not relating directly to the Organization's main mission should be financed from resources released by the identification of such activities. However, Indonesia opposed the concept that new or high-priority programmes and activities were conditional upon elimination of completed or marginal ones. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya observed that, since any activity was subject to review and approval at a number of levels before introduction, the termination of an activity on the grounds of ineffectiveness or marginal utility should be subject to the same scrutiny.

Argentina, Japan and Tunisia supported the CPC recommendation for a central Secretariat unit to monitor programme implementation, while Brazil said such a unit was not advisable. The Bahamas thought the two existing units employed for this purpose should be combined and should report to the highest possible authority, such as the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation. Belgium suggested that it would be better for the resolution on programme planning to urge that monitoring be entrusted to the central Secretariat rather than to a central unit in the Secretariat, so as to give the Secretary-General flexibility in assigning the function. Canada felt that the decision on the proposed unit might best be postponed pending preparation of the programming regulations suggested by CPC and a JIU study on structural changes.

Speaking for the Nordic States, Norway said the establishment of such a unit raised the problem of the autonomy of the units responsible for programme execution and the links which they should have with a central unit. The United Republic of Cameroon believed the unit would help improve efficiency in programme imple-

mentation but it should not serve as a means for programme managers to question the priorities set by Member States. Reiterating its support for evaluation, the United States noted the JIU emphasis on the need to ensure that evaluation became a part of organizational structure and not merely a facade giving an illusion of activity.

Algeria, Austria, the Bahamas and the Netherlands endorsed the JIU suggestion for a single intergovernmental body to replace CPC and ACABQ and to deal with all aspects of programmes and budgets. India also favoured this approach, along with a transfer of the budgeting function from the Office of Financial Services to the Office for Programme Planning and Co-ordination. However, Brazil and the United Republic of Cameroon regarded the idea of replacing the two committees by a single body as premature. Several speakers favoured closer co-ordination between the two bodies.

Algeria, the Bahamas and Indonesia endorsed in principle the JIU suggestion for a special session of the Economic and Social Council or the General Assembly on priorities. However, Australia, Brazil and the United States did not favour such a session. Austria thought it would be enough to have a one- or two-week discussion of the programme at plenary meetings during the 1982 Assembly session, while Canada preferred a special session of CPC or a Fifth Committee working group to make proposals on priorities. Morocco believed that a conference of national planners would be less costly and more useful.

The Netherlands thought that discussion of the medium-term plan by the Assembly's Main Committees should be instituted as soon as possible. However, most other speakers mentioning this JIU recommendation did not favour it.

Canada and India favoured the inclusion of extrabudgetary resources in the priority-setting process.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>CPC: A/36/38. <sup>(2)</sup>JIU: transmitted by S-G note, A/36/171; and S-G comments, A/36/171/Add.1. S-G: <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/477, <sup>(4)</sup>A/C.5/36/1.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(5)</sup>35/56, annex, 5 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 503); <sup>(6)</sup>36/228 A, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(7)</sup>ESC, 1981/180, 23 July (p. 1076).

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.27, 30, 33-37, 65, 67 (30 Oct.-8 Dec.); plenary. A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/228 A

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/806) without vote, 7 December (meeting 65); 9-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.21/Rev.1). orally revised; agenda item 101.

Sponsors: Algeria, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Romania, United Republic of Cameroon, Yugoslavia.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 32/197 of 20 December 1977 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system,

Recalling also its resolutions 34/224 and 34/225 of 20 December 1979 relating, respectively, to medium-term planning in the United Nations and to the identification of activities that have been completed or are obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective,

Recalling further its resolution 34/164 of 17 December 1979, particularly paragraphs 2, 3 and 6 thereof, in which it approved the Glossary of Evaluation Terms, took note of the document entitled Initial guidelines for internal evaluation systems of the United Nations organizations and urged the Joint Inspection Unit to continue its efforts in the area of evaluation, both internal and external,

Recalling Economic and Social Council resolution 2008(LX) of 14 May 1976, the annex to which contains the terms of reference of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination whereby the Committee shall, *inter alia*, recommend an order of priorities among United Nations programmes as defined in the medium-term plan,

Recalling also its resolution 35/9 of 3 November 1980, in which it requested the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination to determine new criteria and methods to be employed in setting programme priorities,

Having considered in detail the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the work of its twenty-first session, the report of the Secretary-General on setting explicit priorities among United Nations programmes and the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit on the setting of priorities and the identification of obsolete activities in the United Nations and on evaluation in the United Nations system,

Taking note of Economic and Social Council decision 1981/180 of 23 July 1981, in which the Council endorsed the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

Considering that the determination of priorities among programmes, the identification of obsolete activities, and evaluation should be fully integrated into the general process of planning, programming and management,

#### Overall conclusions and recommendations

1. Notes with satisfaction the conclusions and recommendations contained in the above-mentioned reports of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, the Secretary-General and the Joint Inspection Unit;

2. Endorses the conclusions and recommendations set forth in the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination concerning an order of priorities among programmes and, in particular:

(a) Requests the Secretary-General to present to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, through the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination at its twenty-second session, proposals enabling it to adopt official rules and regulations governing programme planning, the programme aspects of the budget, the monitoring of implementation and the methods of evaluation, such proposals to take into account all decisions so far taken with respect to planning, programming and evaluation;

(b) Urges that the monitoring of the implementation of programme commitment should be entrusted to a central unit within the Secretariat, noting that, as the work of the unit should include determination of actual programme delivery and a role in the making of decisions that involves their possible modification, that work should be defined in the context of the above-mentioned official rules and regulations, bearing in mind the comments and suggestions made in the reports of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Joint Inspection Unit, as well as by delegations in the Fifth Committee;

(c) Decides that the length of the sessions of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should depend on its programme of work and on problems of scheduling, and emphasizes in this connection the need to grant the Committee, for its session in 1982, sufficient time to enable it to make a complete and detailed examination of the draft medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989;

(d) Reaffirms the need for close co-ordination between the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and, for this purpose, requests the Advisory Committee to study the statements submitted by the Secretary-General on the administrative and financial implications of the recommendations made by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, as endorsed by the Economic and Social Council, and to include its recommendations in a separate chapter of its report or in an addendum thereto for consideration by the General Assembly together with the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination;

3. Recommends that the organizations concerned should increase the effectiveness of their evaluation system and take the necessary steps to implement the recommendations contained in the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit, and in particular those concerning self-evaluation and the integration of evaluation in the planning and management process;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to improve the evaluation services of the United Nations in accordance with the recommendations contained in the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit;

## II

### Order of priority among programmes

Decides to adopt the measures and guidelines set out below for the determination of an order of priority among programmes:

1. The principal purpose of establishing priorities among programmes that form an integral part of the general planning and management process is to rationalize and order the activities and provide a guide for the preparation of the programme budget.

2. The order of priority should be established as follows:

(a) At the highest level, it should be established by as precise an indication as possible of the problems and of the overall orientation and trends deriving from authoritative instruments such as the Charter of the United Nations, the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade and the resolutions on the new international economic order. The introduction to the medium-term plan should, accordingly, analyse the trends that reflect the overall priorities.

(b) At the subprogramme level in the draft medium-term plan or the proposed programme budget, it should be established by a decision of the General Assembly to accept, curtail, reformulate or reject subprogrammes on the basis of the budget and programme performance reports, the detailed evaluation reports and the recommendations of the competent intergovernmental bodies. It being understood that the priorities established at the subprogramme level should contribute to the achievement of the overall priorities determined at the highest level.

3. Without prejudice to arrangements and procedures now in force and to the specific character of the common services, the establishment of an order of priority should apply to all the substantive activities of the Organization and to the common services and serve as a guide for the allocation of all its budgetary and extrabudgetary resources. For that purpose the decisions on priorities should be brought to the attention of Member States and the governing boards of the voluntary funds.

4. The establishment of an order of priority should be based principally on the importance of the objective to Member States, the capacity of the Organization to achieve it and the real effectiveness and usefulness of the results.

5. The timetable and the procedures for the introduction of the new system for setting priorities should extend over a period of two and a half years, as indicated in the report of the Secretary-General.

6. A report on the operation of this new system for setting priorities should be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session, through the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. That critical report should reveal the diffi-

culties encountered, make suggestions for dealing with them and indicate whether further changes must be made in structures and procedures including, inter alia, those proposed by the Joint Inspection Unit and by delegations during the debate on priorities in the Fifth Committee at the thirty-sixth session;

## III

Activities that have been completed or are obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective

1. Reaffirms the need to integrate the identification of activities that have been completed or are obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective in the general process of planning, programming, budgeting evaluation and management;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide the General Assembly, in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget and through the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, with a list of the activities considered obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective, in order to facilitate decision-making;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to achieve better implementation of General Assembly resolutions 3534(XXX) of 17 December 1975, 31/93 of 14 December 1976, 32/201 of 21 December 1977, 33/204 of 29 January 1979, 34/225 of 20 December 1979 and 35/209 of 17 December 1980, concerning activities that have been completed or are obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective and for this purpose requests him to continue to refine further, if necessary, the criteria for the determination of those activities.

### Special review of the work programme

The results of a special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations were presented to the General Assembly in a December 1981 report by the Secretary-General,<sup>(1)</sup> submitted in conjunction with the Assembly's examination of the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983 (p. 1272). This review was conducted by an ad hoc group composed of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, as Chairman; the Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management; and the Assistant Secretaries-General for Financial Services and for Programme Planning and Co-ordination. The report set out conclusions in three annexes which listed activities identified for termination in the proposed 1982-1983 budget as obsolete, marginally useful or ineffective; activities required by legislative mandates and therefore included in the proposed budget but which might be considered of low priority; and high-priority activities that could contribute to the strengthening of ongoing programmes.

The report estimated the cost of the low-priority activities as approximately \$20 million to \$25 million and said that, if the General Assembly agreed, those resources would become available for redeployment towards financing high-priority activities. The report also suggested that the Assembly might refer certain proposals to CPC for further review.

The Assembly, in a resolution adopted without vote on 18 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> took note of



the report and requested CPC to report on the programme implications of the Secretary-General's proposals. It asked the Committee on Conferences to examine and report on those recommendations which related to the limitation of documentation (p. 1370). Furthermore, it requested ACABQ to report on the administrative and financial implications, including those arising out of any recommendations by CPC and the Committee on Conferences. All the reports were to be submitted in 1982.

This resolution was recommended by consensus by the Fifth Committee on 16 December 1981, on a draft proposed by the Chairman after consultations.

The Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management, who presented the Secretary-General's report to the Fifth Committee, observed that any curtailment or modification of programmes covered by existing mandates would have to be predicated on decisions of intergovernmental bodies. Nevertheless, all areas of programmes and activities had been reviewed to assess areas of low priority as well as those where strengthening might seem desirable.

In the Committee's discussion, France, Japan, Trinidad and Tobago, the USSR and the United States expressed regret that the report had reached the Fifth Committee too late for it to take action on low-priority activities. Algeria, Egypt and India said they had joined in the consensus because of the lateness of the report, which deserved more careful study.

Rqort: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/658.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/239, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 80 (12-22 Oct. & 16 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/239

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) by consensus, 16 December (meeting 80); draft by Chairman (A/C.5/36/L.50); agenda item 100.

#### Special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations

The General Assembly

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General;
2. Requests the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination to consider, at its twenty-second session, the programme implications of the proposals contained in the report of the Secretary-General and to report thereon to the General Assembly, at its thirty-seventh session, through the Economic and Social Council;
3. Requests the Committee on Conferences to examine those recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General which relate to conference servicing and to the control and limitation of documentation and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;
4. Requests the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to examine the administrative and financial implications of the Secretary-General's proposals, including those arising out of the considerations and recommendations, if any, of the intergovernmental bodies referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3 above, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Programme objectives

On 23 July 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the Economic and Social Council, acting without vote, endorsed proposals by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) for an overview of the objectives and plans of the organizations of the United Nations system, called for by the General Assembly in 1978.<sup>(2)</sup> The Council requested ACC to submit the overview report to it in 1983, through CPC, utilizing existing resources.

The draft of this decision was proposed orally by the Chairman of the Council's Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee following a suggestion by Pakistan, and was approved by the Committee without vote on 17 July 1981.

In an annex to its annual report to the Council, submitted in May,<sup>(1)</sup> ACC proposed that the overview consist of a narrative describing the major world problems being confronted by the system, and current and future objectives, plans and activities to respond to them. It was envisaged that such an overview report could be presented in 1983.

Report. <sup>(1)</sup>ACC, E/1981/37.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 33/118, para. 10, 19 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 1031). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>ESC, 1981/181, 23 July 1981, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee. E/1981/C.3/SR.14, 15, 16, 17 (16 & 17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.40 (23 July).

#### Economic and Social Council decision 1981/181

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee E/1981/96 (Part III) without vote, 17 July (meeting 17); draft orally proposed by Chairman on suggestion by Pakistan; agenda item 18.

#### Overview of the objectives and plans of the United Nations system

At its 40th plenary meeting, on 23 July 1981, the Council decided to endorse the proposals of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination for an overview of the objectives and plans of the organizations of the United Nations system, called for by the General Assembly in its resolution 33/118 of 19 December 1978, and to request the Committee to submit the overview report to the Council at its second regular session of 1983, through the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, on the understanding that this would be carried out within existing resources.

#### Programme evaluation

After receiving two reports by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) on progress made in evaluating United Nations programmes, the General Assembly, in December 1981, requested a strengthening of the Secretariat's evaluation system.

REPORTS. JIU submitted two reports on programme evaluation during 1981, both prepared by Inspector Earl D. Sohm.

The first, on the status of internal evaluation in United Nations organizations, submitted in February,<sup>(2)</sup> noted that internal evaluation systems were set up to help maximize the effective-

ness of activities by providing analytical information on results to secretariats and intergovernmental bodies and to provide accountability for effective use of resources. The report summarized the status of evaluation in the United Nations and 22 specialized agencies and programmes, with recommendations addressed to a number of them. In regard to the United Nations, the report urged a strengthening of the Evaluation Unit in the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, and close ties with the Programme Analysis and Evaluation Unit of the Department of Administration, Finance and Management. In a general comment, JIU found that a major concern was the small amount of resources devoted to evaluation unit staffing, a problem that could seriously hamper the realization of benefits.

The second JIU report on this subject, submitted in March,<sup>(3)</sup> was a follow-up to the Unit's initial report on evaluation, prepared in 1977.<sup>(7)</sup>

On the problem of staffing evaluation units, it suggested that persons be reassigned from elsewhere in the organization where current staffing was inadequate to meet expanding responsibilities. JIU concluded that internal evaluation systems were entering a critical stage of widespread implementation, in which organizations were faced with the challenge of strengthening and using them effectively. Besides the need for more staff, the report recommended that the organizations consider five areas: the merits of built-in self-evaluation, conducted by the units performing the activity; evaluation system coverage and development plans, guidelines on integrated management system relationships and development, and basic evaluation standards; specific evaluation analysis, follow-up and reporting mechanisms and procedures; current and future actions to assist developing country evaluation activities; and effective training programmes to support evaluation system development.

Commenting in October on the JIU reports, ACC<sup>(4)</sup> strongly supported the JIU thesis that evaluation should be integral to policy formulation, programme planning, budgeting and implementation management. It also concurred on the need for adequate resources for evaluation, remarking that evaluation skills and institutional capability were critical pre-conditions if evaluation was to give effective support to key policy, programme, budget and other management processes. Noting that some organizations faced a zero-growth situation for the next biennium, the report concluded that, if resources could not be augmented, shifts in emphasis and priority might permit their redeployment. In general, ACC believed that a modest level of resources spent on evaluation could yield greater programme benefits, in the form of either savings or increased effectiveness.

While generally supporting the trend towards built-in self-evaluation, ACC believed that it should be complemented by a control mechanism such as a central evaluation unit. It also noted that evaluation methodology had not been formulated for certain kinds of non-programmable activity such as support for negotiations leading to international agreements. In general, ACC agreed with the JIU conclusions and recommendations as guidelines for future evaluation system development, but it suggested that the reports might be somewhat over-optimistic about the degree of acceptance and understanding of the purposes and limitations of evaluation. It also commented on specific JIU recommendations.

Among the proposals on programme planning made by CPC at its May/June session<sup>(1)</sup> was a recommendation that a central Secretariat unit, independent from the units responsible for substantive activities, should monitor and report on programme delivery in all activities covered by the programme budget (p. 1306).

In a related area of evaluation, CPC made three recommendations on methodology for future cross-organizational programme analyses (inter-agency studies on the activities of the United Nations system in specific programme areas). It proposed that the challenge or main problems as defined by legislative mandates should be set out; programmes aimed at overcoming the problems should be described and analysed critically in relation to mandates; and gaps, duplication and the effectiveness or otherwise of co-ordination arrangements should be identified. CPC also examined the most recent of these analyses, concerning youth activities (p. 1016).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In the second of two resolutions on programme planning (p. 1304) adopted without vote on 18 December,<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly, confirming its support for the development of programme evaluation systems and units in each agency, requested the Secretary-General to strengthen the United Nations evaluation system by the following five means: specifying the responsibilities and tasks of evaluation units; preparing for the Assembly precise evaluation plans linked to medium-term planning and the budget cycle; developing guidelines for the planning and design of programmes and projects to make them more susceptible to evaluation; designing basic standards for the conduct, content and process of evaluation, and assuring that the quality of the evaluation products was continually assessed; and ensuring that evaluation findings were promptly and systematically utilized in management decision-making and that follow-up evaluation recommendations were carried out. The Assembly also requested the Secretary-General to

report in 1983, through CPC, on the implementation of these measures.

In its principal resolution on programme planning,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly urged that the monitoring of programme implementation be entrusted to a central unit in the Secretariat. It also recommended that United Nations organizations implement the JIU recommendations on evaluation and requested the Secretary-General to improve United Nations evaluation services.

The revised resolution on evaluation was sponsored by the United States in the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, which approved it without vote on 8 December. The text incorporated two oral amendments, accepted by the sponsor. The first, proposed by Sweden and Yugoslavia, provided for submission of the Secretary-General's report to the Assembly in 1983 instead of 1982. The second, by India, called for submission of the report through CPC.

Austria, supporting all of the JIU recommendations on evaluation, found progress in this area to have been slow and suggested that a general evaluation of the results obtained by the United Nations in the economic and social spheres be submitted to CPC. The Bahamas hoped that imbalances handicapping the internal evaluation machinery would be rectified, preferably through an overall monitoring and evaluation unit. Reiterating its support for evaluation, the United States noted the JIU emphasis on the need to ensure that evaluation became a part of organizational structure and not merely a façade giving an illusion of activity.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>CPC: A/36/38. JIU transmitted by S-G notes: <sup>(2)</sup>A/36/181, <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/182; <sup>(4)</sup>IACC comments, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/479.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(5)</sup>36/228 A, 18 Dec. (p. 1308); <sup>(6)</sup>36/228 B, 18 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(7)</sup>1977, p. 1051.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.27, 30, 33-37, 67 (30 Oct.-8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/228 B

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/806) without vote, 8 December (meeting 67): draft by United States (A/C.5/36/L.31/Rev.1), orally amended by India and by Sweden and Yugoslavia, and orally revised: agenda item 101.

The General Assembly,

Confirming its continued support for the development of evaluation systems and evaluation units within each agency,

Emphasizing its support for the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit on evaluation in the United Nations system,

Encouraging all agencies to co-operate with the Joint Inspection Unit in assuring their own evaluation capacity, in order to make evaluation an integral part of the agency's programming and development process,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to strengthen the United Nations evaluation systems and evaluation units by:

(a) Specifying the responsibilities and tasks of the United Nations evaluation units;

(b) Preparing for the General Assembly precise evaluation

plans linked to the medium-term planning process and the budget cycle:

(c) Developing guidelines for the planning and design of programmes and projects to make them more susceptible to evaluation;

(d) Designing and issuing basic standards for the conduct, content and process of evaluation and assuring that the quality of the evaluation products is continually assessed;

(e) Taking appropriate measures to ensure that evaluation findings shall be promptly and systematically utilized in the management decision-making process and that follow-up evaluation findings and recommendations shall be carried out;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, through the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, on the implementation of paragraph 1 above.

## Joint Inspection Unit

JIU ACTIVITIES. As requested by CPC and endorsed by the General Assembly in 1980,<sup>(27)</sup> the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) adjusted its work programme for 1981 and the following few years to enable it to participate in the Assembly's appraisal of the extent to which the process of restructuring the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system had begun to meet the requirements of the new international economic order. In this area, JIU completed in July a report on relationships between the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation and other Secretariat entities (p. 1093). It planned to prepare 10 more studies between 1982 and 1984, after which it would submit a report that would discuss the impact of restructuring on the secretariats of United Nations organizations.

During 1981, JIU issued 15 reports on various topics which were submitted to the General Assembly. Ten of these related to management and administration, including the one on intra-Secretariat relationships with the Director-General.<sup>(16)</sup> The others concerned: setting priorities and identifying obsolete activities<sup>(8)</sup> (p. 1304); programme evaluation (two reports)<sup>(9,10)</sup> (p. 1310); application of the principle of equitable geographical distribution of Secretariat staff<sup>(14)</sup> (p. 1317); methods of determining staff requirements<sup>(7)</sup> (p. 1362); personnel policy options-career development and types of appointment<sup>(17)</sup> (p. 1325); control and limitation of documentation<sup>(6)</sup> (p. 1370); management services in the United Nations system<sup>(12)</sup> (p. 1378); and building construction procedures of United Nations organizations<sup>(13)</sup> (p. 1382).

The remaining five reports dealt with substantive activities: co-ordination of public information activities in the United Nations system<sup>(11)</sup> (p. 370); assistance to regional intercountry technical co-operation institutions<sup>(4)</sup> (p. 466);

evaluation of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator (UNDRO)<sup>(3)</sup> (p. 472); subregional offices of the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA)<sup>(5)</sup> (p. 668); and application of the Mar del Plata Action Plan on water resource development and administration<sup>(15)</sup> (p. 686).

An account of JIU activities from 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981 was submitted to the General Assembly in the Unit's thirteenth annual report.<sup>(1)</sup> Its work during the second half of 1981 was covered in its 1982 report.<sup>(2)</sup>

In his annual report on implementation of JIU recommendations, submitted to the Fifth Committee in November 1981,<sup>(18)</sup> the Secretary-General discussed the status of implementation of recommendations contained in four earlier JIU reports on: the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (p. 804), the status of women staff members in the Professional category and above (p. 1321), personnel policy reforms (p. 1322) and evaluation of document translation in the United Nations system (p. 1370).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In a decision adopted without vote on 18 December,<sup>(26)</sup> the General Assembly took note of the 1981 report of JIU and its reports on methods of determining staff requirements, management services in the United Nations system and building construction procedures. The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to include in his future comments on JIU reports an indication of which recommendations he considered should or should not be implemented.

The draft decision was approved by the Fifth Committee by consensus on 15 December as orally revised by its sponsors-Australia, Barbados, Guyana, Indonesia and Suriname- to omit a reference to the JIU report on the subregional offices of ECLA. The Byelorussian SSR, which suggested this deletion, noted that the Committee had not discussed the report. (The Economic and Social Council took note on 23 July of the report on ECLA.<sup>(24)</sup>)

Barbados, which introduced the draft decision, said the request to the Secretary-General should help clarify a situation in which he found it difficult to determine when he had a clear mandate to act on JIU recommendations.

The Assembly took action on other JIU reports as follows: on 10 December, it referred the report on control of documentation to the Committee on Conferences;<sup>(19)</sup> on 16 December, it requested a study of ways to enhance the role of United Nations information centres, drawing on the findings of the report on public information activities;<sup>(20)</sup> on 17 December, it transmitted to the Economic and Social Council the Secretary-General's comments on the report on

intra-Secretariat relationships in connection with restructuring the economic and social sectors,<sup>(21)</sup> endorsed the approaches taken by the Secretary-General in his comments on the report on UNDRO<sup>(22)</sup> and took note of the report on assistance to regional intercountry technical co-operation institutions; and on 18 December it noted with satisfaction the conclusions and recommendations of reports on programme evaluation and priority setting, and requested the Secretary-General to improve evaluation services in accordance with those reports.<sup>(23)</sup>

Speaking in the Fifth Committee, Australia said the JIU recommendations on programme planning and evaluation had led to major progress, but in other areas there had been no follow-up; it might therefore be necessary to undertake an evaluation of JIU, especially since the Unit was overburdened with a wide diversity of demands going far beyond its original terms of reference. Praising the high quality of the JIU reports, Morocco said the Unit should not take over the role of the various organs and specialized agencies, but work in close co-operation with them to produce the best results. The Netherlands expressed support for the JIU recommendations. The USSR observed that the quality of JIU reports had improved recently, and added that it should go beyond producing reports and ensure that its recommendations were implemented by legislative bodies. Reiterating its support for JIU, the United States said its impartial, informative and useful work was a means of achieving more efficient management and thereby increasing the percentage of funds available to those for whom they were really intended.

Reports: JIU, <sup>(1)</sup>A/36/34, <sup>(2)</sup>A/37/34. JIU, transmitted by S-G notes: <sup>(3)</sup>A/36/73, and S-G comments, Add.1; <sup>(4)</sup>A/36/101 & Corr.1, and ACC comments, Add.1; <sup>(5)</sup>A/36/102 & Corr.1, and S-G comments, Add.1; <sup>(6)</sup>A/36/167, ACC comments, Add.1, and S-G comments, Add.2; <sup>(7)</sup>A/36/168, and ACC comments, Add.1; <sup>(8)</sup>A/36/171, and S-G comments, Add.1; <sup>(9)</sup>A/36/181, <sup>(10)</sup>A/36/182, and ACC comments, A/36/479; <sup>(11)</sup>A/36/218; <sup>(12)</sup>A/36/296, and comments by UN system organizations, Add.1; <sup>(13)</sup>A/36/297, and S-G comments, Add.1, and ACABQ report, A/36/643; <sup>(14)</sup>A/36/407, and S-G comments, Add.1; <sup>(15)</sup>A/36/411, and S-G comments, Add.1; <sup>(16)</sup>A/36/419, and S-G comments, Add.1; <sup>(17)</sup>A/36/432 & Add.1, and S-G comments, Add.2. <sup>(18)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/41.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(19)</sup>36/117 A, sect. II, para. 11, 10 Dec. (p. 1365); <sup>(20)</sup>36/149 B, para. 20 (b), 16 Dec. (p. 365); <sup>(21)</sup>36/1E7, para. 1, 17 Dec. (p. 1094); <sup>(22)</sup>36/225, para. 4, 17 Dec. (p. 480); <sup>(23)</sup>36/228 A, sect. I, paras. 1 & 4, 18 Dec. (p. 1308).

Decisions: <sup>(24)</sup>ESC: 1981/182, 23 July (p. 668). GA: <sup>(25)</sup>36/449, 17 Dec. (p. 467); <sup>(26)</sup>36/454, 18 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(27)</sup>1980, p. 572.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.34-36, 40, 49, 51, 53, 55, 75 (6 Nov.-15 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

## General Assembly decision 36/454

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/839) by consensus, 15 December (meeting 75): 5-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.38), orally revised on suggestion by Byelorussian SSR; agenda item 104.

Sponsors: Australia, Barbados, Guyana, Indonesia, Suriname.

## Reports of the Joint Inspection Unit

At its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee:

- (a) Took note of the following documents:
  - (i) Annual report of the Joint Inspection Unit;
  - (ii) Reports of the Joint Inspection Unit on methods of determining Staff requirements, management Services in the United Nations system and building construction procedures of United Nations organizations;
- (b) Requested the Secretary-General, starting from 1 January 1982, to include in his comments on the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit a summary indicating which recommendations he considered should or should not be implemented.

## Administrative and budgetary co-ordination in the UN system

The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) issued in November 1981 its annual report<sup>(1)</sup> reviewing and comparing the finances of the following organizations whose agreements with the United Nations provided for a review by the General Assembly: the International Labour Organisation, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the Universal Postal Union, the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Telecommunication Union, the World Meteorological Organization, the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the World Intellectual Property Organization, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

According to the 1982 budget figures given in the report, the regular budgets of the organizations covered, excluding IFAD, would amount to \$1.6 billion, of which \$1.5 billion would be covered by assessed contributions. This represented a 9.6 per cent increase over 1981 for the approved budgets and 6.5 per cent for assessed contributions. Member States contributed over \$2.4 billion in 1980 to various voluntary funds and programmes out of a total of \$3.8 billion in all contributions to United Nations organizations—regular budgets, peace-keeping operations and voluntary donations, according to statistics compiled by the Committee on Contributions and cited in the ACABQ report.

The report stated that the number of established posts authorized or requested for 1982

under the regular budgets of the covered agencies (excluding IFAD) totalled 12,297, or 85 more than the 1981 total, with the entire increase accounted for by WHO. The grand total of established posts in these agencies and the United Nations in 1982 was 23,764. The total number of participants in the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund, which covered all staff members with contracts of at least one year, was 41,020 as at 31 December 1980.

Referring to figures showing that total unpaid contributions as at 30 September 1981 equalled 50 per cent of the amounts payable by member States for 1981, ACABQ pointed out that the organizations had expressed concern at the impact on their cash flow caused by delays in the receipt of contributions. ACABQ also expressed the opinion that organizations which kept funds in non-interest-bearing bank accounts should review their cash management practices with a view to increasing their interest income.

Due to the fact that many agencies no longer had annual budgets, ACABQ recommended that its detailed co-ordination reports be submitted once every two years beginning in 1982, supplemented by brief reports in odd-numbered years.

This recommendation was approved by the General Assembly on 18 December in a resolution<sup>(2)</sup> by which it concurred with the observations and comments in the ACABQ report and referred them to the organizations concerned, along with those made in the Fifth Committee. The resolution was adopted without vote, after the Fifth Committee, on 9 December, approved it by consensus on a draft by Australia and Poland, introduced by Poland.

Also in connection with administrative and budgetary co-ordination, the Assembly adopted a resolution on the impact of inflation on the budgets of United Nations organizations (p. 1300) and a procedural decision on a proposal for a single administrative tribunal (p. 1360).

Commenting in the Fifth Committee on the ACABQ report, Romania suggested that it should have included conclusions on significant trends in budgetary matters and recommendations for increasing the efficiency of administrative and budgetary activities. In the view of the USSR, little had been done to bring about administrative and budgetary co-ordination; the most pressing problem was to reduce the budgetary growth rates of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The United States stressed the need for co-ordination within Governments, whose representatives often spoke with different voices in different organizations. Yugoslavia suggested that a bank be established in which United Nations organizations could deposit their funds, currently placed in different banks.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ A/36/641.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/229, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.55, 60, 62, 65, 69 (25 Nov.-9 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/229

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/838) by consensus. 9 December (meeting 69); 2-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.34); agenda item 103 (a).

Sponsors: Australia, Poland.

#### Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency

The General Assembly,

Concerned with the need for effective administrative and budgetary co-ordination within the framework of the United Nations system,

Recalling its decision of 15 December 1975 to consider in depth the item entitled "Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency" normally in off-budget years.

Recalling also its resolutions 33/142 A of 20 December 1978 and 35/114 of 10 December 1980,

Taking note with appreciation of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on

the administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency,

1. Concurs with the observations and comments of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions as contained in its report;

2. Refers to the organizations concerned the observations and comments contained in the above-mentioned report, as well as the comments and observations made in the course of the debate in the Fifth Committee;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to refer to the executive heads of the organizations of the United Nations system, through the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, matters arising out of the report of the Advisory Committee and of the related debate in the Fifth Committee that call for their attention and necessary action;

4. Transmits the report of the Advisory Committee to the Board of Auditors, the Panel of External Auditors, the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Joint Inspection Unit for their information;

5. Decides that the Advisory Committee shall report on administrative and budgetary co-ordination in the following way:

(a) Once every two years, beginning in 1982, the reports shall contain detailed analyses of the budgets of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency;

(b) In intervening years, the reports shall be confined to tabular material and, as necessary, to special studies dealing with administrative and budgetary problems common to the United Nations system.

## Chapter III

### United Nations officials

The United Nations system had a staff of 50,547 as at 31 December 1981. These members of the international civil service were employed by the United Nations Secretariat (26,281 with contracts of a year or more) and specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency participating in the United Nations common system of salaries, allowances and other conditions of service. The common system encompassed the organizations of the United Nations system except for the intergovernmental financial agencies with headquarters in Washington, D. C. (For a breakdown of established posts in the United Nations Secretariat financed under the regular budget, see table on p. 1276.)

Elements of the common system continued to be regulated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), which held two sessions at United Nations Headquarters in 1981 (p. 1322). Its report<sup>(1)</sup> was reviewed by the General Assembly, which took action in December on several issues affecting the staff of intergovernmental organizations. Also in December, the Assembly acted on several personnel questions related specifically to the United Nations Secretariat. For the first time, the Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee heard repre-

sentatives of staff organizations make oral presentations on these matters (p. 1334).

Following up on its 1980 call to improve the nationality and regional balance and personnel practices of the Secretariat, the Assembly requested an updated report on the situation (p. 1316) and decided to continue discussing the geographical distribution of posts in 1982 (p. 1317). The Secretary-General, in his annual report on the composition of the Secretariat,<sup>(2)</sup> informed the Assembly that the proportion of women in Professional and higher-level posts subject to guidelines for equitable geographical distribution had reached 21.6 per cent and that further steps were being taken to reach the 25 per cent target set by the Assembly in 1978 (p. 1321).

Acting on the 1981 report of ICSC, the Assembly adopted a resolution<sup>(11)</sup> in which it urged United Nations organizations to implement Commission decisions and act on its findings. Expressing regret at an International Labour Organisation (ILO) decision to raise salaries of its General Service staff at Geneva above levels recommended by ICSC, the Assembly reaffirmed the importance of common salary scales. It requested ICSC to give high priority to studies in four areas. Two of these concerned salaries of

Professional and higher-category staff: comparison of total compensation between the international and United States civil services, and the post adjustment system of cost-of-living allowances (p. 1337). The other two areas were career development (p. 1325) and a projected index for adjusting pension payments in high-cost areas (p. 1347). New studies on staff training were also requested (p. 1329).

Also with regard to General Service salaries at Geneva, the Assembly decided not to approve expenditures for a 3 per cent raise which the Secretary-General had intended to give United Nations staff there to match the ILO increase (p. 1340).

In developments affecting fringe benefits for the international civil service, additional benefits were authorized for field personnel serving in localities where living and working conditions were especially difficult (p. 1336) and the Assembly approved an ICSC recommendation to maintain a previous formula linking the amounts of certain payments given on separation from service to salary levels earned while on duty (p. 1342).

The United Nations and several specialized agencies put into effect an ICSC-approved Master Standard of job classification, the first of a three-part scheme to apply common standards in the grading of posts (p. 1327).

The Assembly endorsed recommendations by the Secretary-General to improve the language training programme for Secretariat staff (p. 1330). It also decided to allow staff of the permanent missions of Governments to the United Nations to participate without charge in the programme at Headquarters (p. 1331). Requesting additional information and an ICSC study, the Assembly postponed action on the contractual status of Headquarters language teachers until 1982 (p. 1332).

After considering a proposal for a child-care centre at Headquarters to provide day-care services for the children of staff and others associated with the United Nations, the Assembly endorsed a recommendation that other alternatives be explored (p. 1333).

The Assembly took action on aspects of international civil service pensions. After considering a finding that current contribution rates to the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund would be insufficient in the long run to meet the Fund's obligations to pensioners, the Assembly requested the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board to consider alternatives to improve the Fund's actuarial balance.<sup>51</sup> Following recommendations by the Board,<sup>52</sup> the Assembly approved supplementary measures for certain older pensioners, again authorized the Board to supplement volun-

tary contributions to the Emergency Fund for pensioners facing hardships and approved the Fund's administrative expenses.<sup>53</sup> The Board was asked to recommend measures with respect to the financial obligations of pensioners to spouses or former spouses.<sup>54</sup>

On the Fund's investment policy, the Assembly endorsed diversifying investments in developing countries in accordance with certain financial criteria,<sup>55</sup> requested increased investments in States members of the Organization of African Unity<sup>56</sup> and asked that resources held in shares of transnational corporations be reinvested in developing countries.<sup>(9)</sup>

Concerning respect for the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations system, the Assembly appealed to Member States arresting or detaining such officials to abide by certain principles, including the right of the Secretary-General or organization head to visit the staff member and help arrange for legal counsel.<sup>101</sup>

Consultations continued between ILO and the United Nations on the feasibility of establishing a single administrative tribunal and harmonizing arrangements pertaining to the two existing ones in the United Nations system (p. 1360).

After receiving information that the Secretary-General was about to issue new instructions establishing policies for hiring experts, consultants and other personnel, the Assembly requested updated information on the use of such persons by the United Nations (p. 1361).

In other developments relating to the Secretariat, the Committee of Governmental Experts to Evaluate the Present Structure of the Secretariat in the Administrative, Finance and Personnel Areas continued its work (p. 1376), and the Assembly authorized a new fund for interorganizational security measures, particularly at field offices (p. 1383).

Reports: <sup>1</sup>ICSC, A/36/30 & Corr.1; <sup>2</sup>S-G, A/36/495; (3)UNJSPB, A/36/9 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: (4)36/118 A (p. 1343), <sup>3</sup>36/118 B (p. 1345), <sup>4</sup>36/118 C (p. 1348), <sup>5</sup>36/119 A (p. 1350), (8)36/119 B (p. 1351), (9)36/119 C (p. 1350), 10 Dec.; (10)36/232 (p. 1359), (11)36/233 (p. 1323), 18 Dec.

## Composition of the Secretariat

In his annual report on the composition of the United Nations Secretariat, issued in September 1981,<sup>11</sup> the Secretary-General reviewed progress towards a more equitable geographical distribution of Professional staff by nationality and region (p. 1317), employment of women (p. 1321), Professional staff recruitment (p. 1335), and various matters concerning staff administration, including career development

(p. 1326), job classification (p. 1327), training (p. 1329), staff-management relations (p. 1334) and retirement age (p. 1352).

The report showed that, as at 30 June, the total number of staff in the central Secretariat was 15,318. This figure included all staff members with appointments for a year or more, and covered staff in the Professional and higher categories, technical co-operation project personnel, and General Service and related categories. In addition, staff assigned to the secretariats of other United Nations organs numbered: United Nations Development Programme, 5,841; United Nations Children's Fund, 2,378; Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 1,065; International Trade Centre, 246; United Nations University, 89; United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), 76; United Nations Institute for Training and Research, 40; ICSC, 37; and International Court of Justice, 31. The grand total of staff members was thus 25,121, excluding approximately 16,700 area personnel of UNRWA.

On 18 December,<sup>(3)</sup> the General Assembly took note of the report and requested the Secretary-General to submit in 1982 an updated report on implementation of its December 1980 resolution aimed at improving the geographical composition and personnel practices of the Secretariat.<sup>(2)</sup> The decision was adopted without vote. On 15 December, the draft had been approved in like manner by the Fifth Committee, as proposed and orally revised by its Chairman. The revision deleted the words "with appreciation" from the clause in which the Assembly took note of the report.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/495.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA 35/210, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1164). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/455, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee. A/C.5/36/SR.41. 45. 50-54, 59, 60, 65, 68, 75 (13 Nov.-15 Dec.); plenary A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/455

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/831) without vote, 15 December (meeting 75): draft by Chairman (A/C.5/36/L.49), orally revised; agenda item 107 (a).

#### Composition of the Secretariat

At its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee:

(a) Took note of the report of the Secretary-General on the composition of the Secretariat;

(b) Requested the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session an updated report on the implementation of Assembly resolution 35/210 of 17 December 1980.

#### Geographical distribution

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In accordance with a December 1980 request by the

General Assembly,<sup>(8)</sup> the Secretary-General calculated, and applied from 1 January 1981, new "desirable ranges" for Secretariat posts, showing the numbers of Professional and higher-level posts that should ideally be held by nationals of each Member State. This system of ranges had been established by the Assembly as a guideline for achieving an equitable balance among nationalities in those posts in the Professional category and above defined as subject to geographical distribution. Among staff excluded from the system were those appointed for language requirements (mainly translators and interpreters), field missions and the United Nations Environment Programme.

The Secretary-General's September 1981 report on the composition of the Secretariat<sup>(5)</sup> noted that, on 30 June 1980, 18 Member States were not represented in the Secretariat and, at 30 June 1981, this figure was 19 (Albania, Bahrain, Bhutan, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, Kuwait, Maldives, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Suriname). Figures for under-represented Member States (those whose nationals in geographical posts numbered fewer than the lower limit of their desirable range) were 21 at the earlier date and 26 at the later (in 1981: Brazil, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Czechoslovakia, Dominica, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Mozambique, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela). Because of the introduction of new ranges, the representation of certain States had changed half-way through the reporting year and it was, therefore, difficult to give meaningful figures on recruitment of under- and over-represented and within-range States, the report said.

Of 2,894 staff members in geographical posts holding appointments for a year or more as at 30 June 1981, 682 were Western Europeans, 642 were from North America and the Caribbean, 456 were from Asia and the Pacific, 400 were Africans, 296 were Eastern Europeans, 239 were Latin Americans, 143 were from the Middle East and there were 36 others, including stateless persons. There were 1,127 Professional and higher-level staff with similar appointments in non-geographic posts.

At senior levels-D-1 (Principal Officer) and above-developing countries in Africa and Asia, as a group, had been above the mid-point of their desirable ranges from 1977 to 1981, devel-



oped market-economy countries and developing countries of Latin America and the Caribbean had fallen from above to below that level, and the Eastern European socialist countries had remained below.

JIU REPORT. Citing the concern expressed by many States, three members of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), Alexander S. Bryntsev, Joseph Adolph Sawe and Zakaria Sibahi, prepared a report on application of the principle of equitable geographical distribution of Secretariat staff, transmitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General in August 1981.<sup>(1)</sup> The report concluded that equitable geographical distribution had not been observed by most entities of the Organization, although developing countries' representation had improved. The percentage of nationals from Eastern European countries had declined from 11.8 in 1963 to 10.2 in December 1980. While representation of developing countries in senior posts had improved, Eastern Europe continued to be greatly under-represented at that level.

To reduce these imbalances JIU recommended the following measures, in summary:

(1) The General Assembly should be given annual reports on what each Secretariat entity had done to conform to the Assembly target for appointments from unrepresented and under-represented States and to provide for equitable regional distribution.

(2) During 1982-1984, three out of five candidates for geographic posts should be appointed from unrepresented or under-represented States and appointments from over-represented States should be permitted only exceptionally.

(3) The proportion of permanent contracts should be reduced so that in future a majority of staff would hold fixed-term contracts, to be achieved by not granting probationary contracts on initial appointment and, until geographical distribution was equitable, by limiting the number of new permanent contracts to 50 per cent of those held by departing staff, or such other percentage as the Assembly decided.

new type of interruptible fixed-term contract should be introduced, permitting rotation of persons seconded from their national service and others holding fixed-term contracts.

(5) The search for replacements to fill vacant posts should take place simultaneously among internal and external candidates.

(6) The numbers of unrepresented and under-represented States in senior posts should be improved by setting targets for each region and paying attention to desirable ranges weighted according to post levels.

(7) Technical advisers, regional and interregional advisers, and project personnel of United Nations institutes should be included among geographic posts.

(8) Extension beyond retirement age (60 years)

should be limited to three months and should be granted only when time was needed to find a replacement.

(9) The recruitment and appointment process should be shortened and simplified.

(10) Preparation of an annual recruitment plan should be expedited.

Commenting in November 1981<sup>(2)</sup> on these recommendations, the Secretary-General pointed out that the population of over-represented countries was more than half that of all Member States combined and those countries were a source of many qualified candidates. The difficulty in locating qualified nationals of unrepresented and under-represented States prevented greater progress in improving geographical distribution. Other problems cited were uncompetitive Secretariat salaries, unwillingness to work at some duty stations and to accept junior posts, and language and cultural considerations.

Regarding specific JIU recommendations, the Secretary-General made the following points, in summary:

(1) Although care must be taken to see that no country or group of countries predominated in any unit, to require regional distribution -of posts in every unit would remove the Secretary-General's flexibility in the operation of Secretariat services and create difficulties in staff assignment.

(2) To appoint three out of five candidates from unrepresented and under-represented States would bring in many more than those countries needed to reach the mid-point of their desirable ranges, and in any event the Secretary-General must retain authority to appoint nationals of over-represented countries when others were not available.

(3) A ratio of 25 per cent fixed-term contracts to 75 per cent career appointments had been favoured by the Secretary-General as far back as 1962—a position noted by the Assembly in 1966<sup>(6)</sup>—and the 50:50 ratio recommended by JIU would make it difficult to use the power of career appointment to attract young candidates whose appointment the Assembly had repeatedly urged.

(4) The proposed rotation of persons between United Nations and government service would interrupt the continuity of Secretariat work and result in increased difficulties for career development and staff administration.

(5) In filling vacancies, preference over outside candidates must be maintained for staff already in the Secretariat in order to provide incentive for outstanding effort or performance.

(6) The proposal to apply weighted desirable ranges to senior posts would reduce recruitment to a search for persons statistically appropriate but whose occurrence might be so rare that it was unlikely they would ever be found in combination with the appropriate qualifications for the occupations in which they were to function.

(7) Technical advisers, regional and interregional advisers and staff of United Nations institutes

dependent on technical co-operation funding should continue to be excluded from the system of desirable ranges, but it might be appropriate for the staff of the United Nations Social Defence Research Institute and the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development to be placed in geographic posts.

(8) Reducing to three months the current six-month limit on extensions beyond retirement age would be an unnecessary restriction on the Secretary-General's authority to extend the limit in exceptional circumstances.

(9) The Secretary-General endorsed the JIU objective to shorten and simplify the recruitment and appointment process.

(10) He had reported separately on recruitment planning (p. 1335).

The staff organizations of the United Nations Secretariat also commented on the JIU conclusions and recommendations in a document transmitted to the Fifth Committee in October.<sup>(3)</sup> They stated that, while supporting the concept of geographical distribution as fundamental to a truly international civil service, they believed the recommendations were inimical to an independent and impartial career service as called for by Articles 100 and 101 of the Charter of the United Nations. Therefore, they requested the General Assembly to consider reinforcing the career concept by improving the ratio between fixed-term and career appointments in favour of the latter, and urged that the small advantage given to serving staff in the issuance of vacancy notices be maintained.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 18 December, acting without vote, the General Assembly took note of the JIU report and the Secretary-General's comments, and decided to continue discussion of the subject in 1982.<sup>(10)</sup>

On 15 December, the draft had been similarly approved by the Fifth Committee, as proposed by the Chairman and with oral revisions and amendments by Canada, Egypt and India. When introducing the text, the Chairman proposed to revise it by adding a phrase that would have had the Assembly take fully into account the limited progress made in implementing the principle of geographical distribution. At the suggestion of India, this was changed to state that the JIU report and the Secretary-General's comments took into account the level of progress in implementing that principle, incorporating suggestions by Egypt, supported by the United States, to replace "limited progress" by "level of progress", and by Canada, supported by Egypt, to delete "fully".

In a resolution of 9 December on co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU),<sup>(9)</sup> the General Assembly called on United Nations organizations

to ensure just and equitable representation of Africa at all levels, at both their headquarters and field offices. It also called on them to consider suggestions and proposals made at a meeting between representatives of the General Secretariat of OAU and secretariats of the United Nations system (Geneva, 13-16 April) (p. 228). According to the report on this meeting,<sup>(4)</sup> Africans in the secretariats were fewer in number and lower in seniority than might be expected. OAU expressed the wish that quotas and ranges would be established at the policy-making levels of P-5 to D-2 so as to achieve an equitable representation among regions.

During the Fifth Committee's discussion of the composition of the Secretariat, a number of delegations, including the Byelorussian SSR, Hungary, Liberia and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, emphasized that strict compliance with the Charter would ensure proper representation of inadequately represented Member States, both unrepresented and under-represented. They referred in particular to Article 101, paragraph 3, which cites the need for the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity, with due regard to recruitment on as wide a geographical basis as possible. Guyana said little attention was paid to the Article when it came to recruitment; appointments were often made on the basis of considerations other than quality, competence or geographical representation. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya thought the principle of high standards had been applied at the expense of the complementary principle of equitable geographical representation.

Several States, including Austria, Bangladesh, Kuwait, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Romania, Sierra Leone, Uganda, the USSR and the United Republic of Cameroon, noted some progress in carrying out the provisions of the 1980 resolution<sup>(7)</sup> and some commended the Secretary-General on his efforts to follow the directives therein, particularly with regard to geographical distribution. A number of States, however, stated that progress towards eliminating under-representation was too slow. Thus, Romania said it was wrong to concentrate high-level posts in the hands of a few countries, yet quantitative and qualitative imbalances in the representation of States in the Secretariat were widening. Suriname remarked that, while the position of certain over-represented countries had remained unchanged or had even been strengthened, unrepresented countries did not even receive answers to their applications.

The number of inadequately represented Member States was a matter of concern to Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Brazil, the Byelorussian SSR, the Central African Republic, Czechoslo-

vakia, Japan, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mongolia and Suriname, among others. Brazil suggested that consideration be given to earmarking 40 per cent of available vacancies for inadequately represented nationalities. Bulgaria said that, while gaps should be bridged as soon as possible, this should not serve as an excuse for unnecessary staff increases. The USSR believed that no more candidates should be recruited from over-represented countries.

India, on the other hand, said it could not accept a proposal that recruitment be limited to inadequately represented nationalities; although some major contributors to the United Nations budget were under-represented in raw figures, they were heavily over-represented in terms of influence.

Some countries referred to the need to increase their own representation in the Secretariat. Morocco, for example, observed that States which had joined the United Nations more recently than it had were better represented.

Various suggestions were made to improve the situation. Japan called for periodic competitive examinations for its nationals and the dispatch of recruitment missions, and was joined by the Federal Republic of Germany in supporting the idea of earmarking 50 per cent of post vacancies for inadequately represented countries. Liberia said the practice of appointing increasing numbers of nationals from non-member States should cease until all Member States were represented in the Secretariat. Spain agreed with the JIU recommendation to set up national targets for each geographic region. However, Romania thought it essential to respect the principle of equitable representation of States, not of regions, as the latter would virtually sanction inequities by disregarding individual cases.

Kuwait, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Uganda called for redressing the imbalance between developed and developing countries and improving the representation of the latter in senior, policy-formulating posts. This view was shared by the United Republic of Cameroon, which was also concerned that the average age of staff at the P-1 and P-2 (entry) levels had risen in 1981.

Brazil said that Latin America and the Caribbean were under-represented in senior and policy-formulating posts when compared with developed market economies and Asian and African countries. India was disturbed to note that the percentage of senior appointments from developed countries from July 1980 to June 1981 was higher than the percentage of all appointments for that group of States. Madagascar stressed that the unrepresented States were principally developing countries, and particularly

African countries. Somalia, remarking that the greatest anomalies in geographical composition were in the regional commissions, suggested that the Committee consider corrective guidelines. Suriname felt that the quality of posts was more important than their quantity. Uganda remarked that several developing countries categorized as over-represented were grossly under-represented or not represented at all at senior levels.

The United States observed that, according to the Secretary-General's report, developing countries, far from being under-represented, were above the mid-points of their targeted ranges and had an even higher proportion of senior positions; developed market-economy countries, while slightly over-represented in terms of total staff, were under-represented at senior levels.

Several States stressed that the Eastern European countries had always been under-represented. Poland pointed out that the number from that region in geographical posts had declined from 317 in 1977 to 296 in 1981. According to the USSR, staff in the Office of General Services and in the Electronic Data Processing and Information Systems Division of the Department of Administration, Finance and Management were mainly United States nationals and the legal and financial services were staffed entirely from North America and Western Europe:

Bangladesh was concerned that nearly half of the posts were not subject to geographical distribution and suggested that the Secretariat review posts which might be included in that group; it also urged efforts to restore geographical balance in the General Service category. Romania remarked that the continued imbalance was due in part to the maintenance of a large number of posts not subject to geographical distribution.

Hungary, Mongolia and the Ukrainian SSR argued that one means of achieving equitable geographical distribution would be to reduce the number of permanent contracts and increase the number of fixed-term contracts. The Ukrainian SSR hoped that permanent contracts would be eliminated and said that, until they were, they should not be offered to nationals of over-represented countries. Afghanistan saw permanent contracts as an impediment to recruiting highly qualified professional staff. Bulgaria remarked that, if Member States lost the training and experience of the specialists they supplied to the United Nations, that would represent a new form of brain drain affecting developing countries in particular. The system of permanent appointments perpetuated the under-representation of Eastern Europe, the Byelorussian SSR and Romania said. Czechoslovakia did not believe that reducing the number of permanent

contracts would necessarily lead to a decline in the professional competence of the Secretariat.

Bangladesh, the Syrian Arab Republic and Uganda were also among those favouring fixed-term appointments. Algeria believed that systematic application of a given ratio between permanent and fixed-term contracts might have the effect of excluding certain countries or groups of countries.

On the other hand, Austria believed the majority of contracts should be permanent in view of the need to ensure career development and staff independence. Liberia favoured a balance between the two types of contract so as to ensure responsiveness to changes in priorities and an equitable geographical distribution. Spain said reducing the number of permanent contracts and increasing fixed-term ones would be a blow to the independence of the international civil service and an obstacle to career development.

The Netherlands, opposing discussion of geographical distribution in bodies such as the Committee on Information (p. 366), said it should be considered in relation to the United Nations as a whole and not individual departments.

A number of speakers also commented on recruitment policies and practices (p. 1335) and retirement age (p. 1353) in relation to geographical distribution.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/407; and <sup>(2)</sup>SG comments, Add.1. <sup>(3)</sup>Secretariat Staff Unions and Associations, A/C.5/36/19. S-G, <sup>(4)</sup>A/36/317, <sup>(5)</sup>A/36/495.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(6)</sup>2241 A (XXI), 20 Dec. 1966 (YUN 1966, p. 931); <sup>(7)</sup>35/210, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, P. 1164); <sup>(8)</sup>ibid., sect. II (p. 1165); <sup>(9)</sup>36/80, para. 7, 9 Dec. 1981 (p. 230).

Decision: <sup>(10)</sup>GA: 36/456, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.41, 45, 50-54, 59, 60, 65, 68, 75 (13 Nov.-15 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/456

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/831) without vote. 15 December (meeting 75); draft by Chairmen (A/C.5/36/L.49), orally revised, and orally amended by Canada, by Egypt and by India; agenda item 107 (a).

Application of the principle of equitable geographical distribution

At its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, took note of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the application of the principle of equitable geographical distribution of the staff of the United Nations Secretariat and the comments of the Secretary-General on that report, which took into account the level of progress in implementing that principle, and decided to continue discussion of the subject at its thirty-seventh session.

Employment of women

REPORTS. The Secretary-General, in his September 1981 report on the composition of the

Secretariat,<sup>(3)</sup> described the recruitment of women as a major objective of the Secretariat. Heads of departments and offices had been informed of the need to increase the proportion of women and to offer them equal opportunity in assignments. In addition, efforts had been directed towards increasing the proportion of women in personnel, advisory and administrative boards, while staff rules governing maternity leave and the employment of spouses had been amended to facilitate the employment of female staff.

The proportion of women from Member States in posts subject to geographical distribution rose from 17.7 per cent (473 out of 2,674) on 30 June 1978 to 21.6 per cent (617 out of 2,858) on 30 June 1981. During the reporting year (1 July 1980-30 June 1981), of 294 appointments to posts subject to geographical distribution, 71 (24.4 per cent) were women, as compared with 1979/1980 when, of 269 such appointments, 58 (21.6 per cent) were women. Appointments of women during 1980/1981 included 1 at the Assistant Secretary-General level, 1 at the Principal Officer (D-1) level, 3 at the Senior Officer (P-5) level and 7 at the First Officer (P-4) level.

In a report on integration of women in development (p. 986), transmitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General in September,<sup>(4)</sup> the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) pointed out that the number of women in UNIDO Professional posts was 63 (more than 15 per cent of all Professional staff) by the end of 1980 compared with 50 (less than 13 per cent) at the end of 1979. By the end of 1981, the figure had risen to 66 (15.7 per cent). In May 1981, the Industrial Development Board noted the 1980 percentage increase and stressed the need to accelerate the recruitment of women, particularly at the higher levels and for field activities, taking into account qualifications and equitable geographical distribution.<sup>(2)</sup>

In comments on personnel questions submitted to the Fifth Committee in October,<sup>(1)</sup> the Federation of International Civil Servants' Associations (FICSA) called for increased efforts to recruit women to the Professional category and specific measures to enhance their upward mobility.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 14 December, the General Assembly, in a resolution on equal rights to work,<sup>(6)</sup> expressed concern that women continued to be under-represented in the professional staffs of international organizations, including the United Nations and the specialized agencies, and were not always exempt from discrimination when recruited. The Assembly invited Governments to consider granting work permits for spouses of diplomats and international civil servants. This resolution arose from consideration by the Assembly's Third (Social,

Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee of matters pertaining to the United Nations Decade for Women (1976-1985).

During the Fifth Committee's discussion of the composition of the Secretariat, many States, including Brazil, Guyana, Kuwait, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mongolia, Spain, Suriname, the United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay and Yugoslavia, welcomed the increase in the number of women at all levels in posts subject to geographical distribution and called for more measures to attain the target set by the Assembly in 1978—to have women occupy 25 per cent of all such posts.<sup>(5)</sup> Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian SSR added that such appointments should be in accordance with the principle of geographical distribution, while Japan and Madagascar stressed that, in recruiting more women, particular attention should be paid to under-represented and unrepresented States. Mauritania believed that recruitment of women from over-represented developed countries should be avoided. Morocco said the fact that some States were inadequately represented should take precedence over the recruitment of women.

Brazil considered recruitment of women at the senior level to be unsatisfactory, and Somalia asked that the proportion of female staff in senior posts be sharply increased. Yugoslavia considered that 40 per cent of Professional and higher-level posts should be held by women.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said no significant progress had been made to eliminate discrimination against women in the Secretariat. Malawi urged that due regard be paid to equal pay for equal work and equality of opportunity. Spain stressed the need to facilitate the promotion of women. Sweden, on behalf of the Nordic States, expressed disappointment that the Secretary-General had not submitted a more comprehensive report on the topic. Welcoming the progress made in recruiting women, the United States said there would be even more progress if the Secretary-General and agency heads designated senior officials as co-ordinators to establish policies for the careers of women in the international civil service.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, transmitting FICSA comments, A/C.5/36/26.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>IDB, A/36/16; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/495; <sup>(4)</sup>UNIDO

Executive Director, A/36/470 (transmitted by S-G note).

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(5)</sup>33/143, sect. III, para. 1, 20 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 989); <sup>(6)</sup>36/130, 14 Dec. 1981 (p. 994).

## Personnel questions

Several documents were submitted to the General Assembly during 1981 on a variety of personnel questions affecting United Nations

staff as well as others in organizations participating in the common system of salaries, allowances and other conditions of service followed by the United Nations and most specialized agencies.

The annual report of the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC)<sup>(1)</sup> (p. 1322) dealt with various issues affecting the secretariats of the United Nations system of organizations, including remuneration (p. 1337) and such questions as career development (p. 1325), job classification (p. 1327) and training (p. 1329). A September report of the Secretary-General<sup>(4)</sup> dealt with the composition of the United Nations Secretariat (p. 1316) and described action taken to implement personnel reforms called for by the Assembly in previous years.

Two documents from staff organizations—FICSA<sup>(2)</sup> and the Staff Unions and Associations of the United Nations Secretariat<sup>(3)</sup>—were transmitted to the Fifth Committee by the Secretary-General in October 1981 (p. 1334) in accordance with a December 1980 resolution by which the Assembly reiterated its readiness to receive and consider staff views.<sup>(5)</sup> As provided for under that resolution, FICSA submitted comments in connection with the ICSC report, while the other report dealt with personnel questions affecting the Secretariat. Both documents dealt with career development, remuneration, and the security and independence of the international civil service (p. 1354); the FICSA document also discussed the status of women in the secretariats (p. 1321), while the Secretariat staff paper discussed job classification, promotion from General Service to the Professional category by competitive examination (p. 1328), staff training and staff-management relations (p. 1334).

The Assembly, on 18 December 1981, adopted a resolution on matters arising out of the ICSC report, took procedural decisions on career development and the job classification of language staff (p. 1329), and took action on the United Nations language training programme (p. 1330).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ICSC, A/36/30 & Corr.1; and <sup>(2)</sup>FICSA comments, transmitted by S-G note, A/C.5/36/26. <sup>(3)</sup>Secretariat Staff Unions and Associations, A/C.5/36/19. <sup>(4)</sup>S-G, A/36/495.

Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>35/213, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1196).

## International Civil Service Commission

ICSC ACTIVITIES. The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), established to regulate and co-ordinate conditions of service in the United Nations system and operating under a statute approved by the General Assembly in 1974,<sup>(6)</sup> held two sessions in 1981, at United Nations Headquarters: its thirteenth from 23 February to 13 March and its fourteenth from 6 to 31 July.

Much of the Commission's work, detailed in its report,<sup>(4)</sup> concerned the salaries and allowances of the international civil service (p. 1337). With regard to other personnel issues, it made recommendations to the Assembly and the policy-making bodies of other United Nations organizations concerning career development (p. 1325) - on which it submitted a special study-job classification standards (p. 1327) and staff training (p. 1329). It also reviewed conditions of service of field personnel (p. 1336). At both of its sessions, ICSC continued reviewing its statute and rules of procedure.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 18 December, the General Assembly adopted a three-part resolution<sup>(7)</sup> on the ICSC report. By section I, the Assembly urged all organizations concerned to implement ICSC decisions and act on its recommendations, urged organization heads to report to their governing bodies such proposals as would modify those recommendations and reaffirmed the importance of applying common salary scales for staff in the General Service category (p. 1340). By section II, the Assembly noted the progress made by ICSC in job classification matters and its consideration of staff training. By section III, it requested ICSC to give high priority to the completion of four studies on career development and related questions as well as certain salary and related issues, and listed six other topics for study in regard to salaries and allowances and training.

The resolution was adopted without vote after an orally revised draft, introduced by Barbados and also sponsored by Australia, Belgium and the United Kingdom, had been similarly approved by the Fifth Administrative and Budgetary Committee on 17 December. By one of the revisions, section I, paragraph 1, was changed to urge organizations to act positively on ICSC recommendations in accordance with its statute rather than to respond positively to ICSC recommendations addressed to executive heads of organizations. Another change affected the request for a continued study of comparative compensation (p. 1337). The remaining revisions were drafting changes.

On 7 December, while considering the proposed United Nations programme budget for 1982-1983,<sup>(3)</sup> the Committee approved an additional appropriation of \$427,800 (gross) for ICSC, of which agencies other than the United Nations which shared ICSC expenses were to pay \$220,300. This, added to the initial budget request submitted by the Secretary-General on the Commission's behalf, raised the 1982-1983 budget of ICSC to \$5,770,400 (net).

The addition was requested mainly to add four posts and otherwise strengthen the Cost-

of-Living Section of the ICSC secretariat so that it could improve the methodology of cost-of-living measurements, used in establishing post adjustments. This strengthening had been proposed by ICSC and submitted by the Secretary-General in November as revised budget estimates<sup>(5)</sup> which were endorsed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ). The approved sum also included the cost of a recruitment and training post in the Personnel Policies Division, omitted from the Secretary-General's revised estimates and added at the request of the ICSC Chairman in a letter of 24 November.<sup>(1)</sup> The Fifth Committee approved establishment of this post on an oral proposal by Peru, adopted by 59 votes to 23, with 8 abstentions.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>ICSC Chairman, 24 Nov., A/C.5/36/66.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ACABQ A/36/7Add.9; <sup>(3)</sup>5th. Committee, A/36/845; <sup>(4)</sup>ICSC, A/36/30 & Corr.1; <sup>(5)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/30 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(6)</sup>3357(XXIX), 18 Dec. 1974 (YUN 1974, p. 875); <sup>(7)</sup>36/233, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.31, 34-36, 38, 40, 43, 45, 49, 51, 53, 61, 64, 68, 81 (4 Nov.-17 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/233

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/840) without vote. 17 December (meeting 81); 4-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.43/Rev.1), orally revised; agenda item 108.

Sponsors: Austria, Barbados, Belgium, United Kingdom.

Report of the International Civil Service Commission  
The General Assembly,

Having considered the seventh annual report of the International Civil Service Commission.

Recalling that it established the Commission for the regulation and co-ordination of the conditions of service of the United Nations common system as set forth in article 1 of the statute of the Commission.

Reaffirming the central role of the Commission within the common system in the development of a single unified international civil service through the application of common personnel standards and arrangements,

#### 1

1. Urges all organizations concerned to implement the decisions of the International Civil Service Commission and to act positively on the recommendations of the Commission in accordance with its statute;

2. Urges the executive heads of organizations, after consultation with the Commission, to report to their respective governing bodies such decisions or proposals as would modify the recommendations of the Commission;

3. Supports the efforts of the Commission to promote uniform and co-ordinated action in the common system and calls upon the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, to ensure that adequate measures are taken to this end;

4. Regrets the decision of the International Labour Organisation to adopt only for General Service staff recruited after January 1979 the salary scales recommended by the Commission and to increase from 1 March 1981 by 3 per cent the net salary scale in force for General Service staff in service in 1978 or earlier;

5. Reaffirms the importance of the application of common salary scales, as recommended by the Commission under

article 12 of its statute, for all General Service staff at a particular duty station;

## II

1. Notes the progress made by the International Civil Service Commission under article 13 of Its statute;

2. Notes the Commission's consideration of training as reflected in the relevant sections of Its report;

## III

1. Requests the International Civil Service Commission to give high priority to the completion of the following studies and to report on them to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session:

(a) The broad principles for the determination of conditions of service with particular reference to the concept of career, types of appointment, career development and related questions, taking into account the views expressed by delegations in the Fifth Committee, all related studies and the relevant reports of the Joint Inspection Unit;

(b) The improvement of the comparison of total compensation between the comparator civil service and the International civil service, taking into account all relevant elements, including the level of pensions, but excluding expatriate benefits applicable to staff members in the Professional and higher categories in the comparator civil service;

(c) The fundamental and comprehensive review of the purposes and operation of the post adjustment system with a view to avoiding distortions in the system and ensuring equity;

(d) The elaboration of a special index for pensioners in collaboration with the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board, in accordance with General Assembly decision 35/447 of 17 December 1980;

2. Also requests the Commission to undertake or continue studies on the following questions:

(a) General principles and methodology for surveys to determine the conditions of service of the General Service and other categories of locally recruited staff members, including staff serving at field duty stations;

(b) A review of dependency allowances for all categories of staff and a review of the scope and purpose of the education grant;

(c) Development of Inter-agency co-operation in the field of training with a view to the more efficient and economical use of personnel resources in the common system;

(d) A thorough evaluation, in close collaboration with the organizations, of the utility of current and proposed training activities in the United Nations system, with special reference to management and related training;

(e) A general review of staff assessment for the equitable treatment of all categories of staff at all duty stations;

(f) A comprehensive study of the question of supplementary payments to international civil servants and all related matters.

### Appointment of ICSC members

On 18 December 1981, the General Assembly appointed five persons to a four-year term on ICSC, beginning on 1 January 1982<sup>(47)</sup>, (for a list of the Commission's 15 members, see APPENDIX III). This decision was taken by a recorded vote of 105 to 6 (Australia, Canada, Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States), with 25 abstentions.

The appointees had been recommended by the Fifth Committee on 16 December 1981.<sup>(25)</sup> Two were chosen by acclamation for reappointment—Akira Matsui (Japan) and Antonio

Fonseca Pimentel (Brazil). The three others—Ralph Enckell (Finland), Jean-Claude Fortuit (France) and Helmut Kitschenberg (Federal Republic of Germany)—were selected by ballot. Mr. Fortuit was reappointed and the others were to replace Arthur H. M. Hillis (United Kingdom) and Ersi H. Poston (United States), whose term expired on 31 December 1981.

In accordance with the ICSC statute,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General, as Chairman of the inter-agency Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC), had submitted to the Committee a list of five candidates, drawn up following consultations with Member States, the heads of the other organizations accepting the statute, staff representatives and ACABQ.<sup>(1)</sup> The Secretary-General suggested that four of the current members be reappointed and that Mrs. Poston be succeeded by Richard V. Hennes (United States).

However, on a motion by Finland, the Fifth Committee decided, by 78 votes to 8, with 16 abstentions, to make a selection (by secret ballot) from among the five candidates submitted by the Group of Western European and Other States, including two not on the Secretary-General's list—Mr. Enckell and Mr. Kitschenberg. As a result, those two and Mr. Fortuit, having received the largest number of votes, were recommended, and Mr. Hennes and Mr. Hillis were not.

In the Committee, the Finnish motion to hold a ballot was supported by Chile, Egypt, Fiji, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Indonesia, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Peru, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay. They argued that, as the regional group had submitted five names after having been unable to agree on a list of three, the power to decide whom to appoint rested with the Assembly. Opposing this view were the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States. They contended that it would be contrary to the ICSC statute to vote on candidates whose names had not been submitted by the Secretary-General following consultations.

The opinion of the United Nations Legal Counsel, requested by the United Kingdom and others, was that the Assembly could act only on the names submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with the consultation process provided for in the ICSC statute. If it rejected some or all of those names, it could request the Secretary-General to submit different names after further consultations.

When the Assembly took up the Committee's recommendation, it rejected, by a recorded vote of 46 to 35, with 49 abstentions, a motion by the United States to request the Secretary-General

to compile a new list of candidates for the vacant seats.

Before the United States made its motion, France proposed that the Assembly postpone action on the appointments to enable the Secretary-General to resume consultations. This proposal was supported by Canada and the Netherlands. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Peru, Spain and Venezuela opposed deferral and asked that the Assembly act on the Fifth Committee's recommendation. Spain added that the Secretary-General had not acted correctly in submitting the names of only three candidates from the Group of Western European and Other States, when the Group had submitted five names.

The Legal Counsel, asked by Australia for an opinion, said the only possible interpretation of the Fifth Committee's action was that it rejected the Secretary-General's list and sent the matter back to him for new consultations. The Committee's recommendation, if endorsed by the Assembly, could not produce any final appointments, because that would violate the ICSC statute, which had been accepted by all the organizations belonging to the common system.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/108.

Reprot: <sup>(2)</sup>5th Committee, A/36/546.

Resolution and decision: Res: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 3357(XXXIX), annex, arts. 3 & 4, 18 Dec. 1974 (YUN 1974, p. 876). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/324, 18 Dec. 1981 (no text).

### Career development

An August 1981 report by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) on personnel policy options, prepared by Inspectors Maurice Bertrand and Moustapha Ould Khalifa, was transmitted to the General Assembly in September by the Secretary-General.<sup>(3)</sup>

The report, submitted in response to a December 1980 Assembly request,<sup>(7)</sup> stated that difficulties encountered in dealing with career questions, types of appointment and the definition of occupational groups demonstrated that it was not simply a matter of solving technical problems, but rather that a clarification of all personnel questions involving political choices had become essential. According to the report, the current situation of the international civil service was characterized by: an ideological and political debate on the conception of that service, which had been going on since the founding of the United Nations; the absence of a coherent system for staff management and recruitment, with grave repercussions on staff morale and the effectiveness of secretariats; and repeated efforts at reform yielding only modest results.

The report suggested that the Assembly either accept or reject the idea that negotiation among Member States to determine the proportion of

career staff to fixed-term staff was possible and desirable, and the idea that an overall view of personnel problems was indispensable if the Assembly was to be able to make choices. The definition of a true personnel system would be facilitated, it added, if the Assembly were to give guidance in regard to the career concept, the proportion of career staff to fixed-term staff and types of contract, and the relationship among occupational groups, career paths and recruitment methods.

Commenting on the JIU report in November,<sup>(4)</sup> the Secretary-General conveyed the view of ACC, expressed on 30 October,<sup>(9)</sup> that the personnel policy questions referred to in the report were essentially of the kind on which the organizations must take a co-ordinated approach if the common system was to be maintained and enhanced. Any decisions the Assembly might take, even preliminary ones, would pre-empt development of a common policy responding to the programmes and needs of all organizations. ACC therefore recommended that ICSC and JIU be requested to continue their studies in close collaboration with each other and in full consultation with organization heads and staff representatives.

The study of this subject prepared by ICSC was annexed to its 1981 report to the Assembly.<sup>(1)</sup> The Commission decided that it would not be appropriate for JIU or itself to make any new substantive recommendations to the Assembly in 1981. However, it intended to proceed with a 16-step work plan, on which it had already reached step 9, encompassing studies on career development, recruitment, human resources development and other issues.

The view that any action concerning career structure should be deferred at least until the 1982 session was shared by the Federation of International Civil Servants' Associations (FICSA) in comments transmitted to the Assembly by the Secretary-General in October.<sup>(2)</sup> FICSA added that it believed that all issues raised by the JIU and ICSC reports should be studied at the inter-agency level before any decisions were taken.

The staff organizations of the United Nations Secretariat, in their October report transmitted to the Fifth Committee,<sup>(5)</sup> rejected the JIU recommendations as inimical to an independent and impartial career service. They stressed the need for consulting the staff before far-reaching personnel changes were introduced. They favoured the establishment of a comprehensive career and staff resources planning function, embodying recruitment, job classification, training, and promotion based on merit. To enhance the development of staff members within their profession, the report suggested several steps, including lift-



ing the ban on the use of authors' names in published papers, relaxing regulations on non-recurring outside activities unrelated to United Nations work, greater flexibility in exchanging posts or accepting temporary assignments, creating additional training opportunities, and facilitating greater participation and involvement in work through a more systematic approach to staff consultation and orientation.

At its February/March session, ICSC recommended a set of common procedures for filling vacancies, under which posts would be advertised simultaneously within and outside an organization but would be filled, first, by qualified candidates from within, then from other United Nations organizations and, lastly, from outside the system. It also established a central vacancy-announcement bulletin, which grouped together in one publication descriptions of all vacancies.

In his September report on the composition of the Secretariat,<sup>(6)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that career development objectives were being met through staff placement and reassignment. A computerized roster of internal candidates, expected to be operational in 1982, would facilitate optimum deployment through rapid identification of staff suitable for reassignment. Efforts had been made to link this roster with that of external candidates to establish a unified and comparable data-base for consideration of both external and internal candidates in filling vacancies.

The report also described steps to develop clear and uniform concepts of occupations and occupational groups to be used in recruitment, recruitment planning, rostering of external and internal candidates, career development and staff mobility, organization of recruitment and promotion examinations, training and job classification. Occupational descriptions had been prepared for 14 groups: administration, economics, electronic data processing, engineering and architecture, finance, information, language, legal, library, political affairs, publishing and printing, science and technology, social development, and statistics.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 18 December,<sup>(10)</sup> the General Assembly took note of the ICSC and JIU reports, the Secretary-General's comments and his note transmitting the report of the Secretariat staff organizations. It decided to discuss in 1982 the concept of career, types of appointment, career development and related questions.

The decision was adopted without vote after the Fifth Committee had similarly approved it on 15 December. The text, proposed by the Committee Chairman, incorporated oral drafting changes by him and by Sierra Leone, and an oral

amendment by Canada adding the paragraph by which the Assembly noted the staff organizations' report (p. 1334).

Also on 18 December, the Assembly, in its resolution on ICSC,<sup>(8)</sup> requested that body to give high priority to completion of the study on broad principles for determining conditions of service with particular reference to the concept of career, types of appointment, career development and related questions, taking into account the views expressed by delegations in the Committee and all related studies and JIU reports.

Commenting on this request, the Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management stated that its wording was so comprehensive as to detract from a focus on the study of career development requested by the Assembly in 1980. This comment was endorsed by Algeria. Belgium explained that the wording had been diluted when the sponsors tried to obtain a consensus text for the clause.

In the Fifth Committee discussion of the work of ICSC, a number of States commented on the respective roles of ICSC and JIU in this area. Argentina said the JIU report should be submitted to ICSC before the Assembly considered it. Barbados suggested that, if ICSC and JIU could not resolve their jurisdictional dispute, the Assembly should act in 1982 to set up machinery for that purpose. Belgium thought the divergent views of the two bodies should not be allowed to delay the Assembly's work on such vital matters as personnel policy. Canada believed it useful to refer the questions raised by JIU to the organizations and their staff so that ICSC could take their comments into account when making its recommendations. Ghana said the JIU report should be studied by ICSC, which had a statutory obligation to consult the staff while JIU did not.

The Netherlands remarked that a list of options such as that suggested by JIU should be submitted to Governments only after ICSC and staff organizations had had ample time for their own input. Pakistan said it was unclear that the JIU mandate and statute gave it any role in regard to career concepts, an area in which ICSC had primacy. The United Republic of Cameroon thought the Assembly should take a decision in 1982 after allowing all interested parties to express their views.

On general aspects of career development, Australia commended the ICSC report as a valuable contribution to the establishment of an effective career development system, critical for the continued service of qualified and experienced personnel. Austria stressed the importance of establishing an improved system of career development in which promotion was granted on the basis of merit and not because of political pres-

sure. Finland, speaking for the Nordic States, said career planning by ICSC must be carried out in close co-operation with the organizations and with staff representatives; the Commission had a particularly important role to play in introducing new theoretical knowledge. Japan commended the establishment of a vacancy-announcement system as a positive step to facilitate staff movement between organizations and help identify qualified outside candidates. The United States observed that career development applied equally to the General Service category.

The Ukrainian SSR and the USSR disagreed with the ICSC recommendation that vacancies should be opened first to internal candidates, stating that this would only result in limiting the entry of nationals of inadequately represented countries.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ICSC, A/36/30; and <sup>(2)</sup>FICSA comments, transmitted by S-G note, A/C.5/36/26. <sup>(3)</sup>JIU transmitted by S-G notes: A/36/432 & Add.1; and <sup>(4)</sup>S-G comments, Add.2. <sup>(5)</sup>Secretariat Staff Unions and Associations, A/C.5/36/19. <sup>(6)</sup>S-G, A/36/495.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(7)</sup>35/210, sect. IV, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, 1165); <sup>(8)</sup>36/233, sect. III, para. 1 (a), 18 Dec. 1981 (P. 1324).

18 Dec., text following. Decisions: <sup>(9)</sup>ACC, 1981/17, 30 Oct.; <sup>(10)</sup>GA, 36/457. Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.41, 45, 50-54, 59, 60, 65, 68, 75 (13 Nov.-15 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/457

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/831) without vote. 15 December (meeting 75); draft by Chairman (A/C.5/36/L.49), orally amended by Canada and by Sierra Leone, and orally revised: agenda item 107 (b).

Concept of career, types of appointment, career development and related questions

At its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee:

(a) Took note of the report of the International Civil Service Commission and the report of the Joint Inspection Unit and the comments of the Secretary-General on the report of the Unit;

(b) Decided to discuss at Its thirty-seventh session the subjects of the concept of career, types of appointment, career development and related questions as requested in section IV of its resolution 35/210;

(c) Also took note of the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report submitted by the Staff Unions and Associations of the United Nations Secretariat.

Job classification

In 1981 the United Nations and several specialized agencies put into effect the Master Standard (Tier I) adopted by ICSC in 1980 as the first part of a three-tiered system of job-classification standards.<sup>(5)</sup> The Master Standard incorporated a point-factor rating system to measure the relative importance of jobs. In addition, ICSC promulgated in July the first set of Tier II standards, covering translators and revisers (p. 1329), per-

sonnel management specialists and economists. Tier II described duties and responsibilities at each level within an occupational group, using the rating system of the Master Standard.

In his September 1981 report on the composition of the Secretariat,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that, since 1 January, posts in the Professional category and above, through the Director (D-2) level, were classified according to the Master Standard. With regard to the General Service and related categories in New York, a co-ordination committee, composed of representatives of the administration and staff of the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Children's Fund, had been established to develop job-classification standards to be applied in 1984. All General Service posts at the United Nations Office at Geneva, the Economic Commission for Europe and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development had been tentatively classified by July and completion of the process was expected by year's end.

In its 1981 report,<sup>(1)</sup> ICSC noted with satisfaction the plans by most United Nations organizations to implement the Master Standard as at 1 January. It recommended that responsibility for job classification up to the D-2 level be delegated to organization heads. It also stated that the organizations had insufficient resources to operate proper job-classification systems.

The staff organizations suggested, in their October report for the Fifth Committee,<sup>(2)</sup> that job classification should be flexible enough to allow for changing organizational patterns and programmes and legitimate aspirations for upward mobility.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 18 December, in its resolution on ICSC, the General Assembly noted the progress made by ICSC with regard to job classification.<sup>(4)</sup>

In the Fifth Committee's discussion of the work of ICSC, Algeria stressed the importance of defining occupational groups within which staff could pursue a normal career and said that, in the absence of geographical balance in the Classification Section, there was a danger of arbitrary classifications. Austria said the current job-classification system provided no guarantee that descriptions of posts had been correctly established, that they had not been influenced by the desire to promote the persons occupying the posts and that the posts they described were needed for the work programme. The Byelorussian SSR said the classification system must allow the level of a post to be determined properly; it asked the Secretariat to indicate how many posts had been proposed for upgrading and downgrading. Finland, speaking for the Nordic

States, welcomed the adoption of the Master Standard but said account should be taken of the heterogeneous working conditions in various organizations and flexibility in job classification should be maintained. Malawi thought the proper grading of posts and the existence of promotion prospects could eliminate unnecessary requests for reclassification, which it saw as a commonly used way to promote staff.

The USSR supported the establishment of a job-classification system as a way to improve discipline and regulate job distribution, but said the system should not continue to be complicated by increasing the number of staff dealing with classification and raising administrative costs. The United States said the ICSC recommendation that responsibility for job-classification decisions up to the Director level be delegated to organization heads implied that Member States would no longer be in a position to contain budget growth by controlling personnel classification through the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ICSC A/36/30; <sup>(2)</sup>Secretariat Staff Unions and Associations, A/C.5/36/19; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/495.

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/233, sect. II, para. 1, 18 Dec. (p. 1324).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 1169.

#### Promotion from General Service to the Professional category

In 1981, 48 staff members were promoted to Professional jobs in the Secretariat as a result of the first competitive examination, held in 1979/1980, for the passage of General Service staff and related categories to the Professional category.<sup>(4)</sup> They were chosen from among 750 applicants for the examination, of whom 157 candidates were convoked for interview following a written examination. The results were set forth in the Secretary-General's September 1981 report on the composition of the Secretariat.<sup>(2)</sup> The second examination was held in 1981 and 459 staff sat for it at 12 centres.

United Nations staff organizations, in their October report transmitted to the Fifth Committee,<sup>(1)</sup> expressed concern at the manner in which the results of the 1979 examination had been implemented. They said that orientation and training for the new assignments had been inadequate or non-existent, some staff members had encountered hostility in their new jobs and some posts had been denied to successful candidates. They expressed dissatisfaction with preparations for the 1981 examination, stating that the administration had refused to accept a joint review of its content. They also objected to what they saw as a trend to decrease the number of posts available

for the examination by upgrading them in order to recruit more external candidates at higher levels.

During discussion of personnel questions in the Fifth Committee, Austria stated that organization of the examinations should be improved and inequities in the current promotion procedure eliminated. Barbados hoped it might be possible to develop an internal roster of General Service staff, which might provide an opportunity for making fundamental changes in the competitive examination. Spain, noting that the number of promotions to the Professional category had decreased since the system's introduction, felt that the \$5-million cost could not be justified. Yugoslavia said the modalities for implementing the examination were the Secretary-General's responsibility and experience alone would demonstrate their validity.

The United States felt that the Office of Personnel Services should evaluate the programme to date; it also maintained that staff should be entitled to take the examination after two years (rather than five years) in the General Service category and that a higher percentage of posts should be available for promotion through this means. However, the Ukrainian SSR was opposed to reserving for such promotions more than the current limit of 30 per cent of available posts-established by the General Assembly in 1978<sup>(3)</sup>—and objected to allowing staff without a higher education to take the exam. The latter view was also stated by the USSR. Malawi urged that it be made clear to the administration that the 1978 Assembly resolution on the subject was a directive that must be implemented.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Secretariat Staff Unions and Associations, A/C.5/36/19; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/495.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 33/143, sect. I, para. 1 (g), 20 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 989).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(4)</sup>1980, p. 1159.

#### Job classification and career development of language staff

The Secretary-General, in a September 1981 report on job classification and career development of language staff in the Secretariat,<sup>(2)</sup> described the initial steps in implementing a three-year plan (1981-1983), approved by the Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> for the progressive adjustment of staffing tables of translators, interpreters, verbatim reporters, editors, copy-preparers and proof-readers at Headquarters and Geneva to provide for reclassification of posts and improved career prospects, together with reductions in the number of posts.

The Secretary-General stated that it was too early to provide an analysis of an important element in the plan — the introduction of more insti-

tutionalized "self-revision", whereby a translator produced a final document by translating it and revising the translation instead of sending it to a senior translator for revision. While initial results had been encouraging, the amount of work which could be self-revised during the plan's first three years would depend on the proportion of experienced staff in each language unit who could be entrusted with self-revision. The Secretary-General suggested that, should reviews at offices other than at Headquarters and Geneva indicate the need for reclassifications to ensure equality of treatment, he be permitted to proceed in 1982 and 1983 to the extent that the approved staffing table allowed.

In July 1981, the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) promulgated Tier II grade level standards defining the jobs of translators and revisers throughout the United Nations system, as part of its introduction of a job-classification scheme for the international civil service (p. 1327). In its annual report to the Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> ICSC said it had been placed in a difficult position by the Assembly's 1980 decision endorsing the Secretary-General's proposals to reclassify language posts in the United Nations Secretariat. Though it recognized the United Nations right to change work methods and duties, ICSC affirmed that it was singularly authorized to establish job-classification standards in work common to more than one organization. It requested the United Nations to report to it any post upgradings that could not be justified by the application of ICSC-approved standards.

Speaking in the Fifth Committee, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) said that too little time had elapsed since the introduction of the ICSC Master Standard for job classification to enable ACABQ to study to what extent reclassifications proposed by the Secretariat were consistent with the new system.

The General Assembly took note of the Secretary-General's report on 18 December when it adopted without vote a section of a resolution on questions relating to the programme budget for 1982-1983.<sup>(4)</sup> This action, orally proposed by the Fifth Committee Chairman, had been approved without objection by that Committee on 7 December.

In the Fifth Committee's discussion of this topic, Algeria, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco and the Syrian Arab Republic expressed reservations about the Secretariat's announced intention to abolish posts in the newly expanded Arabic Translation Service (p. 1369 as a consequence of the introduction of self-revision. The Under-Secretary-General for Con-

ference Services and Special Assignments responded that the reduction in posts in the Translation Division would be allocated proportionally among the various services.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ICSC, A/36/30; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/4.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/225, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1195); <sup>(4)</sup>36/235, sect. VIII, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36SR..10, 12-19, 62, 64, 65 (12-22 Oct. & 3-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section VIII

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 7 December (meeting 65): oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 100.

Job classification and career development of language staff [The General Assembly...]

Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the job classification and career development of language staff;

### Staff training

The Secretary-General's September 1981 report on the composition of the Secretariat<sup>(4)</sup> stated that the Staff Development Programme at United Nations Headquarters offered approximately 200 occupational training courses and seminars each year, in addition to the language training programme (p. 1330). During 1981, emphasis had been placed on developing courses to meet specific departmental and organizational needs, on training staff in the General Service and related categories and on developing managerial skills for Professional staff. Between mid-1980 and mid-1981, 1,651 staff had participated in in-house occupational training and 91 in external studies.

At its February/March session,<sup>(2)</sup> ICSC noted the low priority given to training by United Nations organizations, as indicated by an average total staff training expenditure of only 0.39 per cent of overall costs, with 35 Professionals supervising and conducting training programmes for 46,000 staff—a ratio of 1 to 1,300. ICSC recommended that all organizations consider allocating greater resources for training and evaluate training activities to assess their usefulness. In July it instructed its secretariat to study the possible establishment of a common fund for training services.

Information on training activities by United Nations organizations was exchanged at the eighth session of the Sub-Committee on Staff Training, a body of the Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions (Personnel and General Administrative Questions), held at Geneva from 12 to 14 October.<sup>(1)</sup> The Sub-Committee expressed the view that creation of a common fund for training did not seem feasible at that time but it agreed that organizations

should continue sharing the cost of training in which they were jointly interested.

Commenting on training in its October report for the Fifth Committee on personnel questions,<sup>(3)</sup> the staff organizations of the Secretariat maintained that improvement or acquisition of skills beneficial to the Organization should be rewarded and a more flexible attitude towards granting study leave, paid or unpaid, encouraged. Also, adequate funds should be allocated to meet training needs. The staff organizations proposed that guidelines be established on the kind of training and education programmes for which Professional staff might obtain full or partial support from the United Nations and on conditions under which support would be granted.

On 18 December, the General Assembly, in its resolution on ICSC,<sup>(5)</sup> noted that body's consideration of training. The Assembly requested it to study the development of inter-agency co-operation on training with a view to more efficient and economical use of personnel, and to evaluate, in close collaboration with the organizations, the utility of current and proposed training activities in the system, especially management training.

Also on 18 December, the Assembly authorized funding for a training programme for translators/précis-writers at the Economic Commission for Africa (p. 633).

Speaking in the Fifth Committee discussion of the work of ICSC, Finland, on behalf of the Nordic States, said the closed nature of international organizations intensified the need for training. Malawi welcomed the Secretary-General's efforts to organize occupational training courses and management seminars. The United States endorsed the ICSC recommendation that training activities be evaluated in regard to their utility to the organizations and the results they were expected to achieve.

The Byelorussian SSR and the USSR, on the other hand, expressed the view that the United Nations must not become a branch of educational institutions; its recruits should join the Organization after their training had been completed. Hungary said that although training was necessary at the beginning of a staff member's career, it should not become automatic at later stages and the United Nations should not be transformed into a free-of-charge training institution. The Ukrainian SSR thought the ICSC suggestion that additional resources be provided for training implied acceptance of the possibility that the requirement of securing the highest standards of efficiency when recruiting staff would be ignored.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>CCAQ Sub-Committee on Staff Training, ACC/1982/PER/4; <sup>(2)</sup>ICSC. A/36/30; <sup>(3)</sup>Secretariat

Staff Unions and Associations, A/C.5/36/19; <sup>(4)</sup>S-G, A/36/495.  
Resolution: <sup>(5)</sup>GA, 36/233, 18 Dec. (p. 1323).

#### Language training

Decisions were taken in 1981 to improve the language training programme organized at United Nations Headquarters and other major United Nations centres to enhance the language proficiency of Secretariat staff (see below). In addition, the General Assembly, in December, decided to allow staff of the permanent missions of Governments accredited to the United Nations to participate in the programme without charge (p. 1331), and requested further study of a proposal by the Secretary-General to give language teachers the status of staff members (p. 1332).

#### Review of the language training programme

In a June 1981 report reviewing and evaluating the United Nations language training programme for staff members,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General outlined the scope and structure of the programme, described the language proficiency examination, and discussed organizational and administrative aspects. It gave attendance figures of 1,700 per term at United Nations Headquarters and 1,100 at Geneva for courses in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

The report recommended improvements in the programme, including: a decrease in class size at Headquarters to 12-18 students from the current 21 or 22; an increase in teaching hours in each language at all levels; review, completion and harmonization of teaching material and preparation of teachers' manuals; reduction of language proficiency examinations from three to two per year and their revision to ensure that those who passed were fully able to understand and use the language in their official duties; development of additional courses in drafting, correspondence, documentation and conference servicing, open to staff attaining the proficiency level; and increased assistance in pedagogical material and guidance to offices away from Headquarters. Experimentally, it was proposed to carry out these recommendations without adding to the 1982-1983 United Nations budget, by charging a fee to all staff repeating any level, limiting study to one language at a time and setting a maximum of two languages which might be learned free of charge.

The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ), in an October report,<sup>(1)</sup> felt that the Secretary-General's recommendations were consistent with General Assembly objectives on the use of languages in

the Secretariat and recommended their approval. However, it said a fee should not be charged to those repeating a course because of absence from duty attributable to ill-health or to mission assignment of which they were unaware at the time of enrolment. It also recommended that the Secretary-General submit a progress report in early 1983, together with up-to-date and refined statistics.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 18 December, the General Assembly, in its resolution on questions relating to the programme budget for 1982-1983,<sup>(3)</sup> approved the Secretary-General's recommendations on the charging of a fee to repeaters, reducing the number of examinations and limiting study to one language at a time. It endorsed the ACABQ observation that a fee not be charged in certain circumstances and requested the Secretary-General to report in 1983 on the possibility of limiting the number of languages which might be learned free of charge.

This section of the resolution was adopted without vote. On 11 November, the Fifth Administrative and Budgetary Committee had approved the draft without objection as orally proposed by the USSR, incorporating a proposal by Egypt adding the endorsement of the ACABQ observation. Egypt said the Secretary-General should be given latitude to waive the fee when staff were obliged to repeat a class for reasons beyond their control.

Proposing that the Assembly not approve the recommendation to limit to two the number of languages that could be learned free of charge, the USSR said such a step might discriminate against some of the Organization's official languages. This view was endorsed by Algeria, Iraq and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Morocco believed the matter should be studied before a decision was taken.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/7/Add.2; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/2.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/235, sect. II, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 24, 28, 38 (12 Oct.-11 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section II

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 11 November (meeting 38); draft orally proposed, incorporating proposals by Egypt and by USSR; agenda item 100.

United Nations language training programme  
[The General Assembly...]

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the review and evaluation of the United Nations language training programme and the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions,

1. Approves the recommendations made by the Secretary-General in paragraphs 46 (a) to (c) of his report;

2. Endorses the observation contained in paragraph 8 of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to conduct a review for the purpose of exploring the possible quantitative limitations of the number of official languages which may be learned free of charge and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session;

#### Participation by permanent missions

On 18 December 1981, the General Assembly, by a section of its resolution on questions relating to the programme budget for 1982-1983,<sup>(2)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to enable accredited staff of permanent missions of Governments at United Nations Headquarters to participate free of charge in the language training programme from 1 January 1982. This was to be on conditions suggested in a note by the Budget Division:<sup>(1)</sup> that access would be on a first-come, first-served basis with no quota per mission, but limited by available space. The Secretary-General was also requested to adjust the income section of the proposed budget (to compensate for the loss of revenue from fees currently paid by mission personnel) and to report in 1982 on implementation.

This section of the resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 95 to 32, with 11 abstentions. On 16 December, the Fifth Committee had approved the draft, proposed and orally revised by Panama, by a recorded vote, requested by the USSR, of 52 to 30, with 17 abstentions. The revision specified that the decision applied to Headquarters.

The conditions of attendance specified by the Assembly had been defined in one of two options put before the Committee in a note by the Budget Division submitted at the request of Panama.<sup>(1)</sup> The cost of this option was estimated at \$106,000 in 1982-1983, due to abolition of fees based on the 1981 enrolment of 390 mission personnel. Under the other option, mission staff would not be limited to enrolment on a space-available basis but would be able to enrol free of charge upon demand, on the same basis as Secretariat staff. It was estimated that this would have resulted in a doubling of enrolment by mission personnel, requiring additional classes, teachers, staff, equipment and classrooms at a cost of \$281,600, not counting the revenue loss.

Panama, the sponsor of the Assembly's decision, remarked that the benefits it would provide to delegations, particularly those from developing countries experiencing economic difficulties, would be important for the work of the United Nations.

A number of delegations explained their negative votes. The USSR said the Committee did not have the right to use the United Nations budget to pay for free language training for

mission staff. Belgium, Ghana, the United Kingdom and the United States said that such training was the responsibility of Member States. The Netherlands cautioned that approval might pave the way for requests for further privileges.

India abstained because it was not convinced that the draft represented a proper cause. Morocco said its abstention was out of a sense of decency since its mission would have been a main beneficiary. (Both these States voted in favour in the Assembly.)

Explaining their votes in favour, Guinea, Sierra Leone (which abstained in the Assembly) and Uruguay said language training was needed in part because many United Nations documents were not issued simultaneously in all languages. Algeria said it had voted affirmatively in the light of arguments by developing countries. Pakistan believed that enabling delegation members to avail themselves of the United Nations language training programme was consistent with the Organization's objectives, as it would facilitate the missions' work.

During the Committee's discussion, Egypt said mission staff should be given the opportunity, as an experiment, to receive language training within available resources-initially at Headquarters and then, if the experiment was successful, at other United Nations offices. Yugoslavia expressed the view that, as Governments paid for the language training programme, their missions' staff should be allowed access to the classes; if not, Secretariat staff should be required to pay for their tuition.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>Budget Division, A/C.5/36/109.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA. 36/235, sect. XVII. 18 Dec.. text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR. 10, 12-19, 38, 79 (12-22 Oct., 11 Nov. & 16 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section XVII

95-32-11 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) by recorded vote (52-30-17).

16 December (meeting 79); draft by Panama (A/C.5/36/L.47), orally revised: agenda item 100.

Access to the language training programme by accredited staff of permanent missions at Headquarters

[The General Assembly...]

Taking note of the note by the Secretariat and of the related oral report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

1. Requests the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps to enable the accredited staff of permanent missions to participate free of charge in the language training programme at Headquarters from 1 January 1982, on the conditions set forth in option (a) in the note by the Secretariat;

2. Also requests the Secretary-General to make the relevant adjustments in income section 2 of the proposed programme budget and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of this section of the present resolution:

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States,

Abstaining: Bahamas, Brazil, Burma, Colombia, Fiji, Malaysia, Romania, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago,

### Status of language teachers

In a December 1981 report on the contractual status of language teachers at Headquarters,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General proposed that 20 teachers be given renewable one-year appointments as United Nations staff members, entitling them to pension and other benefits which they were not receiving under their current Teacher Employment Agreements. Part-time teachers, numbering 21 as of July, would continue to be paid on an hourly basis. An additional appropriation of \$154,400 for 1982-1983 would be required to implement these proposals, the report added.

The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ)<sup>(1)</sup> said it could not support the proposals until other alternatives had been examined and before the system-wide implications of granting staff-member status had been examined by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC). Therefore, ACABQ recommended that the General Assembly postpone a decision until additional information and the recommendations of ICSC had been received.

On 18 December, the Assembly, by a section of its resolution on questions relating to the programme budget for 1982-1983,<sup>(3)</sup> endorsed the ACABQ recommendations and requested ICSC and the Secretary-General to report to it in 1982.

This section of the resolution was adopted without vote. On 16 December the Fifth Committee had approved the draft without objection as orally proposed by its Chairman, after the USSR had suggested that the Assembly adopt the ACABQ recommendation. The proposal was modified by Algeria to add that ICSC should report in 1982.

In the Fifth Committee, the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services ex-

pressed concern at the consequences of deferring a decision, stating that the proposal to convert language teachers to staff-member status had been advanced after two years of discussion with the teachers and staff representatives, and would benefit the language training programme. Alternative forms of pension coverage could be more costly to the United Nations in future.

The Secretary-General's position was endorsed by Algeria, Egypt, India, Kuwait and Yugoslavia, which stressed the human aspects of the problem. In support of the ACABQ recommendations, the USSR favoured seeking the views of ICSC, while the United States said that giving the teachers staff-member status for an intermittent job would make it more difficult to adjust staffing needs to training requirements.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/7/Add.18; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/67.  
Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/235, sect. XV, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 78 (12-22 Oct. & 16 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section XV

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 16 December (meeting 78); oral proposal by Chairman, based on ACABQ recommendation (A/36/7/Add.18, orally modified by Algeria): agenda item 100.

Contractual status of language teachers at Headquarters  
[The General Assembly...]

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the contractual status of language teachers at Headquarters and the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

1. Endorses the recommendations contained in the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;

2. Requests the International Civil Service Commission and the Secretary-General to consider this matter and report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

## Other personnel questions

### Proposed day-care services at UN Headquarters

The General Assembly, in December 1981, endorsed a recommendation for a study of alternatives to a proposal by the Secretary-General that the United Nations help finance a proposed child-care centre at Headquarters to provide day-care services to children of staff members and others associated with the United Nations.

The Secretary-General's proposal was made in a December report<sup>(2)</sup> as a follow-up to a similar proposal in 1980<sup>(6)</sup> and an Assembly request for a new study.<sup>(3)</sup> The 1981 report called for a centre to accommodate 120 children between 1 and 5 years of age, located in rented space in the second United Nations Development Corporation building (DC-2) being built to provide additional office space for the United Nations be-

tween East 44th and 45th Streets, across United Nations Plaza from the main Headquarters complex. The centre, administered by a board of directors composed of United Nations officials and parents, would serve the children of staff of United Nations organizations at Headquarters and of the permanent missions of Governments accredited there.

The Secretary-General estimated the cost of the centre during its first two years (1982-1983) at \$1,307,000, excluding direct operating costs of some \$418,300 a year to be met through tuition and fund raising. The \$1.3 million included \$804,300 in construction costs, which he proposed that the Assembly appropriate from the United Nations budget, and \$332,700 in space occupancy and other indirect operating costs, which he said could be absorbed within existing appropriations.

After studying this proposal, ACABQ submitted a report<sup>(1)</sup> in which it concluded that the centre's cost-nearly \$7,000 a year for each child-would be too high, and that the provision of day care for 120 children in a United Nations community of 7,000 staff and many more mission officials would cover only a fraction of those potentially eligible. It also thought that potential income from fund raising should not be relied upon to cover operating deficits. Considering the small number of children, other alternatives should be explored, such as payment of a day-care allowance on a graduated scale to all eligible staff or arrangements with existing day-care facilities near Headquarters, ACABQ said.

On 18 December, the General Assembly, in a section of its resolution on questions relating to the programme budget for 1982-1983,<sup>(5)</sup> took note of both reports and endorsed the ACABQ recommendations. This section of the resolution was adopted without vote. On 16 December, the draft had been approved by the Fifth Committee without objection, as orally proposed by its Chairman.

In the Fifth Committee, Costa Rica reiterated its support for the establishment of a child-care centre at Headquarters and expressed regret that the current proposal was regarded as too costly. Sweden, on behalf of the Nordic States, observing that the establishment of such a centre would substantially improve opportunities for women to contribute to the United Nations, expressed regret that it had not been possible to mobilize sufficient support for the proposal and suggested that the matter of a subsidy for child-care expenses be referred to ICSC. The latter proposal was endorsed by Belgium, which proposed that ICSC review dependency allowances for all categories of staff, including the possibility of subsidizing child-care expenses, and review the scope and purpose of the education grant



(p. 1342). This proposal, without the reference to a subsidy for child-care expenses, was included in the Assembly resolution of 18 December on the work of ICSC.<sup>(4)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ A/36/7/Add.19; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/73.  
Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/217, sect. XX, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, 1246); <sup>(4)</sup>36/233, sect. III, para. 2 (b), 18 Dec. 1981 (p. 1324); <sup>(5)</sup>36/235, sect. XVI, 18 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1980, p. 1244.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 78 (12-22 Oct. & 16 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section XVI

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 16 December (meeting 78): oral proposal by Chairman: agenda item 100.

Establishment of a child-care centre at Headquarters  
[The General Assembly...]

Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the establishment of a child-care centre at Headquarters, and of the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

Endorses the recommendations of the Advisory Committee as contained in its report;

#### Amendments to the Staff Rules

In October 1981, the Secretary-General reported to the General Assembly<sup>(1)</sup> on amendments made to the Staff Rules during the year. These changes reflected decisions of the Assembly taken in December 1980 on pensionable remuneration, the education grant and home leave travel,<sup>(2)</sup> and also included revised salary and benefit schedules and rules on matters within the Secretary-General's authority.

On 18 December, the General Assembly took note of this report by a decision adopted without vote.<sup>(3)</sup> On 15 December, the draft had been similarly approved by the Fifth Committee, as proposed by its Chairman.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/9.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 35/214 A and B, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, pp. 1175 & 1177). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/458, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.41, 45, 50-54, 59-60, 65, 75 (13 Nov.-15 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly decision 36/458

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/831) without vote, 15 December (meeting 75): draft by Chairman (A/C.5/36/L.49); agenda item 107 (b).

#### Amendments to the Staff Rules

At its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, took note of the report of the Secretary-General on amendments to the Staff Rules.

#### Staff-management relations

A Secretariat-wide Staff-Management Coordinating Committee, established in June

1980<sup>(3)</sup> and composed of representatives of both administration and staff, held its second (June) and third (September) sessions in 1981. It considered amendments to the Staff Regulations and Rules to reflect the structure of staff representation and staff-management relations. Other items on its agenda concerned the rights and obligations of staff representatives and the facilities to be provided to them, part-time employment, competitive examinations for promotion from the General Service to the Professional category (p. 1328) and the performance evaluation system. In his September 1981 report on the composition of the Secretariat,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that the Committee had already proven to be a useful and important forum.

Commenting on staff-management relations, the Secretariat staff organizations stated, in their October report for the Fifth Committee,<sup>(1)</sup> that a fundamental reorientation of those relations was required to bring them into line with accepted international standards for the public service as defined by the International Labour Organisation (ILO). Stating that there was growing discontent with the consultation system, the staff organizations advocated negotiation, since they considered consultation to be paternalistic, outmoded and leaving too much scope for unilateral decision-making.

In the Fifth Committee's discussion of personnel questions, India stated that ILO conventions were not designed for the international civil service and it was for the General Assembly to decide on their applicability to the Professional and higher categories. The USSR expressed concern over the establishment of the Co-ordination Committee, stating that its power to make proposals affecting the nature of relations between the staff and the Secretary-General would mean an unacceptable change in the Assembly's role. Yugoslavia expressed the view that the Fifth Committee should not become an arbiter or engage in negotiations between the staff and the Secretary-General, who bore exclusive responsibility for personnel policies.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Secretariat Staff Unions and Associations, A/C.5/36/19; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/495.  
Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 1191.

#### Staff representation in the Fifth Committee

Two documents prepared by staff organizations (p. 1322) -the Federation of International Civil Servants' Associations (FICSA)<sup>(1)</sup> and the Staff Unions and Associations of the United Nations Secretariat<sup>(2)</sup>—were introduced in the Fifth Committee by representatives of the organizations. The Committee invited them to do so in accordance with a December 1980 resolution in which the General Assembly decided

that the Committee might invite one representative from each of these two groups for that purpose.<sup>(3)</sup>

The decision to invite the FICSA representative was taken on 10 November by 44 votes to 16, with 32 abstentions. The motion to this effect was made by New Zealand and was put to the vote at the request of the USSR. The FICSA representative addressed the Committee on 12 November.

On 13 November, the Committee decided without discussion or vote, on a motion by Sweden, to invite a representative of the Secretariat staff organizations to introduce their report on personnel questions. The representative addressed the Committee on 23 November.

Voicing their objections to the invitation to a FICSA representative, the German Democratic Republic, Morocco, the USSR and Viet Nam said staff representatives had already had the opportunity to present their position to the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) and, under the Charter of the United Nations, the Secretary-General represented the staff in the Fifth Committee. Also voting against, Kenya would have preferred the Committee to begin its discussion before deciding whether to invite a FICSA representative. Yugoslavia said it did not see why the matter was being raised again after a decision had been taken in 1980. The Bahamas said its negative vote, based on juridical and practical reasons, did not imply insensitivity to staff issues.

Among those abstaining, Brazil said it was not convinced of the need for an oral presentation, while Japan feared that an invitation to FICSA might discourage it from good-faith participation in the work of ICSC.

In favour of extending an invitation, Egypt thought the action was in accordance with the fundamental principles of democracy, while Guyana said it supported staff access to the Committee out of respect for their concerns and because they could contribute to the Committee's decision-making. Peru said an oral statement was the only way the Committee could obtain clarification of the written document. The United Kingdom (for the European Community members) and the United Republic of Cameroon said an oral statement would be a useful supplement to the FICSA document; the latter added that the invitation should not constitute a precedent. Though voting in favour, Argentina thought it premature for the Committee to determine whether an oral statement was desirable.

The Assembly, in its decision of 18 December on career development,<sup>(4)</sup> took note of the Secretary-General's note containing the views of the Secretariat staff organizations. This provision

was originally proposed orally by the Fifth Committee Chairman as a separate draft decision to have the Assembly take note of the staff views as contained in the organizations' report. However, the USSR, supported by Morocco, objected to taking note of staff views, on the ground that only the Secretary-General had the authority to put forward views to the Assembly. Belgium, India and Sri Lanka recalled that the Assembly had authorized the staff to submit their views. The Committee then approved a proposal by Canada, accepted by the USSR, to include the reworded version of the Chairman's proposal in the decision on career development.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>FICSA comments, transmitted by S-G note, A/C.5/36/26; <sup>(2)</sup>Secretariat Staff Unions and Associations, A/C.5/36/19.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/213 para. 3, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1196). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/457, para. (c), 18 Dec. 1981 (p. 1327).

#### Recruitment of Professional staff

The Secretariat's Professional staff recruitment policies were outlined in the Secretary-General's September 1981 report on the composition of the Secretariat.<sup>(1)</sup> Recruitment planning, the report said, was the primary means used to achieve a staff which met the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity and whose members were equitably distributed by nationality and sex. Such planning included vacancy projection, recruitment monitoring, vacancy announcement and publicity, and the establishment of pools of suitable candidates by occupational group.

The first annual work plan of recruitment mandated by the Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> was to cover 1982, during which some 270 posts would be open for recruitment, the report stated. The plan's target was to fill at least 40 per cent of all vacancies arising in posts subject to geographical distribution during 1981-1982 by nationals of unrepresented and under-represented Member States (p. 1317), and to increase the number of women in these posts to 25 per cent by the end of 1982 (p. 1321).

The report stated that, when posts subject to geographical distribution became vacant, candidates recruited from outside were, whenever possible, of another nationality. However, replacement by the same nationality was permitted in respect of Member States whose nationals served primarily on a fixed-term basis.

According to the report, the roster of external candidates continued to be improved and modernized. For P-1 and P-2 (entry-level Professional) posts, examinations were held in April 1981 in France and Japan.

During the debate in the Fifth Committee on personnel questions, Austria, the Federal Repub-

lic of Germany, Japan, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon stressed the importance of competitive examinations for the recruitment of junior Professional staff. To improve this procedure, Japan suggested that future examinations be administered by a single United Nations office, that questions be designed to test potential ability and language proficiency rather than knowledge of minor details about the United Nations system, and that decisions on the appointment of successful candidates be accelerated. However, Algeria and Mauritania were concerned that such examinations might adversely affect the qualitative representation of developing or under-represented countries.

Brazil, Spain and Suriname welcomed plans to organize examinations in their countries, but Spain deplored the fact that they were aimed exclusively at recruitment at the P-2 level rather than at P-3 and P-4. On the other hand, the United Republic of Cameroon believed it inadvisable at the current stage to consider using examinations for recruitment above the P-2 level, though it thought the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) should analyse the system of competitive exams in several years' time.

The Central African Republic urged a new recruitment policy, including semi-annual publication of all vacancy notices to be valid for several months, recruitment missions to inadequately represented States and a streamlined recruitment procedure. Greece, stating that recruitment criteria laid down by the Assembly in 1980 were not always taken into consideration, urged closer co-operation in recruitment procedures between the Office of Personnel Services and other United Nations services. Hungary and Mauritania asked for steps to shorten and simplify recruitment and appointment. India suggested a study of the feasibility of drawing up a medium-term recruitment plan that would be integrated into the United Nations medium-term plan and the programme planning and budgeting process.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya hoped further efforts would be made to announce vacancies well ahead of the time set for recruitment. The USSR, supporting efforts to establish an annual recruitment plan, said it should give figures for recruitment from unrepresented and under-represented countries and a description of the kind of candidates being sought, and should be sent to all permanent missions of Member States to the United Nations.

Bangladesh, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico and the Syrian Arab Republic endorsed a recommendation of JIU, in its report on geographical distribution of the Secretariat (p. 1318), that recruitment procedures be expanded by issuing

vacancy announcements not only within the Secretariat but also externally.

Report: ("S-G, A/36/495.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 35/210, annex, sect. II, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1166).

#### Field personnel

As authorized by the General Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), at its February/March 1981 session,<sup>(1)</sup> approved criteria for use in designating field offices of the United Nations system where, by virtue of conditions of life and work, staff would qualify for accelerated home leave travel on 12- and 18-month cycles (instead of the usual 24 months), additional education grant travel for their children and, at the most difficult duty stations, financial incentives. The financial incentives, in the form of a higher assignment allowance, were \$1,200 a year for a staff member in the Professional or higher category outside his or her home country not accompanied by a dependent spouse and \$2,400 for a similar staff member accompanied by a dependent spouse or child. Decisions on the applicability of these benefits at particular duty stations took effect from 1 January 1981, at a cost which ICSC estimated at \$1,150,000 for the United Nations system as a whole in 1981.

In July, the Commission authorized its Chairman to designate duty stations, from which the Secretary-General had ordered the evacuation of dependants, as qualifying for home leave travel on a 12-month cycle, and to promulgate entitlements for new duty stations. Also in July, ICSC requested information on the use of local or national Professionals so that the question could be considered in 1982.

Commenting on the topic in its document on personnel questions transmitted to the Fifth Committee in October,<sup>(2)</sup> the Federation of International Civil Servants' Associations (FICSA) expressed disappointment that ICSC had not thoroughly reviewed conditions of service of all categories of field staff, including local recruits.

In the Fifth Committee's discussion of the work of ICSC, Japan welcomed the ICSC decision to survey all field offices every three years from the standpoint of conditions of service and asked the Commission to include in its report a statement of general trends. The USSR said it did not understand why ICSC was making a study which could only lead to higher salaries for staff in the field, who were already guaranteed a sufficiently high living standard.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ICSC, A/36/30; and <sup>(2)</sup>FICSA comments, transmitted by S-G note, A/C.5/36/26.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/214 A, 'sect. IV, para. 4, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1176).

## Salaries, allowances and pensions

### Salaries

ICSC CONSIDERATION. During 1981, ICSC examined various aspects of the salary system governing staff in the United Nations system, including the application of the Noblemaire principle- whereby international civil service salaries in the Professional and higher categories were based on the salary levels of the highest paying comparable national civil service- and made several related observations.

Margin of remuneration. ICSC continued to review the relationship between salary levels of the United Nations common system and the United States civil service, the comparator service used as a reference point for United Nations salaries. These comparisons- made annually between United Nations staff in New York at levels P-1 through D-2 and United States civil servants at corresponding levels in Washington, D. C.- were based on the net pay of officials with a dependent spouse but no children, adjusted for the cost-of-living difference between the two cities and averaged over 12 months (1 October-30 September). United Nations salary figures included post adjustment, the salary supplement used to compensate for cost-of-living changes and differences between duty stations.

ICSC found that the margin by which United Nations salaries exceeded those of the United States Government had widened from a ratio of 116.0 in 1979/1980 to 117.8 in 1980/1981 (United States civil service salaries = 100), due principally to the fact that salary increases of United States civil servants on 1 October 1980 had lagged behind movement in the cost of living. The total compensation ratio adjusted for cost-of-living differences was 114.2, however.

Comparison of total compensation. With regard to the methodology for comparing total compensation of the two services- covering salary and allowances and fringe benefits such as pensions and health and life insurance subsidies- ICSC pointed out that the methodology it had developed was highly complex, requiring a large number of parameters and large amounts of data for processing through computerized comparison models. It requested the General Assembly to note that some doubts had been expressed by the organizations and staff concerning the use of the methodology and some of the assumptions employed, that the matter would be kept under review by ICSC and that further improvements in methodology would be made.

Study of the highest paid civil service. ICSC continued its study, begun in 1979,<sup>(10)</sup> into whether the

United States civil service should remain the comparator for United Nations salaries. After preliminary examination of data from the Federal Republic of Germany, it found there was no evidence to suggest that the United States civil service should be replaced as the comparator.

Salary level. Reiterating a request it had made three years previously, FICSA proposed an interim salary increase of 10 per cent for Professional and higher-level staff pending completion of the ICSC studies. However, ICSC said it could not support this proposal as the current trend had been towards a widening of the margin between United Nations salaries and those of the United States civil service. FICSA repeated its request in October in its document on personnel questions for the Fifth Committee.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), on 14 April, asked former Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management George F. Davidson to review all aspects of the question.<sup>(7)</sup> On 30 June, ACC referred the matter to its Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions (CCAQ) for urgent consideration.<sup>(8)</sup> On 30 October,<sup>(9)</sup> ACC adopted a statement saying that it continued to view with concern the erosion in the purchasing power of Professional salaries but was not in a position at that time to propose an increase. It informed the Fifth Committee that it supported continuation of the ICSC studies, including extension of its work on the methodology for total compensation to include expatriate benefits (allowances paid to officials working away from their home country).

Post adjustment Responding to a December 1980 Assembly request to present the results of its review of the post adjustment system at the Assembly's 1981 session,<sup>(4)</sup> ICSC provided details of studies completed with the aid of its Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions, which held its sixth session in Paris from 11 to 25 May. Although much progress had been made towards improving the methodology for cost-of-living measurement surveys, ICSC said, further work remained to be done on this and other aspects of the post adjustment system, which would be reported to the Assembly in 1982. At the Commission's request, the Assembly approved additional funds to strengthen the Cost-of-Living Section of the ICSC secretariat for 1982-1983 so that it could improve the methodology of cost-of-living measurements (p. 1323).

Supplementary payments by Governments. As requested by the Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(5)</sup> ICSC kept under review the matter of supplementary payments made by some Governments to certain of their nationals in the international civil service. After seeking information from the

Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and the United States, ICSC recalled its 1980 recommendation that the Assembly call to the attention of all Member States that such payments were unnecessary, inappropriate, undesirable and inconsistent with staff regulations.<sup>(11)</sup>

Conditions of service in the General Service category. ICSC continued its study of a general methodology for surveys of best prevailing conditions of employment in cities housing United Nations offices, to be used in determining salaries and allowances for General Service and other locally recruited workers. After receiving detailed proposals by its secretariat, it decided, at the request of CCAQ and FICSA, to defer the item to 1982.

After carrying out a survey of the best prevailing conditions of employment at Vienna, Austria, ICSC recommended new salary scales with increases averaging 3.3 per cent for General Service staff and 4.7 per cent for manual workers. It also considered problems which had arisen in the implementation of scales it had recommended in 1980 for Geneva (p. 1340).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In its resolution of 18 December 1981 on the work of ICSC,<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Commission to give high priority to completing four studies and to report on them to the Assembly in 1982. Two of these studies concerned salary issues: improving the comparison of total compensation between the comparator civil service and the international civil service, taking into account all elements including pensions but excluding expatriate benefits applicable to Professional and higher-category staff in the comparator civil service; and a comprehensive review of the purposes and operation of the post adjustment system with a view to avoiding distortions and ensuring equity. The Assembly also requested ICSC to study three other salary-related topics: principles and methodology for surveys on conditions of service of General Service and other locally recruited staff, a general review of staff assessment (p. 1341) and supplementary payments by Governments to international civil servants.

The request for continued study of the total compensation comparison was orally revised by the sponsors to exclude expatriate benefits paid to United States civil servants working in foreign countries. Commenting on this change, the ICSC Chairman recalled that ACC had specifically asked the Commission to include expatriate benefits in the comparison, whereas the text as revised would have the Commission include only those expatriate benefits paid to the international civil service. The Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management said it seemed essential for ICSC, at

some stage, to assess expatriate benefits as part of its overall review of the adequacy of Professional remuneration.

In regard to the provision on supplementary payments, Barbados, in introducing the draft resolution in the Fifth Committee, suggested that, to enable the Assembly to take meaningful decisions, ICSC should provide information on whether other States made such payments and whether they had been made by Governments only to their nationals.

In another action on 18 December, the Assembly decided not to appropriate funds for a proposed salary increase for staff in the General Service category at Geneva (p. 1340).

Various salary issues were commented on by speakers in the Fifth Committee's discussion of the work of ICSC.

A number of speakers expressed concern at the increasing margin between international civil service salaries and those of the United States as the comparator national civil service. Egypt said the two scales should be harmonized within a definite but reasonable time-limit. The Ukrainian SSR saw no reason to maintain such a wide margin. On the other hand, Brazil observed that the increase in the margin had been due to the fact that salaries of the United States civil service had not risen enough to offset inflation fully.

Regarding comparisons of total compensation, the Bahamas suggested that ICSC consider whether the benefits to be expected from the comparison were proportionate to the expenditure entailed by the highly sophisticated methodology adopted. Belgium urged ICSC to submit recommendations on ways to ensure that the margin between total compensation in the two civil services remained reasonable. Finland, speaking for the Nordic States, said it was important to continue to compare and develop new ideas to test the Noblemaire principle, including the possibility of a broader definition of living conditions for comparison purposes.

Spain stated that the study must not lead to unjustified and inflationary salary increases. The Ukrainian SSR welcomed continued work on this topic by ICSC but did not concur with its request for an additional \$350,000 for the purpose a request on which the Assembly took no action. The USSR questioned the exclusion from the comparison of the appreciable expatriate benefits paid to United Nations staff serving away from their home country, and urged that the results of the study be submitted to the Assembly in 1982.

Australia commended ICSC for its restraint in turning down the application for a 10 per cent increase in Professional salaries. Belgium, Ghana,

Hungary and the United States also supported the ICSC decision or opposed the FICSA request; Ghana added that ICSC, when considering such questions in future, should take the world economic crisis into account.

The Bahamas accepted the FICSA argument that the most recent base salary increase approved by the Assembly in 1974 with effect from 1975<sup>(3)</sup> had not fully compensated for the erosion in purchasing power since the previous adjustment, but could not accept other FICSA arguments, such as the idea that the salary slippage had made it increasingly difficult to recruit staff of the requisite calibre. The Netherlands, while not referring specifically to the proposed increase, said staff representatives must pay due regard to the financial realities limiting the organizations' capacity to satisfy their demands. Pakistan said it could not support the proposal for a 10 per cent increase but was prepared to consider salary increases if there was convincing evidence that United Nations salaries had declined in real terms. The Ukrainian SSR viewed the proposal as totally unjustified. The USSR opposed the proposal and hoped FICSA would be more responsible and realistic in future.

Argentina hoped ICSC would propose solutions to the Assembly in 1982 regarding post adjustment, which was of fundamental importance because of its financial implications. Australia thought that the review of post adjustment should be given even higher priority and that anomalies in allowances between high- and low-cost areas should be resolved urgently.

Pakistan said it would be disappointed if ICSC did not come to grips with the central issue of possible anomalies in the post adjustment indices for New York, Geneva and Vienna. Spain urged ICSC to improve the methods for determining cost-of-living differences for post adjustment purposes. The Ukrainian SSR thought ICSC should try to improve cost-of-living surveys; it expressed concern that field surveys were sometimes conducted by "independent persons" who often had close ties with embassy personnel and other expatriates. The USSR said the delay in producing the ICSC study was inadmissible in view of the serious deficiencies in the current system that led to excessive cost-of-living payments; it thought Member States rather than staff should monitor the preparation of cost-of-living indices in order to avert unjustified expenditures.

Regarding the determination of the highest-paid national civil service, Belgium, Ghana and Sierra Leone questioned the wisdom of investing ICSC time and resources in what Ghana called a peripheral problem. Brazil suggested that ICSC

examine as alternatives the totally different conclusions reached in comparison studies by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, Somalia, citing recruitment difficulties and supplementary payments by some Governments, questioned the ICSC conclusion that there was no evidence to suggest that the United States civil service should be replaced as the comparator. Spain supported the continued study by ICSC of whether a civil service other than that of the United States should be chosen as the comparator. The Ukrainian SSR deplored the position of FICSA on this subject and stated that the ICSC comparison supported its conclusion that there was no reason to change the civil service used as the comparator.

Referring to supplementary payments received by some staff from their Governments, Barbados hoped ICSC would submit recommendations that would provide a realistic chance of ending such payments or establishing an acceptable method of meeting the special difficulties of certain States. Egypt said it opposed any privileged or discriminatory treatment of a kind that might compromise the independence or integrity of the international civil service. India viewed such payments as enabling Governments to wield influence over staff. The Netherlands described the practice as unnecessary and dangerous because it could impair the independence of the international civil servant. Pakistan suggested that officials seconded from government service might be given a lump-sum payment prior to their entry into the United Nations system, thereby safeguarding both the special interests of their countries and the impartial character of the international civil service.

The USSR viewed the Commission's work on supplementary payments as neither useful nor a matter of priority. The Bahamas, on the other hand, suggested that ICSC keep the matter under review.

With regard to General Service salaries, the USSR said one of the reasons why unjustified increases had been granted in the past was the selection of foreign or private companies for local salary comparisons in preference to entities which performed work comparable to that of international organizations.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ICSC, A/36/30 & Corr.1; and <sup>(2)</sup>FICSA comments, transmitted by S-G note, A/C.5/36/26.

Resolutions and decisions:

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>3358 A (XXIX), 18 Dec. 1974 (YUN 1974, p. 889); <sup>(4)</sup>35/214 A, sect. I, para. 2, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1176); <sup>(5)</sup>35/214 C, 17 Dec. 1980 (ibid., p. 1177); <sup>(6)</sup>36/233, sect. III, 18 Dec. 1981 (p. 1324).

Decisions: ACC: <sup>(7)</sup>1981/5, 14 Apr.; <sup>(8)</sup>1981/11, 30 June; <sup>(9)</sup>1981/20, 30 Oct.

Yearbook references: <sup>(10)</sup>1979, p. 1167; <sup>(11)</sup>1980, p. 1167.

## Salaries of the General

## Service category at Geneva

In its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> ICSC pointed out that, following its 1980 survey of best prevailing employment conditions for staff of the General Service category at Geneva, six of the seven organizations there (United Nations, World Health Organization, International Telecommunication Union, World Meteorological Organization, World Intellectual Property Organization, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) were implementing new salary scales recommended by ICSC retroactive to 1 March 1980. However, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) had adopted the recommended scale for staff recruited after 1 January 1979 but, with effect from 1 March 1981, had granted a 3 per cent net salary increase to ILO staff in service since 1978 or earlier. The pay of all General Service staff of organizations at Geneva had remained unchanged since a lower scale recommended by ICSC—averaging 17 per cent less than the then current rates—went into effect on 1 January 1978,<sup>(6)</sup> and was to remain at that level until inflation lifted salaries enough to overcome the difference between scales.

Stating that the ILO action had minimized if not disregarded the objective of a single international civil service with common salary scales, ICSC called on organization heads and staff representatives, and recommended that the Assembly call on Member States, to foster development of a single, unified international civil service and to enable ICSC to carry out its mandate.

In a note to the Fifth Committee in October,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General stated that he and the heads of the Geneva-based organizations other than ILO, concluding that equitable treatment of staff was of paramount importance, had decided to grant comparable increases effective 1 March 1981 to staff to whom the higher, pre-1978 scale had once applied. He estimated the cost of the increases to the United Nations at \$903,400 for 1981 and \$1,084,000 for the 1982-1983 biennium.

The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, in a November report,<sup>(2)</sup> expressed the belief that preservation of the common system and equity for the staff did not require the organizations to follow the lead of any one of them which unilaterally deviated from accepted norms. It added that the best way for organizations to discourage unilateral action was by refusing to be bound by it.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. In a section of its 18 December resolution on questions concerning the 1982-1983 programme budget,<sup>(5)</sup> the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to reconsider his intention to grant the

salary increase and decided not to approve the related expenditures for 1981, 1982 and 1983.

This section of the resolution was adopted without vote. On 9 December, the Fifth Committee had approved the draft, proposed by the United States, without objection.

In its 18 December resolution on the work of ICSC,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly reaffirmed the importance of applying common salary scales for all General Service staff at a particular duty station and regretted the ILO decision. It also supported ICSC efforts to promote uniform and co-ordinated action in the common system and called on the Secretary-General, as ACC Chairman, to ensure measures to that end.

Presenting its proposal, the United States said it was important that the Secretary-General be made aware that the Committee knew that Geneva General Service staff were overpaid by local standards.

Before the Fifth Committee acted, the Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management stated that the establishment of General Service salaries fell exclusively within the competence of the Secretary-General. He added that the staff might interpret a refusal to grant the increase as a denial of equal treatment.

During the Fifth Committee discussion of the work of ICSC, an ILO representative said that, while his organization was one of the staunchest supporters of the common system, all organizations had at times felt obliged to make independent arrangements to meet their particular circumstances. The recent increase had been the result of negotiations with staff representatives under an agreement endorsed by the ILO Governing Body in 1978. Following a 10-point rise in a local cost-of-living index, the staff had requested a 5 per cent salary increase but the ILO Director-General had agreed to only 3 per cent.

New Zealand, while regretting the ILO decision, said it would have abstained in a vote; it might have been worth while to consider a compromise solution under which an increase would be given from a later date. Egypt supported this view since it felt there was a contradiction between the paragraphs of the text. Algeria, Morocco and the United Republic of Cameroon also said they would have abstained; the last added that it was not happy with the prospect of granting a salary increase under a zero-growth budget.

A number of States, including Australia, Canada, Finland (for the Nordic States), Ghana, Japan, Sierra Leone, Spain, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, the United Kingdom (for the European Community States) and the United States,

voiced regret at the ILO decision, particularly in the light of the effects on the common system. Despite ICSC recommendations and Assembly decisions, said the Byelorussian SSR, the ILO secretariat had obtained from its Governing Body approval of an illegal salary increase. Japan stated that an effort must be made to prevent such unilateral decisions, especially those not based on objective criteria. The United Kingdom thought it inconsistent for ILO to act against the advice of ICSC and equally inconsistent for the heads of the other organizations, including the United Nations, to follow ILO.

The United States said the salaries concerned were higher than the best local salaries even before the increase had been proposed. Yugoslavia also expressed the view that General Service salaries at Geneva were already too high.

These and other States stressed the importance of maintaining the unity of the common system. Argentina saw the difficulties over General Service salaries at Geneva as demonstrating an alarming shortcoming in that system. Belgium said measures must be taken to prevent a recurrence of such events. Ghana hoped that other organizations would refrain from unilateral action that would further damage the credibility of ICSC and the concept of a unified international civil service. Finland said the ILO decision called into question the ICSC mandate. The Ukrainian SSR saw the decision as creating a dangerous precedent which could undermine efforts towards uniform procedures for determining United Nations salaries. The USSR hoped the Assembly would call on all organizations participating in the work of ICSC to refrain from such measures in future.

Several of these States and others, including Canada, spoke in support of the United States proposal. Sweden, speaking for the Nordic States, thought it inadvisable to condone an error made by one organization by allowing others to repeat the error. New Zealand, however, doubted whether it was fitting to adopt the proposal, as such matters were within the Secretary-General's competence.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/29.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/7/Add.8; <sup>(3)</sup>ICSC, A/36/30.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>36/233, sect. I, paras. 3-5, 18 Dec. (p. 1323); <sup>(5)</sup>36/235, sect. XI, 18 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>1977, p. 991.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 61, 68 (12-22 Oct. & 3, 9 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section XI

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 9 December (meeting 68); draft by United States (A/C.5/36/L.27); agenda item 100.

#### Implementation of revised General Service salary scales at Geneva

[The General Assembly...]

1. Requests the Secretary-General to reconsider his intention to grant a 3 per cent increase in salaries with effect from 1 March 1981 to those General Service staff members at Geneva to whom the pre-1978 scale had once applied, taking into account the views expressed in the Fifth Committee:

2. Decides not to approve the related expenditures for 1981, 1982 and 1983;

#### Staff assessment

In its 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(1)</sup> ICSC said it had not found any suitable alternative to staff assessment—a kind of internal income tax deducted from the gross salary of every United Nations staff member. This sum was paid into a Tax Equalization Fund, used in part to reimburse staff who must pay national or local income tax on their United Nations salary (p. 1287). Most such staff were United States nationals; the nationals of eight other States also received smaller amounts. The system was introduced in 1948 with the aim of equalizing the pay of staff of different nationalities without requiring Member States that did not impose income taxes on United Nations officials to make up the difference.

After a study of the relationship between staff assessment and the Tax Equalization Fund, ICSC indicated that the need for staff assessment would remain so long as the Member States concerned had not exempted their nationals from income tax. It therefore suggested that the Assembly reiterate past requests that Member States make such exemptions, thereby leading to the Fund's abolition.

Changes approved by the Assembly in December 1980 in the staff assessment rates for locally recruited staff, including the General Service category,<sup>(4)</sup> were protested by the Federation of International Civil Servants' Associations<sup>(2)</sup> and by the staff organizations of the Secretariat<sup>(3)</sup> in their October 1981 reports for the Fifth Committee. They called for a further study by ICSC to develop a uniform scheme for all categories of staff. They maintained that: the new rates, decreasing the pensionable remuneration of General Service staff and thereby lowering future pension benefits, violated staff members' acquired rights; there had been inadequate staff-management consultation; and, since some specialized agencies had refused to implement the new rates, the validity of the common system and the role of ICSC were called into question.

In its resolution on the work of ICSC, the Assembly requested ICSC to undertake a general review of staff assessment for the equitable treatment of all categories of staff at all duty stations.<sup>(5)</sup>



Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ICSC, A/36/30; and <sup>(2)</sup>FICSA comments, transmitted by S-G note, A/C.5/36/26. <sup>(3)</sup>Secretariat Staff Unions and Associations, A/C.5/36/19.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/214 B, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1177); <sup>(5)</sup>36/233, sect. III, para. 2 (e), 18 Dec. 1981 (p. 1324).

#### Income tax

The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), on 30 October 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> noted that a Member State had approached several organizations with respect to amending agreements with them regarding reimbursement of income taxes levied on its nationals serving on their staff. ACC referred the matter to its Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions and requested the organizations to refrain from entering into individual arrangements pending receipt of a report from that body.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>ACC, 1981/19, 30 Oct.

#### Allowances

The General Assembly, in December 1981, clarified the method of calculating the repatriation grant and other payments made to staff on separation from the international civil service, and asked for a study of dependency allowances and the education grant.

#### Separation payments

On the recommendation of the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC),<sup>(2)</sup> the General Assembly decided on 18 December 1981 that payments to staff members in the Professional and higher categories on retirement or other separation from service should continue to be based on gross salary adjusted by movements of the world-wide cost-of-living adjustment index for United Nations salaries known as the weighted average of post adjustments (WAPA), less staff assessment.<sup>(1)</sup>

The decision was adopted without vote. The draft, sponsored by Barbados, Belgium and the United Kingdom, had been similarly approved on 17 December by the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee. Introducing the text, the United Kingdom explained that it would maintain the status quo for this type of payment by clarifying the existing rule.

Separation payments-repatriation grant, death grant, termination indemnity and commutation of annual leave-had been calculated since 1977 on the basis of pensionable remuneration (the portion of pay used in calculating pension benefits and contributions) less staff assessment. However, in December 1980, the General Assembly had approved a dual system for determining pensionable remuneration, requiring separate calculations for the pension benefits (based on movements of the United States

consumer price index) and pension contributions (based on movements of WAPA).<sup>(3)</sup> In its 1981 report, ICSC pointed out that, in thus redefining pensionable remuneration, the Assembly had not decided what basis should be used in calculating separation payments. Accordingly, it recommended the revised definition linked directly to WAPA, noting that this would require no immediate change in the scale of separation payments.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/459, 18 Dec., text following.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>ICSC, A/36/30.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(3)</sup>1980, p. 1180.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.31, 34-36, 38, 40, 43, 45, 49, 81 (4 Nov.-17 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly decision 36/459

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/840) without vote, 17 December (meeting 81); 3-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.44/Rev.2); agenda item 108.

Sponsors: Barbados, Belgium, United Kingdom.

#### Report of the International Civil Service Commission

At its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, decided that separation payments (commutation of annual leave, repatriation grant, death grant and termination indemnity) for the Professional and higher categories should continue to be based on gross salary adjusted by movements of the weighted average of post adjustments, less staff assessment, and that, accordingly, in annexes III and IV to the Staff Regulations of the United Nations, concerning termination indemnity and repatriation grant, respectively, the reference to "pensionable remuneration less staff assessment" should be amended to read "gross salary adjusted by movements of the weighted average of post adjustments, less staff assessment".

#### Education grant

In its resolution of 18 December 1981 on the work of ICSC, the General Assembly requested the Commission to review dependency allowances for all categories of staff and the scope and purpose of the education grant- the allowance paid to internationally recruited staff serving outside their home country to reimburse them for part of the additional costs entailed in educating their children.<sup>(2)</sup>

During the Fifth Committee's discussion of proposals for day care at United Nations Headquarters (p. 1333), Belgium had orally proposed that ICSC review dependency allowances including the possibility of subsidizing child-care expenses. No action was taken on this proposal, but Belgium agreed to a suggestion by the USSR that there be an informal understanding that ICSC had been requested to review the possibility of such a subsidy.

In their October report for the Fifth Committee,<sup>(1)</sup> the staff organizations of the Secretariat had urged that the education grant be extended to all groups of staff, including Professionals and local recruits currently excluded.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Secretariat Staff Unions and Associations, A/C.5/36/19.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/233. sect. III, para. 2 (b), 18 Dec. (p. 1324).

### Pensions

#### UN Joint Staff Pension Fund

The number of participants in the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund rose from 49,098 on 31 December 1980 to 51,048 as at 31 December 1981. The principal of the Fund increased from \$2,154,600,924 to \$2,458,365,968; and income from interest and dividends, less investment management costs, was \$166,638,000, compared with \$142,196,000 in 1980. At the end of 1981, 17,357 benefits were being paid, as follows: retirement, 5,874; early retirement, 2,077; deferred retirement, 3,708; widow and widower, 2,026; disability, 382; child, 3,257; and secondary dependant, 33.

During 1981, the number of organization belonging to the Fund increased to 14 with the admission of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), as authorized by the General Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(3)</sup> (For list of member organizations, see APPENDIX III.)

The United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board, charged with overseeing the pension system for staff of the United Nations and the other participating agencies, held its twenty-ninth session at Geneva from 22 June to 3 July at the headquarters of the World Health Organization. The Board's annual report to the General Assembly<sup>(2)</sup> contained, in addition to recommendations for Assembly action (see below): the Fund's audited accounts for 1980, and the report of the Board of Auditors thereon (p. 1345); a summary of Fund investments (p. 1348); statistics on the operation of the Fund in 1980; estimates of administrative expenses (p. 1346); the Board's discussion of a special index for pensioners (p. 1347); and the actuarial valuation of the Fund (see below). The Board also reported on other matters referred to it by the Assembly, including requirements for proof of residence for pensioners (p. 1348) and provisions for admission as a member organization of the Fund (p. 1352).

On 10 December 1981, following consideration of the Board's recommendations and a report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ),<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly adopted six resolutions on pension matters. By the first of them,<sup>(4)</sup> submitted by the Board, supplementary benefits for certain pensioners were approved, a \$100,000 contribution was authorized for the Emergency Fund for pensioners facing hardships and administrative expenses for 1982 were approved

(p. 1346). The Assembly's Fifth Committee had approved this text without vote on 23 November and the Assembly adopted the final version in the same manner.

By the next two resolutions, the Assembly requested studies of alternatives to improve the Fund's actuarial balance<sup>(5)</sup> and of the financial obligations of a pensioner to his or her spouse or former spouse.<sup>(6)</sup> The three other resolutions dealt with the Fund's investments.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/624; <sup>(2)</sup>UNJSPB, A/36/9 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/215A, sect. III, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1186); <sup>(4)</sup>36/118A, 10 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/118 B (p. 1345), <sup>(6)</sup>36/118 C (p. 1348), 10 Dec.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.27, 28, 31, 37, 40, 48, 50 (30 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.93 (10 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/118A

Adopted without vote Meeting 93 10 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/773) without vote, 23 November (meeting 50); draft by UNJSPB (A/36/9); agenda item 109.

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board to the General Assembly and to the member organizations of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund for 1981, chapter iii of the report of the International Civil Service Commission and the related report of the Advisory Committee Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

#### Supplementary measures

Decides, with effect from 1 January 1982, to revise the pension adjustment system contained in General Assembly resolution 35/215 of 17 December 1980, in accordance with the recommendations of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board contained in section III. H of its report to the Assembly for 1981;

#### II

##### Emergency Fund

Authorizes the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board to supplement the voluntary contributions to the Emergency Fund for a further period of one year by an amount not exceeding \$100,000;

#### iii

##### Administrative expenses

Approves expenses, chargeable directly to the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund, totalling \$5,456,900 (net) for 1982 and supplementary expenses of \$147,000 (net) for 1981 for the administration of the Fund.

#### Financial situation

The biennial actuarial valuation of the Pension Fund as at 31 December 1980, summarized in the Pension Board's 1981 report,<sup>(4)</sup> indicated that the current contribution rate would be insufficient in the long run to meet the Fund's obligations. (Contributions continued to be made at the rate of 21 per cent of pensionable remuneration- the portion of staff salaries from which pension benefits and contributions are calculated- of which the staff paid one third and their organizations two

thirds.) Depending on assumptions made as to future rates of inflation and returns on investment, the contribution rate needed to restore the actuarial balance between the Fund's prospective assets and liabilities ranged from approximately 22.5 to 27.8 per cent of pensionable remuneration.

The report stated that this indicated a serious deterioration since the previous valuation, as at 31 December 1978, which had shown contribution requirements ranging from 20.1 to 24 per cent. That deterioration was attributable partly to a more conservative assumption as to the future real rate of return on investments net of inflation, and partly to the fact that large increases in pensionable remuneration (p. 1352) and in pensions had not been completely offset by the Fund's investment experience. Moreover, the valuation results did not reflect the extra cost of modifications in the system for adjusting pensions to cost-of-living changes, adopted by the General Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(5)</sup>

The Board's Committee of Actuaries pointed out that projections beyond the 30-year period of the valuation showed that the Fund, after reaching a peak, would begin to decrease and eventually become depleted. It also emphasized the seriousness of the Fund's financial condition, necessitating immediate action, and suggested a number of remedial measures.

The Board discussed these options, which included: reviewing the current practice of refunding half their contributions to organizations in respect of participants who withdrew before completing five years of pensionable service; raising the interest rate used in calculating the lump-sum withdrawal which pensioners may make on commencing retirement (thereby reducing the amount of the lump sum); reducing the rate of entitlement accumulation (currently 2 per cent of pensionable remuneration for each year of service); and recruiting younger staff. The Board decided that in 1982 it would analyse these measures and review the provisions of an article of the Fund's Regulations concerning deficiency payments, in order to make recommendations to the Assembly.

In its October 1981 report on the Pension Fund,<sup>(3)</sup> ACABQ also stressed the need for early action and, after considering additional information from the Consulting Actuary, noted that the worsening actuarial position of the Fund was due mainly to salaries and benefits rising faster than had been assumed in 1978. It cited figures showing that the actuarial imbalance had increased from \$121.7 million as at 31 December 1978 to \$722.1 million as at 31 December 1980, based on a number of assumptions about inflation, interest rates and number of participants.

While acknowledging that increasing the contribution rate or authorizing deficiency payments would restore the Fund's actuarial balance, ACABQ believed the Board should seek alternative solutions. One way to improve the actuarial position would be to raise the retirement age (p. 1352) from 60 to 62, thereby reducing the actuarial imbalance by more than \$300 million.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 10 December, in a resolution adopted without vote,<sup>(6)</sup> the General Assembly welcomed the Pension Board's intended analysis of all possible measures to improve the actuarial balance and requested it, in co-operation with the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) where necessary, to consider alternative courses of action. The Assembly also requested that the analysis take into account all views expressed in the Fifth Committee and that it be submitted to the Assembly in 1982.

On 23 November, also without vote, the Fifth Committee had approved the draft, sponsored by Egypt. The text was put forward after consultations on four draft decisions, subsequently withdrawn, submitted separately by Belgium, the USSR and the United States (two).

Belgium's draft<sup>(1)</sup> would have had the Assembly request the Board to study the situation where staff members otherwise eligible for participation in the Fund were excluded. Details would have been requested on the categories of staff involved, their numbers and reasons for exclusion, contributions lost to the Fund and the actuarial implications. After this proposal was withdrawn, Belgium said it had been assured that the study to be undertaken by the Board would consider the four points mentioned in the Belgian proposal.

The USSR text<sup>(2)</sup> would have had the Assembly propose that the Board and ICSC urgently compare United Nations pensions with those of national civil servants in countries where Fund member organizations were headquartered. Introducing the proposal, the USSR expressed hope that the Board would emphasize the need to make good the actuarial deficit by adjusting benefits.

The two United States drafts proposed a study on raising the retirement age (p. 1352) and requested a report on arrangements for furnishing proof of pensioners' residence (p. 1348).

During the discussion in the Fifth Committee, general concern was expressed about the deteriorating financial situation of the Pension Fund and various suggestions were put forward to solve the problem. Austria and Canada stressed that the system's financial soundness, especially the Fund's worsening actuarial position, would have to be dealt with promptly. New Zea-

land urged the Board to recommend specific remedies in 1982.

A number of delegations opposed increasing contribution rates to meet the deficit, particularly contributions made indirectly by States through their share of the budgets of participating organizations. Belgium said neither Governments nor the participating organizations would agree to higher assessments, while Canada preferred the actuarial problem to be resolved by measures other than increasing the contribution rate of States. Spain hoped the Board would not recommend increases for staff members or agencies. The United States did not favour any increase in staff or government contributions or any cut in benefits.

The USSR rejected any review of the practice of refunding to organizations half their contributions in respect of participants who withdrew before completing five years of pensionable service and said that a plan to retain all of that sum would be doubly discriminatory.

Concern was also voiced over the possibility of invoking the provisions of the article of the Fund Regulations whereby each member organization would make additional payments to make good any deficiency. Austria, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom hoped this would not be necessary, while the USSR rejected any review of the article which might call for additional contributions by States.

The Byelorussian SSR, Japan and the USSR believed benefits were over-generous. The Byelorussian SSR urged the Board to consider discontinuing any liberalization of retirement benefits pending rectification of the actuarial situation; it also supported a USSR suggestion that United Nations pensions be compared with those paid to corresponding levels of national civil services, which the USSR said were significantly lower than those of the United Nations. Japan suggested that the Board consider cutting back on benefits by reducing the length of contributory service. The United Kingdom opposed further liberalization of benefits until the actuarial balance was restored and thought the frequency of cost-of-living adjustments might be reduced.

Although supporting the resolution, Morocco said there could be no question about asking the Board and ICSC to solve the problem; requesting them to recommend courses of action implied that those measures would be acceptable.

The USSR said it was not surprising that proposals to increase pensions were made in the Pension Board, since two thirds of its members were staff representatives; it suggested that the Board be composed of an equal number of staff and representatives of intergovernmental bodies, with equitable geographical distribution

among the five major regions. A similar suggestion was made by the Byelorussian SSR.

As one possible means to reduce the actuarial deficit, Belgium proposed putting a ceiling on payments to staff members at the highest grade. The United States said new benefits had been introduced without a commensurate increase in new contributions, and it mentioned a number of possible actions to reduce benefit payments.

Commenting on its proposal, later withdrawn, for a study of the circumstances under which individuals had been excluded from participation in the Fund, Belgium remarked that the Fund should include all qualified persons and organizations. The USSR, however, thought that increasing the number of participants would increase the deficit.

The possibility of raising the retirement age in order to improve the Fund's actuarial balance was also discussed (p. 1353).

Draft decisions withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>Belgium, A/C.5/36/L.10; <sup>(2)</sup>USSR, A/C.5/36/L.8.

Reports: <sup>(3)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/624; <sup>(4)</sup>UNJSPB, A/36/9.  
Resolutions: GA: <sup>(5)</sup>35/215 A, sect. II, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1186); <sup>(6)</sup>36/118 B, 10 Dec. text following.  
Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.27, 28, 31, 37, 40, 48, 50 (30 Oct.-23 Nov); plenary. A/36/PV.93 (10 Dec.)

General Assembly resolution 36/118 B

Adopted without vote Meeting 93 10 December  
Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/773) without vote. 23 November (meeting 50); draft by Egypt (A/C.5/36/L.13); agenda item 109.

The General Assembly,  
Recognizing the actuarial situation of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund.

We/coming the intention of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board to undertake a comprehensive analysis of all possible measures to improve the actuarial balance of the Fund,

1. Requests the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board, in co-operation with the International Civil Service Commission where necessary, to consider alternative courses of action that might be taken:

2. Further requests that the analysis to be undertaken take into account all the views expressed during the discussion in the Fifth Committee and that it be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Accounts

The Board of Auditors made three suggestions on accounting practices to the Pension Board in 1981. It called for preparation of a finance manual, for follow-up to ensure that action was taken when organizations delayed their monthly remittances to the Pension Fund, and for establishing a deadline on the submission of annual financial statements to the Board. The Auditors' report on the Pension Fund for 1980 was annexed to the Board's 1981 report to the General Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup>

In its October report on the pension system,<sup>(1)</sup> ACABQ said it had been informed by representa-

tives of the Secretary-General that the United Nations made every effort to pay its contribution by the tenth of each month but that delays occurred from time to time due to cash-flow difficulties attributable to the late receipt from Member States of their assessed budgetary contributions. The Fund's loss of interest in those cases had been compensated by offsetting delays in Fund payments to the United Nations, except that in 1980 the offsets had not matched the Fund's losses. Commenting on a Board suggestion that the United Nations consider raising the amount of its \$130,000 deposit with the Fund to compensate for these interest losses, ACABQ said the question should be studied in the context of the cash-flow difficulties experienced by the United Nations and other organizations.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/624; <sup>(2)</sup>UNJSPB, A/36/9.

#### Administrative expenses

On 10 December 1981, in the resolution on the Pension Fund submitted by the Pension Board,<sup>(4)</sup> the General Assembly approved exchangeable to the Fund, totalling \$5,456,900 (net) for administration of the Fund in 1982. It also approved supplementary expenses of \$147,700 (net) for 1981, raising to \$4,870,200 the amount originally approved by the Assembly in December 1980.<sup>(3)</sup>

In proposing these sums,<sup>(2)</sup> the Board explained that the 1981 supplement was needed to pay higher investment advisory fees due to the increased value of the Fund's portfolio, which also accounted for the bulk of resource growth in 1982. The 1982 figure consisted of \$3,246,000 in investment costs and \$2,210,900 in administrative costs, covering a permanent staff of 88, the same as in 1981. Approval of these expenses was recommended by ACABQ.<sup>(1)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/624; <sup>(2)</sup>UNJSPB, A/36/9 & Corr.1.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/215A, sect. VI, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1186); <sup>(4)</sup>36/118 A, sect. III, 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1343).

#### Contributions to the Emergency Fund

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 10 December 1981<sup>(3)</sup> proposed by the Pension Board,<sup>(2)</sup> authorized the Board to supplement voluntary contributions to its Emergency Fund by up to \$100,000 for an additional year. The proposal had the endorsement of ACABQ.<sup>(1)</sup> The Emergency Fund, established by the Board in 1973 and financed by voluntary contributions from member organizations, staff associations and individuals for the purpose of alleviating hardship among pensioners, had been used to provide aid in individual cases of proven

emergency due to illness, infirmity or similar causes. The Assembly had authorized the Board each year since 1974 to supplement the contributions by \$100,000. Payments by the Fund in 1981 amounted to about \$47,000.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/624; <sup>(2)</sup>UNJSPB, A/36/9.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/118 A, sect. II, 10 Dec. (p. 1343).

#### Benefits

Supplementary payments. Measures to alleviate the situation of pensioners whose retirement in the early years of the Pension Fund resulted in inadequate pensions were approved by the General Assembly in its resolution of 10 December 1981 proposed by the Pension Board.<sup>(4)</sup> Two measures were approved, applying to retirement and disability benefits of those who had retired before 1961: (a) pensioners 75 or older on 1 January 1982 whose annual pension on that date was below half of the net base salary of a Professional staff member at the lowest level (P-1, step 1) were to receive a thirteenth monthly payment every year, from 1982; and (b) pensioners receiving benefits which began before 1961 and amounted to less than \$4,000 on 1 January 1982 were to receive the special adjustments for small pensions introduced on 1 January 1981, even though their benefits were based on fewer than 15 years of contributory service.

The Board's proposals were made in response to a request of the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> made in December 1980 when it approved a change in the post-retirement pension adjustment system to benefit persons receiving an annual pension of less than \$4,000 after 15 or more years' service.<sup>(5)</sup> According to the Board's 1981 report to the General Assembly,<sup>(2)</sup> the Fund's Consulting Actuary estimated the annual cost of the proposed measures at about \$200,000 and said this would have no meaningful effect on the actuarial balance. The Board took no decision on how to finance the cost.

After considering the proposals, ACABQ said it had no objection to the Board's proposals on supplementary payments but did not believe they should be financed by the Emergency Fund (see above), as had been suggested in the Board.<sup>(1)</sup>

When the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee discussed pensions, several countries supported supplementary payments. Austria said the proposal reflected a concern for meeting pressing social needs first. Belgium thought there was a moral obligation to improve modest pensions. In Canada's view, this was a legitimate social concern and it was only just that the United Nations rectify the situation by introducing temporary relief measures. Spain had no objection to such measures but said they should not be financed from the Emergency

Fund. The United Kingdom supported the proposal as a transitional measure whose cost would be insignificant in relation to the Fund's actuarial imbalance.

Expressing some reservations, the Federal Republic of Germany said the measures should apply only to pensioners who had no source of income other than their United Nations pensions. Japan said it was reluctant to support supplementary payments because they would set a precedent for other temporary measures.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/624; <sup>(2)</sup>UNJSPB, A/36/9.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/215 A, sect. VII, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1186); <sup>(4)</sup>36/118 A, sect. I, 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1343).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 1181.

**Special index for pensioners.** The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) initiated in 1981 a study of factors required to elaborate a special index that would be used in calculating an increased pension entitlement for persons residing in a country where the cost of living was substantially higher than in New York. The task of elaborating this index, including the impact of national taxation, was assigned to ICSC, in co-operation with the Pension Board,<sup>(4)</sup> when the General Assembly, in December 1980, decided to authorize such a differential in high-cost countries, effective 1 January 1981.<sup>(5)</sup> Pending application of a special index, pensions of persons retired from the Professional and higher categories were being adjusted according to a comparison between the post adjustment (cost-of-living differential) paid in New York and that paid in the retiree's country of residence, while pensions of General Service retirees were adjusted according to a salary comparison between the duty station and the country of residence.

After initial consideration of the matter in 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> ICSC concluded that it needed more time in view of the complexities involved. It therefore requested its secretariat, in co-operation with that of the Pension Board, to study the issues and make proposals to be forwarded to the Board for comment. The results would be considered by ICSC in 1982, after which recommendations could be made to the Assembly to take effect on 1 January 1983. At that time, the pensions of all retirees, regardless of date of retirement, in countries where the cost-of-living differential was applied would be recalculated. Since early 1981, when the revised pension system went into effect, this differential had been applied in some 30 countries, the ICSC Chairman informed the Assembly's Fifth Committee.

This matter was also a major subject at the June/July 1981 session of the Pension Board,<sup>(2)</sup> which considered alternatives for determining

cost-of-living differentials and for calculating gross pensions in local currency. No conclusions were reached pending receipt of the ICSC recommendations.

On 18 December, in its resolution on the work of ICSC,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly requested the Commission to give high priority to completing the elaboration of a special index for pensioners.

During the discussion in the Fifth Committee on the work of ICSC, Austria and Yugoslavia agreed with the Commission that more time was needed before recommendations on a special index could be submitted to the Assembly, but added that proposals should be submitted in 1982. Canada also looked forward to hearing ICSC proposals in 1982. New Zealand attached high priority to the development of a special index. Spain believed the index would be of great value in deciding on pension adjustments in individual cases; it supported the ICSC decision that all pensions, regardless of retirement date, would be recalculated in accordance with the index.

The USSR also regarded preparation of the index as a high-priority matter and favoured reducing the current cost-of-living differential in countries with low tax rates. The United States was concerned that the study was becoming too complicated, as it tried to take into account State and local taxes throughout the world; it trusted that the outcome would not be additions for high-tax areas but rather deductions for areas with low taxation.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ICSC, A/36/30; <sup>(2)</sup>UNJSPB, A/36/9.

Resolution and decision: Res.: GA, <sup>(3)</sup>36/233, sect. III, para. 1 (d), 18 Dec. (p. 1324). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 35/447, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1186).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>1980, p. 1180.

**Protection of spouses.** On 10 December 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly adopted without vote a resolution by which it noted that the Pension Fund Regulations and Rules contained no provision on the financial obligations of a pensioner to his or her spouse or former spouse. It requested the Pension Board to study in 1982 the desirability and feasibility of measures to deal with such situations and to make recommendations to the Assembly.

The resolution was adopted on a revised draft by Belgium, Kenya and the United States, including an oral drafting change by the sponsors, which the Fifth Committee had approved without vote on 23 November.

The United States, introducing the draft to the Committee, expressed the view that the Pension Fund should have a provision similar to that in the United States civil service, which allowed for garnishment of a pension when an estranged spouse or former spouse received no financial assistance from a pensioner.

Australia, Egypt and Greece said they had approved the text on the understanding that the Board should take account of national laws in its study of this matter. Morocco also supported it, saying that it was closer to the Moroccan legal régime and to Islamic morality with regard to the status of spouses.

Resolution: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/118 C, 10 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.27 28, 31, 37, 40, 48, 50 (30 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.93(10 Dec.)

General Assembly resolution 36/118 C

Adopted without vote Meeting 93 10 December 1981  
Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/773) without vote. 23 November (meeting 50); 3-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.7/Rev.1). orally revised: agenda 109.

Sponsors: Belgium. Kenya. United States.

The General Assembly,

Noting that no provision exists under the Regulations and Rules of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund with respect to the financial obligations of a pensioner to his or her spouse or former spouse,

Concerned that this may give rise to serious injustice and hardship,

Requests the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board to study, at its thirtieth session, the desirability and feasibility of measures to deal with such situations and to make recommendations thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

Determination of pensioners' residence. In response to a December 1980 request by the General Assembly,<sup>(3)</sup> the Pension Board, at its June/July 1981 session,<sup>(2)</sup> agreed on a definition of residence for pension purposes and on a system of verifying a pensioner's residence. Residence was defined as the place of a pensioner's "primary home and habitual abode". The Board said a reliable indication of residence would be the test of tax treatment, as most national tax systems distinguished between residents and non-residents. However, because of different definitions for tax purposes, a person could be a resident simultaneously in more than one country. Thus, other evidence would have to be sought, but its nature could not be prescribed uniformly as it depended on the laws and institutions of each country.

Responding to the Assembly's question as to the feasibility of prorating payments for pensioners who spent a significant part of a year away from the stipulated country of residence, the Board concluded that this would not be feasible as it would conflict with the primary purpose of pension adjustments.

In the Fifth Committee in November, the United States submitted but later withdrew a draft decision calling for a Pension Board report in 1982 on the application of the definition of residence and on the operation of arrangements to furnish proof.<sup>(1)</sup>

Spain, speaking during the Committee's discussion of pensions, endorsed the Board's definition of residence but said that more work was needed on verification of proof of residence so as to rule out unreasonable and opportunistic claims and establish appropriate limits. Welcoming the current study on determining residence, the United States hoped the Pension Fund secretariat would pay close attention to proofs of residence and would pay the base dollar pension when a pensioner could not conclusively prove that he was living in a high-cost country. Uruguay said it was essential to effect without delay the revised system for adjusting pensions according to country of residence.

Draft decision withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>United States, A/C.5/36/L.9.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>UNJSPB, A/36/9.

Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/215 B, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1186).

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.31, 48 (4 & 19 Nov.)

## Investments

The Pension Board informed the General Assembly in its 1981 report<sup>(1)</sup> that the Pension Fund's investments had a market value of \$2,495 million at 31 March 1981, up from \$1,875 million a year previously. The investment return in the year ended 31 March 1981 had been 26.6 per cent, reflecting unusual strength in most equity (stock) and bond markets and the fact that the year had started from an especially low base. This figure compared with a return of minus 0.39 per cent for the previous year, and an average of 6.35 per cent per annum over 21 years. Over that period, the Fund's average annual return on United States equities had been 7.4 per cent, while those outside the United States had provided 8.82 per cent and bonds 4.79 per cent.

In December, the General Assembly adopted three resolutions on Pension Fund investments. Two dealt with diversifying investments in developing countries (see below) and the third with investments in States members of the Organization of African Unity (p. 1350).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNJSPB, A/36/9.

Investments in developing countries. The Pension Board, reviewing in its 1981 report<sup>(2)</sup> the investment of Pension Fund assets in developing countries, noted that resources placed in development-related securities had increased over the year ended 31 March and that additional investments had been made in major development institutions and in issues of developing countries previously represented in the portfolio. The Board welcomed what it characterized as significant progress in increasing such investments, in compliance with the requirements of

safety, profitability, liquidity and convertibility. With regard to reinvestment in developing countries of funds held in transnational corporations (TNCs)—called for by the Assembly in previous years— the Board noted difficulties arising from the lack of a clear or officially accepted definition of the term and the fact that virtually all areas of economic activity which provided expectations of good investment returns had some involvement in international business.

The Secretary-General, in an October report to the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee on Pension Fund investments, (1) reviewed investment policies, provided information on the size and growth of investments, and indicated progress made in implementing Assembly resolutions on the subject. As at 30 June, it said, investments in development-related securities amounted to \$392 million, representing 18 per cent of the total Fund (up from 16 per cent) and a 28 per cent increase over the \$306 million of a year earlier. The proportion of development-related bond issues had increased from \$300 million to \$366 million, or from 35 to 37 per cent of the bond portfolio. Investments made directly in developing countries, as opposed to those in regional development banks, stood at \$133 million compared with \$81 million on 30 June 1980. New bond investments had been made in Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Panama, Thailand and Zimbabwe, and equity investments in Malaysia, Mexico, Papua New Guinea and Singapore.

Concerning investment in TNCs, the Secretary-General said it had been largely those investments which had provided the best contributions to the Fund's investment return, and divesting any large share of the Fund could not be done without disruption and probable loss. In view of the flow of new money into the Fund, increased investment in developing countries did not necessarily require that existing investments be sold. In the circumstances, actions during the year were considered to conform to the prudent balance called for by Assembly resolutions. The Fund would continue to focus on increasing investment in developing countries in accordance with the basic criteria to which its investments must adhere and on the basis of a prudent overall investment strategy.

On 10 December, acting without vote, the General Assembly adopted two resolutions on Pension Fund investments in developing countries.

By the first, it reaffirmed confidence in the Secretary-General as trustee of the Fund's assets and endorsed the policy of diversification of its investments in developing countries, wherever that served the interests of participants and bene-

ficiaries, in accordance with the four criteria of safety, profitability, liquidity and convertibility.<sup>(4)</sup>

By the second resolution,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly, observing with satisfaction the increasing pace at which the Fund was investing in developing countries, commended the Secretary-General's work as trustee, and requested him to accelerate efforts to diversify the Fund's investments and to maintain consultations with the Investments Committee to ensure that investments in TNC shares would be reinvested in developing countries to the greatest extent practicable, subject to observance of the four criteria, and in conformity with the Fund's Regulations. The Assembly requested him to report on those efforts in 1982.

Both resolutions had been approved without vote by the Fifth Committee. The first, introduced by the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Community (EC) members and later revised by them to reflect changes suggested by the United Republic of Cameroon, was approved by the Committee on 23 November. The second, introduced by Cuba, was also sponsored by Barbados, Costa Rica, Guinea, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mexico, Panama and Peru, and was approved on 19 November.

Introducing the first resolution, the United Kingdom said it was designed merely to indicate that the Secretary-General's report was consistent with the Assembly's intentions.

In explanation of its position, Ghana said it would have abstained in a vote on the resolution because it could not accept the false hypothesis on which it was based— that only investments in developing countries were risky.

Explaining its position on the text introduced by Cuba, Canada welcomed the changes made over the past two years in resolutions on Pension Fund investments and said it had supported the current text in the desire to protect the interests of the Fund and its participants. Sweden, agreeing with the main provisions, said it supported diversification of investments provided that no particular type of investment suffered and it agreed to more investments in developing countries provided that no particular type of investment was prejudiced, but the Secretary-General should determine how those objectives should be met. Australia endorsed the statements by Canada and Sweden. The United Kingdom, on behalf of the EC members, said they had supported the resolution because it was more moderately worded than one submitted to the Assembly in 1980<sup>(3)</sup> and because it indicated the need to observe the requirements of safety, profitability, liquidity and convertibility.

Several delegations in the Fifth Committee expressed support for the Pension Fund's investing



in developing countries. The Byelorussian SSR noted with satisfaction the growth of investments in those countries, particularly in Africa, and said that investment diversification enabled the four criteria to be satisfied. Congratulating the Secretary-General on the increasing rate of investments in developing countries, Panama stated that fears expressed in the Committee 'regarding the safety of such investments were unjustified since the custodians could only invest where the four criteria were met. Also emphasizing the importance of meeting the criteria, Spain reaffirmed its view that, provided those basic conditions were guaranteed, preference should be given to investment in developing countries, thus contributing to one of the Organization's most important objectives.

Among those countries critical of current investment policies, Cuba considered that the volume of investment in TNCs was still very high. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya welcomed the increase of investments in developing countries but pointed to a gap between the amount invested in TNCs and that invested in developing countries. Yugoslavia said the Investments Committee should increase investments in developing countries while taking into account the preference of many such countries for capital assistance on a concessionary basis. Zaire said that investments made in developing countries remained very modest.

Morocco stated that, as two thirds of Pension Fund resources came from States, it was not surprising that they should seek to guide to some extent the way in which those resources were invested; if more trust was placed in TNCs than in States, no real intergovernmental work was being done. The USSR said the Fund should invest in the most reliable areas and those which yielded the greatest return, an approach that should by no means preclude an increase in developing countries.

Benin, the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone and Tunisia expressed support for the resolution on reinvestment of the Fund's resources invested in TNCs.

Certain delegations, while supporting diversification of investments in developing countries, emphasized that other points should be considered in investment strategy. Austria endorsed the resolution on priority for investment in developing countries when the four criteria were satisfied but expressed reservations about calling on the Secretary-General to reinvest in developing countries the resources invested in TNCs since that would require the liquidation of previous investments, possibly some of the most prof-

itable. The United States was pleased that the Secretary-General, while increasing investments in developing countries, had continued to stress safety and profitability; it felt he should not be requested to invest in developing countries or anywhere else, since he alone was responsible for the Fund's investments.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/12; <sup>(2)</sup>UNJSPB, A/36/9.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/216 B, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1187); <sup>(4)</sup>36/119 A, 10 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/119 C, 10 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.27, 28, 31, 37, 40, 48, 50 (30 Oct.-23 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.93 (10 Dec.)

General Assembly resolution 36/119 A

Adopted without vote Meeting 93 10 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/773) without vote, 23 November (meeting 50); 10-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.5/Rev.1); agenda item 109.

Sponsors: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 34/222 A of 20 December 1979 and 35/216 A of 17 December 1980,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General on the investments of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund;

2. Endorses the policy of diversification of the investments of the Fund in developing countries, wherever this serves the interests of the participants and beneficiaries, in accordance with the four criteria of safety, profitability, liquidity and convertibility;

3. Reaffirms its confidence in the Secretary-General as trustee of the assets of the Fund.

General Assembly resolution 36/119 C

Adopted without vote Meeting 93 10 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/773) without vote, 19 November (meeting 48); 9-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.12); agenda item 109.

Sponsors: Barbados, Costa Rica, Cuba, Guinea, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mexico, Panama, Peru.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 31/197 of 22 December 1976, 32/73 A of 9 December 1977, 33/121 A of 19 December 1978, 34/222 A of 20 December 1979 and 35/216 B of 17 December 1980,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the investments of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund,

Observing with satisfaction the increasing pace at which the Fund is making investments in developing countries.

1. Commends the work of the Secretary-General as trustee of the assets of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to continue and accelerate the efforts to diversify the investments of the Fund, and to maintain the consultations initiated with the Investments Committee in order to ensure that the resources which the Fund holds invested in shares of transnational corporations shall be reinvested in developing countries to the greatest extent practicable, subject to observance of the criteria of safety, profitability, liquidity and convertibility, and in conformity with the Regulations of the Fund;

3. Further requests the Secretary-General to report on those efforts to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

Investments in Africa. The Secretary-General, in his October 1981 report on the Pen-

sion Fund's investments,<sup>(1)</sup> said its investments in Africa had increased from \$24 million as at 30 June 1980 to \$30.3 million as at 30 June 1981. In March, a letter had been sent to all countries of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to obtain further information and assistance in locating investments meeting the criteria established by the General Assembly. For this purpose, liaison had been established with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, as well as with private sources.

The Secretary-General reiterated two major constraints to speeding up investments in Africa. First, because of high interest rates, international bond markets had remained unattractive to African Governments as a source of funds; consequently, few public issues had been offered in those markets during the year. Second, restrictions existed which made it difficult for foreign portfolio investors such as the Fund to invest in African domestic capital markets. The investment staff and advisers would monitor opportunities to increase investment in Africa which met the criteria of the Fund.

On 10 December, the General Assembly adopted without vote a resolution<sup>(2)</sup> by which, expressing concern at the low level of Fund investments in OAU countries, it requested the Secretary-General to continue consultations with each OAU member, the African Development Bank and other financial institutions in Africa with a view to improving the level of investments in member States. He was asked for a further report in 1982.

This text, sponsored by 18 countries, most of them African, had been approved without vote by the Fifth Committee on 19 November.

In the Committee, the United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, orally proposed the addition of the words "taking due account of the requirements of safety, profitability, liquidity and convertibility referred to in the preamble" to the paragraph calling for increased investments in OAU countries. Egypt, one of the sponsors, remarked that the amendment was redundant since the Assembly's criteria for investment still applied. The United Kingdom withdrew its proposal when the sponsors agreed to revise the second preambular paragraph, citing the view of the Pension Board that the four criteria "must be" (rather than "have been") observed.

Introducing the draft resolution, Zaire said the institutions mentioned in the text were sufficiently sound financially to guarantee the safety of the Fund's resources and to meet the four investment criteria.

During the Fifth Committee discussion, several African countries expressed support for investment in OAU countries. Benin said the African

countries wished to participate fully in the operation of the Fund, especially with regard to investments. The Central African Republic pointed out that the draft resolution did not seek to give orders to the Secretary-General; it simply requested that investments be made in viable institutions in Africa, since in that way the Fund's assets would benefit the countries most in need of development resources. Kenya, expressing satisfaction at the progress made with respect to Fund investments in Africa, said such investments were protected by the Assembly's criteria and because the Governments of developing African countries in which such investments were placed safeguarded the funds.

In Morocco's view, investments in African countries should be increased since many of them had difficulty in finding resources in developed countries due to restrictions that were frequently political. Sierra Leone said that, by adopting the resolution, the international community would be expressing confidence in the capacity of the developing African States and their financial institutions to raise the level of living of their peoples.

Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, the Ivory Coast, Mexico, Poland, Romania, Tunisia and Yugoslavia also expressed support for the resolution.

Some delegations mentioned the Secretary-General's efforts to improve investments in OAU countries. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was pleased that he had asked OAU for further information and assistance in locating investments that met the Assembly's criteria. Zaire suggested that, to increase investments in Africa, a contact mission to the Governments concerned would be more useful than an exchange of correspondence. This idea was endorsed by Cuba. Yugoslavia, commending the Secretary-General's efforts to increase the Fund's investments in African and other developing countries, said more investments could be made there.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/12.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/119 B, 10 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.27, 28, 31, 37, 40, 48 (30 Oct.-19 Nov.); plenary. A/36/PV.93 (10 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/119 B

Adopted without vote Meeting 93 10 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/773) without vote. 19 November (meeting 48); 18-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.11), orally revised; agenda item 109.

Sponsors: Benin, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Panama, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Zaire.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 33/121 B of 19 December 1978, 34/222 B of 20 December 1979 and 35/216 C of 17 December 1980.

Taking into consideration the report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board, in which the Board recognized that

in spite of some constraints due to the behaviour of the market, the four criteria must be observed,

Concerned at the very low level of the investments made to date in the States members of the Organization of African Unity,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to continue his consultations with each State member of the Organization of African Unity, the African Development Bank and other financial institutions in Africa with a view to improving the level of investments in member States;

2. Further requests the Secretary-General to report on this question to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Admission of members to the Fund

The Pension Board, in response to a 1980 suggestion by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions that it review requirements for membership of organizations in the Fund,<sup>(2)</sup> agreed at its June/July 1981 session<sup>(1)</sup> that a pre-condition should be strict adherence to the United Nations common system in such areas as salaries and pensionable remuneration of the two major categories of staff (Professional and General Service), promotion policies and minimum retirement age. The Board concluded that there was no need to change the qualifications stipulated by article 3 (b) of the Fund's Regulations, requiring that a member be either a specialized agency or another international, intergovernmental organization participating in the United Nations common system of salaries, allowances and other conditions of service. The Board believed that approval by the General Assembly, following the Board's recommendation, was a sufficient safeguard for screening organizations seeking admission to the Fund.

The Board postponed until 1982 consideration of a membership application from the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization, to await its action on a proposal that it join the common system.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>UNJSPB, A/36/9.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(2)</sup>1980, p. 1182.

#### Pensionable remuneration

The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), in its 1981 report,<sup>(1)</sup> informed the General Assembly that the pensionable remuneration for staff in the Professional and higher categories—the portion of their pay counted in calculating their pension benefits and contributions—would rise from 117.9 per cent of gross salary to 128.2 per cent, effective 1 October 1981. This rise was the result of increases in both the weighted average of post adjustments index (based on cost-of-living adjustments at major duty stations throughout the United Nations system) and the United States consumer price index.

In the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee's discussion of the work of ICSC, Bel-

gium said the increase in pensionable remuneration over the past eight years—at least 139 per cent since 1973 for staff at the P-5 level and above while the United States cost of living had risen by 75 per cent—was difficult to justify in the light of conditions in the United States civil service and the actuarial difficulties of the Pension Fund.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ICSC, A/36/30.

#### Retirement age

The Secretary-General informed the General Assembly, in his September 1981 report on the composition of the Secretariat,<sup>(3)</sup> that in conformity with requests by the Assembly in 1978<sup>(4)</sup> and 1980,<sup>(5)</sup> extensions of service beyond the mandatory retirement age of 60 had been granted since 1979 for up to six months only, and solely for the purpose of finding replacements for retiring staff, with the exception of staff with special language requirements and General Service staff with special technical skills. According to tables in the report, between 1977 and 1981 the number of staff in geographic posts (P-1 to D-2 levels) retained in service beyond the age of 60 (as at 30 June) fell from 78 to 26, the number in language posts from 30 to 11, and those in other categories from 74 to 24, for a total reduction from 182 staff members in 1977 to 61 in 1981. However, the total in 1981 increased from 49 in 1980, mostly in the General Service and related categories.

The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), in its August 1981 report on geographical distribution of the Secretariat (p. 1317), recommended that extension beyond retirement age be limited to three months and granted only when time was needed to find a replacement. However, the Secretary-General, in comments on this report, said such an action would unnecessarily restrict his authority to extend the limit in exceptional circumstances.

The possibility of raising the mandatory retirement age was mentioned by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in its October report on pensions.<sup>(2)</sup> It said it had been informed that such action would be one way to improve the actuarial position of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund (p. 1343). It understood that if all participating organizations followed the practice of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which had a retirement age of 62, the actuarial imbalance would be reduced by more than \$300 million.

In the General Assembly's Fifth Committee, the United States submitted a draft resolution, which it later revised and then withdrew, to have the Assembly welcome the intention of the

United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board to undertake a comprehensive analysis of all measures which could restore the Fund's actuarial balance, and request the Board, in co-operation with ICSC, to consider recommendations that might be taken to increase the statutory retirement age. Introducing the revised draft,<sup>(1)</sup> the United States pointed out that it had been reworded so as to delete mention of a specific retirement age (65 in the original version); it added that the purpose was to restore the actuarial balance, not to force staff to retire later or lose any acquired rights. At the suggestion of the Committee Chairman, the United States later withdrew the draft when Egypt submitted another more broadly based text—subsequently adopted<sup>(6)</sup>—calling for a review of alternatives to improve the Fund's actuarial situation.

In the Committee's discussion on pensions, Austria suggested a study of the possibility of raising the retirement age for some categories of staff not subject to geographical distribution, such as General Service and language staff. Belgium said raising the retirement age not only would reduce the actuarial deficit, but would also have the advantage of limiting abuses resulting from the age-limit of 60, such as undeserved promotion to the grade of Assistant Secretary-General. Spain said the current retirement age was low and often resulted in retirement at the very time a staff member could be most useful to the Organization.

Reservations about raising the retirement age were voiced in the Committee's debates on pensions and on personnel policies. Austria said the right of staff to retire at 60 must not be denied. Hungary and Suriname did not agree to the suggestion to raise the retirement age to 65. Japan could not support a higher retirement age, believing that it would have many negative effects on personnel policy. Malawi favoured standardization of the retirement age without necessarily raising the limit above 60. The Upper Volta doubted whether increasing the retirement age to 65 would be the best way of eliminating the Pension Fund's actuarial deficit and believed the effects of such a move on personnel matters should be studied. In Yugoslavia's view, such a measure would not improve the Fund's actuarial position, but would block the recycling of Secretariat personnel and hamper professional mobility.

Several States expressed concern about the effects a rise in the retirement age would have on the Secretariat's nationality balance. Greece said raising the retirement age would perpetuate geographical imbalances. Stressing the political impact of the United States draft resolution, Kenya, supported by Uganda, said that, whatever the results of the study, the principle of

equitable geographical distribution must not be jeopardized. While expressing concern about the actuarial imbalance of the Pension Fund, the USSR said the proposal would lead to only a temporary improvement which would be followed by a sharper deterioration; its adoption would extend the service of staff holding permanent contracts and jeopardize the geographical distribution of posts.

Algeria and Yugoslavia preferred that a comprehensive study be carried out before the Committee was asked to decide on the matter. The Bahamas, however, considered the proposed study inadvisable because an analysis would not provide any new information, and Ghana questioned its timeliness.

The Federal Republic of Germany was among those favouring keeping to the minimum extensions beyond the established retirement age. Greece said that extensions beyond that age granted in 1981 could have been avoided if post vacancies had been announced well in advance. Mauritania and Mongolia were among those sharing the view of JIU on the subject. The Syrian Arab Republic called for the statutory retirement age to be respected strictly. Uganda expressed the view that more could have been done to enforce the mandatory age by beginning to seek a replacement well before a staff member retired.

Draft resolution withdrawn: <sup>(1)</sup>United States, A/C.5/36/L.6/Rev.1.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/624; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/36/495.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>33/143, sect. II, para. 3, 20 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 989); <sup>(5)</sup>35/210, sect. I, para. 6, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1165); <sup>(6)</sup>36/118 B, 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1345).

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.31, 40, 48 (4-19 Nov.).

## Other staff questions

### Privileges and immunities

The Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC), in its annual overview report for 1980/1981 submitted to the Economic and Social Council in May,<sup>(7)</sup> expressed concern at what it called the tendency of some countries to demonstrate contempt for international rules and practices, which could seriously affect the security and effectiveness of the international civil service. It recalled a statement it had adopted in 1980, expressing concern at measures against international civil servants which threatened their security and obstructed the discharge of their duties.<sup>(19)</sup>

In November 1981, the Secretary-General submitted a report,<sup>(10)</sup> requested by the General Assembly in December 1980,<sup>(14)</sup> on cases in which

the international status of staff of the United Nations or the specialized agencies had not been fully respected. The report used a definition of "cases" approved by ACC on 14 April 1981,<sup>(16)</sup> relating to instances where a verified breach of a staff member's status had occurred and had not been remedied by the Government concerned. The law on this matter, ACC said, should consist principally of the Charter of the United Nations and other constituent instruments of the organizations concerned, the 1946 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations,<sup>(11)</sup> the 1947 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies,<sup>(12)</sup> the 1959 Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the various headquarters agreements, the Standard Basic Assistance Agreements of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the practice developed in implementing those agreements.

The report, based in part on information from these organizations, gave details of 47 cases of arrest, detention or disappearance, as follows: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)—26 cases in the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic, including one staff member recently sentenced in the West Bank and, in the Syrian Arab Republic, one currently detained and one missing; UNDP—11 cases in Poland, Uganda and the United Arab Emirates, including one imprisoned in Poland since 1979; United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)—3 cases in Afghanistan and Mozambique, including one currently detained; Economic Commission for Africa—4 cases in Ethiopia, including 2 currently detained and 1 missing after detention; Economic Commission for Latin America—2 earlier cases in Chile; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)—1 case in the German Democratic Republic, currently under arrest.

The report also mentioned restrictions imposed by Israel on the official travel of five UNRWA officials, and differences with Thailand over duty-free importation of automobiles by three officers with the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.

Cited in the report was a January 1980 memorandum from the Assistant Secretary-General for General Services to the heads of United Nations offices away from Headquarters, stating that the United Nations had the right to visit and converse with an arrested staff member, to be apprised of the grounds for arrest or detention, to assist the staff member in arranging for legal counsel and to appear in legal proceedings to defend any United Nations interest.

In written comments to the General Assembly's Fifth Committee in October on various personnel matters,<sup>(8)</sup> the Federation of International Civil Servants' Associations asked that the fate of staff who had been arrested or detained or had disappeared be drawn to the Assembly's attention, and urged reiteration of an appeal to Member States to respect the privileges and immunities of officials of United Nations organizations and the status of all international civil servants.

The staff organizations of the Secretariat, in their October report for the Committee,<sup>(9)</sup> proposed that diplomatic immunity, but not privileges, be accorded to all United Nations staff. They suggested that this be done through a protocol to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, which, they noted, accorded such immunity only to staff at the Assistant Secretary-General level and above, and to experts on mission.

The number of parties to the Conventions on the privileges and immunities of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies remained unchanged during 1981 (p. 1243). Action was taken during 1981 to improve security measures for staff and premises of the United Nations system (p. 1383).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 18 December, the General Assembly, in a resolution on the privileges and immunities of United Nations system officials,<sup>(15)</sup> appealed to any Member State which had arrested or detained such a person to enable the Secretary-General or organization head to visit and converse with the staff member, to apprise himself of the grounds for arrest or detention, to enable him to assist in arranging for legal counsel and to recognize the functional immunity of a staff member as asserted by him in conformity with international law. The Secretary-General was asked to request information from other United Nations organizations on cases where there were clear indications that those principles or the status of staff had not been respected, and to report annually on cases in which he had been unable to exercise full responsibility for the protection of United Nations staff. The Assembly requested him and organization heads to ensure that staff observed their obligations in accordance with the staff rules and regulations and international conventions.

The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 117 to none, with 17 abstentions. On 11 December, the revised 19-nation draft, amended by Ethiopia and the German Democratic Republic with an oral sub-amendment by Sri Lanka, and further orally amended by Jordan, had been approved by the Fifth Committee by a recorded vote of 78 to none, with 27 abstentions.

The approved amendment by Ethiopia and the German Democratic Republic added a preambular paragraph recalling staff obligations, in the conduct of their duties, to observe the laws and regulations of States. It was adopted by 75 votes to 8, with 17 abstentions, after its sponsors accepted an oral proposal by Sri Lanka-supported by Morocco- that the paragraph be added to the text rather than replace one recalling that the International Court of Justice had held (in a 1949 advisory opinion<sup>(17)</sup>) that international organizations had the power and responsibility to protect their staff.

The Jordanian amendments, supported by Morocco, were accepted by the resolution's sponsors. Among other things, they: added to the last preambular paragraph-recalling that staff of specialized agencies enjoyed privileges and immunities similar to those of the United Nations- the phrase "in accordance with the instruments mentioned in the second preambular paragraph above" (a reference to conventions on privileges and immunities and agreements with host Governments); added references to these instruments in paragraphs 1 and 4; deleted from paragraph 1 the words "whether internationally or locally recruited" from the clause appealing for action by States in regard to arrested or detained staff; and, in paragraph 4, replaced a reference to the "inherent right and duty" of organization heads to protect their staff by the word "responsibility".

The amended paragraph 1-appealing to States to follow certain principles when they had arrested or detained a staff member-was approved by 70 votes to 14, with 17 abstentions. The amended paragraph 4-requesting an annual report-was approved by 72 votes to 14, with 16 abstentions.

Four other amendments by Ethiopia and the German Democratic Republic were rejected in Committee by recorded votes, taken at Ethiopia's request. They were as follows:

In the fourth preambular paragraph, to have the Assembly note the various positions of States on the role and responsibility of the Secretary-General and of agency heads (instead of the position consistently upheld by the United Nations) in the event of arrest and detention of United Nations staff-rejected by 51 votes to 21, with 25 abstentions; to replace paragraph 1 by an appeal that all Member States respect the privileges and immunities accorded United Nations officials by the 1946 and 1947 Conventions-rejected by 51 votes to 23, with 24 abstentions; in paragraph 3, to delete mention of the principles from the request that United Nations organizations inform the Secretary-General of cases where the principles in paragraph 1 or a

staff member's status had not been respected, and to add a request that he report to the Assembly "whenever necessary"-rejected by 52 votes to 19, with 28 abstentions; and to delete paragraph 4, containing the request for an annual report from the Secretary-General-rejected by 59 votes to 20, with 23 abstentions.

The fourth preambular paragraph, unamended, was approved by 70 votes to 13, with 18 abstentions.

The Committee, by recorded votes, also rejected two amendments by Bulgaria:<sup>(5)</sup> to add a preambular paragraph stating that nothing in the resolution authorized the United Nations or the specialized agencies to intervene in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State-rejected by 45 votes to 34, with 19 abstentions; and to delete a preambular paragraph expressing awareness of the necessity that staff be enabled to discharge tasks assigned by the Secretary-General without interference-rejected by 57 votes to 19, with 23 abstentions.

Three additional operative paragraphs proposed by the USSR<sup>(6)</sup> were rejected in Committee by recorded votes requested by New Zealand: an appeal that any Member State which had-arrested or detained a United Nations staff member enable an official of the Member State of which the staff member was a national to visit and converse with him, without prejudice to the 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations<sup>(18)</sup> by 48 votes to 27, with 24 abstentions (the reference to the Vienna Convention was added to the amendment on an oral proposal by New Zealand which the USSR accepted); a request that the Secretary-General present in 1982 a comparative analysis of the levels of privileges and immunities enjoyed by staff in the States where United Nations organizations had their headquarters-rejected by 48 votes to 30, with 24 abstentions; and a decision that the privileges and immunities item be considered in 1982 by the Sixth (Legal) Committee-rejected by 45 votes to 31, with 25 abstentions.

The last amendment was proposed orally after the USSR withdrew an amendment to have the Assembly appeal to Member States in which the headquarters of the United Nations and the specialized agencies were located to ensure that the levels of privileges and immunities granted to staff members were raised to the most favourable existing level.

Amendments to the original draft resolution were not put to the vote after the revised text was submitted. They included amendments by: Bulgaria, to include a reference to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter (on non-intervention in the domestic jurisdiction of a Member State);<sup>(1)</sup> Ethiopia, to mention the obligation of staff to

refrain from abuses of privilege and to have the Secretary-General submit a report when he deemed necessary (rather than annually);<sup>(2)</sup> the German Democratic Republic, to state that the privileges and immunities of United Nations officials under Article 105 of the Charter were indispensable for a proper discharge of their duties, and to delete mention of the 1949 advisory opinion in which the International Court held that international organizations had the power and responsibility to protect their staff;<sup>(3)</sup> and the USSR, to add an appeal that an official from an arrested or detained staff member's State be enabled to visit him, a request for a comparative analysis of the levels of privileges and immunities enjoyed in different headquarters countries, and an appeal that host Governments raise that level to the most favourable of existing ones.<sup>(4)</sup>

The revised draft resolution incorporated four preambular paragraphs proposed to the original by the German Democratic Republic, mentioning Article 100 on the commitment of each Member State to respect the exclusively international character of staff members' responsibilities and the requirement that staff not seek or receive instructions from any external authority, reaffirming staff regulations, and citing the necessity that staff be enabled to discharge their duties without interference. The German Democratic Republic noted that these paragraphs had been taken from the 1980 Assembly resolution on the subject.<sup>(13)</sup> Also incorporated in the revised text, with modified wording, was a paragraph by Ethiopia requesting the Secretary-General to ensure that staff observed their obligations under the conventions on privileges and immunities and the staff rules and regulations.

The Netherlands, which introduced the draft resolution in its original and later revised forms, said the sponsors believed it necessary to reaffirm the responsibility of international organizations to protect their staff. The text did not cover acts performed in a personal capacity, nor was it intended to put any country on trial. The revised draft struck a balance between the need to protect the staff and the obligations with which they must comply. It extended no new immunities, nor did it extend the range of staff to whom those immunities applied; it merely reaffirmed existing commitments and powers.

In the Committee's debate, the United Nations Legal Counsel explained that most United Nations officials-including locally recruited salaried employees-were accorded functional rather than diplomatic immunity, meaning that the immunity attached not to the person but to official acts. Most violations cited in the Secretary-General's report involved cases in

which the Secretary-General had been prevented from exercising his right under international instruments to determine independently whether an official act had been involved.

Explaining their abstentions on all amendments and the draft text as a whole, Algeria ascribed its position to the circumstances in which the debate had taken place while Egypt stated that it regarded the proposals as unbalanced. Brazil said it had abstained on the draft resolution because a number of issues required further legal study-a view shared by Yugoslavia, which voted in favour. Sierra Leone said its abstentions in all the votes reflected its view that the issues transcended administrative and budgetary questions and that the Fifth Committee could have benefited from the Sixth Committee's views.

Iraq said it had not participated in the vote as it considered a precipitate decision unwise; but, as the future host country of the Economic Commission for Western Asia (p. 672), it was providing every possible assistance to the United Nations and its staff.

Ethiopia, which voted for the resolution, expressed reservations on paragraphs 1 and 4. Jordan, also voting affirmatively, voiced dissatisfaction with the Secretary-General's report on the grounds that it used the term "east Jordan" instead of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, it made no reference to the fact that the West Bank had been an occupied territory since 1967, and it accused Jordan of violating various agreements without giving Jordan an opportunity to defend itself. Explaining its positive vote, Liberia said the resolution was well balanced and incorporated the views of various States.

A number of States expressed their views on individual provisions of the resolution and the amendments proposed to it.

Introducing the amendments it sponsored jointly with Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic said they proposed to replace paragraph 1 because it provided for a procedure which, if accepted, would be a near violation of the sovereignty of Member States.

Several States explained their negative votes on the four rejected two-nation amendments. Canada said they would seriously dilute the Secretary-General's inherent rights and duties in respect of protection of the functional immunities of staff. The Netherlands said they would reverse the thrust of the resolution, depriving the Secretary-General of an opportunity to be active and dynamic in supporting the staff. Peru felt the resolution's sponsors had made every effort to arrive at consensus by accepting a number of changes. Spain said the sponsors would regard a vote for the amendments as a vote against their draft. The United States said

the amendments sought to replace an important principle by a statement that varying views were held, and suggested that the Secretariat be stripped of the right to express concern about officials in difficulties, including trial or detention.

Chile abstained on paragraph 1, stating that it would have preferred a clearer statement that in no case did staff privileges and immunities affect the independence of national judiciaries or domestic laws. Malawi, which voted for the amendment to paragraph 1, reserved its position on the paragraph as approved. Mauritania abstained in the votes on the two-nation amendments, referring to its view that the proposals had legal implications which should be handled by the Sixth Committee.

Commenting on the one amendment by Ethiopia and the German Democratic Republic which the Committee approved, the United States, though voting against, said it had no difficulty with wording recalling the obligations of the staff, on the understanding that observance of those obligations was not a pre-condition to respect for privileges and immunities.

The USSR, speaking of its amendments proposing a comparative study of privileges and immunities in different headquarters cities and appealing to States to raise privileges and immunities to the most favourable existing level, said the privileges and immunities granted to international civil servants in Austria and Switzerland were much more extensive than those granted in New York.

The Netherlands regarded this proposed appeal as a new element best dealt with in a separate draft resolution. New Zealand thought the appeal would prejudice the results of the proposed study. The United States, which voted against the proposal for a study, said the requested analysis was similar to one made in 1974 and, as no substantial changes had occurred since then, it would be a waste of time.

Explaining their votes against the USSR amendment requesting that an official of an arrested staff member's country be allowed to visit him, Canada regarded it as redundant; Ghana said it might conflict with Article 100 of the Charter (on the international character of the staff); the Netherlands thought such a matter should be dealt with through bilateral contacts between the country of nationality and the host country, and the United States remarked that legal difficulties would arise where the State of nationality had no relations with the State with which the staff member had problems.

Four States explained their votes against the USSR amendment to have staff privileges and immunities discussed by the Sixth Committee

beginning in 1982. Australia felt the amendment was procedurally incorrect; the Fifth Committee could not decide, but only recommend, that an item be considered by the Sixth Committee. Canada and Spain said that if the Sixth Committee were to deal with the item, it should consider only the legal aspects; personnel aspects should remain before the Fifth Committee. The Netherlands said the proposal ran counter to the earlier decision to discuss the matter in the Fifth Committee.

Bulgaria, introducing its amendments, said the draft resolution was one-sided; observance of privileges and immunities should not be at the expense of the rights of Member States.

Explaining why it had proposed to delete the reference to the advisory opinion of the International Court, the German Democratic Republic said it was inappropriate to refer to an opinion which the Assembly had never endorsed.

Before the voting, Iraq proposed that the matter be deferred until 1982 and submitted then to the Sixth Committee; it remarked that the Secretary-General's report contained misleading political connotations and the revised draft resolution would present Governments with problems of implementation. Iraq's proposal was supported by Algeria, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Mauritania, the United Arab Emirates and Yugoslavia; they felt that political and legal implications were involved and that unnecessary confrontation should be avoided. Sri Lanka thought a co-ordinated meeting of the Fifth and Sixth Committees should have been sought and that the resolution did not take full account of the laws of host countries.

A number of States explained their opposition to deferral. Barbados said deferral would erode the confidence of the staff and might result in prolonged imprisonment for those being held incommunicado. The latter point was echoed by Australia and Canada, with Canada adding that deferral would be an abdication by Member States of their responsibilities. France said the practical implications of the resolution merited immediate attention. Ghana saw the question as neutral since the resolution made no specific reference to any country or individual. Greece and Trinidad and Tobago felt that the matter was within the Fifth Committee's competence and the context of personnel questions. The United Kingdom concurred and was joined by Mexico and New Zealand in pointing out that lengthy consultations on the draft resolution had already taken place. Kenya saw no reason to defer, as the sponsors of the resolution had agreed to amendments that covered all matters of concern to Kenya.



Also opposing deferral, Spain said the resolution's adoption would provide the incoming Secretary-General with the means to take firm action to protect United Nations officials. Sweden was concerned that deferral might mean the question would not receive the consideration it merited. This position was shared by Australia, which added that the draft did no more than recall existing provisions. The United States felt that deferral would be a rebuff to the United Nations and its staff.

The Bahamas abstained on the Iraqi proposal but said immediate action should be taken to prevent further hardship for staff members.

After deciding, by 48 votes to 39, with 11 abstentions, to give priority to Iraq's proposal, the Committee rejected it by a recorded vote, requested by Canada, of 51 to 41, with 16 abstentions.

Also during the item's consideration, the United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Community (EC) members, proposed that a paper presented by the UNESCO Director-General to that body's Executive Board be distributed to the Committee. Subsequently, the United Kingdom withdrew the proposal, stating that this was in the interest of expediting the Committee's work. The proposal had been supported by the United States but opposed by the German Democratic Republic and the USSR on the grounds that no new facts had been presented and that the issue was not relevant to the item under discussion.

During the the Fifth Committee's discussion of personnel questions, the Committee heard a statement by a representative of staff organizations in the United Nations Secretariat (p. 1334), who said the Organization's effectiveness and authority were seriously compromised when the Secretary-General was unable to offer guarantees of protection to his staff.

Most speakers in the debate urged respect for staff privileges and immunities. Barbados and Liberia voiced disapproval of their infringement and urged all States to comply with their commitments and obligations. Mauritania pledged to abide by its commitment to respect staff privileges and immunities. Mexico remarked that, as all members of an organization had acceded to its constituent instrument, they must respect the guarantees established in the staff rules.

The Netherlands supported the Secretary-General's view that he should be able to converse with arrested or detained staff, be apprised of the charges against them, assist in arranging for legal counsel and be given the right to defend any United Nations interest in legal proceedings. Taking a similar position, Sweden, on behalf of the Nordic States, said the immunity of United

Nations employees was an integral part of the characteristics of an independent international civil service. This view was shared by the United Kingdom, for the EC members, which added that only the Secretary-General or other organization head could determine whether particular acts had been performed in an official capacity. The United States observed that a violation of the immunity of an international civil servant was an attack on the United Nations.

The Byelorussian SSR expressed the view that the Secretary-General's report presented unclear and tendentious information and slandered some States. Czechoslovakia said it firmly opposed any interpretation of immunities that would allow staff to enjoy United Nations protection even if they had violated obligations imposed by the Charter. Ethiopia stated that, by abusing their privileges and immunities, staff were often a source of conflict and misunderstanding between an international organization and the host country; the best way to protect their rights was to establish a mechanism through which the host country and the organization could work to see that those rights were exercised solely for the work of the organization. The USSR said it favoured strengthening the privileges and immunities of international civil servants; however, the intelligence services of imperialist States recruited such persons, in flagrant violation of their status, for activities having nothing to do with international organizations.

India expressed the view that the practice of some countries which made supplementary payments to their nationals in the Secretariat (p. 1337) was a much more damaging violation of its international character than the small number of reported cases in which privileges and immunities had been violated. Jordan said it respected international law and conventions on privileges and immunities but did not think they covered violation of the laws of the host country by local citizens subject to those laws. Malawi thought the United Nations and related organizations should continue efforts to negotiate with the States concerned. The Syrian Arab Republic and the United Republic of Cameroon said they intended to respect all applicable instruments and hoped international civil servants would observe the regulations that guided their professional conduct.

Chile and Peru voiced reservations on the proposal by Secretariat staff organizations (p. 1354) to grant diplomatic immunity to all categories of staff; they believed this would give rise to abuses.

With regard to the case of Percy Stulz, Director of the Cultural Heritage Division of UNESCO who according to the Secretary-General's report

had been detained and arrested while visiting his country, the German Democratic Republic, in March 1980—the representative of that country told the Fifth Committee that Mr. Stulz had been sentenced for anti-State activities performed on the instructions of a Western secret service, had submitted his resignation from UNESCO and had subsequently been released after serving two thirds of his prison term. A UNESCO representative informed the Committee that the organization had not been formally informed that Mr. Stulz had been freed, but in any case the State concerned should permit him to return to UNESCO headquarters either to resume work or to resign in conformity with the rules.

Regarding the detention of a locally recruited official of UNICEF in Afghanistan, that country's representative said that, as such a person was first of all a national of his country, the State's jurisdiction over him could not be disputed.

Israel, explaining its vote for the resolution, said that, whenever a staff member was arrested, it endeavoured to give prompt notice to UNRWA and the family concerned; it was unaware of cases in which an individual had been arrested or detained because of acts relating to his functions as a staff member.

Amendments not voted upon (to 14-nation draft A/C.5/36/L.16): <sup>(1)</sup>Bulgaria, A/C.5/36/L.23; <sup>(2)</sup>Ethiopia, A/C.5/36/L.20; <sup>(3)</sup>German Democratic Republic, A/C.5/36/L.18; <sup>(4)</sup>USSR, A/C.5/36/L.19.

Amendments rejected: <sup>(5)</sup>Bulgaria, A/C.5/36/L.40; <sup>(6)</sup>USSR, A/C.5/36/L.37.

Reports: <sup>(7)</sup>ACC, E/1981/37; <sup>(8)</sup>FICSA comments, transmitted by S-G note, A/C.5/36/26; <sup>(9)</sup>Secretariat Staff Unions and Associations, A/C.5/36/19; <sup>(10)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/31.

Resolutions and decision:

Resolution: GA: <sup>(11)</sup>22 A. (I), annex, 13 Feb. 1946 (YUN 1946-47, p. 100); <sup>(12)</sup>179 (II), annex, 21 Nov. 1947 (YUN 1947-48, p. 190); <sup>(13)</sup>35/212, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1142); <sup>(14)</sup>ibid., para. 3 (p. 1143); <sup>(15)</sup>36/232, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Decision: <sup>(16)</sup>ACC: 1981/8, 14 Apr.

Yearbook references: <sup>(17)</sup>1948-49, p. 393; <sup>(18)</sup>1963, p. 510; <sup>(19)</sup>1980, p. 1140.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR. 41, 45, 50-54, 59-61, 65, 68, 69, 77-73 (13 Nov.-14 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/232

117-0-17 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/831) by recorded vote (78-0-27), 11 December (meeting 72); 19-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.16/Rev.1), amended by 2 nations (A/C.5/36/L.36, para. 2, orally sub-amended by Sri Lanka) and orally by Jordan: agenda item 107.

Sponsors of draft: Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Liberia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand.

Sponsors of amendment: Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic.

Respect for the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and related organizations

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/212 of 17 December 1980,

Recalling the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations of 13 February 1946, the Convention on

the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies of 21 November 1947, the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Atomic Energy Agency of 1 July 1959 and the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and related organizations and the respective host Governments,

Noting the report of the Secretary-General,

Noting a/so the position consistently upheld by the United Nations in the event of the arrest and detention of United Nations staff members by governmental authorities,

Reaffirming the responsibility and authority of the Secretary-General as the Chief Administrative Officer of the United Nations under the Charter,

Mindful of Article 100 of the Charter of the United Nations, under which each Member State has undertaken to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary-General and the staff and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities.

Mindful also of the fact that under the same Article of the Charter, the Secretary-General and the staff shall not, in the performance of their duties, seek or receive Instructions from any Government or from any other authority external to the Organization,

Recalling that the International Court of Justice has held that international organizations have the power and responsibility to protect members of their staff.

Recalling also the obligations of the staff in the conduct of their duties to observe the laws and regulations of Member States.

Reaffirming the relevant staff regulations,

Aware of the absolute necessity that staff members be enabled to discharge their tasks as assigned to them by the Secretary-General without interference on the part of any Member State or any other authority external to the Organization.

Realizing that staff members of the specialized agencies and related organizations enjoy similar privileges and immunities in accordance with the instruments mentioned in the second preambular paragraph above,

1. Appeals to any Member State which has placed under arrest or detention a staff member of the United Nations or of a specialized agency or related organization to enable the Secretary-General or the executive head of the organization concerned, in accordance with the rights inherent under the relevant multilateral conventions and bilateral agreements, to visit and converse with the staff member, to apprise himself of the grounds for the arrest or detention, including the main facts and formal charges, to enable him also to assist the staff member in arranging for legal counsel and to recognize the functional immunity of a staff member asserted by the Secretary-General or by the appropriate executive head, in conformity with international law and in accordance with the provisions of the applicable bilateral agreements between the host country and the United Nations or the specialized agency or related organization concerned;

2. Requests the Secretary-General and the executive heads of the organizations concerned to ensure that the staff observe the obligations incumbent upon them, in accordance with the relevant staff rules and regulations, the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies and the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Atomic Energy Agency;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to bring the present resolution to the attention of all specialized agencies and related organizations of the United Nations system, with the request that they furnish information to him on cases where there are clear indications that the principles expressed in paragraph 1 above or the status of the staff members of such an organization have not been fully respected;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at each regular session, on behalf of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, an updated and comprehensive annual report relating to cases in which the

Secretary-General or the competent executive head has not been able to exercise fully his responsibility in respect of the protection of staff members of the United Nations or of a specialized agency or related organization in accordance with the multilateral conventions and applicable bilateral agreements with the host country.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba,<sup>a</sup> Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, China, Czechoslovakia, Fiji,<sup>b</sup> German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Ivory Coast, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Viet Nam.

<sup>a</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

<sup>b</sup> Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to vote in favour.

#### Proposal for a single administrative tribunal

Responding to a 1979 General Assembly decision<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted a note to the Assembly in October 1981 on the feasibility of establishing a single administrative tribunal in the United Nations system.<sup>(3)</sup> Currently two judicial bodies, the United Nations Administrative Tribunal and the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), heard and decided on grievances by staff against the administration.

In the note, the Secretary-General stated that ILO had sought the views of the intergovernmental organizations submitting to the jurisdiction of its Administrative Tribunal, concerning the broad lines along which harmonization between the two tribunals might be sought. The United Nations Office of Legal Affairs had also undertaken a study. As consultations were continuing between ILO and the United Nations, and as the International Court of Justice had been asked for an advisory opinion in respect of a judgement of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal (p. 1202), the Secretary-General suggested that the question be taken up at a future session.

On 18 December, the General Assembly, acting without vote, took note of the Secretary-General's note and requested him to report again in 1982.<sup>(2)</sup> On 9 December, the draft had been similarly approved by the Fifth Committee, as orally proposed by the Chairman.

Decisions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>34/438, 17 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1223); <sup>(2)</sup>36/453, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Note: <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/23.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.55, 60, 62, 65, 69 (25 Nov.-9 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18

General Assembly decision 36/453

Adopted without vote

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/838) without vote, 9 December (meeting 69); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 103 (b).

Feasibility of establishing a single administrative tribunal

At its 105th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee:

(a) Took note of the note by the Secretary-General on the feasibility of establishing a single administrative tribunal;

(b) Requested the Secretary-General, pursuant to General Assembly decision 34/438 of 17 December 1979, to submit a report on the subject to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Activities of the UN Administrative Tribunal

The United Nations Administrative Tribunal met in a special plenary session at Geneva on 8 May 1981 and in its annual plenary session in New York on 8 October. It held two panel sessions during the year, at Geneva from 27 April to 15 May and in New York from 21 September to 9 October, at which it considered 12 cases. During 1981, the Tribunal delivered 13 judgements. An outline of its work was transmitted to the General Assembly in October, attached to a note by the Secretary-General.<sup>(1)</sup> The International Court of Justice received a request for an advisory opinion on a May 1981 judgement by the Tribunal (p. 1202).

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>Administrative Tribunal, transmitted by S-G note, A/INF/36/5.

#### Travel of staff and other UN officials

In his annual report to the General Assembly on first-class travel in the United Nations, issued in October 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> the Secretary-General estimated that \$247, 226 had been saved between 1 October 1980 and 30 June 1981 through application of the rule, established by the Assembly in 1977, that most high officials previously entitled to first-class travel for all flights would have only economy-class entitlement for flights of under nine hours.<sup>(2)</sup> The report also listed exceptions made during the period to allow first-class travel by 14 officials, mainly staff members, including 5 cases for medical reasons.

In addition, in response to a December 1980 request by the Assembly for a study on travel of permanent representatives accredited to the United Nations while on official missions for the Organization,<sup>(3)</sup> the report said that, out of 155 such trips between 1 January 1978 and 30 April 1981, 35 had been made in whole or in part by first class, either because they had been longer than nine hours or because exceptions had been made. If all 155 trips had been by first class, they

would have cost \$297,209, or 43 per cent higher than their actual cost of \$208,191-averaging about \$574 more per trip.

On 18 December, the General Assembly, by a section of its resolution on questions relating to the programme budget for 1982-1983,<sup>(4)</sup> took note of the report. This section of the resolution was adopted without vote. On 24 November, the draft had been approved without objection by the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, as orally proposed by the Chairman on an oral recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/16.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>32/198, 21 Dec. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 1004); <sup>(3)</sup>35/217, sect. X, para. 4, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1197); <sup>(4)</sup>36/235, sect. V, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 52 (12 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section V

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 24 November (meeting 52); oral proposal by Chairman on ACABQ oral recommendation; agenda item 100.

First-class travel in the United Nations

[ The General Assembly ...]

Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on first-class travel in the United Nations;

#### Use of experts and consultants

Pursuant to a December 1980 General Assembly request,<sup>(4)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted a report in November 1981 on the use of experts and consultants in the United Nations.<sup>(3)</sup> The report ascribed past difficulties in monitoring their use to the lack of clear definitions. It stated that, early in 1982, new administrative instructions would be issued establishing policies for obtaining the services of individuals on behalf of the Organization and distinguishing between regular staff, temporary staff, individual contractors, consultants, participants in advisory meetings and technical co-operation personnel. Consultants and participants in advisory meetings would be used to provide expertise, special skills or knowledge not normally possessed by regular staff and for which there was no continuing need in the Secretariat. Consultants would not be engaged to assist regular staff in their normal work or to deal with peak work-loads or unexpected demands or to cover temporary vacancies; those needs would be met by temporary staff or contractors.

A table annexed to the report showed that \$6,102,000 had been spent on consultants in 1980 under the United Nations regular budget, consisting of \$4,870,300 in remuneration and \$1,231,700 for travel. In addition, \$1,830,300

had been spent from extrabudgetary funds.

In a December 1981 report,<sup>(2)</sup> ACABQ stated that strict application of the definitions proposed by the Secretary-General should lead to reduced expenditure on consultants. If that was accompanied by greater use of temporary staff, strengthened administrative controls would be needed. Believing that up-to-date data on the use of consultants and temporary staff would assist its consideration of the Secretary-General's budget proposals, ACABQ recommended that his next report on the subject cover the period to February or March 1983 and be available to ACABQ in time for its examination of the proposed budget for 1984-1985.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 18 December 1981, the General Assembly, by a section of its resolution on the programme budget for 1982-1983,<sup>(5)</sup> took note of both reports and requested the Secretary-General to submit an updated report in 1982. This section was adopted without vote. On 17 December 1981, the draft had been similarly approved by the Fifth Committee, as orally proposed by the Chairman on Poland's suggestion.

In a related action on 18 December, the Assembly requested information on experts and consultants employed by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations (p. 604).

No action was taken on a draft resolution submitted in the Fifth Committee by the United States.<sup>(1)</sup> This would have had the Assembly note with concern that appropriations for experts and consultants had increased by 61.5 per cent between 1976-1977 and 1980-1981, express pleasure that the Secretary-General's proposed budget for 1982-1983 reflected a 10.6 per cent decrease for this item from the previous biennium, note with concern that additional appropriations approved by the Assembly in 1981 would significantly increase the initial estimates, and request the Secretary-General to re-examine proposed expenditures on experts and consultants in 1982-1983 with a view to achieving savings.

Draft resolution not acted upon: <sup>(1)</sup>United States, A/C.5/36/L.48.

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/7/Add.15; <sup>(3)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/46.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(4)</sup>35/224, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1246); <sup>(5)</sup>36/235, sect. XIX, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 82 (12-22 Oct. & 17 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section XIX

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without vote. 17 December (meeting 82); oral proposal by Chairman on Suggestion by Poland; agenda item 100.

Use of experts and consultants in the United Nations

[ The General Assembly ...]

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the use of experts and consultants in the United Nations and

the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to submit an updated report on this subject to the General Assembly at Its thirty-seventh session;

#### Methods of determining staff requirements

A January 1981 report by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), prepared by Inspector Mark E. Allen and transmitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General in April, stated that the most important feature in the budgetary process from the point of view of cost and administrative efficiency was determining the number of staff required to carry out programmes and their distribution among secretariat units. Noting that staff costs accounted for about 70 per cent of regular budgets of the United Nations system, or about \$900 million in 1980, the report concluded that units did not have sufficiently precise techniques for accurately assessing their staffing requirements and that central management services could play a greater role in that respect. Reviews of staff requirements did not give sufficient attention to demonstrating the continuing need for existing staff, and legislative bodies did not always have the information needed for an informed judgement.

The report recommended that: work measurement systems and analytical estimating techniques should be devised for both new and existing posts, leading to the adoption of productivity norms to guide the preparation of staffing

proposals; organizations with central management services should participate in determining staff requirements by helping to introduce such systems; secretariats should provide legislative bodies with information in their draft budgets to permit better assessment of staffing proposals; and those bodies should decide whether the cost of programme elements was commensurate with their value or whether there were cheaper alternatives.

Commenting on this report in October,<sup>(3)</sup> the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) said it would not be desirable or possible to formulate one set of practices and procedures for determining staff requirements that would be useful for all United Nations organizations, in view of their varied budgetary and management practices. While endorsing the use of work measurement techniques and accepting the recommendations for inter-agency information exchange and participation of central management services, ACC was not convinced that including greater detail in budget documents would be useful.

On 18 December, the General Assembly took note of this and other JIU reports.<sup>(1)</sup>

During discussion of JIU reports in the Fifth Committee, Barbados expressed the view that furnishing additional detail in budget documents could only be helpful to States responsible for approving budgets.

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/454, para. (a) (ii), 18 Dec. (p. 1314).

Reports: <sup>(2)</sup>JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/168; and <sup>(3)</sup>ACC comments, Add.1.

## Chapter IV

### Other administrative and management questions

The General Assembly approved in December 1981 measures to rationalize the scheduling of United Nations conferences and meetings, and extended until the end of 1982 a moratorium on the establishment of new subsidiary bodies of the Assembly.<sup>(2)</sup> Also in December, it decided that documents be given simultaneous distribution in the various United Nations languages;<sup>(3)</sup> urged United Nations-related bodies established by treaty to review their documentation requirements;<sup>(4)</sup> and approved guidelines for the control and limitation of documentation for special conferences.<sup>(5)</sup>

Most of those actions were taken on the recommendation of the Committee on Conferences. In addition, the Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee approved funding for additional Arabic language services in

1982-1983 for the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and subsidiary bodies of the Assembly (p. 1369). The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) presented recommendations on ways to improve the documentation system (p. 1370).

On other administrative questions, the Committee of Governmental Experts to Evaluate the Present Structure of the Secretariat in the Administrative, Finance and Personnel Areas began its work by identifying areas for further inquiry (p. 1376). In December, the Assembly requested the Committee to continue its work.<sup>(6)</sup> JIU recommended measures to improve the management services of the United Nations system (p. 1378).

Also in December, the Assembly approved a revised construction project at Nairobi, Kenya, for a permanent headquarters of the United

Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (p. 1380). Agreement was reached between the two main Secretariat units located at the United Nations Centre at Nairobi-UNEP and the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) - that a common organizational unit should administer certain of their administrative services (p. 1381).

Two agreements with the Government of Austria concerning facilities at the Vienna International Centre entered into force in 1981 (p. 1381). In December, the Assembly requested a study of the adequacy of conference facilities at the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Africa at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (p. 634). JIU reported on building construction procedures of United Nations organizations (p. 1382) and the Secretary-General submitted an interim report on office accommodation at Headquarters (p. 1380).

The Assembly in December authorized the Secretary-General to enter into financial commitments for security measures to protect staff members and property at field offices of United Nations organizations, with the expenses to be shared by those organizations under an agreed reimbursement formula (p. 1383).

In July, the Economic and Social Council approved measures intended to strengthen inter-agency co-ordination of computerized information systems.<sup>(1)</sup> The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination decided to continue the Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems as a clearing-house and forum for the exchange of experience on information systems within the United Nations system, but without operational functions or an operational secretariat (p. 1386). In December, the Assembly approved budget estimates for the International Computing Centre (p. 1387).

The 1981 gross revenue of the United Nations Postal Administration from the sale of philatelic items totalled almost \$17 million. During the year, six commemorative postage stamps and two souvenir cards were issued (p. 1387).

Resolutions: <sup>(1)</sup>ESC: 1981/63, 23 July (p. 1385). GA: <sup>(2)</sup>36/117 A (p. 1364), <sup>(3)</sup>36/117 B (p. 1376), <sup>(4)</sup>36/117 C (p. 1373), <sup>(5)</sup>36/117 D (p. 1374), 10 Dec.; <sup>(6)</sup>36/238, 18 Dec. (p. 1378).

## Conferences and meetings

On 10 December 1981, the General Assembly adopted four resolutions relating to the pattern of conferences, including conference-related documentation (p. 1370).

By the first resolution, on the future work of the Committee on Conferences,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted with-

out vote, the Assembly took note of the Committee's report and approved its recommendations. It decided that the capacity of the United Nations Secretariat's documentation services should be considered in drawing up calendars of conferences and meetings (p. 1365). It extended a moratorium on the establishment of subsidiary bodies of the Assembly (p. 1366) and dealt with the possibility of shortening sessions of United Nations organs (p. 1367). It recommended that the Economic and Social Council consider calling on the Committee on Conferences to review proposals affecting the Council's calendar and asked the Secretary-General to prepare a manual to assist committee secretaries (p. 1365). It approved the calendar of United Nations conferences and meetings for 1982-1983 (p. 1368), requested the Secretary-General to submit a programme for replacing and upgrading electronic equipment in the conference rooms at Headquarters and asked for recommendations on the way in which conference-servicing costs were calculated (p. 1368).

The Fifth Committee approved the text, which was prepared during informal consultations and introduced by a Committee Vice-Chairman, without vote on 4 December.

Most of the provisions of the resolution were based on recommendations by the Committee on Conferences.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES. The work of the 22-member Committee on Conferences in 1981 focused on five main areas: control and limitation of documentation; utilization of conference resources; calendar of conferences and meetings for 1982-1983; co-ordination of United Nations conferences; and future requirements for conference services, facilities and documentation.

The Committee held 12 meetings between 30 January and 18 September to deal with specific problems pertaining to the 1981 calendar of conferences (p. 1367). In addition, it held four meetings on substantive questions from 22 to 24 April.

In accordance with a November 1980 Assembly resolution outlining the Committee's main tasks,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee agreed on a procedure for reviewing proposals made at Assembly sessions which affected the schedule of conferences and meetings.

In its report submitted to the Assembly in September,<sup>(1)</sup> the Committee made several recommendations concerning the limitation of conference documentation, including reports of subsidiary organs of the Assembly (p. 1370). It recommended to the Assembly the adoption of two draft resolutions: one on possible limitation of documentation of treaty bodies, and the

other containing guidelines for the control and limitation of documentation and national papers for special conferences (p. 1373).

The Committee recommended that the Assembly approve the draft calendar of conferences and meetings for 1982-1983 (p. 1368), and that it authorize the Committee to make the necessary adjustments arising from decisions taken by the Assembly at its 1981 regular session and at its 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27), or from the scheduling of a session in 1982 of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (p. 130).

Annexed to the Committee's report were a suggested format for national papers and the draft calendar of conferences and meetings for 1982-1983.

The recommendations of the Committee on Conferences were endorsed in general by a number of speakers in the Fifth Committee debate on the pattern of conferences, among them Bulgaria, Hungary, Kenya, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and Uruguay. Kenya believed that the recommendations contributed constructively by identifying possible areas where rationalization of United Nations activities and savings were feasible, and Ghana said if the recommendations were implemented the high cost resulting from the proliferation of conferences would be minimized. The USSR, on the other hand, remarked that the Committee had made little headway in holding down the costs of conferences and meetings. The Ukrainian SSR expressed a similar opinion, and Hungary said the Committee must fulfil its mandate by making recommendations that would ensure the most efficient use of conference resources, facilities and services.

The United States suggested that the Committee, in co-operation with the United Nations Secretariat and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, study ways to remedy the inadequacy of information on conference services provided in the programme budget, so that more effective control could be exercised. Yugoslavia declared its support for further strengthening the role of the Committee in its efforts to achieve economical and effective use of conference facilities and related budgetary resources.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Conferences, A/36/32 & Corr.1.  
Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/10A, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1225); <sup>(3)</sup>36/117 A, 10 Dec. 1981, text following.  
Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.44, 45, 51, 54, 55, 57, 60, 63 (17 Nov.-4 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.93 (10 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/117 A

Adopted without vote Meeting 93 10 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/787) without vote. 4 December (meeting 63); draft by Vice-Chairman (A/C.5/36/L.26): agenda items 105,8 (b) and 12.

#### Future work of the Committee on Conferences The General Assembly

##### I

1. Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Committee on Conferences and approves the recommendations contained therein, as amended;
2. Approves the calendar of conferences and meetings of the United Nations for 1982-1983 as submitted by the Committee on Conferences and amended by subsequent decisions taken by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session;
3. Authorizes the Committee on Conferences to make any adjustments, within approved resources, in the calendar of conferences for 1982-1983 that may become necessary as a result of action and decisions by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session and at its second special session devoted to disarmament;
4. Decides that in drawing up future calendars of conferences and meetings the implications on the capacity of the documentation services of the Secretariat to process and issue in time the documentation required for the sessions of all scheduled organs should be taken into account;
5. Invites the Committee on Conferences to pursue its efforts towards accomplishing a shortening of sessions or a biennial cycle of sessions of United Nations organs, as specified in paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 35/10 A of 3 November 1980, with a view to submitting further concrete proposals to the Assembly at its thirty-eighth session;
6. Recommends that the Economic and Social Council should consider calling upon the Committee on Conferences to review, prior to their adoption by the Council, all proposals made at sessions of the Council that affect the schedule of conferences and meetings;
7. Decides to extend until the end of 1982 the moratorium on the establishment of new subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly, as declared in paragraph 1 of its resolution 35/5 of 20 October 1980;
8. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare a manual for secretaries of United Nations organs to guide them in the efficient preparation and organization of their work, in the scheduling of meetings and in the submission of documentation in good time;
9. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, through the Committee on Conferences, a programme of systematic and progressive replacement and upgrading of the electronic equipment in the conference rooms at United Nations Headquarters;

##### II

1. Requests the Committee on Conferences to undertake, on a priority basis, a comprehensive study of the rationale that currently determines the provision of meeting records to the United Nations organs, with a view to identifying criteria for the selection of organs that should receive records in the future and, in this connection, to take fully into account the potential offered by new technologies;
2. Further requests the Committee on Conferences to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session appropriate recommendations in connection with paragraph 1 above and with Assembly resolution 35/10 B of 3 November 1980;
3. Requests the Committee on Conferences to examine the practices and policies followed by the reproduction and documents distribution services of the Secretariat with a view to identifying areas for achieving economies and improving efficiency;
4. Requests the Committee on Conferences, pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/83 of 24 July 1981 on control and limitation of documentation, to review the calendar of conferences and meetings for the biennium 1982-1983, with particular reference to the economic and social fields, with a view to adjusting the calendar to the

servicing capacities within the Secretariat, taking into account the problems that are occurring with regard to the submission and distribution of documents in good time and to consult with the Bureau of the Council concerning the implementation of this request;

5. Confirms the rule that thirty-two pages should be the maximum length of all action-oriented documents prepared by the Secretariat for Intergovernmental meetings, in accordance with the internal instructions of the Secretariat, and requests its subsidiary organs to ensure that their reports shall be as brief as possible and shall not exceed the desired limit of thirty-two pages;

6. Urges all its subsidiary organs to reduce the number of requests for additional documents and to attempt to limit the number of reports required to cover any one subject of specific concern to a given organ;

7. Requests its subsidiary organs to consider inviting the Secretariat to make brief oral statements in lieu of written reports, in particular progress reports, at the outset of each session;

8. Decides that lists of all documents requested by each United Nations organ, including the Main Committees of the General Assembly, shall be submitted by the Secretary-General at the end of each session, with an indication of the date on which it will be possible to issue each document in all required languages, reflecting the time required for its preparation by both the substantive and conference-servicing units of the Secretariat;

9. Insists that the Secretary-General take the necessary administrative measures within available resources to prevent in future the undue delays in the submission of documents for translation, reproduction and distribution which continue to be experienced;

10. Encourages the Secretary-General to make wider use of contractual translation services in view of their demonstrated financial advantages;

11. Decides to refer the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on control and limitation of documentation in the United Nations system, together with the comments of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and the Secretary-General, to the Committee on Conferences for further examination;

12. Requests the Committee on Conferences to consider this and future reports of the Joint Inspection Unit containing recommendations which deal with matters falling within the mandate of the Committee and to submit its observations thereon to the General Assembly for its attention when examining the relevant reports of the Unit;

13. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item entitled "Control and limitation of documentation";

### III

Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the Committee on Conferences and to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions a comprehensive analysis of the existing budgetary techniques used in the calculation and presentation of conference-servicing costs in statements of administrative and financial implications prepared pursuant to rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. In the consolidated statement of conference-servicing costs and in the programme budget and invites both organs to submit appropriate recommendations relevant to their respective areas of competence to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Pattern of conferences

Following a recommendation of the Committee on Conferences,<sup>(1)</sup> the General Assembly, in its resolution of 10 December 1981 on the work of the Committee,<sup>(4)</sup> decided that in drawing up

the calendar of conferences and meetings the implications for the documentation services of the Secretariat, and its ability to issue documentation in time for sessions of United Nations organs, should be taken into account. The Assembly recommended that the Committee review proposals before the Economic and Social Council affecting the schedule of conferences and meetings. It requested the Secretary-General to prepare a manual to assist secretaries of United Nations organs in preparing and organizing their work, scheduling meetings and submitting documentation in good time.

With a view to ensuring the availability of documentation in time for meetings, the Economic and Social Council requested, in a resolution of 24 July,<sup>(2)</sup> that the Secretary-General submit proposals for the consideration of some items before the Council biennially or triennially, suggest how items might be better distributed between the Assembly and the Council, and indicate desirable changes in the calendar of conferences.

The Council recommended that the Assembly examine the question of United Nations documentation (p. 1370) and that the Committee on Conferences be asked to review the 1982-1983 calendar of conferences and meetings, particularly in the economic and social fields, in order to adjust it to the servicing capacities of the Secretariat.

The Trade and Development Board of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), on 7 October 1981, decided to ask UNCTAD to consider at its sixth (1983) session how the Board might comply with a November 1980 Assembly instruction<sup>(3)</sup> that all subsidiary organs of the Assembly complete their reports to the Assembly by 1 September (p. 538).

The recommendation that the Committee on Conferences examine proposals before the Economic and Social Council affecting the calendar of conferences and meetings was endorsed in the Assembly's Fifth Committee by several speakers, including Austria, Brazil and Kenya. The USSR said the Committee should act as an advisory body to the Council, as it had already done for the Assembly.

Hungary and New Zealand endorsed the request that a handbook for conference secretaries be prepared. Indonesia declared it would support any measure to mobilize committee secretaries in an effort to ensure that Assembly decisions on conferences and documentation were put into practice.

Other matters taken up during the debate on the pattern of conferences included a fixed time-limit for statements, favoured by Australia,



among others. Morocco, however, said it might be difficult to implement that suggestion; it favoured instead the preparation of common positions by groups of States, an idea also supported by Australia and Yugoslavia.

Concerning requests for additional conference services, Poland said they should be limited and the United States declared it would not agree to providing conference resources for informal groups. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, on the other hand, considered it important that meetings of unofficial bodies and regional groups, which formed part of the decision-making process, be provided with conference services.

Uruguay expressed concern at the cost of meetings held away from United Nations offices, saying they involved costly transfer of staff, equipment and documents. Japan held it necessary that meetings of marginal usefulness be identified; budget resources for additional meetings or conferences should come only from the termination, or reduction in number, of meetings with a low priority. In order to control demand for conference services, the United States said, perhaps the most effective control could be exercised through the programme budget.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Conferences, A/36/32.

Resolutions: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC: 1981/83, 24 July (p. 1090). GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/10 A, para. 4, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1225); <sup>(4)</sup>36/117 A, sect. I, 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1364).

#### Subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly

##### Establishment of bodies

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 10 December 1981 on the work of the Committee on Conferences, extended until the end of 1982 a moratorium on the establishment of new subsidiary bodies of the Assembly.<sup>(4)</sup> It had declared a one-year moratorium in October 1980, as a temporary measure and with exceptions for certain bodies.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Secretariat, by a note of 19 October 1981 to the Assembly's Fifth Committee,<sup>(1)</sup> pointed out that too short a time had elapsed since the adoption of the October 1980 resolution to allow an assessment of the degree to which the new policy had been implemented. This observation also applied to a provision of a November 1980 Assembly resolution which had stipulated that preparatory committees for special conferences should be established only if preparations could not be carried out appropriately by an existing intergovernmental organ.<sup>(3)</sup>

In the course of its 1981 regular session, the Assembly waived the moratorium several times and established the following: the Ad Hoc Committee of the International Conference on Kampuchea (p. 243), the Group of Governmental Ex-

perts on International Co-operation to Avert New Flows of Refugees (p. 1050), the Interim Committee of the United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology (p. 756), and the Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 690).

Extension of the moratorium was favoured in the Fifth Committee by several speakers, among them Brazil, Hungary and Japan. Hungary, however, noted that the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee of the International Conference on Kampuchea had violated that rule and said such an exception should not be repeated.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>Secretariat, A/C.5/36/22.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/5, para. 1, 20 Oct. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 464); <sup>(3)</sup>35/10 C, para. 2, 3 Nov. 1980 (*ibid.*, p. 1225); <sup>(4)</sup>36/117 A, sect. I, para. 7, 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1364).

##### Meetings of bodies

On 6 and 21 October 1981, the General Assembly decided to permit 10 of its subsidiary bodies to meet at United Nations Headquarters during its regular session.<sup>(2)</sup> The Assembly acted without vote, after the General Committee approved likewise on 6 October the recommendations of the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences, made by letters dated 21 September<sup>(3)</sup> and 2 October<sup>(4)</sup> to the Assembly President. The Chairman had transmitted requests from eight bodies for an exception to the 1979 Assembly decision that its subsidiary bodies should not meet during regular sessions unless specifically authorized to do so.<sup>(1)</sup> In addition, the Chairman recommended on 13 October<sup>(5)</sup> that two further bodies be permitted to hold meetings.

Decisions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>34/401, sect. V, para. 34, 25 Oct. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 441); <sup>(2)</sup>36/403, 6 & 21 Oct. 1981, text following.

Letters: Committee on Conferences Chairman: <sup>(3)</sup>21 Sep., A/36/537; <sup>(4)</sup>2 Oct., A/36/537/Add.1; <sup>(5)</sup>13 Oct., A/36/537/Add.2.

Meeting records: GA: General Committee, A/BUR/36/SR.3 (6 Oct.); plenary, A/36/PV.28, 40 (6, 21 Oct.).

##### General Assembly decision 36/403

Adopted without vote

Approved by General Committee (A/36/250/Add.1) without vote. 6 October (meeting 3); requests by Committee on Conferences Chairman (A/36/537 and Add.1,2) (Add.2 approved by Assembly): agenda item 8 (b).

Meetings of subsidiary organs during the thirty-sixth session  
At its 28th and 40th plenary meetings, on 6 and 21 October 1981, the General Assembly decided that the following subsidiary organs should be authorized to hold meetings during the thirty-sixth session:

(a) Advisory Committee on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa;

(b) Advisory Committee on the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law;

(c) Committee on Relations with the Host Country;

(d) Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(e) Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:

(t) Special Committee against Apartheid:

(g) Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean;

(h) Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa;

(i) United Nations Council for Namibia;

(j) Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

#### Duration of sessions

During 1981, a seven-member working group of the Committee on Conferences- discussed ways to implement requests made by the General Assembly in October<sup>(3)</sup> and November 1980<sup>(4)</sup> that the duration of sessions of subsidiary organs of the Assembly should be reduced.<sup>(2)</sup> On the group's recommendation, the Committee Chairman wrote to the chairmen of seven such bodies seeking their co-operation. He also contacted the Assistant Secretary-General of the Centre for Disarmament with respect to the number and duration of sessions of various expert groups.

Of those which responded, the Committee on Contributions agreed to hold a four-week session only in those years when it considered a new scale of assessments and a two-week session in all other years. The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (p. 1095) adopted a revised pattern of conferences which took account of suggestions by the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences. Other bodies responded that, while it was not possible to shorten their sessions, they could take measures to improve the utilization of conference resources. A note by the Secretariat to the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee<sup>(1)</sup> stated that the results of the Committee's consultations had been reflected in the draft calendar for 1982-1983 (p. 1368).

In its resolution of 10 December 1981 on the work of the Committee on Conferences,<sup>(5)</sup> the Assembly invited the Committee to continue its efforts to bring about a shortening of sessions of subsidiary bodies, or to indicate which could meet on a biennial basis.

During the debate in the Fifth Committee, the USSR expressed regret that the problem of shorter sessions had not been solved and that no subsidiary organ had agreed to decrease the number of its sessions; there were objective criteria, such as the non-use of time and conference services allocated, to evaluate meeting requirements, yet the Committee on Conferences had not taken a consistent position in order to establish such requirements.

Morocco said it was encouraged by the prospect that some sessions could be reduced in length; at the same time, it must be stressed that the United Nations could not carry out its role fully if efforts to collaborate were frustrated and conference diplomacy was jeopardized. In considering the question of shortening sessions, Argentina stated, the needs of developing countries must be borne in mind.

Note: <sup>(1)</sup>Secretariat, A/C.5/36/22.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on Conferences, A/36/32.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>35/5, para. 3, 20 Oct. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 464); <sup>(4)</sup>35/10 A, para. 5, 3 Nov. 1980 (ibid., 1225); <sup>(5)</sup>36/117 A, sect. I, para. 5, 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1364).

#### Calendar of conferences

The Chairman of the Committee on Conferences informed the General Assembly President, by a letter of 15 September 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> how the Committee would implement a November 1980 Assembly resolution on the scheduling of conferences and meetings.<sup>(2)</sup> By that resolution, the Committee was asked to review proposals before the Assembly affecting the calendar of meetings when they had administrative implications. The Chairman stated that the Committee would send its recommendations to the Assembly's Main Committees, with the exception of the Fifth, before they adopted draft resolutions and decisions affecting the calendar. These would be issued as addenda to the statements of administrative and financial implications.

Letter: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Conferences Chairman, 15 Sep., A/36/514.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 35/10 A, para. 6, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1225).

#### Changes in the 1981 calendar

In accordance with its mandate, laid down in 1974<sup>(2)</sup> and redefined in 1977,<sup>(3)</sup> the Committee on Conferences approved changes requested by three bodies in the places or dates of their 1981 sessions. <sup>(1)</sup> In each case the Committee stipulated that the changes should be made within existing resources. It agreed to an additional session for the Intergovernmental Group of Experts on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development (changed from a session in New York in January/February to one at Geneva in April and one in New York in June) (p. 737), to an extended session for the Group of Experts on the Reduction of Military Budgets (Geneva, November/December) (p. 93) and to a change of venue for the International Civil Service Commission (New York instead of Vienna) (p. 1322).

The Committee noted a growing tendency for bodies to seek departures from the calendar for reasons of convenience rather than necessity and decided to consider future requests for changes

only if accompanied by convincing justification. It also decided that the Secretariat should inform the Committee, well in advance, of the need for sessions to be postponed, giving substantive reasons for the delay.

In addition to the changes approved by the Committee, the Economic and Social Council took several decisions affecting the calendar of some of its subsidiary organs, including dates, changes of venue and the addition of sessions (p. 1089). The General Assembly also decided to permit 10 of its subsidiary bodies to meet at United Nations Headquarters during its 1981 regular session (p. 1366).

Speaking during the debate on the pattern of conferences in the Assembly's Fifth Committee, Morocco said it was pleased that all changes in the calendar had been effected without additional financial implications; none the less, it was disturbed at the disruption caused by such changes. Yugoslavia regarded as unacceptable the growing tendency to seek changes in the calendar for reasons of convenience rather than necessity. In Indonesia's view, the wastage of conference resources due to cancellation, late starts and early endings of meetings had reached alarming proportions. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya pointed out that frequent changes impeded the timely preparation and distribution of documents; it hoped the Committee on Conferences would deal at greater length with that problem in its next report.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Conferences, A/36/32.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>3351 (XXIX), sect. II, 18 Dec. 1974 (YUN 1974, p. 922); <sup>(3)</sup>32/72, 9 Dec. 1977 (YUN 1977, p. 1039).

#### 1982-1983 calendar

On the recommendation of the Committee on Conferences, the General Assembly, in its resolution of 10 December 1981 on the work of the Committee, <sup>(2)</sup> approved the 1982-1983 calendar of United Nations conferences and meetings and authorized the Committee to make any changes that might result from decisions of the Assembly in 1981 or at its 1982 special session on disarmament (p. 27). It also approved the recommendation that the Committee should propose necessary adjustments in the calendar resulting from the scheduling in 1982 of a session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (p. 130). The calendar, annexed to the 1981 Committee report, <sup>(1)</sup> contained 196 listings for bodies to meet in 1982 and 173 in 1983.

The Economic and Social Council also approved a 1982-1983 calendar of conferences for its own subsidiary and related organs, and at various times during 1981 it took decisions amending the calendar in respect of dates, venue

and the addition of sessions (p. 108). The Trade and Development Board took similar decisions affecting the 1981-1982 calendar of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (p. 537).

During the Fifth Committee debate, Uruguay said the calendar seemed dynamic and had apparently been determined on the basis of current needs of organs, rather than on their work-load in earlier years. The Ukrainian SSR expressed its support of the calendar on the understanding that any additional meetings and conferences would be funded out of resources released from revised priorities and the elimination of obsolete activities. Argentina said it was gratified by the observation of the Committee on Conferences that for the first time practical results had materialized, which was only the first step towards a more effective distribution of the time available; meetings particularly important for the fulfilment of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations should have priority and be allocated a greater proportion of resources.

Morocco said the 1982-1983 calendar must allow enough time for such bodies as the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund and the United Nations Environment Programme to submit their reports to the Economic and Social Council. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya noted that, despite the importance of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories (p. 301), no meetings had been scheduled for it.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Conferences, A/36/32.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/117 A, sect. I, paras. 2 & 3, 10 Dec. (p. 1364).

#### Conference and meeting services

The General Assembly, in its resolution of 10 December 1981 on the work of the Committee on Conferences, <sup>(3)</sup> requested the Secretary-General to submit to its 1982 regular session a programme for replacing and upgrading electronic equipment in the conference rooms at United Nations Headquarters. It also asked him to submit an analysis to the Committee on Conferences and to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) on the way in which conference-servicing costs were calculated and presented in statements of administrative and financial implications, in the consolidated statement of conference-servicing costs presented near the close of each Assembly session, and in the programme budget. The Assembly invited both Committees to make recommendations on these procedures in 1982.

Earlier in the year, the Committee on Conferences discussed a Secretariat note on future requirements for conference facilities and services, including the replacement and modernization of electronic equipment, the installation of four small conference rooms without interpretation facilities, increased seating capacity in the Economic and Social Council Chamber and in conference rooms, and installation of additional electronic voting machines.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Secretary-General, in his consolidated statement of administrative and financial implications of conference-servicing costs submitted in December, informed the Assembly's Fifth Committee that the full cost of servicing all additional 1982 meetings newly authorized by the Assembly in 1981 totalled \$28,986,400 more than had been provided for in the proposed 1982-1983 budget (\$21 million for Headquarters, \$6.1 million for Geneva and \$1.9 million for Vienna, Austria); however, all but \$12 million of this could be absorbed.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Fifth Committee agreed on 16 December 1981 to an ACABQ recommendation that an additional \$10 million (rather than \$12 million) be appropriated for 1982 for conference-servicing costs, allocated as follows: \$3.6 million for Headquarters, \$3.7 million for Geneva and \$2.7 million for Vienna. Appropriations for conference services in 1982-1983, as included in the 1982-1983 programme budget approved by the Assembly on 18 December 1981,<sup>(4)</sup> totalled \$231,521,900.

After adoption of the ACABQ recommendation, the United States said if a vote had been taken it would have voted against. The USSR stated that it would not have been able to support the recommendation in a vote, and Japan, although having joined in the consensus, believed that the Committee on Conferences should review the calendar of meetings with a view to reducing the expenditure on temporary staff.

During the Fifth Committee debate on the pattern of conferences, New Zealand called for inclusion in a work programme of issues such as the modernization of sound equipment, the installation of additional voting machines and the enlargement of seating capacity, so that their study could be undertaken systematically and the expenditure spread over a number of years; the Secretariat should be asked to examine requirements in that area and to submit proposals in time to the Committee on Conferences.

In other action pertaining to conference servicing, the Assembly, in December, decided on a further programme for training translators for the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) (p. 633), requested a study of the adequacy of conference facilities at ECA headquarters at

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (p. 634), and took note of a report by the Secretary-General on job classification and career development of language staff (p. 1328).

Financial implications: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G statement, A/C.5/36/105.

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>Committee on Conferences, A/36/32.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(3)</sup>36/117 A, sect. I, para. 9, & sect. III, 10 Dec. (p. 1364); <sup>(4)</sup>36/240 A, 18 Dec. (p. 1278).

#### Arabic language services

On 7 December 1981, the Fifth Committee accepted without vote cost estimates of \$9,965,500 (net) to finance additional Arabic language services for the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly in 1982-1983. These included the cost of 109 new Secretariat posts, including 68 at Headquarters, 31 at Geneva, 8 at Vienna (for the United Nations Industrial Development Organization) and 2 at Nairobi, Kenya (for the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)).

The additional money and staff were provided to implement a December 1980 decision of the Assembly to provide additional Arabic language services.<sup>(3)</sup> In line with the Assembly's request that the Economic and Social Council include Arabic among its official languages by 1 January 1983, the Council, on 8 May 1981, agreed to pursue arrangements and to finalize them at its first regular session of 1982.<sup>(4)</sup> Also in accordance with the December 1980 Assembly resolution, the Governing Council of UNEP decided on 26 May 1981 to include Arabic as one of its official and working languages (p. 822).

The Fifth Committee's decision was taken following the submission of reports on Arabic language servicing requirements by the Secretary-General<sup>(2)</sup> and ACABQ.<sup>(1)</sup> The Secretary-General said funding in the amount of \$10.2 million (\$6 million for subsidiary organs of the Assembly, and \$4.2 million for the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council) would be required for interpretation, translation, meeting records and documentation, library services and conference room alterations. ACABQ recommended a reduction of \$231,600, to be achieved through savings on office accommodation and supplies for new staff members. The Fifth Committee agreed to this reduction but also approved, by a recorded vote of 69 to 9, with 18 abstentions, an oral proposal by Algeria to add five additional Arabic translation posts at Headquarters, at a cost of \$452,000.

Speaking during the Fifth Committee debate on the pattern of conferences, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya called for services in all languages to be provided to all the regional groups, now that a larger number of Arabic interpreters were available.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/7/Add.11; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/54 & Corr.1,2.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/219 A, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1245). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1981/135, 8 May 1981 (p. 1092).

#### Draft rules of procedure for conferences

As requested by the General Assembly in November 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General submitted in September 1981 a set of draft standard rules of procedure for special United Nations conferences.<sup>(1)</sup> The draft rules governed such aspects of special conferences as their preparation, participation and representation of delegations and others, organization of sessions, conduct of business, officers, general committee, subsidiary organs, secretariat, decision-making procedures, languages and documentation. Also submitted was a model agreement between the United Nations and host countries for conferences.

On the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, as proposed orally by the United Kingdom on behalf of the member States of the European Community, taking up a suggestion by Japan, the Assembly decided without vote on 10 December to defer consideration of the draft rules until 1982, recommending that at that time they be referred to the Sixth (Legal) Committee.<sup>(3)</sup> The Fifth Committee similarly approved the decision on 7 December.

The recommendation that the draft rules be referred to the Sixth Committee and that they be considered in 1982 was supported by a number of speakers in the Fifth Committee, among them Brazil, Bulgaria, New Zealand, the Ukrainian SSR and the United States.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya regarded the draft rules as an important step towards achieving savings and hoped they would also help improve documentation. New Zealand thought the rules should result in saving time for the Secretariat and preparatory organs of conferences.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/36/199 & Corr.1.

Resolution and decision: Res: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 35/10 C, para. 6, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1225). Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/427, 10 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.44, 45, 51, 54, 55, 57, 60, 63, 65 (17 Nov.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.93 (10 Dec.).

#### General Assembly decision 36/427

Adopted without vote

Approved By Fifth Committee (A/36/787) without vote, 7 December (meeting 65); oral proposal by United Kingdom, for EC members, on suggestion by Japan: agenda item 105.

#### Draft standard rules of procedure for United Nations conferences

At Its 93rd plenary meeting, on 10 December 1981, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, decided to defer to its thirty-seventh session consideration of the report of the Secretary-General on draft standard rules of procedure for United Nations conferences and recommended that at that session the report should be referred to the Sixth Committee.

## Documentation

#### Limitation of documentation

JIU RECOMMENDATIONS. A study on the control and limitation of documentation in the United Nations system,<sup>(2)</sup> noting the increasing volume and late distribution of documents and making recommendations to improve the situation, was completed by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) in December 1980 and transmitted by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly in April 1981.

In order to reduce documentation, JIU recommended that bodies should periodically review their meeting calendars with a view to reducing meetings, and organizations should establish rules governing the length and timely issuance of documents and should consider which documents could be discontinued or issued less frequently. An intergovernmental body in each organization might be asked to review the implementation of decisions on documentation. The Committee on Conferences should be renamed the Committee on Conferences and Documentation, to extend its terms of reference.

Where appropriate, organizations should consider introducing a document quota system. They should strengthen their documents and editorial control units, closely relate central editing units with documents control, and provide drafting and editing courses for their staff. Organizations should analyse costs for regular staff, temporary assistance and contractual services for document translation and typing, and select the most cost-effective. They should study the cost-effectiveness of modern documentation technology and act according to the findings. The Inter-agency Meeting on Language Arrangements, Documentation and Publications, convened by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), should assume responsibility for identifying methods to control and limit documentation of individual organizations.

The JIU report also contained recommendations on meeting records (p. 1374).

Comments on the report were submitted in October by ACC<sup>(3)</sup> and by the Secretary-General.<sup>(4)</sup>

The Secretary-General noted that only the Assembly could make decisions to reduce the meetings of its subsidiary bodies and that the Economic and Social Council itself established and reviewed its subsidiary bodies' programme of meetings and agenda. He would welcome a 32-page limit for reports of subsidiary bodies and expert groups, and would favour a reiteration of the rule that subsidiary bodies' agenda

include an item on documentation. He did not consider it advisable to change the title of the Committee on Conferences and believed its current terms of reference entitled it to discuss all aspects of documentation. In the opinion of ACC, control and limitation of documentation could only be effectively sought as a joint effort of the Member States, as represented in the various bodies, and the secretariats.

With regard to the JIU recommendation on a document quota system, ACC said that, while certain agencies had such a system, others were not convinced of its appropriateness; the Secretary-General stated that a quota system was not workable at the United Nations. Concerning documents control and editorial control services, ACC said some organizations felt their services were sufficiently effective while others were studying the introduction or strengthening of such services within existing budget restrictions. The Secretary-General believed there was adequate central authority to enforce rules and procedures regarding documentation at the United Nations, although in some offices practical arrangements could be strengthened.

ACC indicated that some organizations provided drafting and editing courses, while others questioned whether the seriousness of their documentation problems warranted the expense of introducing them. The Secretary-General said the United Nations planned to increase the number and intensity of its courses.

With regard to the most cost-effective methods of translating and typing documents, ACC noted that organizations were giving them continuing consideration as part of their regular budget processes. The Secretary-General said the same occurred at the United Nations and the question was a matter of regular management attention. On modern documentation technology, ACC reported that organizations were interested in such techniques and, where cost-effective, took action to introduce them. The Secretary-General said the Secretariat kept itself informed of technological advances but sometimes encountered resistance from delegations to changes in traditional services.

In a November report to the Fifth Committee<sup>(6)</sup> on implementation of past JIU recommendations (p. 1313), the Secretary-General said that only two recommendations made by JIU in a 1980 evaluation of the translation process in the United Nations could be identified as not implemented: a call for consideration of a document quota system, which would require General Assembly approval, and a suggestion that translation staff receive the same financial incentives as other staff members to learn additional languages.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. During 1981, the Committee on Conferences studied mecha-

nisms to enforce rules on documentation,<sup>(1)</sup> and recommended that the Assembly's subsidiary organs reduce requests for documents, limit the number of reports on a subject and consider requesting oral rather than written reports. Their reports should not exceed 32 pages. The Committee recommended the adoption of guidelines on documentation for special conferences and of a resolution to limit documentation of treaty bodies (p. 1373). It considered the practice of circulating Member States' communications as documents of the Assembly, but did not submit recommendations on the matter.

In its resolution of 10 December on the work of the Committee on Conferences,<sup>(8)</sup> the Assembly requested the Committee to examine Secretariat policies on the reproduction and distribution of documents, and to adjust the 1982-1983 calendar of conferences, especially in the economic and social fields, to the Secretariat's document servicing capacities. Confirming a 32-page limit for action-oriented Secretariat documents and documents of its subsidiary organs, the Assembly urged the latter to reduce requests for documents, limit the number of reports on a subject and consider requesting oral rather than written reports. It decided that at the end of sessions of United Nations organs the Secretary-General should submit lists of the documents requested, with the expected date of issuance. It insisted that the Secretary-General take the necessary measures to prevent undue delays in the submission of documents, encouraged him to make wider use of contractual translation services and referred the JIU report on documentation to the Committee on Conferences for observations.

In a December report to the Assembly on a special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations (p. 1309), the Secretary-General suggested that existing limitations on the length of documents be amplified by imposing a 32-page limit on reports of subsidiary bodies of the Economic and Social Council and the Assembly, and by reducing the maximum number of pages for any Secretariat document from 32 to 24.<sup>(5)</sup> The Assembly, in a resolution of 18 December,<sup>(9)</sup> requested the Committee on Conferences to examine those recommendations and to report to it in 1982.

During the Fifth Committee debate on the pattern of conferences, a number of speakers, including Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Guyana, Hungary, Japan, Morocco, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, the United States and Uruguay, voiced concern about the increasing volume of documentation.

While countries such as Austria, Morocco and New Zealand held that the Secretariat was responsible to a great extent for the proliferation of

documentation, others, such as Bulgaria and Poland, stated that the excessive volume of documents overburdened the Secretariat staff. In Guyana's opinion, much of the responsibility for excessive documentation lay with delegations, which continually requested additional studies and reports; the failure to control documentation reflected the failure to find solutions to problems besetting the international community and the never-ending stream of documents would continue until the political will to implement United Nations resolutions and decisions was found. Japan said what was needed to control documentation was the will of Member States to take remedial action.

Attributing the increasing volume of documents to the increasing number of meetings, Argentina expressed the view that, once the necessary rationalization of meetings and conferences had been achieved, it might be possible to implement the *JIU* recommendations on control of documentation, in particular the proposed procedures to ensure efficient use of the programme budget.

Venezuela called for the appointment of an ad hoc group of experts to study the problem. That proposal was endorsed by several others, among them Japan, Kenya and Morocco. Opposition to the idea was voiced by Guyana.

In order to rationalize and control the flow of documentation, Austria, supported by New Zealand and the United States, suggested that a consolidated list be issued of documents requested by the Main Committees of the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, indicating the anticipated length of documents and the date by which they were to be prepared; such a list would enable Member States to see exactly what documents they had requested and, at the same time, they should be informed by the Secretariat of any difficulties in issuing documentation.

With regard to the *JIU* recommendations, the USSR said they should be studied closely in the Committee on Conferences before a final decision was taken in 1982; the suggestion of a quota system to limit the volume of documentation was a valuable one, as was the extension of the 32-page limit to other United Nations organizations. The Ukrainian SSR agreed that the Committee should become more actively involved in the question of limiting the volume of documentation. Hungary said subsidiary organs should strictly observe the 32-page limit; also, it would be wise to establish a moratorium on the reproduction of previous Assembly resolutions in reports of subsidiary organs. By setting lower limits on the number of copies distributed, Guyana said the Secretariat could contribute to reducing the volume of documentation.

Brazil felt United Nations bodies and organizations should include regularly in the agenda of their sessions the question of discontinuing the production of recurrent documents which had become redundant or had lost their usefulness, and should issue some documents at less frequent intervals; action to limit the volume of documentation should take into account the experience of preceding sessions. The recommendation that redundant documents be discontinued while others be issued less frequently was also supported by Morocco and the USSR.

Morocco also declared its support for the *JIU* recommendations concerning review of the implementation of decisions of intergovernmental bodies on documentation, strengthening the documents control unit and an analysis of the cost for translation and typing of documents.

Kenya said the application of the principle of cost-effectiveness would cut down on the volume of documents, improve their quality and expedite their distribution.

The delays in the preparation and distribution of documents were another concern of a number of States, among them Argentina, Chile, Guyana, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Ukrainian SSR, Uruguay and Yugoslavia. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya thought the main reason for delay in documentation was the failure of most departments to observe deadlines, and requested that the Secretary-General consider measures to deal with the problem. The USSR called for strict adherence to deadlines and suggested the use of document submission schedules. Hungary and Yugoslavia proposed that the reasons for delays be explained to the bodies concerned, and the Ukrainian SSR said the Committee on Conferences should become more involved in order to ensure that documents were produced on time.

With regard to the translation of documents, the USSR favoured a more extensive use of contractual services, but held it necessary when contracting out work to be more selective, to tighten control and to impose harsher penalties for work below acceptable standard.

OTHER ACTION. On 27 June 1981, in a decision on the rationalization of its work,<sup>(10)</sup> the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme called for strict implementation of measures recommended to control its documentation, including specific limits on the number of pages to be submitted to it in 1982, except for documents on country and intercountry programmes (p. 458). The Economic and Social Council, by a resolution of 24 July 1981,<sup>(7)</sup> called for steps to reduce the volume of documentation and delays in its submission and circulation.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Conferences, A/36/32 & Corr.1.  
<sup>(2)</sup>JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/167; <sup>(3)</sup>ACC  
 comments, Add.1; and <sup>(4)</sup>S-G comments, Add.2. S-G,  
<sup>(5)</sup>A/36/658, <sup>(6)</sup>A/C.5/36/41.

#### Resolutions and decision:

Resolutions: <sup>(7)</sup>ESC: 1981/83, 24 July (p. 1090). GA:  
<sup>(8)</sup>36/117 A, sect. II, paras. 3-13, 10 Dec. (p. 1364);  
<sup>(9)</sup>36/239, para. 3, 18 Dec. (p. 1310).

Decision: <sup>(10)</sup>UNDP Council (report, E/1981/61/  
 Rev.1): 81/37, 27 June.

#### Treaty bodies

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 10 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> invited treaty bodies to consult with the Committee on Conferences on possible measures to control documentation, urged them to review their documentation and meeting records requirements with a view to restricting the volume, and requested them to report in 1982 on the measures they had taken.

The resolution, adopted without vote, was addressed to bodies established by treaty and serviced by the United Nations, such as the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (p. 871) and the Human Rights Committee (p. 889).

The Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee approved the text on 4 December by implication when it approved the draft on the work of the Committee on Conferences, submitted by a Committee Vice-Chairman (p. 1363). The text was proposed by the Committee on Conferences in its 1981 report<sup>(1)</sup>

During the Fifth Committee debate, Ghana expressed reservations about the resolution and cautioned against any action that would prevent treaty bodies from effectively discharging their duties. Chile, on the other hand, declared its support of the text.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Conferences, A/36/32.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/117 C, 10 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.44, 45, 51, 54, 55, 57, 60, 63 (17 Nov.-4 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.93 (10 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/117 C

Adopted without vote Meeting 93 10 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/787) by implication when it approved draft by vice-Chairman, A/C.5/36/L.26, on 4 December (meeting 63); draft by Committee on Conferences (A/36/32); agenda item 105.

Control and limitation of documentation for treaty bodies  
 The General Assembly,

Concerned at the critical situation prevailing with regard to the issuance of documentation in all the official languages in good time,

Noting the considerable volume of documentation and summary records for treaty bodies whose conference-servicing costs are borne by the regular budget of the United Nations and their adverse effect on the processing capacity of the central conference services for other documentation required for intergovernmental meetings,

1. Invites the officers of treaty bodies to consult with the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences on possible measures to control and limit documentation;

2. Urges all treaty bodies, as a matter of priority, to review their requirements for documentation in all languages and for meeting records, with a view to adopting immediate measures to restrict substantially the present volume of documentation;

3. Requests all bodies to inform the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, through the Committee on Conferences, about the practical measures they have taken.

#### Conferences

By a resolution of 10 December 1981 on documentation for special conferences,<sup>(3)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly decided that the design of such conferences should be harmonized with documentation needs and that national papers should be called for only if they were to play an integral part in the preparatory activities and at the conferences themselves. Annexed to the resolution were guidelines for the control and limitation of conference documentation. They stipulated that measures on documentation in force when a special conference was being prepared or held would apply to the conference and its preparatory organs, and that summary records of meetings would not be provided unless they were determined to be necessary for legal codification conferences. The guidelines contained provisions for national papers-including their length, languages, format, deadlines for submission, number of copies and distribution-as well as for documents submitted by non-governmental organizations.

The Fifth Committee approved the resolution on 4 December when it approved the draft on the work of the Committee on Conferences (p. 1363). The text was proposed by the latter Committee. An amendment prepared during informal consultations and introduced by a Fifth Committee Vice-Chairman, adding a provision to the guidelines for national papers to allow for limits on the number of language versions, was approved without vote.

At its 1981 session,<sup>(1)</sup> as requested by the Assembly in November 1980,<sup>(2)</sup> the Committee on Conferences discussed the guidelines, prepared by it in 1979. It noted the considerable impact national papers had on the Secretariat's translation, typing, reproduction and distribution services, and the need to consider whether such papers would play a significant role in the work of the conference and its preparation.

During the debate in the Fifth Committee, Ghana voiced reservations about the resolution, saying it not only was redundant but also challenged the authority of the organs preparing special conferences and deprived Member States of necessary resources; some of the recommendations were reminiscent of attempts in previous years to introduce a quota system for the allocation of conference resources and might prevent the United Nations from convening conferences



to discuss unforeseen but important issues as and when they arose.

Chile, on the other hand, expressed support of the resolution. Poland and the Ukrainian SSR called for a stricter attitude with regard to the organization of special conferences. Poland said attention should be given to the inter-secretariat co-ordination of preparations for servicing such conferences and to the number of staff involved, and the Ukrainian SSR thought the Committee on Conferences should become involved in efforts to reduce the number of sessions and meetings. Yugoslavia opposed the establishment of any new machinery to service special conferences; instead, existing staff should be strengthened or local staff used and preparatory committees should be established only when existing intergovernmental bodies were inadequate.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Conferences, A/36/32.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/10 C, para. 5, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1225); (3)36/117 D, 10 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.44, 45, 51, 54, 55, 57, 60, 63, (17 Nov.-4 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.93 (10 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/117 D

Adopted without vote Meeting 93 10 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/787) by implication when it approved draft by Vice-Chairman, A/C.5/36/L.26, on 4 December (meeting 63); draft by Committee on Conferences (A/36/32), amended by Fifth Committee as result of informal consultations (A/C.5/36/L.25); agenda item 105.

#### Control and limitation of documentation for special conferences

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming its resolution 35/10 C of 3 November 1980,

1. Decides that, if and when special conferences of the United Nations are convened, particular attention shall be given to harmonizing the proposed design of the conference with the documentation needs, so as to foster attainment of the stated objectives of the conference during both the preparatory phase and the conference phase itself;

2. Declares that the submission of national papers on the occasion of special conferences should be proposed only if such papers are intended to play an integral part in the preparatory activities and at the conference itself, taking into account the time required for a useful integration of such papers both in the preparatory activities and in the negotiating process of the conference;

3. Approves the guidelines for the control and limitation of documentation for special conferences of the United Nations set forth in the annex to the present resolution.

#### ANNEX

##### Guidelines for the control and limitation of documentation for special conferences of the United Nations

1. All measures to control and limit documentation in force at the time when a special conference is being prepared or held shall apply to documentation prepared for that conference as well as to any preparatory organ that may be designated.

2. Summary records shall not be provided to special conferences and their preparatory organs, with the exception of legal codification conferences, for which the needs will be determined in each case.

3. Whenever Governments are requested to submit national papers or reports, the following rules might apply:

(a) The organ which decides to convene the conference or preparatory organ, whenever it has been designated, should adopt specific rules to limit the length of national papers or summaries thereof, to the extent possible, and to determine the language versions in which they should be issued, taking into account experience gained on the occasion of past special conferences in the same area of activity;

(b) Each paper or report and each summary or abstract should be prepared in the format described in the layout appended to annex II to the report of the Committee on Conferences;

(c) A firm deadline for the submission of such papers or reports and their summaries and abstracts should be established, taking into account the purpose for which they are required in the preparatory process, but which in any event should not be later than eight weeks before the opening of the conference;

(d) All papers or reports received, as well as summaries or abstracts thereof, should be listed by the Secretariat in an information document and grouped in various ways, such as alphabetically by country, region or by subject;

(e) National papers or reports should not be redistributed at the conference site, if the conference is held away from established headquarters; Instead, a library should be established at such a conference site which shall contain in single copies all relevant material pertaining to the conference;

(f) The Secretary-General should keep the total number of copies printed for this type of documentation under constant review and adjust it to a realistic level of demand.

4. Submissions by non-governmental organizations shall bear a uniform cover page with a document symbol and number provided by the Secretariat. It shall be the responsibility of each submitting non-governmental organization to make sure that this cover page appears on each copy of the report. The Secretariat shall then distribute such a report if it is submitted in a sufficient number of copies. Reports by non-governmental organizations will not be translated or reproduced by the Secretariat, nor will they be transported to the conference site by the Secretariat if the conference is held away from established headquarters. Furthermore, a deadline shall be set for the presentation of such reports to the Secretariat. A list of all documents presented by non-governmental organizations will then be issued by the Secretariat.

#### Meeting records

JIU REPORT. The April 1981 report of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) on control and limitation of documentation in the United Nations system<sup>(2)</sup> included a review of practices in producing verbatim and summary records of meetings. It noted that verbatim records, prepared for the General Assembly's plenary meetings, the Security Council and certain other bodies, entailed overtime costs in the Department of Conference Services which in 1978 had amounted to over \$408,000 and in 1979 had increased 37 per cent to over \$557,000. Other organizations issuing verbatim records for major organs were the International Labour Organization, the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

In its report, JIU recommended that organizations which issued verbatim records in each working language consider introducing multi-

lingual records, as employed by WHO, UNESCO and FAO. In his comments on the JIU recommendations,<sup>(3)</sup> the Secretary-General said consideration should be given to issuing verbatim records only in the language in which a statement was made, relying on sound recordings of its interpretation into other official languages. He would be pleased to explore with Member States any alternative method, but changes increasing the translation work-load could result in higher costs and delays.

JIU also recommended that, whenever possible, United Nations organizations dispense with verbatim and summary records and that secretariats be more active in advising intergovernmental organs on measures to limit meeting records. Noting in his comments that the Assembly had addressed such requests to its subsidiary bodies, the Secretary-General said he believed that an argument could be made that, in principle, subsidiary bodies should not have written records; views of States on matters dealt with by a subsidiary body could be reflected in the records of the Assembly, its General and Main Committees, and the three Councils (Security, Trusteeship, and Economic and Social). An argument could also be made that all the records of the latter bodies should be verbatim. However, the Secretary-General stated, the question should perhaps be based on a reconsideration of the régime of written records according to the needs of the Organization, bearing in mind technological advances.

**OTHER ACTION.** In 1981, the Committee on Conferences<sup>(1)</sup> discussed exceptions to an Assembly rule dating from 1979<sup>(6)</sup> that summary records be discontinued for its subsidiary organs, with exceptions specified by the Assembly in November 1980.<sup>(7)</sup> The Committee concluded that the time elapsed since the exceptions had been applied was too short for final judgement and that the question should be discussed further in 1982, including alternatives to the current practice. It requested the Secretariat to submit a report on the matter.

In a resolution of 24 July 1981 on documentation,<sup>(5)</sup> the Economic and Social Council reaffirmed for a further two years, with some exceptions, the discontinuance of summary records for its subsidiary bodies. It decided to consider in 1982 the possibility of discontinuing, for an experimental period of two years, the provision of summary records for its sessional committees and their replacement by reports reflecting the course of discussions.

The Assembly, in a resolution of 10 December 1981 on the work of the Committee on Conferences,<sup>(8)</sup> requested the Committee to study the rationale determining the provision of meeting

records to United Nations organs, with a view to identifying criteria for the selection of those that should receive records in the future. The Committee was requested to submit recommendations in 1982 on the matter as well as on the November 1980 resolution allowing certain bodies to have summary records.<sup>(7)</sup>

In a December 1981 report to the Assembly on a special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations (p. 1309), the Secretary-General suggested the elimination of written records for all subsidiary bodies of the Economic and Social Council and the Assembly, as well as of summary records for the Council's sessional committees and the Assembly's Main Committees.<sup>(4)</sup> The Assembly, in a resolution of 18 December,<sup>(9)</sup> requested the Committee on Conferences to examine those recommendations and to report to it in 1982.

During the Fifth Committee debate on the pattern of conferences, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya suggested that the proposal to dispense with summary records be studied in depth and that the possibility be considered of gradually applying the experiment to all bodies. In Australia's opinion, formal meeting records frequently impeded the free flow of informal negotiation. The USSR expressed the hope that the Committee on Conferences would pursue its work on summary records with a view to reducing expenses; however, the USSR felt it would not be wise to discontinue verbatim records for meetings of the Security Council, the Assembly and its First Committee.

Poland welcomed limiting the number of bodies entitled to summary records and voiced doubts about the advisability of issuing both summary records and press releases; to set an example and limit documentation, the Fifth Committee should discontinue the latter, which could be dispensed with if summary records were prepared on the day of the meeting and issued in one language.

Brazil, on the other hand, felt that the complete elimination of summary records for the subsidiary organs of the Assembly should be given further study and that other viable alternatives should be considered. Morocco said summary records were very useful if issued promptly; the current delays in their publication were attributable to the failure of the Department of Conference Services to comply with a strict schedule.

New Zealand expressed doubts about the JIU recommendation on the introduction of multilingual verbatim records, while Guyana saw some merit in such a system.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Conferences, A/36/32. <sup>(2)</sup>JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/167; and <sup>(3)</sup>S-G comments, Add.2. <sup>(4)</sup>S-G, A/36/658.

Resolutions: <sup>(5)</sup>ESC: 1981/83, paras. 8 & 9, 24 July (p. 1090). GA: <sup>(6)</sup>34/50, para. 2, 23 Nov. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1215); <sup>(7)</sup>35/10 B, para. 2, 3 Nov. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1230); <sup>(8)</sup>36/117 A, sect. II, paras. 1 & 2, 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1364); <sup>(9)</sup>36/239, para. 3, 18 Dec. (p. 1310).

#### Distribution of documents

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 10 December 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> decided that documents should be given effective simultaneous distribution in the official and working languages of the United Nations, and requested the Secretary-General to report in 1982 on the resolution's implementation.

The Assembly adopted the text without vote, after the Fifth Committee approved it by consensus on 4 December. The draft was introduced by France, also on behalf of China, Peru, Saudi Arabia, the Ukrainian SSR and the United Kingdom. One of its preambular paragraphs was orally revised by France to include mention of two 1972 Assembly resolutions on the inclusion of Arabic<sup>(2)</sup> and Chinese<sup>(1)</sup> among the languages of United Nations bodies.

Explaining its position in the Committee, Sweden observed that the resolution was aimed at greater equity among the already privileged; it hoped that the simultaneous distribution of documents would not make matters more difficult for those to whom all official United Nations languages were foreign languages. Spain, on the other hand, said it was sure that the production of translations, for simultaneous distribution would not be used as an excuse to delay the availability of documentation in the original language. Iraq and Venezuela expressed the hope that the simultaneous distribution of documents would be implemented as soon as possible.

Introducing the text in the Committee, France said the six sponsors represented the official United Nations languages and the draft was largely a recapitulation of past Assembly resolutions; however, while some progress had been made in recent years, the many examples of failure justified further emphasis on the principle of equality of all languages. The resolution required only an extra effort by the Administration and had no financial implications.

In the opinion of Argentina, Chile and Uruguay, the unequal treatment of the various official languages was a matter of concern; Argentina added that it would continue to raise the matter until it was given the attention it deserved.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>3189(XXVIII), 18 Dec. 1973 (YUN 1973, p. 803); <sup>(2)</sup>3191(XXVIII), 18 Dec. 1973 (ibid.); <sup>(3)</sup>36/117 B, 10 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.44, 45, 51, 54, 55, 57, 60, 63, 65 (17 Nov.-7 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.93 (10 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/117B

Adopted without vote Meeting 93 10 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/787) by consensus, 4 December (meeting 63); 6-nation draft (A/C.5/36/L.22), orally revised; agenda item 105.

Sponsors: China, France, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian SSR, United Kingdom.

Simultaneous distribution of documents in the different languages of the United Nations

The General Assembly,

Aware that the diversity of languages of the United Nations is a source of general enrichment and of better understanding among Member States,

Recalling Its resolution 2(I) of 1 February 1946 entitled "Rules of procedure concerning languages",

Recalling further its resolutions 2247(XXI) of 20 December 1966 and 2292(XXII) of 8 December 1967 as well as its resolutions 3189(XXVIII), 3190(XXVIII) and 3191 (XXVIII) of 18 December 1973,

Noting the necessity of giving full effect to paragraph 3 of resolution 2247(XXI) and paragraph 4 of resolution 2292 (XXII) concerning the simultaneous distribution of documents,

Reiterating its deep concern at the steady lengthening of delays in the distribution of documents in the different official languages.

1. Decides that documents shall be given effective simultaneous distribution in sufficient time in the official and working languages of the organs of the United Nations;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution.

## Administration and management

### Structuring of the Secretariat

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE OF GOVERNMENTAL EXPERTS. The 17-member Committee of Governmental Experts to Evaluate the Present Structure of the Secretariat in the Administrative, Finance and Personnel Areas, established in December 1980,<sup>(3)</sup> held two organizational meetings in September 1981 and 17 substantive meetings between 12 October and 5 November.<sup>(1)</sup> In view of delays in the appointment of its members, the Assembly authorized the Committee, on 14 September, to meet beyond its original deadline of 1 September.<sup>(4)</sup>

In November, the Committee reported to the General Assembly that it had identified the following seven areas of inquiry for its work: the capacity of the Secretariat's structure to promote policy coherence and clear lines of authority; the structure's adequacy to implement the Assembly's personnel reforms and recruitment policies; the role of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General in relation to the administrative, finance and personnel areas; the structure's capacity to achieve a balance between administrative decentralization and central control and co-ordination; the role of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation in relation to the administrative, finance and per-

sonnel areas; the structure's adequacy to undertake programme planning in relation to the programme budget and allocation of resources; and the development of effective management tools based on modern information systems to enhance the effectiveness of the administrative, finance and personnel areas through a review of the roles of the Secretariat's Administrative Management Service and the Electronic Data Processing and Information Systems Division.

The Committee concluded that, due to time constraints, it had been unable to complete its examination of those questions and suggested that the Assembly might wish to decide on further action.

Reporting to the Assembly in September on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system,<sup>(2)</sup> the Secretary-General said he would bring to the Committee's attention matters concerning the implications of restructuring for the functioning of the Secretariat (p. 1094).

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>Committee on Secretariat structure, A/36/44 & Corr.1; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/36/477.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 35/211, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1194). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>35/455, 14 Sep. 1981 (text following).

General Assembly decision 35/455

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by President; agenda Item 8.

Committee of Governmental Experts to Evaluate the Present Structure of the Secretariat in the Administrative, Finance and Personnel Areas

At its 114th plenary meeting, on 14 September 1981, the General Assembly decided, in view of the fact that the members of the Committee of Governmental Experts to Evaluate the Present Structure of the Secretariat in the Administrative, Finance and Personnel Areas had just been appointed, to authorize the Committee to meet beyond the deadline of 1 September, provided for in paragraph 24 of Assembly decision 34/401, in order to perform its task and submit its report during the thirty-sixth session.

### Continuation of the Committee

By a resolution of 18 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> adopted without vote, the General Assembly requested the Committee of Governmental Experts to continue its work, taking into account reports of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) and the Secretary-General's comments, and to submit a final report in 1982. It asked the Secretary-General to consult with the Committee on the questions outlined in its 1981 report (p. 1376), to submit his views to the Assembly and to maintain the interim measures, within the existing administrative structure, which it had asked him to take in 1980<sup>(1)</sup> to ensure that the Office of Personnel Services had the authority to implement the personnel policies outlined by the Assembly. That was to be done without prejudice to the Assembly's decision on the Committee's report in 1982.

The Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee approved the draft, proposed by the Chairman after consultations, by consensus on 16 December. After Morocco proposed the deletion of paragraph 6, requesting that interim measures concerning the Office of Personnel Services be maintained, the Chairman, following further consultations, orally revised the paragraph to state that this should be done without prejudice to the Assembly's decision in 1982.

Explaining its position in the Fifth Committee, France said if a vote had been taken it would have voted against the extension of the mandate of the Committee of Governmental Experts; the organization of Secretariat units should be within the competence of the Secretary-General alone. France's view was endorsed by the Netherlands and the United States; the latter added it would have abstained but would none the less continue to assist in the Committee's work. The USSR said it shared the same doubts but, since there seemed to be general agreement, it would not object to continuation. The Federal Republic of Germany opposed the maintenance of interim measures, saying that the Department of Administration, Finance and Management should continue as an integrated structure.

Morocco said that, as a result of concessions to achieve consensus, the resolution did not correspond to its original wishes; it had not intended to divide the Secretary-General's responsibilities. Explaining its proposal to delete the paragraph on interim measures, Morocco said that, while it had no wish to undermine the efforts of the Committee of Governmental Experts, the ultimate responsibility for administrative and personnel matters had to be vested in the Secretary-General. Support for the Moroccan proposal was also expressed by France and the United States. Peru believed the interim measures were no longer required.

Sierra Leone, on the other hand, stated that the continuation of the Committee's mandate would not have been meaningful if the paragraph on interim measures had been deleted; those measures did not prejudice the continuity of the Secretariat's administration, nor did they restrict the Secretary-General. Rwanda also supported the extension of the Committee's mandate, emphasizing that it should work independently of the Secretariat. The Sudan said the Committee had been set up neither to resolve personal differences in the Secretariat nor to replace the Secretary-General.

Opposition to deletion of the paragraph was also expressed by the Bahamas, the Congo and Pakistan. Benin, supported by Ethiopia, Panama and Sierra Leone, said the paragraph was important; until the Committee completed its task,

interim measures would have to remain. The United Republic of Tanzania thought deletion of the paragraph could have serious consequences; interim measures were needed because the Office of Personnel Services had a central role in implementing reforms. Trinidad and Tobago said deletion of the last paragraph might give the impression that the interim measures were to be discontinued; however, the paragraph should not be seen as derogating from the Secretary-General's authority.

Guinea, India and the United Republic of Cameroon urged Morocco to withdraw the proposal. India stated that the Committee of Experts had started its work on the assumption that the interim measures would remain in effect until it submitted its final report.

Renewal of the Committee's mandate was supported by a number of States, among them China, India, Mauritania, Norway (speaking for the Nordic countries), Pakistan, Panama, Poland, and Trinidad and Tobago. Benin thought the delay in setting up the Committee explained why it had completed only part of its work. Morocco stated that the Committee could only make recommendations, while the ultimate responsibility lay with the Secretary-General.

Belgium expressed the hope that the Committee would interview a sufficient number of women Secretariat officials.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(1)</sup>35/211, para. 4, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1194); <sup>(2)</sup>36/238, 18 Dec. 1981, text following.

Financial implications: S-G statement, A/C.5/36/106.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 61, 67, 75, 77, 80 (12-22 Oct. & 3-16 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/238

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) by consensus, 16 December (meeting 80): draft by Chairman (A/C.5/36/L.42), orally revised: agenda item 100.

Report of the Committee of Governmental Experts to Evaluate the Present Structure of the Secretariat in the Administrative, Finance and Personnel Areas

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 35/211 of 17 December 1980, by which it established the Committee of Governmental Experts to Evaluate the Present Structure of the Secretariat in the Administrative, Finance and Personnel Areas,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Committee of Governmental Experts to Evaluate the Present Structure of the Secretariat in the Administrative, Finance and Personnel Areas;

2. Requests the Committee to continue its work, taking into account the relevant reports of the Joint Inspection Unit, with the comments of the Secretary-General thereon, and to submit a final report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to consult with the Committee, prior to the next session of the Committee, on the questions outlined in its report;

4. Also requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly his views on the final report of the Committee;

5. Decides to consider at its thirty-seventh session the final report of the Committee and the report of the Secretary-General thereon;

6. Further requests the Secretary-General to maintain the interim measures within the existing administrative structure as provided for in paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 35/211, pending and without prejudice to the decision to be taken by the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

#### Management services

A report describing the management services in the United Nations system<sup>(2)</sup> and suggesting changes to increase their effectiveness was completed by JIU in February 1981. The Secretary-General transmitted the report to the General Assembly in June and the comments of United Nations organizations in November.

The report stated that seven of the 11 participating organizations of JIU had management services, as did, within the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Office at Geneva. JIU made 21 recommendations on management improvement to ensure it higher priority.

It recommended that organizations carry out management improvement functions on a continuing basis, in addition to responding to specific problems and situations as they arose. Management services should ensure that the organization did not become fixed in routines and that policy changes were promptly reflected in rules and procedures. They should assume a leadership role in reviewing policies and procedures to simplify and rationalize them, with substantive offices participating actively, and should prepare and revise manuals of policies and procedures on a continuing basis. They should advise on staffing requirements through organization and methods reviews and through the establishment of norms and investigations, such as work measurement studies. Managers and staff should be involved in the preparation of long- and short-term management services work programmes.

Training programmes for management services staff must advance skills in a planned progression and emphasize know-how and experience in the behavioural sciences. With the help of management services units, supervisors and staff should be trained in modern management practices. Career development policies should provide for movement into and out of management services.

Organizations should foster links among management services units through short secondments of staff, assistance to smaller organizations through loans of management specialists, annual meetings of the heads and senior officers of management services units, shared training and exchange of information. They should seek

to increase the resources of management services by reconsidering priorities and shifting budgetary allocations or by having staff of other units undertake specific management service assignments.

In their comments on the JIU report, United Nations organizations expressed agreement with most recommendations. The United Nations noted the concern voiced in the Assembly's Fifth Committee and elsewhere that it did not have manuals for finance, personnel and general administration, and reported that most sections of a new finance manual had been prepared. It suggested that JIU might propose, on a pilot basis, a basic outline for manuals in a number of areas, including purchasing and inventory control, but it did not support centralized preparation of manuals.

Another comment was that it was already standard practice for management services to advise on staffing requirements. Two organizations pointed out, however, that while work measurement techniques could be applied to repetitive tasks, methodologies to be applied to other tasks required development. The United Nations said there was great reluctance to accept and apply work standards.

Organizations supported the involvement of executive heads and staff members. They accepted the proposals that staff from other units should be drawn upon to help in carrying out management service projects and that managers and staff should be involved in review. With regard to training, they agreed that management services staff should be systematically trained in modern management practices. Organizations looked forward to co-operation in implementing the recommendations on centralized co-ordination of training, system-wide meetings and interchange between management services, and increased exchange of information.

The Assembly, in a decision of 18 December,<sup>(1)</sup> took note of the report, as well as of another JIU report on methods of determining staff requirements in the United Nations system (p. 1362).

Decision: <sup>(1)</sup>GA, 36/454, para. (a) (ii), 18 Dec. (p. 1314).

Report: <sup>(2)</sup>JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/296, and comments by UN system organizations, Add.1.

#### Administrative Management Service

The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) reported to the General Assembly in October 1981 on the United Nations Secretariat's Administrative Management Service (AMS).<sup>(1)</sup>

It noted that the activities of AMS in 1980 included management reviews of the Budget and Accounts Divisions of the Office of Financial Services, and reviews of the security function at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, and of staffing

requirements of the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights, projects for which final reports were completed. Among projects for which draft reports were completed and sent to departments for comment were reviews of the Treasury Division of the Office of Financial Services, the, Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs, the secretariat of the Economic Commission for Africa, the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat), the common services at the United Nations Centre at Nairobi, Kenya, the Secretariat's editing function, and management and training at United Nations Headquarters. Future surveys would focus on a limited number of activities, including comparative studies of units performing similar functions and the resolution of difficulties arising from overlapping responsibilities between organizational units.

In its comments, ACABQ trusted that AMS would keep abreast of developments in office management, particularly regarding new technology. It favoured closer relations between AMS and such organs as JIU, the Board of Auditors and the Internal Audit Division. It believed that topics of AMS study should be identified in advance and that they should not duplicate those being investigated by JIU, the Board of Auditors or Secretariat units; ad hoc requests should be kept to a minimum. ACABQ recommended that AMS be permitted to submit biennial rather than annual reports, in keeping with the biennial budget cycle.

The Assembly, acting without vote on 18 December,<sup>(2)</sup> took note of the ACABQ report and endorsed its comments and recommendations. The Fifth Committee recommended that action without objection on 2 November, as orally proposed by its Chairman.

Explaining its position in the Committee, the United States said AMS could be useful in increasing Secretariat efficiency; closer links with other organs would be of benefit, although there should be no duplication of work.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/7/Add.3.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/235, sect. I, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 28 (12 Oct.-2 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

#### General Assembly resolution 36/235, section I

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection. 2 November (meeting 28); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 100.

#### Activities of the Administrative Management Service

[The General Assembly. .]

1. Takes note of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on the activities of the Administrative Management Service;

2. Endorses the comments and recommendations contained therein;

## UN premises

### Headquarters

Submitting an interim report on office accommodation at Headquarters<sup>(1)</sup> to the General Assembly in November 1981, the Secretary-General proposed to postpone until 1982 a full report on the cost of consolidating rented office space into new premises so that more precise financial and other implications could be presented.

The Secretary-General reported that a high-level committee had been established to assess needs and consider longer-term plans for the rationalization of office space arrangements. During the year, several Secretariat units were relocated in outside rented premises to alleviate overcrowding. However, since most of the foreseeable needs for the next several years would be met by the new United Nations Development Corporation building (located across United Nations Plaza from the main Headquarters buildings), it would not be prudent to undertake additional high-cost rental commitments before the building was ready for occupancy in 1983.

The Assembly, without vote, took note of the interim report on 18 December.<sup>(2)</sup> The Fifth Committee recommended that action without objection on 9 December, as orally proposed by its Chairman and the Chairman of ACABQ.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/63.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/235, sect. XII, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 69 (12-22 Oct. & 9 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section XII

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 9 December (meeting 69); oral proposal by Chairman on oral recommendation by ACABQ; agenda item 100.

Office accommodation at Headquarters

[The General Assembly...]

Takes note of the interim report of the Secretary-General on office accommodation at Headquarters;

### Nairobi

#### Construction

The General Assembly, on 18 December approved by a recorded vote of 130 to 9 a revised construction project at Nairobi, Kenya, for a permanent headquarters of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and for accommodation of other United Nations offices.

Under the programme budgets for 1978-1979 and 1980-1981, the Assembly had appropriated

\$7,942,400 for the project. The balance of funds required, in the amount of \$19,135,800, was included in the 1982-1983 programme budget adopted by the Assembly also on 18 December 1981.<sup>(5)</sup> The Fifth Committee, on the recommendation of ACABQ, approved that amount without vote on 8 December.

This action was taken after the Secretary-General reported to the Assembly in November<sup>(2)</sup> that the cost of the project in Kenyan shillings might be some KSh 14,637,300 higher than the KSh 254,944,000 limit approved by the Assembly in 1979. However, due to a devaluation of the Kenyan currency in relation to the United States dollar, he envisaged no increase in the dollar cost of the project, currently estimated at \$27,078,200 but subject to change when construction bids were tendered in January 1982.

By its 18 December 1981 resolution,<sup>(4)</sup> the Assembly authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments in excess of appropriations, with the prior concurrence of ACABQ provided that the total cost of the project in United States dollars remained within the dollar equivalent of the original KSh 254,944,000 limit, using the exchange rate in effect in 1980 when the Assembly confirmed the limit<sup>(3)</sup> (KSh 7.33 = \$US 1.00 at the United Nations operational rate of exchange).<sup>(6)</sup> He was requested to report on those commitments as well as on the results of the tendering of bids.

The Assembly acted on the recommendation of ACABQ<sup>(1)</sup> approved without objection by the Fifth Committee on 8 December 1981.

Explaining its position in the Committee, the USSR said it would have voted against the proposal, had it been put to a vote. Iraq, on the other hand, said it was pleased that the proposal was adopted; the construction project should result in model facilities. Kenya said there could be no question of not performing work already authorized by the Assembly; future exchange-rate fluctuations and cost inflation would be absorbed in the normal way.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/7/Add.14; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/57.

Resolutions: GA: 35/222, para. 2, 17 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1240); <sup>(4)</sup>36/235, sect. IX, 18 Dec. 1981, text following; <sup>(5)</sup>36/240 A, 18 Dec. (p. 1278).

Yearbook reference: <sup>(6)</sup>YUN 1980, p. 1237.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 66 (12-22 Oct. & 8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section IX

130-9 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 8 December (meeting 66); ACABQ recommendations (A/36/7/Add.14); agenda item 100.

United Nations accommodation at Nairobi

[The General Assembly...]

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on United Nations accommodation at Nairobi and the related

report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions,

1. Approves the revised construction project at Nairobi;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions as soon as possible on the results of the tendering and to make recommendations based on those results;

3. Authorizes the Secretary-General to enter into commitments, with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee. In excess of the appropriations, provided that the total cost of the project in United States dollars remains within the dollar equivalent of 254,944,000 Kenyan shillings at the time the General Assembly specified that amount as the limit of the cost of the project, reflecting the commitments in question, if any, in the performance report to be submitted to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

\*\*\*

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR.

### Common services

Agreement was reached in 1981 that a common organizational unit should administer certain administrative services required by the two main Secretariat entities located at the United Nations Centre at Nairobi-UNEP and the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS), also known as Habitat.

Reporting to the General Assembly in November<sup>(2)</sup> on that agreement, reached between the Executive Directors of UNEP and UNCHS, the Secretary-General stated that the common unit would administer services which either were primarily in support of the physical layout or stood alone as independent service functions, such as buildings and grounds management and the medical service. It had not been possible to achieve an agreed division of responsibilities in regard to certain other administrative functions, including personnel administration, recruitment and financial services. Resources for the central unit would be drawn from both extrabudgetary resources and the United Nations regular budget. The Secretary-General said he would report to the Assembly in 1982 following further consultations.

Commenting on the report,<sup>(1)</sup> ACABQ urged the Secretary-General to achieve further progress on the remaining common services before completion of the construction project (p. 1380). It said a common approach would be in the interest of the United Nations and trusted that objective criteria would be used in determining which of the remaining functions would be assigned to a common unit. ACABQ believed that the common unit's staff should be provided to the maximum extent possible through redeployment. It would consider unacceptable a continuation of common service functions as currently performed, with only co-ordination by the common unit.

The Assembly, without vote, took note on 18 December of the Secretary-General's report and the comments of ACABQ.<sup>(3)</sup> The Fifth Committee recommended this action without objection on 8 December, as orally proposed by the Chairman.

In the Committee, Canada expressed appreciation of the Secretary-General's report and of the progress already achieved; it agreed with ACABQ that, even though managerial authority was vested in each of the Executive Directors, the final decision on common service functions should be taken in the best interest of the Organization as a whole.

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/7/Add.14; <sup>(2)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/39. Resolution: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 36/235, sect. X, 18 Dec., text following. Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 66 (12-22 Oct. & 8 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section X

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 8 December (meeting 66); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 100.

Common services at the United Nations Centre at Nairobi [The General Assembly. . .]

Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General regarding common services at the United Nations Centre at Nairobi and of the comments and observations thereon contained in the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;

### Vienna

An agreement between the United Nations and Austria regarding the headquarters of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and other offices at the Vienna International Centre-regulating the occupancy of the Centre by international organizations, including the use of the land, buildings and facilities-entered into force on 1 October 1981.

An agreement between the United Nations, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and Austria regarding the establishment and administration of a common fund for financing major repairs and replacements at the Vienna



International Centre was signed and entered into force with effect from 1 January 1981. The cost of such work would be borne equally by the parties, except that the United Nations and IAEA would not be required to pay more than \$225,000 a year each; expenditures beyond those amounts would be met by the Austrian Government. A protocol to that agreement, which entered into force on the same date, listed elements to be used in deciding whether a repair or replacement was major and thus to be financed from the fund.

Reporting to the General Assembly in September,<sup>(1)</sup> ACABQ said it regretted not having had the opportunity to comment on the agreement prior to signature. It trusted that the provision regarding disbursements would be applied with the proviso that neither the United Nations nor IAEA would have to pay for repairs which were the responsibility of the Government. The Secretary-General had given assurances that no reimbursement would be made for repairs necessitated by force majeure or due to faulty material, design or labour, since under the agreement such expenses were to be borne by the Government. In the Advisory Committee's interpretation, the ceiling of 225,000 for annual payments included a limit on liability for payment.

The ACABQ report added that the Secretary-General planned to develop a long-range major maintenance and replacement programme which would be updated biennially and submitted to ACABQ for review in connection with the biennial budget; he intended to submit the first of these with the 1984-1985 budget. ACABQ believed, and the Secretary-General agreed, that proposed revisions of the ceiling on financial responsibility should be reviewed by it before the Secretary-General accepted them.

The Assembly, without vote, took note of the ACABQ report on 18 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> endorsed its observations and understandings, and took into account the Secretary-General's assurances. The Fifth Committee recommended this action without objection on 11 November, as orally proposed by the Chairman.

Explaining its position, Austria said its participation in the Fifth Committee decision would not prejudice its legal rights under the agreement in question, which must be executed in accordance with the provisions of international law governing the application and interpretation of treaties.

Canada regretted that the agreement had been signed before being submitted to ACABQ; it was important that the Assembly took note of the Advisory Committee's observations but, since the latter was not a party to the agreement, it was not clear what legal validity those might have.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ A/36/7/Add.1

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/236, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 28, 38 (12 Oct.-11 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/238

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 11 November (meeting 38); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda item 100.

Vienna International Centre

The General Assembly

1 Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on the Vienna International Centre as well as of the agreements referred to therein;

2 Endorses the observations and understandings put forward by the Advisory Committee with respect to those agreements;

3 Takes into account the assurances given by the Secretary-General on the various concerns expressed by the Advisory Committee in its report.

Addis Ababa

On the recommendation of the Economic and Social Council, made on 24, July 1981, the General Assembly requested on 17 December a study of the adequacy of conference facilities at the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Africa at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (p. 634).

Building construction procedures

In accordance with a 1979 General Assembly resolution,<sup>(3)</sup> the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) reported in February 1981 on building construction procedures of United Nations organizations. The Secretary-General transmitted its report to the Assembly in June.<sup>(2)</sup> The report was based on information from the United Nations and four agencies on their general practices for 12 projects and on detailed information for six of those.

The Inspectors stated that most buildings in their survey had been designed with insufficient flexibility to meet evolving requirements, and recommended that consideration be given to the cost-effectiveness of each building over its lifetime. Organizations had abandoned too much responsibility for control and supervision of building design and construction. In order for them to deal effectively with architects and building contractors, organizations should form an in-house technical team, engage a consulting firm or combine both approaches. Architects for large projects should be chosen through international competition and contracts should contain clauses on architects' financial responsibility for errors or omissions.

Organizations should maintain responsibility for construction management, cost estimating and quantity surveying. Non-revisable fixed-price contracts should be eliminated except for

jobs of one year or less. Revisable fixed-price contracts were preferable to cost-plus-fee contracts where the organization bore a greater share of the risk. Bonds should be used to protect organizations against a contractor not fulfilling his obligations. There should be rigorous application of competitive bidding, wherever possible on an international basis. A sufficient number of contractors should submit bids and organizations should have the technical expertise to evaluate them. The Assembly might request the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) to pay special attention to building projects and report on them promptly to the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee. More attention should be given to the preparation of accurate cost estimates.

Comments on the JIU report were made by the Secretary-General in October<sup>(2)</sup> and by ACABQ in November.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Secretary-General remarked that, because decisions regarding space requirements could be affected by political and financial considerations, each situation needed individual consideration. It would be desirable to establish a special unit to plan, supervise and control major new construction at United Nations Headquarters; at other United Nations offices, limited technical personnel should be supplemented by in-house staff or consultants. International competitions to select architects were better suited to projects involving new buildings than to alteration and modification work. It was planned that architectural contracts at Headquarters would provide for different fee levels according to the nature of the project.

The Secretary-General welcomed the active interest of ACABQ in past projects and expected its guidance in future. He noted that the preparation of cost estimates during inflation and currency revaluation was not a simple matter, nor was it possible to foresee delays in work due to such problems as energy shortages and strikes. Some of the JIU recommendations would increase the initial estimates of construction costs, although they were predicated on the expectation that costs would be recouped by reducing actual construction costs and through flexibility of use and maintenance.

In its report, ACABQ concurred with JIU on the need for a clear delineation of responsibilities and for supervision, control and co-ordination in construction projects. For construction away from Headquarters, the Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management and the Assistant Secretary-General of the Office of General Services should provide the central point of overall direction and

control. Before a decision was taken on construction projects, the Assembly and other intergovernmental bodies should be given information, including options that took into account a forecast of long-range needs.

The technical expertise, knowledge and experience in the United Nations system should be shared. The rigorous application of competitive bidding would reduce costs and ensure the quality and timely completion of projects. The report outlined how the Secretary-General's procedures for construction project proposals could be refined to allow for closer involvement of ACABQ at the earliest stages.

The Assembly took note of the JIU report on 18 December.<sup>(4)</sup>

Reports: <sup>(1)</sup>ACABQ, A/36/643; <sup>(2)</sup>JIU, transmitted by S-G note, A/36/297, and S-G comments, Add.1.

Resolution and decision: Res.: <sup>(3)</sup>GA, 34/233, sect. X, 20 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 1229). Dec.: <sup>(4)</sup>GA, 36/454, para. (a) (ii), 18 Dec. 1981(p.1314).

## Security measures

The General Assembly, on 18 December 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> by a recorded vote of 128 to 10, authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for interorganization security measures in an amount not exceeding \$300,000 in a biennium and to seek reimbursement from other organizations in accordance with an agreed cost-sharing formula. It authorized him to enter into commitments in excess of that amount with the prior concurrence of ACABQ and requested him to report security-related expenditures and the related reimbursements to the Assembly.

The Assembly's Fifth Committee recommended that action on 19 November without objection, as orally proposed by the Chairman on the recommendation of ACABQ.

A similar authorization was given by the Assembly in another resolution of 18 December, on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for 1982-1983.

Explaining its position in the Fifth Committee, the Byelorussian SSR said that, if the ACABQ recommendation had been put to a vote, it would have voted against. The USSR declared it would have abstained, while Sweden and Yugoslavia expressed their support.

Measures to deal with threats to the safety of staff members and property at field offices of United Nations organizations were initially proposed on 14 April by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC).<sup>(6)</sup> In its annual overview report to the Economic and Social Council,<sup>(2)</sup> ACC noted an increase of instances in

which the safety of persons and property had been endangered. On the basis of recommendations by an Ad Hoc Inter-agency Meeting on Security Matters (Crisis Management in the Field) in January, ACC approved various measures including those relating to security facilities and evacuation procedures.

ACC reaffirmed a 1980 decision that each agency should designate a field security coordinator and an alternate. It agreed that security facilities for housing should be provided on a system-wide basis and recommended that the Secretary-General remind host Governments of their responsibility for protecting United Nations personnel and property. It requested the United Nations and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to study arguments for and against the employment of security guards for private housing and to study the introduction of a system-wide identity card. It asked United Nations organizations to provide the host Government with a list of staff and agreed that a designated official might require the evacuation of dependants when staff members had to remain on duty.

It endorsed a 1980 decision to establish a Global Security Fund to cover the costs of evacuation operations and provision of short-term security personnel and movable security equipment. It decided that the Fund should remain at \$400,000 and that the possibility of increasing it should be considered only after gaining experience of its operation at that level.

In May, members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination expressed dismay over the ACC decision to establish the Fund, questioned its authority to do so and asked who would contribute to it.<sup>(3)</sup> A proposal for its establishment should first have been submitted to an intergovernmental body for approval.

The Secretary-General reported to the Assembly in October<sup>(4)</sup> that, in collaboration with UNDP, he had formulated a plan for the establishment of the Fund as a special account administered by the United Nations and contributed to by all participating organizations.

In November,<sup>(1)</sup> ACABQ reported that, according to the Secretary-General's representatives, approximately \$130,000 in security-related expenditures had been incurred in the preceding 18 months, mainly for the purchase of radio equipment. Should the Assembly approve the establishment of the Fund at an initial level of \$400,000 in 1982-1983, approximately half would be used for the purchase of additional mobile communications equipment. The balance would be held in reserve for servicing the equipment, travel of security staff, the provision of

emergency food and health supplies, and emergency transportation.

ACABQ stated that the desired objective of the Fund could, however, be attained without its establishment. Accordingly, it recommended the action which the Assembly subsequently took (p. 1383) and which required no additional appropriations.

Reports: (1)ACABQ, A/36/7/Add.6; <sup>(2)</sup>ACC, E/1981/37; <sup>(3)</sup>CPC, A/36/38; <sup>(4)</sup>S-G, A/C.36/24.

Resolutions and decision: Res.: GA, 18 Dec.: <sup>(5)</sup>36/235, sect. IV, text following; <sup>(6)</sup>36/241, para. 1 (c). Dec.: <sup>(7)</sup>ACC, 1981/7, 14 Apr.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 47 (12 Oct.-19 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (18 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section IV

128-10 (recorded vote) Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 19 November (meeting 47): oral proposal by Chairman incorporating ACABQ recommendation (A/36/7/Add.6); agenda item 100.

#### Interorganizational security measures

##### [The General Assembly...]

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General regarding interorganizational security measures and the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions,

1. Authorizes the Secretary-General to enter into commitments in an amount not exceeding \$300,000 in any one biennium under section 28D of the programme budget of the United Nations, initially under the terms of the General Assembly resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses, and to seek reimbursement from the other organizations in accordance with the agreed cost-sharing formula, as indicated in his report;

2. Further authorizes the Secretary-General, should commitments in excess of \$300,000 be required in any biennium, to enter into such commitments with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to report all such security-related expenditures, and the related reimbursements, to the General Assembly in the context of his performance reports on the programme budget;

Recorded vote In Assembly as follows:

In favour: Algeria., Angola, Argentina, Australia. Austria., Bahamas Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil., Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia., Congo., Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique., Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR.

## Computers and information systems

### Co-ordination of information systems

The Economic and Social Council, on 23 July 1981, adopted without vote a resolution on strengthening the inter-agency co-ordination of information systems.<sup>(2)</sup> Affirming the importance to Governments of timely and accurate information on the United Nations system, it requested the Secretary-General to submit in 1982 a report which would include ACC recommendations on enhancing co-ordination, bearing in mind recommendations made in 1979 by the Joint Inspection Unit.<sup>(5)</sup> The Council asked ACC to draw up a proposal for ensuring the cost-effective compatibility of computerized information systems, including the continued elaboration of vocabularies of common terminology. It requested the Secretary-General to engage independent experts to prepare the proposals and recommendations. The Council also asked ACC to reconsider its decision that the Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems should no longer retain operational functions (p. 1386).

The Council's Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee approved the draft without vote on 17 July 1981. The text was introduced by the United States, also on behalf of Belgium, Japan, Norway, Spain and the United Kingdom, and was orally revised by the sponsors so that the Secretary-General would report to the Council with the agreed recommendations of ACC, rather than have the Council request United Nations organizations to report their agreed recommendations to the Council. The sponsors also revised the paragraph on the preparation of recommendations by experts, so as to characterize the experts as independent rather than international.

On 30 October,<sup>(3)</sup> ACC decided to appoint two experts to assist it in developing its proposals. Their terms of reference stipulated that they should assess the scope for the harmonization of, and compatibility between, information systems in order to: provide access to programme and project planning, implementation and evaluation, and to information on the United Nations system; facilitate access to and exchange of information, particularly that of a scientific and technical nature; and utilize and exchange experience on technological developments, particularly in computer communications. They should recommend measures for those purposes, including the development of common termi-

nologies and indexing vocabularies, and assess the main operational implications and benefits to be derived from the recommended measures. ACC decided to convene an ad hoc inter-agency meeting, as soon as possible after the report of the experts became available, to prepare a draft report for the Economic and Social Council.

The Secretary-General reported those developments to the Council in October.<sup>(1)</sup> On 2 November, the Council, acting without vote on an oral pro proposal by its President, took note of the report.<sup>(4)</sup>

In a related action, the General Assembly decided on 18 December to continue the Information Systems Unit in the United Nations Secretariat's Department of International Economic and Social Affairs and to finance it within the United Nations budget (p. 397).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, E/1981/117.

Resolution and decisions: Res.: <sup>(2)</sup>ESC, 1981/63, 23 July, text following. Dec.: <sup>(3)</sup>ACC, 1981/16, paras. (c)-(f), 30 Oct.; <sup>(4)</sup>ESC, 1981/197 2 Nov., text following.

Yearbook reference: <sup>(5)</sup>YUN 1979, p. 961.

Meeting records: ESC: Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.1-3, 5-8, 17 (2-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.40,43 (23 July, 2 Nov.).

### Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/63

Adopted without vote Meeting 40 23 July 1981

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/96, Part III) without vote, 17 July (meeting 17); 6-nation draft (E/1981/C.3/L.19), orally revised; agenda items 18 and 19.

Sponsors: Belgium, Japan, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, United States.

Strengthening of the co-ordination of information systems  
The Economic and Social Council.

Recalling its interest in the co-ordination of information systems as expressed in Council resolution 1889(LVII) of 31 July 1974, in which it recommended, *inter alia*, that the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination should strengthen the Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems and its staff,

Aware of the concern and serious need of recipients of services of the United Nations system for the strengthening of the planning and delivery of effective activities,

Recognizing the importance, for maximizing the development activities of the United Nations system in favour of developing countries, of the harmonization of information systems,

Stressing the importance to all Member States of easily accessible comprehensive information on the applications of the resources made available to the United Nations system,

Emphasizing the importance of rationalizing, co-ordinating and ensuring the useful compatibility of hardware, software, and data-set information systems,

Recalling the recommendations for the strengthening of the Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems made by the Joint Inspection Unit in its report concerning the co-ordination of information systems,

1 Endorses the recommendation of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination at its twenty-first session that the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination should review its decision 1981/3, by which it had terminated the operational functions of the Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems and abolished its secretariat:

2. Affirms that timely and accurate information on the activities, resources, results and findings of the United Nations

system is important to Governments in enabling them to participate more effectively in the programme planning and evaluation process;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a report to the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982, including the agreed recommendations of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination on methods of enhancing the effectiveness of the co-ordination of the information systems in the United Nations system, bearing in mind the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit;

4. Requests the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination to include in the recommendations called for in paragraph 3 above a detailed proposal for ensuring the cost-effective compatibility of computerized information systems, including the continued elaboration of vocabularies of common terminology;

5. Requests the Secretary-General, as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, to engage immediately, within the limits of existing resources, independent recognized experts to prepare recommendations which will assist in developing the proposals and recommendations mentioned in paragraphs 3 and 4 above.

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/197

Adopted without vote

Oral proposal by Council President: agenda item 2.

Strengthening the co-ordination of information systems

At Its 43rd plenary meeting, on 2 November 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Secretary-General on strengthening the co-ordination of information systems, submitted in accordance with a decision taken by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, in pursuance of Council resolution 1981/63 of 23 July 1981.

Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems

Continuation of IOB. On 14 April 1981,<sup>(5)</sup> ACC decided to continue the Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems (IOB) as a clearing-house and forum for the exchange of experience on information systems within the United Nations system, but without operational functions or an operational secretariat. The Chairman of IOB, a body composed of representatives of the United Nations and a number of specialized agencies, was asked to report to ACC on the practical arrangements for implementing the decision, and IOB was requested to report regularly to ACC on its activities.

In May, ACC reported to the Economic and Social Council<sup>(1)</sup> that the IOB Chairman had concluded that the intrinsic value of what the IOB machinery had produced could not be regarded as commensurate with the effort made. The report added that participating organizations should individually assume a more active role and absorb the cost within existing resources.

In June,<sup>(3)</sup> the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) expressed surprise and dissatisfaction over the ACC decision, noting that IOB had made modest progress and had achieved some positive results. Recalling the importance that Member States attached to establishing a centralized means of examining proposals to

create new information systems and ensuring their compatibility, CPC recommended that ACC review its decision and requested it to submit to the Council in July the measures it advocated for enhancing the effectiveness of information system co-ordination.

Reporting to the Council in July,<sup>(2)</sup> ACC suggested arrangements for continuing certain IOB activities, including the following. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) would assume responsibility for servicing IOB as a forum for the exchange of experience, limited to documentary information systems. With the co-operation of participating organizations, UNESCO would maintain and update such information tools as the Directory of United Nations Information Systems and the Common Register of United Nations Serial Publications. Under the general responsibility of the ACC Consultative Committee on Substantive Questions, the United Nations Development Programme would become responsible for the data base of CORE 1—the first phase of the Common Register for Development Activities—designed to produce a financial analysis of the development expenditures of United Nations organizations by sector and country. Organizations participating in CORE 1 would make financial contributions and supply information.

ACC noted that co-ordination of information systems was a complex matter and that there was a desire to rationalize systems and halt their proliferation, while at the same time there were repeated calls for ambitious new systems. To entrust IOB with the power and responsibility to vet new or redesigned systems would involve virtually insuperable difficulties. ACC did not consider it justified to devote scarce resources to endeavours having uncertain results.

On 23 July,<sup>(7)</sup> the Economic and Social Council decided without vote to take note of the ACC report. The Third Committee approved the decision in like manner on 17 July, as orally proposed by its Chairman.

On the same day, in its resolution on strengthening the co-ordination of information systems, the Council endorsed the CPC recommendation that ACC should review its decision to terminate the operational functions of IOB.<sup>(4)</sup>

On 30 October,<sup>(6)</sup> ACC decided to continue the IOB staff in service until the April 1982 session of ACC and to approve, on a contingency basis, a 1982 budget for the IOB secretariat (p. 1387) at the 1980-1981 level, subject to the standard adjustments for inflation and currency fluctuations, on the understanding that ACC would decide in April 1982 on the continued use of funds.

Reports: ACC, <sup>(1)</sup>E/1981/37, <sup>(2)</sup>E/1981/95; <sup>(3)</sup>CPC, A/36/38.

Resolution and decisions:

Resolution: <sup>(4)</sup>ESC: 1981/63, para. 1, 23 July (p. 1385).

Decisions: ACC: <sup>(5)</sup>1981/3, 14 Apr.; <sup>(6)</sup>1981/16, paras.

(a) & (b), 30 Oct. <sup>(7)</sup>ESC: 1981/179, 23 July, text following.

Meeting records: ESC: 3rd Committee, E/1981/C.3/SR.1-3, 5-8, 13-15, 17 (2-17 July); plenary, E/1981/SR.40 (23 July).

Economic and Social Council decision 1981/179

Adopted without vote

Approved by Third Committee (E/1981/96, Part III) without vote. 17 July (meeting 17); oral proposal by Chairman; agenda items 18 and 19.

Report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination on co-ordination of information systems  
In the United Nations family

At its 40th plenary meeting, on 23 July 1981, the Council took note of the report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination on co-ordination of information systems in the United Nations family.

**Financing of IOB.** On 24 November 1981, the General Assembly's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee decided without vote to approve \$280,500 as the United Nations share of the 1982 budget of IOB. The Committee acted on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ), on the basis of a contingency budget submitted by ACC. The total budget, as reported by the Secretary-General in November 1981,<sup>(1)</sup> amounted to \$674,300, taking into account the ACC decision of 30 October regarding the staff and budget of IOB (p. 1386).

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/38.

Meeting record: GA, 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.53 (24 Nov.).

International Computing Centre

The General Assembly, on 18 December 1981,<sup>(2)</sup> approved without vote 1982 budget estimates in the amount of 5,343,100 for the International Computing Centre (ICC), an inter-agency facility at Geneva financed by the United Nations and 12 other participating United Nations organizations and programmes.

The Fifth Committee recommended this action without objection on 24 November, as proposed orally by its Chairman on an oral recommendation of the Chairman of ACABQ.

The budget estimates were submitted by the Secretary-General in November,<sup>(1)</sup> following a review by a panel of the ACC Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions, composed of representatives from organizations using ICC services. During that review, the ICC Director noted that there was a movement away from the use of central computer facilities towards mini- and micro-computers.

The share of the United Nations in the 1982 budget came to \$1.7 million.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/44.

Resolution: <sup>(2)</sup>GA, 36/235, sect. VII, 18 Dec., text following.

Meeting records: GA: 5th Committee, A/C.5/36/SR.10, 12-19, 53 (12 Oct.-24 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.105 (19 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/235, section VII

Adopted without vote Meeting 105 18 December 1981

Approved by Fifth Committee (A/36/845) without objection, 24 November (meeting 53); oral proposal by Chairman on oral recommendation by ACABQ; agenda item 100.

International Computing Centre

[ The General Assembly ... ]

Approves the budget estimates for the International Computing Centre for the year 1982;

## UN postage stamps

The 1981 gross revenue of the United Nations Postal Administration from the sale of philatelic items at United Nations Headquarters and at overseas offices totalled almost \$17 million. Revenue derived from the sale of stamps for philatelic purposes was retained by the United Nations; revenue from stamps used for postage from United Nations Headquarters was retained by the United States Postal Service in accordance with an agreement between the United Nations and the United States Government. Similarly, revenue from stamps used for postage from the Palais des Nations, Geneva, and from the Vienna International Centre was retained by the Swiss and Austrian postal, telephone and telegraph enterprises, in accordance with agreements between the United Nations and the Swiss and Austrian Governments.

Six commemorative stamps and two souvenir cards were issued.

The theme of the first commemorative stamp, issued on 30 January, was "Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People". The denominations were 15 cents, 0.80 Swiss francs (SwF) and 4 Austrian schillings (S).

The second commemorative, issued on 6 March, paid tribute to the "International Year of Disabled Persons". The stamps were issued in denominations of 20 and 31 cents, SwF 0.40 and 1.50 and S 4 and 6. A souvenir card was also issued.

On 15 April, the Fresco stamp, in the "Art at the United Nations" series, was the third commemorative to be issued, in denominations of 20 and 31 cents, SwF 0.80 and S 6.

"New and Renewable Sources of Energy" was the theme of the fourth commemorative stamp, issued on 29 May in denominations of 20 and 31 cents, SwF 1.10 and S 7.50. A souvenir card was issued at the same time.

The second group of 16 stamps was issued in the commemorative "Flag Series" on 25 September, in denominations of 20 cents each.

The sixth and final commemorative issue for 1981 was "10th Anniversary of the United Nations Volunteers Programme". The stamps were issued in denominations of 20 and 31 cents, SwF 0.40 and 0.70, and S 5 and 7.

By the end of 1981, United Nations stamps were available for purchase in local currency to collectors in 115 countries outside the United States.

The number of first-day covers serviced for the various issues in 1981 was as follows:

Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People	453,479
International Year of Disabled Persons	698,347
Fresco	529,277
New and Renewable Sources of Energy	570,102
Flag Series	3,961,237
10th Anniversary of the United Nations Volunteers Programme	694,187

In line with a December 1980 Assembly decision to issue stamps on the conservation and protection of nature,<sup>(2)</sup> the Postal Administration, with the advice and assistance of the United Nations Environment Programme, selected the six themes of flora, insects, reptiles, birds, mammals,

and fish and other marine life, each of which was to be the subject of a stamp. A stamp design competition was organized and 206 designs by 59 artists from 23 countries were received. An Interdepartmental Stamp Design Committee selected the winning designs and international bids were sought for the printing of the issue. The stamps were to be released in November 1982.

In an October 1981 report<sup>(1)</sup> to the General Assembly on the United Nations financial emergency (p. 1295), the Secretary-General estimated the net revenue from their sale at \$2 million. Part of this was to be earmarked for promoting, under United Nations auspices, the conservation and protection of nature and endangered species; the rest was to be placed in a special account, as required by the Assembly's 1980 resolution.

In a resolution of 10 December 1981,<sup>(3)</sup> the Assembly noted that a partial or interim solution to the Organization's financial problem could enhance its liquidity and might facilitate progress towards a comprehensive settlement. It requested the Secretary-General to submit in 1982 a progress report on the postage stamp project.

Report: <sup>(1)</sup>S-G, A/C.5/36/28.

Resolutions: GA: <sup>(2)</sup>35/113, 10 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 1220); <sup>(3)</sup>36/116 B, para.5 (a), 10 Dec. 1981 (p. 1298).

## PART TWO

### Intergovernmental organizations related to the United Nations



## Chapter I

## International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

In 1981, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) continued its activities to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world and to ensure that the assistance provided was not used for military purposes.

Continued emphasis was placed on safeguards, the safety of nuclear power stations, nuclear fuel-cycle services and the management of nuclear waste, and the provision of technical assistance to member States, particularly the developing countries.

The Agency's responsibility in the field of safeguards was the focus of discussions in 1981 following an attack by Israel on an Iraqi nuclear research centre on 7 June (p. 275).

At the end of 1981, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons<sup>a</sup> (Non-Proliferation Treaty) had 113 non-nuclear-weapon States parties (Antigua and Barbuda, and Egypt became parties during the year; Cape Verde's accession in 1979 was notified to IAEA on 7 May 1982) and 98 per cent of the world's nuclear facilities outside the nuclear-weapon States were under IAEA safeguards. The Agency continued its efforts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of its international safeguards system, which aimed at deterring the proliferation of nuclear weapons by early detection, while respecting States' sovereign rights. Work also continued on assuring supplies of nuclear material, equipment and technology and fuel-cycle services, on possible schemes for international storage of plutonium and on the international management of spent fuel.

Progress in completing an up-to-date set of internationally agreed safety standards for nuclear power plants-IAEA's Nuclear Safety Standards (NUSS)-was made during the year and the Agency assisted member States in implementing NUSS recommendations through advisory missions and training courses.

Revised Basic Safety Standards for Radiation Protection were approved in 1981. These were the result of a joint effort between IAEA and the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; they were based on recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protec-

tion (ICRP), an independent non-governmental expert body. Increasing emphasis was also given to an exchange of information in such fields as safety research, nuclear-plant operating experience and emergency preparedness.

Membership of IAEA remained at 110 in 1981. Zimbabwe, admitted to membership by the IAEA General Conference on 21 September 1981, had not deposited its instrument of acceptance as at 31 December.

The twenty-fifth session of the General Conference of IAEA was held at Vienna, Austria, from 21 to 26 September. The Conference decided, among other things: to suspend immediately the provision of any assistance to Israel under the Agency's technical assistance programme and to consider at its 1982 regular session the suspension of Israel from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership, if by that time it had not complied with a Security Council resolution of 19 June 1981 (p. 276); to request the IAEA Board of Governors-its executive organ-to submit recommendations on proposed amendments to its statute in relation to representation on the Board of the areas of Africa and of the Middle East and south Asia; to appoint Hans Blix (Sweden) as IAEA Director-General for a four-year term; to confer the title of "Director-General Emeritus of the International Atomic Energy Agency" upon Sigvard Eklund, who retired in 1981, as Director-General; to request the Board of Governors to take the necessary measures so that technical assistance might be funded through IAEA's regular budget or through other assured resources and so that such funds were increased to respond adequately to increasing requirements; and to request the Director-General to increase substantially the number of staff members drawn from developing areas, particularly at the senior and policy-making levels.

The Board of Governors met four times during 1981, in February, June, July/August and September, at Vienna.

## Agency safeguards responsibilities

As at 31 December 1981, 113 non-nuclear-weapon States and three nuclear-weapon States (USSR, United Kingdom, United States) had

<sup>a</sup> See YUN 1968, p. 17, text of Treaty, annexed to resolution 2373(XXII) of 12 June 1968.

ratified or acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Safeguards agreements with IAEA, concluded under article III of the Treaty, had entered into force for 70 non-nuclear-weapon States parties. An agreement with France and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) under which IAEA might apply safeguards to certain nuclear material in civil nuclear facilities in France entered into effect on 12 September 1981. Similar agreements had previously entered into force with the United Kingdom (1978) and the United States (1980).

Agency safeguards were applied under other agreements in 10 non-nuclear-weapon States not party to the Treaty but having substantial nuclear activities, namely Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Israel, Pakistan, South Africa and Spain, as well as with Cuba and Viet Nam. In eight of these States, all substantial nuclear activities known to IAEA were covered by a network of individual safeguards agreements.

On 17 December, Greece acceded to the 1973 safeguards agreement concluded between the non-nuclear-weapon States of EURATOM, EURATOM itself and IAEA.

At the end of 1981, safeguards applied by IAEA covered material in 133 power reactors, in 176 research reactors and critical assemblies, in four conversion, 39 fuel fabrication, seven reprocessing and four enrichment plants, and in 486 other nuclear installations.

#### Technical assistance

During 1981, more than 70 countries received IAEA technical assistance in the form of expert services or equipment or both. A total of 608 fellows were carrying out individual field studies, and 595 persons participated in 28 group training projects. Technical assistance provided by IAEA in 1981 exceeded \$21 million in value, 11.3 per cent higher than in 1980.

The Agency served as the executing agency for 37 large-scale projects financed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Among these were: installation and operation of a research and service reactor (Albania); a national centre for non-destructive testing and quality control, and nuclear engineering (Argentina); exploration for atomic minerals (Bangladesh, Chile, Colombia, Greece, India, Madagascar, Malawi); nuclear manpower training, and development of agriculture through nuclear technology (Brazil); a centre for isotope application (Bulgaria); a nuclear power plant (Chile); introduction and techniques application of nuclear techniques (Cuba, Ethiopia, Ghana, Senegal); a national centre for radiation technology (Egypt); radiation processing for industries

(Indonesia); applied nuclear physics training and research (Morocco); nuclear techniques in animal production (Nigeria); nuclear energy (Peru); training in nuclear power-plant safety analysis, engineering and public information, and manpower development (Philippines); nuclear technology (Romania); radioactive tracer techniques for studying coastal sedimentology (Sri Lanka); industrial application of high-energy ionizing radiation, and uranium analysis and ecological laboratories (Yugoslavia); strengthening the infrastructure of the regional centre for nuclear studies at Kinshasa (Zaire); nuclear analytical techniques (regional, Africa); industrial application of isotopes and radiation technology, and nuclear techniques training in the mineral industry (regional, Asia and the Pacific); and Rift Valley fever control and modern techniques in physics (interregional).

The Agency also continued to provide large-scale assistance to projects in Bangladesh and India for the use of nuclear techniques in agricultural research, financed by Sweden. A project funded by the Federal Republic of Germany, Sweden and the United Kingdom provided assistance for control of the tsetse fly in Nigeria.

The target for member States' voluntary contributions to IAEA's regular programme was \$13 million in 1981, of which \$11.86 million was pledged. Other sources of support for the technical assistance programme were UNDP funds (\$5.2 million) extrabudgetary contributions (\$3.6 million) and assistance in kind (\$2.8 million).

#### Nuclear power

At the end of 1981, 272 nuclear power plants with a total capacity of 152,603 megawatts (electrical) (MW(e)) accounted for around 9 per cent of the world's electricity-generating capacity. The record of operating nuclear power plants continued to be excellent; 2,600 reactor years had accumulated without any significant spread of radioactivity to the environment or any radiation-induced fatality.

The Agency continued to help its developing member States introduce nuclear-powered electricity-generating plants by assistance with planning surveys, feasibility studies and the evaluation of technical bids. It also continued preparation of a series of guidebooks, for example, on manpower development for nuclear power, on technical evaluation of bids for nuclear power plants, on the introduction of nuclear power, on the interaction of grid characteristics with the design and performance of nuclear power plants, and on nuclear power plant instrumentation and control.

In 1981, six interregional training courses, four of which focused on special aspects of

nuclear power plant safety, were attended by 200 participants from developing countries. During the year IAEA continued to develop its energy data bank and to collect and disseminate information on nuclear technology and the reliability of nuclear power plants.

A computerized power-reactor information system was established which contained nuclear power plant operating-experience data provided by member States since 1971.

#### Environment

Because the future growth of nuclear power was felt to depend to a large extent on providing evidence of the capability to manage radioactive waste safely, IAEA continued to attach importance to its waste management programme, addressing the technological, environmental, safety and regulatory aspects of the treatment and disposal of radioactive waste. Two technical reports, reviewing the technology of waste handling and treatment, and three reports in a Safety Series, containing guidance on the safe underground disposal of radioactive waste, were completed for publication in 1981.

Work was begun on a code of practice for, and a seminar was held in the Federal Republic of Germany in October on, the management of radioactive waste from nuclear power plants; a symposium was also organized, jointly with NEA, on the migration of long-lived radionuclides in the terrestrial environment (Knoxville, Tennessee, United States, in July).

At IAEA's request and within its responsibilities under the 1975 Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, a United Nations Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Pollution was reviewing, with a view to recommending improvements, the oceanographic model used for the definition of high-level radioactive waste under the Convention.

#### Nuclear safety

The Agency continued development of its safety standards and regulations for nuclear power plants: 37 of 57 planned safety guides were completed. An extensive effort to implement those standards was under way by means of training courses, seminars and visits by experts to member States. The Basic Safety Standards for Radiation Protection of workers and the general public, developed by IAEA, were revised in 1981 to reflect the latest ICRP recommendations.

Advisory services continued throughout the year to member States with developing nuclear programmes; some 24 missions dealt with a wide spectrum of safety issues, from general questions

such as problems of organizing a national regulatory authority to those which involved specific details such as mechanical problems with a particular nuclear power-plant component.

The exchange of information continued to be emphasized. Safety information was transmitted in many training courses given by IAEA throughout the world.

The Agency also maintained its radiological assistance plan, involving about 20 duty officers ready to deal with radiation-release accidents. New publications and training courses strengthened the programme of emergency preparedness planning, and special assistance missions were sent to member States to develop, evaluate and improve their emergency plans.

#### Nuclear information

The International Nuclear Information System, with 67 participating countries and 14 international organizations, provided a comprehensive nuclear information and abstracting service from its file of more than 640,000 items.

#### Life sciences

In co-operation with WHO, IAEA continued to promote the use of nuclear techniques in medicine, biology and health-related environmental research and to conduct research on techniques for improving the accuracy of radiation dosimetry.

Symposia were held in June on health impacts of different sources of energy (Nashville, Tennessee, United States) and nuclear techniques in the study and control of parasitic diseases (Munich, Federal Republic of Germany). Seminars treated quality assurance in the use of nuclear medicine instruments, and the prospective methods of radiation therapy in developing countries. Advisory groups dealt with: nuclear-based techniques for the *in vivo* study of human body composition; immunological and pathological criteria associated with the use of radiation-attenuated vaccines; radiation treatment of domestic wastes; and high-dose inter-comparisons for industrial purposes.

The IAEA/WHO network of Secondary Standard Dosimetry Laboratories encompassed 43 member laboratories, 30 of which were located in developing countries. Thirteen co-ordinated research programmes were continued and developed during 1981. These related to: maintenance of equipment and quality control of radioassay techniques in nuclear medicine; trace elements in nutrition and in environmental pollution; high-dose standardization and inter-comparison; radiation sterilization of medical supplies; preparation of irradiated vaccines; improved methods of radiotherapy; radiation-

induced chromosomal changes and biological hazards of low-level radiation.

#### Physical sciences and laboratories

The role of IAEA in co-ordinating the international effort in controlled fusion was reflected in the continuation of the INTOR (International Tokamak Reactor) Workshop, in which scientists from the major fusion laboratories of EURATOM, Japan, the USSR and the United States participated. The conceptual design of the machine was completed in July 1981 and work on optimization of the design and cost/benefit/risk analysis of design alternatives was under way.

A UNDP preparatory assistance project on industrial applications of isotopes and radiation technology was fully implemented in Asia and the Pacific region under the Regional Co-operation Agreement for Research, Development and Training Related to Nuclear Science and Technology (RCA)-in force in 1981 for IAEA and for 13 member States in that region-in the field of nucleonic control systems for paper gauging, non-destructive testing, radiation processing of rubber, and nuclear instrument maintenance.

Efforts continued to be devoted to radioisotope production for medical purposes by the use of accelerators and research reactors. Within the isotope hydrology programme, isotope techniques were used, in co-operation with other organizations of the United Nations system, to help 25 member States in the assessment of their water resources. A regional seminar was held in Colombo, Sri Lanka, in November to inform hydrologists at the management level, from countries in Asia and the Pacific region, of the potential and scope of isotope hydrological techniques in water resources development investigations.

The Agency continued to provide nuclear data services to member States. In response to requests, which increased by more than 50 per cent during the year, 778 nuclear data reports, 54 data-processing codes and 56,000 numerical data sets were distributed to scientists. With the aim of training nuclear scientists in developing countries, IAEA initiated a new research programme on the measurement and analysis of fast-neutron nuclear data.

The International Laboratory of Marine Radioactivity in Monaco, with the co-operation of the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, conducted studies in the occurrence, distribution and behaviour of radionuclides and other pollutants in the Mediterranean Sea and the Pacific, Atlantic and

Indian Oceans. Research activities related to the disposal of radioactive wastes in the oceans were established with several countries.

The IAEA Laboratory at Seibersdorf, Austria, provided back-up services for the Agency's research, radioisotope and safeguards programmes. Agricultural work emphasized fertilizer utilization, residues left by agrochemicals, mutation breeding and the sterile-male technique for insect control. Medical programmes included studies on trace elements in human hair and animal bone. A new medical applications and dosimetry laboratory was commissioned at Seibersdorf as the central reference for a growing network of dosimetry laboratories in member States.

The Safeguards Analytical Laboratory continued to analyse nuclear fuel-cycle samples collected by IAEA's safeguards inspectors. On 12 October, IAEA took over full responsibility for the operation of the Laboratory, with the agreement of the Austrian authorities.

#### Food and agriculture

Under joint programmes of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and IAEA, work continued through 25 co-ordinated research programmes on the application of isotope and radiation techniques in order to increase agricultural production, improve the quality of food, reduce food losses and minimize pollution of food and the environment. Support was given to 86 technical assistance projects in 46 developing member States during the year.

Work continued on insect control, particularly the control of the Mediterranean fruit fly in Central America and the tsetse fly in Nigeria. Other projects were designed to improve crop and livestock production.

#### Secretariat

As at the end of 1981, 1,660 staff members were employed by IAEA. Of these 596-drawn from 66 countries-were in the Professional and higher categories and 1,064 were in the General Service and Maintenance and Operatives Service categories.

#### Budget

The General Conference of IAEA at its September 1981 session adopted a regular budget of \$86,369,000 for 1982. The target for voluntary contributions to finance the Agency's technical co-operation programme for 1982 was set at \$16 million.

# Annex I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY AND CONTRIBUTIONS

(Membership as at 31 December 1981; contributions as assessed for 1981 and 1982)

MEMBER	CONTRIBUTION FOR 1981		CONTRIBUTION FOR 1982		MEMBER	CONTRIBUTION FOR 1981		CONTRIBUTION FOR 1982	
	Percent- age	Net amount (In US dollars)	Percent- age	Net amount (In US dollars)		Percent- age	Net amount (In US dollars)	Percent- age	Net amount (in US dollars)
Afghanistan	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927	Libyan Arab				
Albania	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927	Jamahiriya	0.23685	193,435	0.23749	183,685
Algeria	0.08678	70,877	0.08381	64,823	Liechtenstein	0.01030	8,411	0.01032	7,985
Argentina	0.58535	478,049	0.56655	438,194	Luxembourg	0.05149	42,052	0.05163	39,933
Australia	1.90512	1,555,898	1.91026	1,477,472	Madagascar	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927
Austria	0.74145	605,539	0.74345	575,016	Malaysia	0.06551	53,500	0.6330	48,960
Bangladesh	0.03201	26,142	0.3119	24,125	Mali	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927
Belgium	1.26665	1,034,460	1.27006	982,318	Mauritius	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927
Bolivia	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927	Mexico	0.57270	467,724	0.55451	428,878
Brazil	0.92347	754,193	0.89162	689,617	Monaco	0.01030	8,411	0.01032	7,985
Bulgaria	0.11753	95,989	0.11367	87,918	Mongolia	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927
Burma	0.00821	6,707	0.00802	6,202	Morocco	0.03728	30,447	0.03611	27,925
Byelorussian SSR	0.41192	336,409	0.41303	319,452	Netherlands	1.69916	1,387,691	1.70375	1,317,744
Canada	3.41892	2,792,203	3.42814	2,651,460	New Zealand	0.27804	227,078	0.27880	215,632
Chile	0.05497	44,891	0.05348	41,360	Nicaragua	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927
Colombia	0.08361	68,288	0.08112	62,739	Niger	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927
Costa Rica	0.01483	12,109	0.01435	11,100	Nigeria	0.11543	94,273	0.11145	86,202
Cuba	0.08109	66,228	0.0784	60,679	Norway	0.52519	428,923	0.52661	407,302
Cyprus	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927	Pakistan	0.05497	44,891	0.05348	41,360
Czechoslovakia	0.86503	706,461	0.86736	670,851	Panama	0.01483	12,109	0.01435	11,100
Democratic Kampuchea	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927	Paraguay	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.03770	30,790	0.03655	28,268	Peru	0.04465	36,467	0.04324	33,441
Denmark	0.77235	630,769	0.77443	598,975	Philippines	0.07750	63,298	0.07532	58,253
Dominican Republic	0.02178	17,787	0.02104	16,273	Poland	1.00446	820,331	0.97909	757,269
Ecuador	0.01483	12,109	0.01435	11,100	Portugal	0.13881	113,366	0.13418	103,781
Egypt	0.05371	43,862	0.05215	40,331	Qatar	0.03089	25,230	0.3098	23,958
El Salvador	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927	Republic of Korea	0.10890	88,939	0.10521	81,372
Ethiopia	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927	Romania	0.15902	129,869	0.15421	119,275
Finland	0.50460	412,102	0.50596	391,331	Saudi Arabia	0.60758	496,205	0.60922	471,193
France	6.51862	5,323,691	6.53619	5,055,347	Senegal	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927
Gabon	0.02060	16,822	0.02065	15,973	Sierra Leone	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927
German Democratic Republic	1.45201	1,185,845	1.45593	1,126,073	Singapore	0.05730	46,794	0.05528	42,758
Germany, Federal Republic of	8.65030	7,064,615	8.67361	6,708,16	South Africa	0.32079	261,986	0.31068	240,292
Ghana	0.02254	18,406	0.02184	16,892	Spain	1.77125	1,446,564	1.77603	1,373,649
Greece	0.25719	210,043	0.24874	192,386	Sri Lanka	0.01516	12,384	0.01471	11,375
Guatemala	0.01516	12,384	0.01471	11,375	Sudan	0.00811	6,621	0.00791	6,116
Haiti	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927	Sweden	1.36963	1,118,564	1.37332	1,062,182
Holy See	0.01030	8,411	0.01032	7,985	Switzerland	1.09158	891,488	1.09453	846,551
Hungary	0.26457	216,074	0.25784	199,425	Syrian Arab Republic	0.02178	17,787	0.2104	16,273
Iceland	0.03089	25,230	0.03068	23,958	Thailand	0.07414	60,551	0.07177	55,506
India	0.47618	388,896	0.46303	358,122	Tunisia	0.02178	17,787	0.02104	16,273
Indonesia	0.11963	97,706	0.11589	89,635	Turkey	0.22117	180,625	0.21397	165,490
Iran	0.48054	392,456	0.46437	359,160	Uganda	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927
Iraq	0.08552	69,847	0.08248	63,793	Ukrainian SSR	1.52410	1,244,717	1.52821	1,181,976
Ireland	0.16476	134,563	0.16521	127,782	USSR	11.55433	9,436,306	11.58546	8,960,6559
Israel	0.25745	210,256	0.25815	199,659	United Arab Emirates	0.10298	84,104	0.10326	79,864
Italy	3.59399	2,935,178	3.60368	2,787,227	United Kingdom	4.64439	3,793,025	4.65690	3,601,634
Ivory Coast	0.02178	17,787	0.02104	16,273	United Republic of Cameroon	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927
Jamaica	0.01506	12,298	0.01460	11,289	United Republic of Tanzania	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927
Japan	9.97874	8,149,537	10.00563	7,738,751	United States	25.74494	21,025,635	25.81431	19,965,819
Jordan	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927	Uruguay	0.03033	24,769	0.02942	22,752
Kenya	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927	Venezuela	0.36842	300,884	0.35576	275,155
Kuwait	0.20596	168,205	0.20651	159,726	Viet Nam	0.02338	19,092	0.02273	17,578
Lebanon	0.02211	18,062	0.02140	16,548	Yugoslavia	0.31364	256,150	0.30313	234,456
Liberia	0.00788	6,432	0.00766	5,927	Zaire	0.01506	12,298	0.01460	11,289
					Zambia	0.01483	12,109	0.01435	11,100
					Zimbabwe'	-	-	-	-
					Total	100.00000	81,669,000	100.00000	77,344,000

\*Zimbabwe had not deposited its instrument of acceptance as at 31 December 1981.

## Annex II. OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
(For period October 1981-October 1982)

## OFFICERS

Chairman: Hidetoshi Ukawa (Japan).  
Vice-Chairman: Emil Keblusek (Czechoslovakia), Harjono Nimpuno (Indonesia).

## MEMBERS

Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Turkey, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Zambia.

## MAIN COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

## ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY COMMITTEE

Participation in the Administrative and Budgetary Committee is open to all members of the Board of Governors.

## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

Participation in the Technical Assistance Committee is open to all members of the Board of Governors.

## SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

C. Castro Madero (Argentina), Floyd L. Cutler (United States), I. Dostrovsky (Israel), M. A. N. El-Guebeily (Egypt), B. Goldschmidt (France), L. Gutiérrez-Jodra (Spain), W. Haefele (Germany, Federal Republic of), J. Jennekens (Canada), Malu wa Kalenga (Zaire), W. C. Marshall (United Kingdom), J. Minczewski (Poland), W. Murata (Japan), H. N. Sethna (India), I. Ursu (Romania), A. A. Vasiliev (USSR).

## SENIOR SECRETARIAT OFFICERS

Director-General: Hens Blix.  
Deputy Director-General for Safeguards: Hans Gruemm.  
Deputy Director-General for Technical Operations: Boris Semenov.

Deputy Director-General for Administration: Nelson F. Sievering, Jr.  
Deputy Director-General for Technical Co-operation: Carlos Vélaz Ocón.  
Deputy Director-General for Research and Isotopes: Maurizio Zifferero.

## HEADQUARTERS AND OTHER OFFICE

## HEADQUARTERS

International Atomic Energy Agency  
Vienna International Centre  
Wagramerstrasse 5, Post Office Box 100  
A-1400 Vienna, Austria  
Cable Address: INATOM VIENNA  
Telephone: (222)2360-1270  
Telex: 1-12645

## LIAISON OFFICE

International Atomic Energy Agency  
Liaison Office at the United Nations  
United Nations Headquarters, Room DC-1155  
New York, N. Y. 10017, United States  
Telephone: (212)754-6010, 754-6011

## Chapter II

## The International Labour Organisation (ILO)

During 1981, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) continued activities in its four major programme areas: promotion of policies to create employment and satisfy basic human needs; improvement of working and living conditions and environment; strengthening of industrial relations and tripartite (government/employer/worker) co-operation; and the advancement of human rights in the social and labour fields. The main instruments of action continued to be standard-setting, technical co-operation activities, research and publishing.

Membership in ILO rose to 146 during the year, with the admission of Equatorial Guinea (30 January) and Belize (17 November).

## Meetings

The sixty-seventh session of the International Labour Conference, held at Geneva from 3 to 24 June 1981, was attended by nearly 1,900 dele-

gates, advisers and observers from 137 countries. The Conference had before it the annual report of the ILO Director-General and the seventeenth special report on the effect of apartheid on labour and employment in South Africa.

The Conference adopted an International Labour Convention and Recommendation on the promotion of collective bargaining, a Convention and Recommendation to ensure equality of treatment for both men and women workers with family responsibilities, and a Convention and Recommendation on occupational safety and health and the working environment. It also held a first discussion on the maintenance of workers' rights in social security, and on termination of employment at the initiative of the employer, with a view to adopting standards at its 1982 session.

In accordance with usual practice, a tripartite Conference committee examined the application

by member States of the 153 Conventions and 162 Recommendations adopted since 1919. It also reviewed application of the ILO standards concerning minimum age for admission to employment or work.

Ratifications of ILO Conventions registered during the Conference raised the total number of ratifications to 4,917.

On 18 June, the Conference adopted a new Declaration concerning the policy of apartheid in South Africa, which updated a 1964 Declaration (p. 179).<sup>a</sup> It also adopted resolutions on the training and retraining of managers, ILO's role in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade,<sup>b</sup> the economic and social consequences of disarmament, participation of women in ILO meetings, and training. A new ILO Governing Body was elected for a three-year term (1981-1984).

Guidelines to cushion the impact of technological change were proposed by the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers at its eighth session (Geneva, 13-22 January). Adopted were conclusions on employment, work organization, health and safety, women workers and part-time employment, and equality of opportunity and treatment.

The Second Tripartite Technical Meeting for the Printing and Allied Trades (Geneva, 22 September-1 October) adopted conclusions relating to technological change and its effect on working conditions, remuneration, skill requirements and employment, and on training.

The improvement of working conditions and environment, and training in developing countries, were the focus of conclusions reached by the Tenth Session of the Iron and Steel Committee (Geneva, 13-22 October), which called for reliance on tripartite consultation in resolving the serious economic and social problems facing the industries.

Steps to improve employment security in the teaching profession, overcome teacher shortage in developing countries and reduce the workload and nervous tension of teachers were among measures proposed by a Joint Meeting on Conditions of Work of Teachers (Geneva, 27 October-4 November).

The Third Tripartite Technical Meeting for the Timber Industry (Geneva, 1-10 December) adopted conclusions designed to promote employment and training and improve occupational safety and health in the industry.

#### Working environment

The International Programme for the Improvement of Working Conditions and Environment, approved by the Governing Body in 1976, continued to encourage member States to set

definite objectives and carried out standard-setting and operational activities, studies and tripartite meetings, clearing-house activities in the fields of occupational safety and health and quality of working life.

By the end of 1981, multidisciplinary teams of experts had visited 14 countries. Tripartite evaluation missions on the effectiveness of labour administration were also carried out. The International Occupational Safety and Health Alert System became fully operational, facilitating communication among 98 countries regarding urgent safety and health hazards. A number of tripartite seminars and symposia were held in various parts of the world. A code of practice for safety and health in the construction of fixed offshore installations in the petroleum industry was finalized. The Programme also expanded its educational and training activities.

#### World Employment Programme

Launched in 1969 as ILO's principal contribution to the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade,<sup>c</sup> the World Employment Programme remained a central feature of the Agency's contribution to the Strategy for the Third Development Decade. The Programme was designed to assist Governments to promote employment, alleviate poverty and satisfy basic needs. The Declaration of Principles and the Programme of Action adopted by the 1976 World Employment Conference,<sup>d</sup> and reaffirmed by the 1979 session of the International Labour Conference, reinforced ILO's mandate to play a main role in the worldwide attack on unemployment and poverty.

The Programme, through its action-oriented research, technical advisory services and other field activities paid special attention to the development problems of rural areas where the vast majority of poor and underemployed lived, and to the rapidly growing urban informal sector. Activities in the areas of appropriate and new technologies, employment forecasting, manpower planning and labour market information, population and labour policies, labour intensive public works and emergency employment schemes, and the special problems of rural women all figured prominently in this work. It was also concerned with the international aspects of employment policy, including the contribution to employment objectives of expanded trade and restructuring of the world economy.

<sup>a</sup>See YUN 1964, p. 492.

<sup>b</sup>See YUN 1980, p. 503, text of Strategy, annexed to resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980.

<sup>c</sup>See YUN 1970, p. 319, text of Strategy, contained in resolution 2626(XXV) of 24 October 1970.

<sup>d</sup>See YUN 1976, pp. 346 and 942.

**Field activities**

During 1981, ILO spent more than \$106.5 million on technical co-operation activities (an increase of about 7 per cent compared with 1980) to promote employment, development of human resources and social institutions, and improvement in living and working conditions.

Most of this expenditure (\$55.6 million) continued to be financed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The ILO regular programme provided \$7.6 million in 1981 while expenditure funded from multi-bilateral arrangements and other special programmes rose to \$36.9 million. Activities financed by the United

Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) increased to \$6.3 million.

An analysis of expenditure showed that training received the largest share of funds (\$46 million), followed by employment planning and promotion (\$31.1 million), sectoral activities (\$15.8 million), working conditions and environment (\$6.5 million), and industrial relations and labour administration (\$2.9 million). Of the remaining \$3 million, social security received \$1 million.

A breakdown of expenditure on technical co-operation by field of activity, source of funds and country, territory or region is shown in the tables below.

**ASSISTANCE IN 1981 BY ACTIVITY AND SOURCE OF FUNDS**

(Excluding programme support costs; in US dollars)

Activity	Regular budget	UNDP	Trust funds (including UNFPA)	Total
Training	2,253,016	30,337,065	13,493,844	46,083,925
Employment and development	1,533,070	10,974,635	18,602,719	31,110,424
Sectoral activities	220,268	8,960,911	6,699,904	15,881,083
Working conditions and environment	1,508,082	3,460,882	1,571,697	6,540,661
Industrial relations and labour administration	1,193,054	660,166	1,012,321	2,865,541
Social security	117,347	679,234	222,688	1,019,269
Regional services	—	—	860,858	860,858
International Institute for Labour Studies	26,683	513,447	20,575	560,705
Statistics and special studies	382,745	42,980	—	425,725
Programming and management	40,219	—	294,660	334,879
International labour standards	181,504	7,655	133,756	322,915
Relations and meetings	188,111	—	88,299	276,410
Personnel, budget and finance, internal administration	—	—	262,819	262,819
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,644,099</b>	<b>55,636,975</b>	<b>43,264,140</b>	<b>106,545,214</b>

**COUNTRIES, TERRITORIES, REGIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS AIDED BY ILO IN 1981**

EXPENDITURES ON AID GIVEN BY SOURCE OF FUNDS  
in US dollars)

COUNTRY, TERRITORY OR OTHER	No. of experts provided	No. of fellowships awarded	ILO regular programme	UNDP*	UNFPA	Trust funds	Total
Afghanistan	1	17	2,920	244,202	—	—	247,122
Algeria	12	10	—	479,625	—	122,517	602,142
Angola	9	12	4,525	596,399	—	—	600,924
Antigua	9	2	—	282,586	—	28,298	310,884
Argentina	6	15	2,983	539,201	—	24,850	567,034
Australia	—	2	—	—	—	—	—
Austria	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
Bahamas	1	2	984	71,912	—	1,830	74,726
Bahrain	4	2	—	350,526	—	—	350,526
Bangladesh	55	22	55,614	2,598,150	205,414	3,259,545	6,118,723
Barbados	2	2	743	80,706	—	55,261	136,710
Belgium	—	5	—	—	—	—	—
Belize	1	—	3,573	35,155	—	—	38,728
Benin	9	2	8,338	627,727	—	147,935	784,000
Bermuda	1	2	—	70,037	—	—	70,037
Bhutan	1	—	—	103,952	—	—	103,952
Bolivia	4	2	—	70,367	257,993	183,906	512,266
Botswana	19	2	3,154	465,631	—	652,659	1,121,444



EXPENDITURES ON AID GIVEN BY SOURCE OF FUNDS  
(In US dollars)

COUNTRY, TERRITORY OR OTHER	No. of experts provided	No. of fellowships a warded	ILO regular programme	UNDP*	UNFPA	Trust funds	Total
Brazil	6	60	33,222	431,284	-	88,104	552,610
Bulgaria	-	4	990	89,498	27,194	-	117,682
Burma	1	4	12,030	420,961	-	43,266	476,257
Burundi	19	3	56,686	780,356	-	743,835	1,580,877
Cape Verde	7	-	4,000	164,234	-	338,304	506,538
Caribbean islands	-	-	255,040	381,004	-	-	636,044
Cayman Islands	1	-	-	13,280	-	-	13,280
Central African Republic	6	1	5,578	348,053	-	-	353,631
Chad	-	-	-	2,000	-	-	2,000
Chile	1	5	4,661	38,417	-	4,889	47,967
China	-	3	5,000	-	-	-	5,000
Colombia	4	10	24,153	282,484	-	-	306,637
Comoros	6	2	4,169	202,550	-	-	206,719
Congo	16	23	19,430	1,288,704	161,179	149,409	1,618,722
Cook Islands	-	-	2,527	3,456	-	-	5,983
Costs Rica	11	12	24,693	189,970	-	257,915	472,578
Cubs	2	3	23,479	143,034	-	-	166,513
Cyprus	3	5	25,384	86,358	91,633	-	203,375
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
Democratic Yemen	-	16	18,377	360,657	-	62,038	441,072
Denmark	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Djibouti	5	3	-	139,499	-	25,592	165,091
Dominica	6	3	-	54,453	-	555,973	610,426
Dominican Republic	6	6	13,606	111,401	-	185,661	310,668
Ecuador	3	4	13,398	373,451	-	-	386,849
Egypt	27	107	88,595	579,862	36,993	820,581	1,526,031
El Salvador	4	5	13,139	-	-	359,746	372,885
Equatorial Guinea	3	1	5,360	27,102	-	-	32,462
Ethiopia	21	25	21,773	1,362,816	-	213,013	1,597,602
Fiji	8	2	82,891	95,101	-	126,886	304,878
France	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
Gabon	9	3	-	481,236	87,249	97,065	665,550
Gambia	10	3	-	337,314	-	211,748	549,062
Germany, Federal Republic of	-	7	-	-	-	-	-
Ghana	-	7	3,196	(2,516)	-	35,492	36,172
Greece	4	1	19,790	18,000	-	7,883	45,673
Grenada	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
Guatemala	3	2	4,567	60,977	123,133	12,641	201,318
Guinea	10	8	35,250	480,161	-	-	515,411
Guinea-Bissau	7	3	-	154,052	489	247,062	401,603
Guyana	1	2	20,586	-	-	-	20,586
Haiti	15	3	29,005	907,590	-	68,256	1,004,851
Honduras	5	9	16,806	19,441	-	239,636	275,883
Hong Kong	2	-	3,986	83,118	22,129	-	109,233
Hungary	-	1	780	-	-	-	780
India	24	46	110,058	2,503,334	69,702	988,038	3,671,132
Indonesia	29	53	37,545	1,205,438	-	607,002	1,849,985
Iraq	46	128	6,933	184,740	84,802	2,612,188	2,888,663
Ireland	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
Israel	-	1	33,014	-	-	-	33,014
Italy	-	195	-	-	-	-	-
Ivory Coast	10	28	-	129,648	-	281,535	411,183
Jamaica	2	4	-	-	16,771	30,270	47,041
Jordan	15	13	21,106	738,266	207,834	-	967,206
Kenya	15	18	15,128	478,046	-	527,012	1,020,186
Kiribati	-	-	1,849	10,987	-	-	12,836
Kuwait	7	-	28,667	366,863	-	16,334	411,864
Lao People's Democratic Republic	1	-	13,750	(6,019)	-	-	7,731
Lebanon	5	2	15,338	173,680	-	2,273	191,291
Lesotho	3	3	6,987	131,271	-	359	138,617

EXPENDITURES ON AID GIVEN BY SOURCE OF FUNDS  
(In US dollars)

COUNTRY, TERRITORY OR OTHER	No. of experts provided	No. of fellowships awarded	ILO regular programme	UNDP*	UNFPA	Trust funds	Total
Liberia	13	-	-	103,514	-	557,250	660,764
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	17	19	500	456,893	-	837,044	1,294,437
Luxembourg	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
Madagascar	18	9	42,398	954,169	-	175,588	1,172,155
Malawi	18	4	6,000	1,194,327	-	47,566	1,247,893
Malaysia	7	38	13,912	174,152	-	347,347	535,411
Maldives	1	-	2,100	14,268	-	-	16,368
Mali	7	6	8,338	268,666	3,598	209,840	490,442
Malta	1	3	17,034	63,408	-	-	80,442
Mauritania	11	7	19,294	658,845	-	245,057	923,196
Mauritius	2	2	-	70,110	-	-	70,110
Mexico	9	35	78,056	533,471	-	115,425	726,952
Mongolia	7	13	1,908	418,956	-	-	420,864
Montserrat	-	4	-	-	-	-	-
Morocco	1	5	7,877	86,227	-	-	94,104
Mozambique	6	-	6,551	-	-	186,905	193,456
Namibia	3	1	-	245,098	-	458,968	704,066
National liberation movements**	-	9	76,987	93,043	-	-	170,030
Nepal	9	4	3,111	219,781	68,655	43,020	334,567
Netherlands	-	4	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands Antilles	10	1	2,255	598,028	-	-	600,283
New Hebrides	-	-	573	-	-	-	573
New Zealand	-	1	20,596	-	-	-	20,596
Nicaragua	2	6	33,422	281,225	-	104,374	419,021
Niger	18	30	-	568,236	-	337,435	905,671
Nigeria	15	216	30,801	936,104	-	38,277	1,005,182
Niue	2	-	-	58,119	-	-	58,119
Pakistan	29	12	50,512	1,235,275	77,149	437,914	1,800,850
Panama	5	6	41,462	298,940	-	46,364	386,766
Papua New Guinea	8	1	9,253	180,962	-	244,421	434,636
Paraguay	-	5	21,700	(3,741)	-	-	17,959
Peru	11	12	50,083	150,530	101,833	238,807	541,253
Philippines	10	41	71,078	339,233	-	509,485	919,796
Poland	-	-	6,529	-	-	-	6,529
Portugal	4	16	33,790	266,427	-	-	300,217
Qatar	1	-	-	-	-	94,757	94,757
Republic of Korea	6	-	10,065	356,085	-	-	366,150
Romania	-	1	-	32,388	-	-	32,388
Rwanda	6	-	36,328	105,512	-	57,293	199,133
Saint Lucia	-	1	2,733	-	-	-	2,733
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1	3	-	-	-	24,794	24,794
Samoa	-	-	5,219	30,277	-	-	35,496
Saudi Arabia	-	-	-	(31)	-	-	(31)
Senegal	21	16	34,427	429,505	56,691	559,595	1,080,218
Seychelles	2	1	31,234	64,838	-	296	96,368
Sierra Leone	8	6	8,084	107,490	239,500	311,880	666,954
Singapore	3	10	31,285	229,335	-	-	260,620
Solomon Islands	8	-	1,889	360,880	-	-	371,769
Somalia	14	10	20,013	805,176	17,136	199,580	1,041,905
South Africa	-	-	8,983	-	-	-	8,983
Spain	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
Sri Lanka	8	16	45,990	195,111	77,867	473,473	792,441
Sudan	39	34	49,107	3,122,624	42,897	90,910	3,305,538
Suriname	4	4	14,999	189,837	-	-	204,836
Swaziland	8	4	23,269	206,684	-	133,553	363,506
Switzerland	2	-	-	-	-	54,415	54,415
Syrian Arab Republic	18	10	18,091	847,639	61,857	-	927,587
Thailand	26	50	103,300	992,087	-	430,860	1,526,247
Togo	8	6	44,124	728,941	-	141,896	914,961
Tokelau	-	-	-	11,692	-	-	11,692

EXPENDITURES ON A/D GIVEN BY SOURCE OF FUNDS (in US dollars)							
COUNTRY, TERRITORY OR OTHER	No. of experts provided	No. of fellowships awarded	ILO regular programme	UNDP*	UNFPA	Trust funds	Total
Tongs	2	2	7,286	58,741	-	(3,249)	62,778
Trinidad and Tobago	4	4	3,762	129,889	-	29,604	163,255
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands		-	-	330	-		330
Tunisia	12	11	50,460	291,518	(1,239)	70,844	411,583
Turkey	13	32	87,113	601,620		33,167	721,900
Tuvalu	1		3,920	65,715	-		69,635
Uganda	15	6	9,486	1,182,390			1,191,876
United Arab Emirates	9	-	11,729	291,786		450,394	753,909
United Kingdom		4	357				357
United Republic of Cameroon	25	34	6,815	1,247,005	115,439	635,158	2,004,417
United Republic of Tanzania	22	45	75,064	375,349	-	1,940,688	2,391,101
United States	2	1		-	-	100,075	100,075
Upper Volta	5	3	1,542	442,243	-	103,982	547,767
Uruguay	2	8	1,816	10,950	-	45,009	57,775
Vanuatu	1			117,953	-		117,953
Venezuela	1	5	6,500		-	14,540	21,040
Yemen	-	-	2,563		202,028		204,591
Yugoslavia	-	2	-		33,204		33,204
Zaire	15	45	1,051	1,413,263	53,187	8,533	1,476,034
Zambia	20	11	33,630	272,177	25,723	534,936	866,466
Zimbabwe	9	3	57,600	133,895	-	12,343	203,838
Occupied Arab Territories		4	-		-		-
Subtotal	1,117	1,869	2,771,310	48,965,948	2,568,040	26,167,220	80,472,518
INTER-COUNTRY REGIONAL PROJECTS***							
Africa	80	-	1,138,629	1,603,149	474,155	5,006,912	8,222,845
Asia	66	-	1,283,035	2,184,049	741,719	1,593,905	5,802,708
Europe	2	-	40,634	189,874	-		230,508
Latin America and the Caribbean	38		1,129,335	1,463,590	342,541	1,020,229	3,955,695
Arab States in the Middle East	3	-	36,987	-	282,510	41,023	360,520
Subtotal	1,306	1,869	6,399,930	54,406,610	4,408,965	33,829,289	99,044,794
INTERREGIONAL PROJECTS	60	-	1,244,169	1,230,365	1,917,232	7,232,711	11,624,477
Total		-	7,644,099	55,636,975	6,326,197	41,062,000	11,669,271
Deduct Agency Cost	-	-	-	-		(4,124,057)	(4,124,057)
GRAND TOTAL	1,366	1,869	7,644,099	55,636,975	6,326,197	36,937,943	106,545,214

\*Includes projects for which ILO acted as executing agency.

\*\*Liberation movements of South Africa.

\*\*\*Number of fellowships awarded Included In list above by country.

### Educational activities

The International Institute for Labour Studies at Geneva, an ILO centre for advanced study in the labour and social fields, included in its 1981 programme 11 educational activities for 320 participants: 105 from government institutions; 79 from employers' groups; 135 from organizations of workers; and one from a university. Seven of the educational activities were four-day

national industrial-relations seminars which were held in Bangladesh, India (two), Indonesia, Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand. Each seminar incorporated the Institute's decision-making exercise on plant-level industrial relations and one objective was to train a nucleus of national officials from governments, trade unions and employers' associations who would in turn reach a much wider group.

The second international course on labour/management relations in the petroleum industry was held at Geneva in May. During the three-week course, attended by 31 participants from Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle East and Western Europe, participants analysed basic labour/management relations.

A seminar on the social aspects of rural development was held for 40 participants from the French-speaking countries of Africa, from 28 September to 10 October at Tashkent (Uzbekistan, USSR). This was a continuation of the programme initiated in 1980 with the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions of the USSR and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research.

The annual International Internship Course on Active Labour Policy Development was held at Geneva during October and November and was attended by 18 participants from 15 countries in Africa, the Americas, Asia and Europe. Major topics included the processes of economic and social change, population, labour force and employment issues, industrial relations, and ILO's role in the formulation and implementation of an active labour policy.

In December, the Institute and the Ambekar Institute for Labour Studies (Bombay, India) conducted a joint seminar for trade unionists from India and Sri Lanka on labour studies research, thus continuing a co-operative programme initiated several years earlier.

#### International Centre for Advanced Technical and Vocational Training

During 1981, ILO's International Centre for Advanced Technical and Vocational Training at Turin, Italy, continued to conduct residential training courses covering four main programme areas: educational technology, trade unionism, industry and management. Sixty-nine courses for 1,224 participants from 125 developing countries were held. The Centre also administered 645 individual fellowship programmes of varying duration.

The main preoccupations of ILO for the 1980s were given increased emphasis in the Centre's 1981 training programme: new and renewable energy sources and energy conservation; working conditions and the environment; labour administration; and small enterprise and co-operative development. The Centre also moved into new fields of advanced training, taking into account openings created by the possible uses of microelectronics and computers in developing countries.

The year witnessed a diversified approach to training activities: before overseas training was

initiated, preparatory work took place at national level in many programmes, with specific follow-up in the trainee's country of origin. A distinct trend was towards technical training tied to a period of in-plant or in-service training, and towards practical training in an industrial environment.

Efforts to transfer the Centre's experience in educational technology to regional and national institutions in developing countries also continued in 1981.

#### Publications

The ILO's published research covered a wide range of topical social and labour questions. New volumes issued in 1981 included *Employment, Trade and North-South Co-operation*; *Minimum Wage Fixing: An International Review of Practices and Problems*; *The Urban Informal Sector in Developing Countries: Employment, Poverty and Environment*; *Industries in Trouble*; *Workers' Participation in Decisions in Undertakings*; *Child Work, Poverty and Underdevelopment*; *Black Migration to South Africa*; *The Cost of Social Security: Tenth International Inquiry, 1975-1977*; *Modular Programme for Supervisory Development* (5 volumes); *Guide to Tools and Equipment for Labour-Based Construction*; *Employment Effects of Multinational Enterprises in Industrialised Countries*; and *Employment Effects of Multinational Enterprises in Developing Countries*.

Among the periodicals and technical serials which continued to be produced were: the bimonthly *International Labour Review*, the quarterly *Social and Labour Bulletin*, the *Yearbook and Bulletin of Labour Statistics and Women at Work*,

#### Secretariat

As at 31 December 1981, the total number of full-time staff under permanent, fixed-term and short-term appointments at ILO headquarters and elsewhere was 3,194. Of these, 1,671 were in the Professional and higher categories (drawn from 112 nationalities), and 1,523 were in the General Service category. Of the Professional staff, 874 were assigned to technical co-operation projects.

#### Budget

In June 1981, the International Labour Conference adopted a budget of expenditure for the 1982-83 biennium amounting to \$230,033,000. Of this amount, member States were to be assessed \$119,023,222 in 1982 and \$111,009,778 in 1983. The budget included \$7,884,428 for reimbursement to the Working Capital Fund and \$3,703,531 under Undistributed Reserve.

# Annex I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION AND CONTRIBUTIONS

(Membership as at 31 December 1981; contributions as assessed for 1982)

CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
MEMBER	Percent- age	Gross amount fin US dollars)	MEMBER	Percent- age	Gross amount fin US dollars)	MEMBER	Percent- age	Gross amount (in us dollars)
Afghanistan	0.01	11,902	Ghana	0.03	35,707	Panama	0.02	23,805
Algeria	0.12	142,828	Greece	0.35	416,582	Papua New Guinea	0.01	11,902
Angola	0.01	11,902	Grenada	0.01	11,902	Paraguay	0.01	11,902
Argentina	0.77	916,479	Guatemala	0.02	23,805	Peru	0.06	71,414
Australia	1.82	2,166,223	Guinea	0.01	11,902	Philippines	0.10	119,023
Austria	0.70	833,163	Guinea-Bissau	0.01	11,902	Poland	1.23	1,463,986
Bahamas	0.01	11,902	Guyana	0.01	11,902	Portugal	0.19	226,144
Bahrain	0.01	11,902	Haiti	0.01	11,902	Qatar	0.03	35,707
Bangladesh	0.04	47,610	Honduras	0.01	11,902	Romania	0.21	249,949
Barbados	0.01	11,902	Hungary	0.33	392,777	Rwanda	0.01	11,902
Belgium	1.21	1,440,181	Iceland	0.03	35,707	Saint Lucia	0.01	11,902
Belize*	-	-	India	0.59	702,237	Saudi Arabia	0.57	678,433
Benin	0.01	11,902	Indonesia	0.16	190,437	Senegal	0.01	11,902
Bolivia	0.01	11,902	Iran	0.64	761,749	Seychelles	0.01	11,902
Botswana	0.01	11,902	Iraq	0.12	142,828	Sierra Leone	0.01	11,902
Brazil	1.26	1,499,693	Ireland	0.16	190,437	Singapore	0.08	95,219
Bulgaria	0.16	190,437	Israel	0.25	297,558	Somalia	0.01	11,902
Burma	0.01	11,902	Italy	3.42	4,070,594	Spain	1.69	2,011,493
Burundi	0.01	11,902	Ivory Coast	0.03	35,707	Sri Lanka	0.02	23,805
Byelorussian SSR	0.39	464,191	Jamaica	0.02	23,805	Sudan	0.01	11,902
Canada	3.25	3,868,255	Japan	9.51	11,319,109	Suriname	0.01	11,902
Cape Verde	0.01	11,902	Jordan	0.01	11,902	Swaziland	0.01	11,902
Central African Republic	0.01	11,902	Kenya	0.01	11,902	Sweden	1.30	1,547,302
Chad	0.01	11,902	Kuwait	0.20	238,047	Switzerland	1.04	1,237,842
Chile	0.07	83,317	LSO People's Democratic Republic	0.01	11,902	Syrian Arab Republic	0.03	35,707
China	1.61	1,916,274	Lebanon	0.03	35,707	Thailand	0.10	119,023
Colombia	0.11	130,926	Lesotho	0.01	11,902	Togo	0.01	11,902
Comoros	0.01	11,902	Liberia	0.01	11,902	Trinidad and Tobago	0.03	35,707
Congo	0.01	11,902	Libyan Arab Jamahiriyi	0.23	273,754	Tunisia	0.03	35,707
Costa Rica	0.02	23,805	Luxembourg	0.05	59,512	Turkey	0.30	357,070
Cuba	0.11	130,926	Madagascar	0.01	11,902	Uganda	0.01	11,902
Cyprus	0.01	11,902	Malawi	0.01	11,902	Ukrainian SSR	1.45	1,725,837
Czechoslovakia	0.82	975,991	Malaysia	0.09	107,121	USSR	11.02	13,116,359
Democratic Kampuchea	0.01	11,902	Mali	0.01	11,902	United Arab Emirates	0.10	119,023
Democratic Yemen	0.01	11,902	Malta	0.01	11,902	United Kingdom	4.43	5,272,729
Denmark	0.73	868,870	Mauritania	0.01	11,902	United Republic of Cameroon	0.01	11,902
Djibouti	0.01	11,902	Mauritius	0.01	11,902	United Republic of Tanzania	0.01	11,902
Dominican Republic	0.03	35,707	Mexico	0.75	892,674	United States	25.00	29,755,806
Ecuador	0.02	23,805	Mongolia	0.01	11,902	Upper Volta	0.01	11,902
Egypt	0.07	83,317	Morocco	0.05	59,512	Uruguay	0.04	47,610
El Salvador	0.01	11,902	Mozambique	0.01	11,902	Venezuela	0.49	583,214
Equatorial Guinea	0.01	11,902	Namibia	0.01	11,902	Viet Nam	0.03	35,707
Ethiopia	0.01	11,902	Nepal	0.01	11,902	Yemen	0.01	11,902
Fiji	0.01	11,902	Netherlands	1.62	1,928,177	Yugoslavia	0.42	499,898
Finland	0.47	559,409	New Zealand	0.27	321,363	Zaire	0.02	23,805
France	6.21	7,391,342	Nicaragua	0.01	11,902	Zambia	0.02	23,805
Gabon	0.02	23,805	Niger	0.01	11,902	Zimbabwe	0.01	11,902
German Democratic Republic	1.38	1,642,521	Nigeria	0.16	190,437			
Germany, Federal Republic of	8.25	9,819,416	Norway	0.49	583,214			
			Pakistan	0.07	83,317			
						Total	100.00	119,023,222

\*Became a member on 17 November 1981.

## Annex II. OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION (As at 31 December 1981)

### MEMBERSHIP OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

Chairman: Gabriel Ventejol (France).

#### REGULAR MEMBERS

Vice-Chairman: Jean-Jacques Oechslin (France). Employers' Group:  
Gerd Muhr (Federal Republic of Germany), Workers' Group.

Government members  
Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brazil,\* Bulgaria, Canada.'

China,\* Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, France,\* German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of.\* India,\* Italy,\* Japan,\* Kenya, Mali, Mexico, Mozambique, Nigeria, Netherlands, Philippines, Senegal, USSR,\* United Kingdom,\* United States,\* Venezuela.

#### Employer' members

Frank Bannerman-Menson (Ghana), Murat Eurnekian (Argentina), Daniel Flunder (United Kingdom), Henri Georget (Niger), Abderrahim Gharbaoui (Morocco), David Grove (United States), Wolf-Dieter Lindner (Germany, Federal Republic of), Marwan Nasr (Lebanon), Jean-Jacques Oechslin (France), George Polites (Australia), Naval Tata (India), Albert Verschueren (Belgium), Horacio Villalobos (Venezuela), Koh Yoshino (Japan).

#### Workers' members

Irving Brown (United States), Shirley Carr (Canada), Cliff Dolan (Australia), José González Navarro. (Venezuela), Abdul Issifu (Ghana), Glynn Lloyd (United Kingdom), Elias Mashashi (United Republic of Tanzania), Kanti Mehta (India), Gerd Muhr (Germany, Federal Republic of), Vassily Prokhorov (USSR), Alfonso Sanchez Madariaga (Mexico), Moussa Sow (Mauritania), John Svenningsen (Denmark), Yoshikazu Tanaka (Japan).

Member holding a non-elective seats as a State of chief industrial importance.

### SENIOR OFFICIALS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

Director-General: Francis Blanchard.

Deputy Directors-General: Bertil Bolin, Surendra Jain, Albert Tévoédjré.\*

#### DEPUTY MEMBERS

##### Government deputy members

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Belgium, Burma, Cuba, Denmark, Ethiopia, Ghana, Hungary, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mongolia, Panama, Portugal, Ukrainian SSR, Uruguay, Zimbabwe.

##### Employers' deputy members

Agil Al-Jasem (Kuwait), Vicente Castellano Sabater (Spain), Sidney Chambers (Jamaica), Albert Deschamps (Canada), Pedro Escobar Padrón (Colombia), Johan von Holten (Sweden), Felix Moukoko Kingue (United Republic of Cameroon), Munga-wa-Nyasa (Zaire), Tom Owuor (Kenya), Aurelio Periquet (Philippines), Najib Said (Tunisia), Lucia Sasso-Mazzufferi (Italy), Fanel Sumbwe (Zambia), Fernando Yllanes Ramos (Mexico).

##### Workers' deputy members

Jerome Abondo (United Republic of Cameroon), Nangbog Barnabo (Togo), Gideon Ben-Israel (Israel), Marc Blondel (France), Youcef Briki (Algeria), Tulio Cuevas (Colombia), V. David (Malaysia), Heribert Maier (Austria), Democrito Mendoza (Philippines), Agus Sudono (Indonesia), Jozsef Timmer (Hungary), Raffaele Vanni (Italy), Frank Walcott (Barbados), Newstead Zimba (Zambia).

\*As Director of the International Institute for Labour Studies.

"As Director of the International Center for Advanced Technical and Vocational Training, Turin, Italy.

### HEADQUARTERS, REGIONAL, LIAISON AND OTHER OFFICES

#### HEADQUARTERS

International Labour Office  
4 Route des Morillons  
1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland  
Cable address: INTERLAB GENEVA  
Telephone: (022) 99 79 40  
Telex: 22271

#### REGIONAL OFFICES

International Labour Organisation Regional  
Office for Africa  
P. O. Box 2788  
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia  
Cable address: INTERLAB ADDISABABA

International Labour Organization Region  
Office for the Americas  
Apartado Postal 3638  
Lima 1, Peru  
Cable address: INTERLAB LIMA

International Labour Organisation Regional  
Office for Asia and the Pacific  
P. O. Box 1759  
Bangkok 2, Thailand  
Cable address: INTERLAB BANGKOK

International Labour Organisation Regional  
Office for Europe  
1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland  
Cable address: INTERLAB GENEVA

#### LIAISON OFFICES

International Labour Organization Liaison  
Office with the European Communities and  
the Benelux  
40 Rue Aimé Smekens  
B-1040 Brussels, Belgium

International Labour Organisation Liaison  
Office with the United Nations  
300 East 44th Street, 18th floor  
New York, N. Y. 10017, United States

International Labour Organisation Liaison  
Office with the United Nations Economic  
Commission for Latin America  
Casilla de Correo 2353  
Santiago, Chile

#### OTHER OFFICES

International Labour Organisation Office  
01-Boîte Postale 3960  
Abidjan 01, Ivory Coast

International Labour Organisation Office  
Boîte Postale 226  
Alger-Gare, Algeria

International Labour Organisation Office  
P. K. 407  
Ankara, Turkey

International Labour Organisation Office  
Boîte Postale 683  
Antananarivo, Madagascar

International Labour Organisation Office  
Boîte Postale 114-5096  
Beirut, Lebanon

International Labour Organisation Office  
Hohenzollernstrasse 21  
D-5300 Bonn 2, Federal Republic of Germany

International Labour Organisation Office  
Caixa Postal 04-401/403  
70 000 Brasília DF, Brazil

International Labour Organisation Office  
Avenida Julio A. Roca 710 (3er piso)  
Buenos Aires, Argentina

International Labour Organisation Office  
9 Dr. Taha Hussein Street  
Zamalek  
Cairo, Egypt

#### OTHER OFFICES (cont.)

International Labour Organisation Office  
P. O. Box 2061  
Dacca, Bangladesh

International Labour Organisation Office  
Boîte Postale 414  
Dakar, Senegal

International Labour Organisation Office  
P. O. Box 9219  
Dar es Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania

International Labour Organisation Office  
P. O. Box 1047  
Islamabad, Pakistan

International Labour Organisation Office  
P. O. Box 75  
Jakarta, Indonesia

International Labour Organisation Office  
Boîte Postale 7248  
Kinshasa 1, Zaire

International Labour Organisation Office  
P. O. Box 20275 SAFAT  
Kuwait, Kuwait

International Labour Organisation Office  
P. O. Box 2331  
Lagos, Nigeria

International Labour Organisation Office  
96/98 Marsham Street  
London SW1P 4LY, England

International Labour Organisation Office  
P. O. Box 2181  
Lusaka, Zambia

International Labour Organisation Office  
P. O. Box 2965  
Manila, Philippines

## OTHER OFFICES (cont.)

International Labour Organisation Office  
Apartado Postal 12-992  
Mexico 12, D. F., Mexico

International Labour Organisation Office  
Petrovka 15, Apt. 23  
Moscow K.9, USSR

International Labour Organisation Office  
7 Sardar Patel Marg  
Ch a n a k y a p u r i  
New Delhi 110021 India

International Labour Organisation Office  
Fuller Building, Suite 202  
79 Albert Street  
Ottawa K 1P 5E7, Ontario, Canada

International Labour Organisation Office  
205 Boulevard Saint-Germain  
F-75007 Paris, France

International Labour Organisation Office  
P. O. Box 1201  
Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago

International Labour Organisation Office  
Villa Aldobrandini  
Via Panisperna 28  
I-00184 Rome, Italy

International Labour Organisation Office  
Apartado Postal 10170  
San José, Costa Rica

International Labour Organisation Office  
P.O.Box 1546  
Government Buildings  
Suva, Fiji

## OTHER OFFICES (cont.)

International Labour Organisation Office  
INAOKA Building, 5th floor,  
36 Jimbo-cho 2-Chome  
Kanda, Chiyoda-Ku  
Tokyo 101, Japan

International Labour Organisation Office  
1750 New York Avenue, N. W., Suite 330  
Washington, D. C. 20006, United States

International Labour Organisation Office  
Boite Postale 13  
Yaoundé, United Republic of Cameroon

## INSTITUTE

International Institute for Labour Studies  
4 Route des Morillons  
1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland

## TRAINING CENTRES

Jobs end Skills Programme for Africa  
(JASPA)  
P. O. 2532  
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Asian Regional Project for Strengthening  
Labour/Manpower Administration (ARPLA)  
c/o ILO Regional Office for Asia  
and the Pacific  
P. O. Box 1759  
Bangkok, Thailand

Asian Regional Skill Development  
Programme (APSDEP)  
P. O. Box 1423  
Islamabad, Pakistan

## TRAINING CENTRES (cont.)

Asian Regional Team for Employment  
Promotion (ARTEP)  
P. O. BOX 2-146  
Bangkok 2, Thailand

Inter-American Labour Administration Centre  
(CIAT)  
Apartado Postal 3638  
Lima 1, Peru

Inter-American Centre of Research and  
Documentation on Vocational Training  
(CINTERFOR)  
Casilla de Correo 1761  
Montevideo, Uruguay

African Regional Labour Administration  
Centre (ARLAC)  
P. O. Box 59672  
Nairobi, Kenya

Regional Employment Programme for Latin  
America and the Caribbean (PREALC)  
Casilla de Correo 618  
Santiago, Chile

International Centre for Advanced Technical  
and Vocational Training  
Via Ventimiglia 201  
I-10127 Turin, Italy

African Regional Labour Administration  
Centre (CRADAT)  
Boite Postale 1055  
Yaoundé, United Republic of Cameroon

## Chapter III

## Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

The Governing Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), held its twenty-first biennial session at Rome, Italy, from 7 to 25 November 1981 and noted, in its final report, the gloomy economic situation in the world, which, it said, was marked by economic recession, a slow-down in the growth of trade, a continuation of protectionist pressures and practices and widespread inflation and unemployment, which, along with the lack of a fully effective system of world food security, made the present period one of the most economically difficult since the Second World War.

The Conference reaffirmed its support of FAO's 1979 Plan of Action on World Food Security<sup>a</sup> calling for the establishment and maintenance of national and regional food stocks to ensure against shortages and emergencies.

It recommended that the agricultural energy

needs of developing countries be assured through better use of fertilizers and other inputs and through more effective application of locally available and renewable sources, such as the recycling of organic matter, draught animals, biogas, and solar and wind energy.

The Conference appointed Edouard Saouma to a second six-year term of office as Director-General from January 1982.

On 7 November, the Conference admitted five new members-Bhutan, Equatorial Guinea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Tonga and Zimbabwe-bringing membership of the organization to 152. The Conference also appointed Dr. Monkombu Sambasivan Swaminathan, an Indian agricultural research scientist, to the post of Independent Chairman of the 49-nation Council-FAO's main governing body between

<sup>a</sup>See YUN 1979, p. 1253.

sessions-in succession to Bukar Shaib (Nigeria). World Food Day was held for the first time on 16 October and the Conference urged that future activities be intensified to increase awareness of world food problems (p. 725).

#### World food and agricultural situation

While the immediate threat of another world food crisis had been averted with a larger cereals harvest in 1981, the agency considered that the food and agricultural situation continued to be unsatisfactory.

World food and agricultural production increased by about 2.5 per cent and 2.7 per cent respectively in 1981, following two years of increases of less than 1 per cent. Although those increases were a little above the annual average rate for the 1970s, food and agricultural output failed to regain the long-term trend level and was unevenly distributed around the world.

In developed country regions, North America and Oceania recovered well from 1980, but output in western Europe declined after two good years, while in eastern Europe and the USSR the declines in production which had marked 1979 and 1980 were little more than arrested.

Increased food production in 1981 reflected larger harvests of cereals, pulses, roots and tubers, and sugar, production of some of which had declined in 1980. Production of poultry meat showed a significant increase, while such non-food crops as coffee and cotton also expanded.

Some rebuilding of cereal stocks through 1981/1982 was in prospect as a result of the increase in cereal production, although stocks would still be lower than the estimated minimum safe level for food security.

Availability of food aid remained at disappointingly low levels in relation to rising needs for cereal imports of low-income, food-deficit countries, estimated at 41 million tons for 1980/1981. Total shipments of food aid in cereals fell to 8.6 million tons in 1980/1981, the lowest level since 1975/1976. On the positive side, fulfilment of the 500,000-ton target for the International Emergency Food Reserve was assured for 1981, and the International Monetary Fund expanded its compensatory financing facility to enable developing countries to finance exceptional rises in import costs of cereals.

#### Activities in 1981

##### Field programmes

The trend towards increasing diversification of funding sources for FAO's field programmes continued in 1981. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) was the major source of

funds, but its share of the total decreased from 87 per cent in 1971 to 56 per cent in 1981. This reflected the increasing importance of various Trust Fund sources and the establishment of FAO's Technical Co-operation Programme (TCP).

The 1981 total field programme delivery of \$314 million was divided between the three main components, with \$180 million under UNDP, \$118.6 million under Trust Funds and \$15.4 million from TCP. Operating at the end of the year were 895 UNDP-financed projects, 695 Trust Fund projects and 550 TCP projects. Experts in the field numbered 2,150.

With an increase in the total field programme delivery from \$287 million in 1980 to \$322 million in 1981, the steady expansion of previous years came to a halt since the increase reflected inflated costs alone.

The organization remained the largest executing agency for UNDP, with 25 per cent of its total expenditures for 1981. During the year, a large number of FAO/UNDP programming missions in agriculture, forestry and fisheries were carried out to prepare programmes and projects for FAO implementation in the third 5-year cycle (1982-1986). Particular attention was paid to the poorest countries with a predominantly agricultural base.

The major Trust Fund category in 1981 continued to be the FAO/Government Co-operative programme. Expenditure totalled \$53.1 million, including disbursements for 336 associate experts.

The FAO/Near East Co-operative Programme, financed by oil-exporting countries, was primarily for the benefit of less privileged countries in the Near East and north Africa. Expenditures under this and related funding arrangements were \$5.2 million in 1981. Some Near East countries drew on FAO's competence in entrusting to it, for execution under Unilateral Trust Fund arrangements, development activities in their own countries. In 1981, expenditure under this heading amounted to \$10.3 million.

In November 1981, the Technical Co-operation Programme completed its fifth year of operation; during this period, 1,299 projects were approved at a cost of \$81.7 million.

##### World Food Programme

For the fifth consecutive year, World Food Programme (WFP) shipments exceeded one million tons of food commodities in 1981. This assistance was heavily concentrated upon the least developed countries and those most seriously affected by the world economic crisis.

New projects approved in 1981 represented an outlay of some \$513 million. The largest of these was for further expansion of a \$33 million



project in Upper Volta, supporting government programmes for rural development. Other approved projects included: several in China to expand the agricultural base of state farms; a \$13 million project to assist settlers in India's Rajasthan canal area; and a \$27 million expansion for Indonesia's transmigration scheme to resettle 2.5 million people by the end of 1984.

Emergency assistance to Democratic Kampuchea continued with five expansions of the initial commitment for the relief operation, valued at \$18.5 million, for a total of \$98.9 million.

Between January and mid-November 1981, there were eight expansions of aid to Afghan refugees in Pakistan, valued at \$68.8 million, bringing the total cost of emergency relief to \$109 million since inception at the end of 1979. In Somalia, over the same 1981 period, WFP assistance consisted of three expansions valued at \$16.1 million, for a total of \$24.6 million since the end of 1979.

(See also p. 726.)

#### Capital for development

During 1981, the Investment Centre of FAO worked on 126 projects for submission to financing institutions. Among projects approved for financing during 1981 was one for \$62 million in north-west Bangladesh to establish a reliable long-term credit system. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), through its affiliate, the International Development Association (IDA), extended a credit of \$40 million for this purpose, and also promised \$35 million towards a \$55-million project to rehabilitate 174 pumping systems in the Sudan along the White Nile.

Co-operation with regional banks, such as the African and Asian Development Banks, increased substantially during 1981. The Asian Development Fund contributed \$16 million to a paddy and rice storage project prepared by the Investment Centre in Burma. At full development, the project was to result in annual savings of some 28,000 tons of rice, worth about \$9 million.

#### Freedom from Hunger Campaign

In Africa, FAO's Freedom from Hunger/Action for Development programme, with private funding, helped local organizations to support such rural projects as village-level food storage, income-generating activities for women's associations, and co-operative fishing and horticultural projects for young people.

Under this programme, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in India and other Asian countries trained staff to work with the rural poor in development activities at community

level, and exchange visits were made between workers in similar projects in neighbouring countries.

The programme helped to create the Latin American Association of Development Organizations, a regional coalition of 15 national NGOs whose main interest was to promote agricultural education and training through community-based projects.

In September 1981, 82 projects, totalling \$5 million, were in operation. In addition 65 new projects, totalling \$5.6 million, were at various stages of preparation.

#### Plant production and protection

During 1981, FAO continued to concentrate on programmes for intensive breeding of high yielding and high quality field food crops with more than 100 persons from Africa, Asia and Latin America attending training courses.

Technical support was given to 123 horticultural projects and 71 field projects for the improvement of arid and semi-arid rangelands and development of tropical pastures, and a major Trust Fund project to intensify range research in Saudi Arabia was started.

The Seed Improvement and Development Programme involved 118 countries in 1981; 43 new projects on seed production were implemented; four seed production and training centres were established and twelve training courses held on seed technology for 270 trainees.

Twenty-two countries received assistance from FAO in 1981 in the application of integrated pest control to cereal crops, and three training courses were held on plant quarantine and on grain storage.

Action to control the African migratory locust upsurge, started in 1980, was completed in 1981.

#### Livestock

Control of African animal trypanosomiasis and work on related development continued to receive high priority in 1981. Preparatory missions advised Governments on control policies and on related land use.

Projects for trypanotolerant cattle improvement were carried out in Benin and Guinea. Tsetse and trypanosomiasis control projects in various countries continued to receive technical inputs including monitoring environmental effects of tsetse control activities.

Breeding improvement programmes paid special attention to dairy cattle suited to humid tropical conditions. In co-operation with the Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), work started to establish a data bank on animal genetic resources.

Projects were under way in several African countries for the development of sheep and goat production, particularly on small farms. With the support of UNDP, an FAO mission to Latin American countries recommended a co-operative project between a number of developing countries to develop livestock production technologies for small farms. Integrated crop/livestock/fish production and small-scale poultry and rabbit production in rural areas was also promoted.

Increasing prices for fuel oil had led to a renewed interest in draught animals. An FAO consultant's report on this subject formed the basis for recommendations on draught animal power included in the Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development of New and Renewable Sources of Energy adopted at the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 710). The importance of buffaloes in Asia, both as draught and milk animals, led to projects for their improvement, in collaboration with the Animal Production and Health Commission for Asia, the Far East and the Southwest Pacific.

A test kit developed to measure the resistance of various tick populations to different acaricides was distributed to laboratories throughout the world and training in its use was given during the year to specialists from Latin American countries.

The sudden spread of rinderpest in west Africa in 1980 called for emergency (TCP) assistance to Benin, Gambia, Ghana, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Togo, Uganda and Upper Volta and the disease was brought under control. However, further outbreaks in west and east Africa during the year brought representatives of the countries to meet in Nairobi, Kenya, under the sponsorship of the FAO/International Office of Epizootics/OAU to plan a strategy for eradication of the disease from Africa. During the year, assistance was extended to Argentina, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Peru and the Republic of Korea for the control of foot-and-mouth disease. With financial support from the European Community, 700,000 doses of foot-and-mouth vaccine were provided for use in a buffer zone of south-eastern Europe.

#### Land and water management

The sixth session of the Committee on Agriculture, held in Rome during March and April, emphasized the alarming rate of deterioration of agricultural lands and the need for public awareness. The Committee recognized the importance of field projects to stimulate development of national soil conservation programmes. During the year, FAO conducted 12 projects in the field of soil conservation alone, and another

44 in which soil conservation was an essential component.

The organization's Remote Sensing Centre aided agriculture, forestry and fisheries in over 40 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The fertilizer programme carried out operations in 21 countries during the agricultural year (July 1980-June 1981), which included demonstrations, training courses, field days, and managing pilot schemes on fertilizer distribution and credit.

#### Rural development

Seven high-level FAO missions assisted Governments in overall policy reviews in implementation of the Programme of Action adopted by the World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development.<sup>b</sup> Additional missions were concerned with specific areas of work, such as agrarian reform and land settlement-aid for which was provided, through UNDP- and WFP-assisted projects-aimed mainly at country assistance in national policy and programme formulation. In follow-up, over 100 projects were formulated in 48 countries.

During 1981, perspectives in agricultural education, training and extension were reoriented towards the grassroots concept with self-help being promoted within the context of increased technical co-operation among developing countries. Small farmers in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Near East received special help and some 60 projects relating to access to improved advisory services were supported technically.

Separate programmes for women among the rural poor and efforts to bring the concerns of rural women more actively into the technical programmes of FAO were two initiatives undertaken in 1981. The Organization embarked upon a programme for people's participation in rural development through promotion of self-help organizations of the rural poor and some 30 projects in Asia, Africa and Latin American countries were identified with international funding from non-governmental organizations and others to be implemented in 1982-1983.

#### Food production, trade and security

Special commodity studies were completed in 1981 on agricultural trade barriers, protectionism, and the scope for increased trade among developing countries. Several projects were also undertaken to help developing countries strengthen their commodity policies, particularly in relating national development objectives to production and marketing policies to improve farm income level.

<sup>b</sup>See YUN 1979, p. 500.

The Food Security Assistance Scheme continued to assist countries to establish national emergency food reserves with missions visiting 12 developing countries to formulate food security policies and prepare suitable projects. A feasibility study on the establishment of national and regional food security reserves in the Sahel was concluded in 1981 and its recommendations endorsed by the Council of Ministers of the Permanent Inter-State Committee for Drought Control in the Sahelian Zone.

Trust Fund contributions to this Scheme from four new donors, Austria, Australia, Italy and Japan, helped overall resources to reach \$55 million at the end of 1981. Six projects were completed during the year, 12 new projects worth \$3.8 million became operational, and a further 22 in preparation were worth over \$10 million. Twenty-one new projects valued at \$15.5 million were approved by the Director-General of FAO.

#### Fisheries

During 1981, FAO continued to give priority to the special programme launched in 1979 to assist coastal states among developing countries in the management and development of fisheries in exclusive economic zones. Advice was also given to a large number of countries on the legal aspects of exclusive economic zone fisheries development. Monitoring, control and surveillance concepts and procedures were of special interest to member States, and regional training seminars were held in west Africa and South-East Asia.

Management and development advice continued to be channelled through technical assistance projects associated with FAO's network of regional fishery commissions and special assistance in stock management was given to specific regions.

The Regional Co-operative Research Programme for fish technology continued its work on post-catch waste and was expanded to include additional institutions in both Africa and Latin America. Over 30 institutions were co-operating in the Programme.

International trade in fishery products was assisted by the further activities of FAO's Fish Marketing Information Service in Latin America and the establishment of a similar service for Asia.

During 1981, some 170 projects supported the efforts of more than 60 Governments in training activities, institution building, research, development of small-scale fisheries, aquaculture and inland water fisheries.

#### Forestry

Through training, information programmes and direct assistance FAO endeavoured to provide for the developing world's current and future fuel-

wood needs, and two projects with this goal were approved during the year, one for afforestation in the Peruvian Sierra for energy and rural development purposes and the other to supply Burma's national fuelwood programme with equipment and technical advisers in planting, agro-forestry, extension training and communications.

Twenty-seven forestry for local community development projects were in operation during the year. The majority aimed to introduce and strengthen agro-forestry systems and increase land productivity, while others were designed to increase fuelwood supplies through promoting village wood lots, and still others to increase local incomes through small-scale forestry activities.

#### Publications

In addition to books and papers published in 1981 under the aegis of FAO, the Organization issued its annual Commodity Review and Outlook, the Animal Health Yearbook, the Yearbook of Fishery Statistics, the Yearbook of Forest Projects, the Production Yearbook and the Trade Yearbook. Quarterlies included the Plant Protection Bulletin, the World Animal Review, Food and Nutrition (nos. 1-2 and 3-4 in two issues), and *Unasylva* the forestry magazine. *Ceres*, a review of the agricultural, economic and social aspects of development, appeared bimonthly. Monthlies included the Monthly Bulletin of Statistics. Lists of publications, depository libraries and sales agents appeared in FAO Books in Print.

Four works of major interest were also issued in 1981: *Poplars and Willows, Eucalypts for Planting*, *Tropical Feeds*, and a new, expanded edition of the *FAO Atlas of the Living Resources of the Seas*.

#### Secretariat

At the end of September 1981, the total number of staff employed by FAO at its headquarters and regional and country offices was 4,520 of whom 1,541 (drawn from 103 countries) were in the Professional and higher categories, and 2,979 in the General Service category. Field project personnel, working in 123 countries, comprised 2,248 staff members in the Professional and higher categories and 661 in the General Service category. Of the 338 associate experts working for the organization, 310 were in the field and 28 were at headquarters and regional offices.

#### Budget

The November 1981 session of the FAO Conference approved a budget of \$366.6 million for 1982-1983, an increase of some \$86 million over the previous biennium, needed to counter inflation; actual programme growth was 2.9 per cent per annum.

# Annex I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND CONTRIBUTIONS

(Membership as at 31 December 1981;  
contributions as assessed for 1982-1983 biennium)

CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
MEMBER	Percent- age	Net amount (in US dollars)	MEMBER	Percent- age	Net amount fin US dollars)	MEMBER	Percent- age	Net amount (in US dollars)
Afghanistan	0.01	17,619	Ghana	0.04	70,476	Papua New Guinea	0.01	17,619
Albania	0.01	17,619	Greece	0.43	757,617	Paraguay	0.01	17,619
Algeria	0.15	264,285	Grenada	0.01	17,619	Peru	0.07	123,333
Angola	0.01	17,619	Guatemala	0.02	35,238	Philippines	0.12	211,428
Argentina	0.95	1,673,805	Guinea	0.01	17,619	Poland	1.52	2,678,088
Australia	2.24	3,946,656	Guinea-Bissau	0.01	17,619	Portugal	0.23	405,237
Austria	0.87	1,532,853	Guyana	0.01	17,619	Qatar	0.04	70,476
Bahamas	0.01	17,619	Haiti	0.01	17,619	Republic of Korea	0.18	317,142
Bahrain	0.01	17,619	Honduras	0.01	17,619	Romania	0.26	458,094
Bangladesh	0.05	88,095	Hungary	0.40	704,760	Rwanda	0.01	17,619
Barbados	0.01	17,619	Iceland	0.04	70,476	Saint Lucia	0.01	17,619
Belgium	1.49	2,625,231	India	0.73	1,286,187	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.01	17,619
Benin	0.01	17,619	Indonesia	0.20	352,380	Samoa	0.01	17,619
Bhutan	0.01	17,619	Iran	0.80	1,409,520	Sao Tome and Principe	0.01	17,619
Bolivia	0.01	17,619	Iraq	0.15	264,285	Saudi Arabia	0.71	1,250,949
Botswana	0.01	17,619	Ireland	0.20	352,380	Senegal	0.01	17,619
Brazil	1.55	2,730,945	Israel	0.31	546,189	Seychelles	0.01	17,619
Bulgaria	0.20	352,380	Italy	4.22	7,435,218	Sierra Leone	0.01	17,619
Burma	0.01	17,619	Ivory coast	0.04	70,476	Somalia	0.01	17,619
Burundi	0.01	17,619	Jamaica	0.02	35,238	Spain	2.08	3,664,752
Canada	4.01	7,065,219	Japan	11.72	20,649,468	Sri Lanka	0.02	35,238
Cape Verde	0.01	17,619	Jordan	0.01	17,619	Sudan	0.01	17,619
Central African Republic	0.01	17,619	Kenya	0.01	17,619	Suriname	0.01	17,619
Chad	0.01	17,619	Kuwait	0.24	422,856	Swaziland	0.01	17,619
Chile	0.09	158,571	Lao People's Demo- cratic Republic	0.01	17,619	Sweden	1.60	2,819,040
Chins	1.98	3,488,562	Lebanon	0.04	70,476	Switzerland	1.28	2,255,232
Colombia	0.13	229,047	Lesotho	0.01	17,619	Syrian Arab Republic	0.04	70,476
Comoros	0.01	17,619	Liberia	0.01	17,619	Thailand	0.12	211,428
Congo	0.01	17,619	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.28	493,332	Togo	0.01	17,619
Costa Rica	0.02	35,238	Luxembourg	0.06	105,714	Tonga	0.01	17,619
Cuba	0.13	229,047	Madagascar	0.01	17,619	Trinidad and Tobago	0.04	70,476
Cyprus	0.01	17,619	Malawi	0.01	17,619	Tunisia	0.04	70,476
Czechoslovakia	1.02	1,797,138	Malaysia	0.11	193,809	Turkey	0.37	651,903
Democratic Kampuchea	0.01	17,619	Maldives	0.01	17,619	Uganda	0.01	17,619
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.06	105,714	Mali	0.01	17,619	United Arab Emirates	0.12	211,428
Democratic Yemen	0.01	17,619	Malta	0.01	17,619	United Kingdom	5.45	9,602,355
Denmark	0.91	1,603,329	Mauritania	0.01	17,619	United Republic Of Cameroon	0.01	17,619
Djibouti	0.01	17,619	Mauritius	0.01	17,619	United Republic of Tanzania	0.01	17,619
Dominica	0.01	17,619	Mexico	0.93	1,638,567	United States	25.00	45,547,500
Dominican Republic	0.04	70,476	Mongolia	0.01	17,619	upper Volta	0.01	17,619
Ecuador	0.02	35,238	Morocco	0.06	105,714	Uruguay	0.05	88,095
Egypt	0.09	158,571	Mozambique	0.01	17,619	Venezuela	0.61	1,074,759
El Salvador	0.01	17,619	Namibia	0.01	17,619	Viet Nam	0.04	70,476
Equatorial Guinea	0.01	17,619	Nepal	1.99	3,506,181	Yemen	0.01	17,619
Ethiopia	0.01	17,619	Netherlands	0.33	581,427	Yugoslavia	0.51	898,569
Fiji	0.01	17,619	New Zealand	0.01	17,619	Zaire	0.02	35,238
Finland	0.59	1,039,521	Nicaragua	0.01	17,619	Zambia	0.02	35,238
France	7.66	13,496,154	Niger	0.01	17,619	Zimbabwe	0.02	35,238
Gabon	0.02	35,238	Nigeria	0.20	352,380			
Gambia	0.01	17,619	Norway	0.61	1,074,759			
Germany Federal Republic of	10.16	17,900,904	Oman	0.01	17,619			
			Pakistan	0.09	158,571			
			Panama	0.02	35,238			
						Total	100.00	177,690,000*

\*The total sum for the biennium 1982-1983 was \$355,380,000.

## Annex II. MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL OF THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

Holding office until 31 December 1981:  
Australia, Botswana, Egypt, El Salvador.  
France, Ghana, India, Italy, Kuwait.  
Madagascar, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia.  
Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United  
Kingdom.

Holding office until 31 December 1982:  
Argentina, Bangladesh, Chins, Germany.  
Federal Republic of, Indonesia, Ivory Coast.  
Japan, Malaysia, Panama, Portugal, Syrian  
Arab Republic, Thailand, United Republic of  
Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Holding office until conclusion of twenty-  
second session of the FAO Conference. No-  
vember 1983: Afghanistan, Angola, Barba-  
dos, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Congo, Cuba,  
Ireland, Kenya, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco,  
Nigeria, Poland, Romania, United States.

## Annex III. OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

## OFFICERS

## OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

Director-General: Edouard Saouma.

Deputy Director-General: Ralph W. Phillips.

Executive Director, World Food Programme: Bernardo de A. Brito (acting).

Co-ordinator, Freedom from Hunger Campaign/Action for Development: A. Pena Montenegro.

## DEPARTMENTS

Assistant Director-General, Office of Programme and Budget: Vacant.

Assistant Director-General, Administration and Finance Department: P. J. Skoutis.

Assistant Director-General, Agriculture Department: D. F. R. Bommer.

Assistant Director-General, Development Department: J. de Meredieu.

Assistant Director-General, Forestry Department: M. A. Flores Rodas.

Assistant Director-General, Department of General Affairs and Information: A. Sylla.

Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Department: N. Islam.

Officer-in-Charge, Fisheries Department: A. Labon.

## REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

Director, Liaison Office for North America: D. C. Kimmel.

Representative, Liaison Office with the United Nations (Officer in Charge): T. N. Saraf.

Assistant Director-General and Regional Representative for the Near East: S. Jum'a.

Assistant Director-General and Regional Representative for the Far East: Dioscoro L. Umali.

Assistant Director-General and Regional Representative for Latin America: Pedro Moral-López.

Assistant Director-General and Regional Representative for Africa: S. C. Sar.

Regional Representative for Europe: S. Stampach (acting).

## HEADQUARTERS AND REGIONAL OFFICES

## HEADQUARTERS

Food and Agriculture Organization  
Vie delle Terme di Caracalla  
Rome 00100, Italy  
Cable address: FOODAGRI ROME  
Telephone: 57971  
Telex: 610181

## REGIONAL AND OTHER OFFICES

Food and Agriculture Organization Regional  
Office for Africa  
United Nations Agency Building  
North Maxwell Road  
P. O. Box 1628  
Accra, Ghana

## REGIONAL AND OTHER OFFICES (cont.)

Food and Agriculture Organization Regional  
Office for Asia and the Pacific  
Maliwan Mansion  
Phra Atit Road  
Bangkok 2, Thailand

Food and Agriculture Organization Regional  
Office for the Near East  
Via delle Terme di Caracalla  
Rome 00100, Italy

Food and Agriculture Organization Regional  
Office for Europe  
Via delle Terme di Caracalla  
Rome 00100, Italy

## REGIONAL AND OTHER OFFICES (cont.)

Food and Agriculture Organization Regional  
Office for Latin America  
Avenida Providencia 871  
Casilla de Correo 10095  
Santiago, Chile

Food and Agriculture Organization Liaison  
Office with the United Nations  
United Nations Headquarters, Room DC-1125  
New York, N. Y. 10017, United States

Food and Agriculture Organization Liaison  
Office for North America  
1776 F Street, N. W., Suite 101  
Washington, D. C. 20437, United States

## Chapter IV

United Nations Educational,  
Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

During 1981, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) continued to give priority to its contributions to the new international economic order, to the promotion of peace, human rights and the elimination of colonialism and racism. A broad range of activities was carried out in the Organization's many fields of competence: education, natural and social sciences, culture and communication.

In 1981, Samoa (15 April) and the Bahamas (23 April) joined UNESCO, bringing the number of member States to 155. One associate member, the British Eastern Caribbean Group, also belonged to UNESCO.

## Education

The education programme of UNESCO for 1981 emphasized literacy, the elimination of all forms of inequality and discrimination, improvement of the quality of education while assuring its relevance with respect to the advancement of knowledge and of the needs of a multidimensional endogenous development and, finally, its contribution to strengthening peace, disarmament, international understanding and co-operation, the promotion of human rights and the elimination of all forms of oppression.

The Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport, held its second session

at UNESCO headquarters in Paris from 3 to 10 March. In addition to the 30 States members of the Committee, 43 States sent high-level officials as observers. The Committee adopted a number of recommendations directed at the solution of the problems it had examined in its field.

A regional intergovernmental meeting (Quito, Ecuador, 6-11 April) examined objectives and strategies for the implementation of a major education programme begun by UNESCO in the Latin American and Caribbean region.

As part of the programme to mobilize world public opinion to support the fight against illiteracy, an effort was made to intensify activities related to the observance of International Literacy Day (8 September).

A world conference on actions and strategies for education and integration of the handicapped and prevention of disabilities was held (Torremolinos, Spain, 2-7 November) as part of the programme of the International Year of Disabled Persons. More than 100 countries and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations met to exchange information, adopt recommendations and to formulate a solemn declaration.

A plan for a regional agreement on the mutual recognition of studies and certificates, diplomas, degrees and other credentials of higher education in the African States was submitted for adoption to an intergovernmental conference at Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, in December 1981. The agreement was similar to those for the region of the Americas and the Caribbean (1974), for Arab and European countries bordering on the Mediterranean (1976), for Arab States (1978) and European States (1979).

The International Institute for Educational Planning strengthened its research and training activities in 1981, particularly in the areas of adult education and literacy. It has based its co-operation with national research and training institutions in the framework of a fund established in 1977 to promote research and training in developing countries. Between 1978 and 1981, 77 contracts were concluded with institutions in 37 countries.

The UNESCO Institute for Education at Hamburg, Federal Republic of Germany, pursued its research on continuing education and undertook a series of case studies on teaching strategies for the continuing education of the newly literate.

The organisation took part in 298 national, regional and subregional projects with assistance from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), regional banks and funds-in-trust.

#### Natural sciences

During the year, UNESCO continued its efforts to use the resources of science and technology for the benefit of developing countries by assisting member States in planning, training and research activities. Following meetings held in May and September, a group of eminent scientists drew up recommendations concerning the organization's activities during 1984-1989.

The year also saw the launching by UNESCO of the International Organization for Chemical Sciences in Development and the International Biosciences Network (a joint undertaking with the International Council of Scientific Unions). Their objective was to expedite the growth of expertise in chemical and biological sciences, respectively, in developing countries.

An international conference on hydrology and the scientific bases for the rational management of water resources, convened jointly by UNESCO and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) (Paris, 18-27 August), adopted an outline plan for the third phase of the International Hydrological Programme (1984-1989) with the ultimate goal of helping to solve the crucial water-related socio-economic problems which could be foreseen from 1984 onwards.

The education of engineers and technicians received high priority throughout the year, as did activities relating to new and renewable sources of energy, with pilot projects, seminars and training courses and the development of a global network of information systems and services. The organization also co-operated in the preparation of the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (Nairobi, 10-21 August).

An international symposium on coastal lagoons was held in Bordeaux, France, in September and was attended by 285 scientists from over 40 countries. The symposium discussed scientific and environmental management problems with a view to identifying scientific research requirements and to developing a strategy to ensure that scientific knowledge was effectively used in the management of lagoons.

The tenth anniversary of the intergovernmental Man and the Biosphere programme, of which 101 countries were currently members, was marked in 1981. It had set up 209 biosphere reserves in 55 countries. A conference-exhibition was held in September on "Ecology in Practice", following which several hundred copies of the exhibition were to be shown worldwide.

The sixth session of the Standing Conference of National Science and Technology Policy-making Bodies in Latin America and the Caribbean was organized by UNESCO in Bolivia in

October. Among its recommendations was one proposing the agenda items for a second conference on the application of science and technology for development in Latin America and the Caribbean. The Conference also issued a "Declaration of La Paz" on science, technology and development in rural areas of Latin America.

Throughout the year, the International Geological Correlation Programme placed increasing emphasis on projects executed in and by developing countries in order to draw their earth scientists into closer regional and inter-regional co-operation. An agreement was concluded with the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development, whereby UNESCO would undertake a feasibility study for the assessment and mitigation of earthquake risk in the Arab region.

#### Social sciences

In the course of 1981, UNESCO encouraged debates on the tasks and challenges for the social sciences in the 1980s at national, regional and international levels. It continued to support the development of the social sciences in all regions directly and indirectly through international professional, non-governmental organizations, regional centres and associations. Activities covered the areas of training, research, theory and methodology, information and documentation services, international exchanges and publications.

Studies for development were concerned with: socio-cultural inequalities between and within nations; new styles of development and participation of populations in the development process; socio-cultural aspects of rural development; the socio-cultural impact of the activities of transnational corporations; the conditions of exchange of knowledge for an endogenous development; and the situation and the role of children in different cultural and environmental contexts.

Activities concerning socio-economic analysis and development planning were aimed at the elaboration and application of social science methods of analysis, planning and evaluation, with a view to strengthening national capacity in those skills. They dealt with: the practical use of socio-economic indicators to illuminate problems of rapid socio-economic change, and the social integration of the disabled and the use of indicators at the national and sub-national levels for analysis and planning; research on planning methods, including modelling, and the strengthening of national capacity to use the UNESCO Educational Simulation Model; and studies on evaluation methods and their use in different countries. Several operational projects to train

planners in developing countries were initiated in 1981.

Environmental activities were directed towards research on rural habitat and public participation, rehabilitation of historic centres, the broader ecosystem in which people lived, the integrated training of planners and administrators of human settlements, and the training of "barefoot" architects, and the UNESCO mass media programme to inform the public of environmental issues which concerned them.

Population activities dealt with: the demographic, socio-cultural and economic aspects of internal and international migration; the interrelationship between population, resources and development; assistance to member States to develop strategies for peoples' participation and involvement in development and in implementing population policies and programmes; the integration of human rights and development considerations in population communication programmes; the training of personnel in social communication techniques; and the training of journalists.

The organization continued its work on an analysis of human rights violations and the conditions for a constructive peace. Activities in this field dealt, in particular, with racism, the teaching of human rights and peace research. A symposium to examine scientific theories invoked to justify racism and racial discrimination was held in April 1981. Similarly, a meeting on ethno-development and ethnocide was organized in Latin America in December.

Other activities included: setting up specialized courses in human rights for university students and related socio-professional organizations; creation of an international network of institutions and the improvement of information and documentation for human rights teachers and peace researchers; and follow-up to the 1980 International Congress on Disarmament Education, including regional training seminars for university teachers and the publication of teaching materials.

Philosophical and interdisciplinary research was carried out on several planes, namely, philosophical investigation of the fundamental problems of endogenous development, comparative philosophical studies on changes in the relation between science and society, philosophical perspectives on the concept of environment, and studies on the process of change in a culture and the concept of a transcultural universal.

#### Culture

Study continued on African, Latin American, Caribbean, Arab, Asian, Oceanic, European and Arctic cultures. Research and studies were also

carried out in the field of intercultural studies, and a revision was begun of the History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind.

Particular efforts were made within the framework of the literature translation programme to maintain an equitable geographical balance in the publication of representative works; works from Africa, Asia and Latin America were being translated in collaboration with professors of comparative literature, and, in the European series of the collection, the Nordic countries received increasing attention.

In 1981, a commemorative day was organized at UNESCO Headquarters on the occasion of the centenary of the birth of Pablo Picasso, gathering together personalities in the arts and the humanities, writers, painters, art critics and museum directors, who discussed the influence of African art on the painter's work and Picasso's influence on modern art.

Within the framework of the International Year of Disabled Persons, four seminar/workshops were organized in different regions on the general theme of art in the service of the handicapped, the purpose of which was to promote the integration of disabled persons in social and cultural life.

The Programme for 1981-1983 saw an increase in the number of international campaigns for the protection of cultural heritage with the addition of the following new sites and monuments: Plaza Vieja, in Havana (Cuba); monuments and sites in Wadi Hadramaut and the architectural heritage of the city of Shibam (Democratic Yemen); the site of Göreme, in Cappadocia, and historic quarters and monuments of Istanbul, including the Golden Horn area (Turkey); monuments and the site of Paharpur Vihara and the mosque-city of Bagerhat, in particular the Shait Gumbad Mosque, and an archaeological park at the site (Bangladesh); and the historic city of Sana'a

In 1981, appeals were launched to mobilize international support for the safeguarding of: Fez (Morocco); the Palais de Sans Souci, Citadelle de la Ferrière and Site des Ramiers (Haiti); historic buildings and sites of Malta; the architectural heritage of the island of Gorée (Senegal); monuments of Hué (Viet Nam); exceptional monuments and sites in the "Cultural Triangle" (Sri Lanka); and ancient city sites of Mauritania.

The World Heritage Committee, meeting in Sydney, Australia, from 26 to 30 October, added the following to the World Heritage List: Los Glaciares (Argentina); Kakadu National Park, the Great Barrier Reef and the Willandra Lakes region (Australia); Anthony Island and Head-Smashed-In Bison Jump (Canada); Speyer

Cathedral and Wurzburg Residence (Federal Republic of Germany); Fontainebleau, Chambord Château, Amiens Cathedral, the Roman Theatre and Triumphal Arch in Orange, and Roman and Romanesque monuments of Arles and Fontenay Abbey (France); Quirigua ruins (Guatemala); Nimbe District Nature Reserve (Guinea); the Medina of Fez (Morocco); Thatta, Lahore Fort and Shalimar Gardens (Pakistan); Darien National Park (Panama); Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary and Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal); Kilwa Kisiwani and Songo Mnara ruins, and Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania); and Mammoth Cave National Park and Olympic National Park (United States).

Efforts continued to promote public awareness of the objectives of the 1972 International Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and to encourage contributions to the World Heritage Fund. Ratifications of the Convention increased to 62 States and currently 112 sites were protected by the Convention.

#### Communications

In 1980, UNESCO continued to promote a free and better balanced flow of information, studies on the role of communication in society and the formulation of national communication policies and plans. Preparatory work was begun for the Intergovernmental Conference on Communication Policies in the Arab States, to be held in 1983.

The final report of the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, *Many Voices, One World*, examined by the UNESCO General Conference in 1980, became the subject of a number of seminars and studies in 1981, whose aim was to assess and analyse the report and suggest areas for further elaboration and exploration.

Among other activities were studies and consultations on the right to communicate, on reduction of telecommunication and satellite tariffs and on working conditions of journalists, as well as on the new world information and communication order and its relationship to the concept of an international economic order.

The first session of the 35-member Intergovernmental Council of the International Programme for Development of Communication (IPDC), established by UNESCO's General Conference in 1980, was held in Paris from 15 to 22 June. The Council discussed identification of the needs of Member States with regard to the development of communication, methods of determining priorities for the different groups of activities constituting the programme, criteria



for the presentation and selection of projects under the international programme, the system of financing required, and ways of ensuring reciprocal consultation and better co-ordination.

A pilot project for the production of children's books was launched in Benin in the framework of a project on African languages. Assistance was given by UNESCO in book promotion and reading to national and regional training programmes in the book trade and to those co-publishing moderately priced books within the plan of activities of the Asian Cultural Centre for UNESCO, as well as the regional centres for the promotion of books in Africa south of the Sahara and in Latin America and the Caribbean. Publication of a work in a series of studies on books and reading and the organization in Bologna, Italy, of an international seminar on the role of children's books in the integration of the young handicapped in daily life constituted UNESCO's contribution to the 1981 International Year of Disabled Persons.

#### General Information Programme

The General Information Programme of UNESCO was concerned with the development and promotion of information systems and services in the fields of scientific and technological information, documentation, libraries and archives at the national, regional and international levels.

The Programme continued to emphasize socio-economic information and the special needs of developing countries. It aimed at facilitating member States' choice, use and adaptation of advanced information and communication technology and at strengthening UNESCO's role in the information field within the United Nations system.

Publications included the quarterly Journal of Information Science, Librarianship and Archives Administration, as well as guidelines, studies, technical reports, state-of-the-art reviews and directories.

#### Technical assistance

##### Assistance in 1981 under UNESCO Participation Programme

As at 31 December 1981, the allocations approved by the Director-General under the UNESCO Participation Programme, through which member States and organizations participated in technical assistance activities, amounted to \$9,433,849 or 62.7 per cent of the \$15,048,800 sum approved by the General Conference at its twenty-first (1980) session. The amounts (in United States dollars) by sector and by region are as follows.

sector	Approved budget	Allocation
Culture	3,388,000	2,616,871
Education	3,339,900	2,109,917
Social sciences	2,385,700	1,301,265
Communication	1,584,100	648,259
Natural sciences	1,512,600	1,147,270
National commissions	1,392,200	735,820
Information systems and Services	1,197,800	760,497
Statistics	99,800	85,700
Copyright	85,500	9,750
Fellowship administration	63,200	18,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>15,048,800</b>	<b>9,433,849</b>
Region	Requests received	Approved allocation
Africa	26,798,096	2,597,420
Asia and Oceania	7,344,425	1,599,700
Latin America and the Caribbean	5,895,172	1,388,599
Arab States	4,322,140	1,054,920
Europe	3,937,390	1,355,170
Interregional	4,409,549	1,438,040
<b>Total</b>	<b>52,706,772</b>	<b>9,433,849</b>

#### Projects executed for UNDP and UNFPA

As at 31 December 1981, the provisional amounts-based on preliminary data on expenditures and obligations for 1981-obligated for projects for which UNESCO served as executing agency for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) totalled over \$61.5 million, as shown in the tables below (in thousands of United States dollars).

##### PROJECTS EXECUTED BY UNESCO FOR UNDP IN 1981

sector	Amount obligated
Education	30,932
Natural sciences	16,211
Culture	3,321
General Information Programme	2,158
Communication	1,753
Social sciences	364
Statistics	254
<b>Total</b>	<b>54,993</b>
Region	
Africa	19,556
Asia and the Pacific	17,384
Latin America and the Caribbean	8,436
Arab States	6,725
Europe and North America	2,830
Interregional and global	62
<b>Total</b>	<b>54,993</b>

##### PROJECTS EXECUTED BY UNESCO FOR UNFPA IN 1981

sector	Amount obligated
Education	3,542
Social sciences	1,895
Infrastructure	908
Statistics	114
Natural sciences	83
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,542</b>

Region	Amount obligated
Asia and Oceania	1,682
Latin America and the Caribbean	1,238
Arab States	1,110
Africa	919
Europe	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>4,950</b>
Infrastructure	908
Global and interregional activities	684
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,592</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,542</b>

## Budget

The twenty-first session of the General Conference of UNESCO, held in October 1980, approved a budget of \$625.4 million for the three-year period 1981-1983. The Conference fixed the level of the Working Capital Fund at \$20 million; amounts to be advanced by member States were to be calculated according to their percentage contribution. Amounts (in thousands of United States dollars) allocated are shown in the table below.

## Secretariat

As at 31 December 1981, the total number of full-time staff employed by UNESCO on permanent, fixed- and short-term appointments was 3,469 drawn from 130 nationalities. Of these, 1,468 were in the Professional or higher categories and 2,001 were in the General Service and Maintenance Worker categories.

Of the Professional staff, 576 were experts serving in the field; 497 General Service and Maintenance Workers were also employed in the field.

## UNESCO REGULAR BUDGET

	Amount
Programme operations and services	340,818
Provision for currency fluctuation	70,813
Appropriation reserve	52,183
General administrative services	43,060
Common services	41,469
Conference, language and document services	40,307
General policy and direction	28,024
Capital expenditure	8,700
<b>Total</b>	<b>625,374</b>

## Annex I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION AND CONTRIBUTIONS

(Membership as at 31 December 1981;  
annual contributions as assessed for 1981- 1983)

CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
MEMBER	Percent- age	Amount (in us dollars)	MEMBER	Percent- age	Amount fin US dollars)	MEMBER	Percent- age	Amount (in us dollars)
Afghanistan	0.01	19,916	Democratic			Iran	0.64	1,274,624
Albania	0.01	19,916	Kampuchea	0.01	19,916	Iraq	0.12	238,992
Algeria	0.12	238,992	Democratic People's			Ireland	0.16	318,656
Angola	0.01	19,916	Republic of Korea	0.05	99,580	Israel	0.25	497,900
Argentina	0.77	1,533,532	Democratic Yemen	0.01	19,916	Italy	3.41	6,791,356
Australia	1.81	3,604,796	Denmark	0.73	1,453,868	Ivory coast	0.03	59,748
Austria	0.70	1,394,120	Dominica	0.01	19,916	Jamaica	0.02	39,832
Bahamas	0.01	19,916	Dominican Republic	0.03	59,748	Japan	9.48	18,880,368
Bahrain	0.01	19,916	Ecuador	0.02	39,832	Jordan	0.01	19,916
Bangladesh	0.04	79,664	Egypt	0.07	139,412	Kenya	0.01	19,916
Barbados	0.01	19,916	El Salvador	0.01	19,916	Kuwait	0.20	398,320
Belgium	1.21	2,409,836	Equatorial Guinea	0.01	19,916	Lao People's		
Benin	0.01	19,916	Ethiopia	0.01	19,916	Democratic		
Bolivia	0.01	19,916	Finland	0.47	936,052	Republic	0.01	19,916
Botswana	0.01	19,916	France	6.19	12,328,004	Lebanon	0.03	59,748
Brazil	1.26	2,509,416	Gabon	0.02	39,832	Lesotho	0.01	19,916
Bulgaria	0.16	318,656	Gambia	0.01	19,916	Liberia	0.01	19,916
Burma	0.01	19,916	German Democratic			Libyan Arab		
Burundi	0.01	19,916	Republic	1.37	2,728,492	Jamahiriya	0.23	458,068
Byelorussian SSR	0.38	756,808	Germany, Federal			Luxembourg	0.05	99,580
Canada	3.24	6,452,784	Republic of	8.22	16,370,952	Madagascar	0.01	19,916
Cape Verde	0.01	19,916	Ghana	0.03	59,748	Malawi	0.01	19,916
Central African			Greece	0.35	697,060	Malaysia	0.09	179,244
Republic	0.01	19,916	Grenada	0.01	19,916	Maldives	0.01	19,916
Chad	0.01	19,916	Guatemala	0.02	39,832	Mali	0.01	19,916
Chile	0.07	139,412	Guinea	0.01	19,916	Malta	0.01	19,916
China	1.60	3,186,560	Guinea-Bissau	0.01	19,916	Mauritania	0.01	19,916
Colombia	0.11	219,076	Guyana	0.01	19,916	Mauritius	0.01	19,916
Comoros	0.01	19,916	Haiti	0.01	19,916	Mexico	0.75	1,493,700
Congo	0.01	19,916	Honduras	0.01	19,916	Monaco	0.01	19,916
Costa Rica	0.02	39,832	Hungary	0.33	657,228	Mongolia	0.01	19,916
Cuba	0.11	219,076	Iceland	0.03	59,748	Morocco	0.05	99,580
Cyprus	0.01	19,916	India	0.59	1,175,044	Mozambique	0.01	19,916
Czechoslovakia	0.82	1,633,112	Indonesia	0.16	318,656	Namibia*	-	-

CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
MEMBER	Percent-age	Amount fin US dollars)	MEMBER	Percent-age	Amount (in US dollars)	MEMBER	Percent-age	Amount (in US dollars)
Nepal	0.01	19,916	Sao Tome and Principe	0.01	19,916	USSR	10.98	21,867,768
Netherlands	1.61	3,206,476	Saudi Arabia	0.57	1,135,212	United Arab Emirates	0.10	199,160
New Zealand	0.27	537,732	Senegal	0.01	19,916	United Kingdom	4.41	8,782,956
Nicaragua	0.01	19,916	Seychelles	0.01	19,916	United Republic of Cameroon	0.01	19,916
Niger	0.01	19,916	Sierra Leone	0.01	19,916	United Republic of Tanzania	0.01	19,916
Nigeria	0.16	318,656	Singapore	0.08	159,328	United States	25.00	49,790,000
Norway	0.49	975,884	Somalia	0.01	19,916	upper Volta	0.01	19,916
Oman	0.01	19,916	Spain	1.68	3,345,888	Uruguay	0.04	79,664
Pakistan	0.07	139,412	Sri Lanka	0.02	39,832	Venezuela	0.49	975,884
Panama	0.02	39,832	Sudan	0.01	19,916	Viet Nam	0.03	59,748
Papua New Guinea	0.01	19,916	Suriname	0.01	19,916	Yemen	0.01	19,916
Paraguay	0.01	19,916	Swaziland	0.01	19,916	Yugoslavia	0.41	816,556
Peru	0.06	119,496	Sweden	1.30	2,589,080	Zaire	0.02	39,832
Philippines	0.10	199,160	Switzerland	1.04	2,071,264	Zambia	0.02	39,832
Poland	1.23	2,449,668	Syrian Arab Republic	0.03	59,748	Zimbabwe	0.02	39,832
Portugal	0.19	378,404	Thailand	0.10	199,160	-	-	-
Qatar	0.03	59,748	Togo	0.01	19,916	Total**	100.04	199,239,664
Republic of Korea	0.15	298,740	Tonga	0.01	19,916	ASSOCIATE MEMBER		
Romania	0.21	418,236	Trinidad and Tobago	0.03	59,748	British Eastern Caribbean Group	0.01	19,916
Rwanda	0.01	19,916	Tunisia	0.03	59,748			
Saint Lucia	0.01	19,916	Turkey	0.30	597,480			
Samoa	0.01	19,916	Uganda	0.01	19,916			
San Marino	0.01	19,916	Ukrainian SSR	1.44	2,867,904			

\*Namibia's assessment remained suspended in 1981.

\*\*Includes contributions assessed for Bahamas, Samoa and Zimbabwe, admitted as members after assessments for the period 1981-1983 had been set by the 1980 session of the UNESCO General Conference

## Annex II. OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (As at 31 December 1981)

### MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Chairman: Victor Massuh (Argentina).

Vice-Chairmen: Aziz Al-Hajj Ali Haider (Iraq), Barnabé Karorero (Burundi), Guillermo Putzeys Alvarez (Guatemala), Nikolai I. Smirnov (USSR), Kaw Swasdi Penich (Thailand), François Valéry (France).

Members: Daniel Arango (Colombia), Mario Cabral (Guinea-Bissau), Estrella Z. de Carazo (Costa Rica), Cu-Huy-Can (Viet Nam), Georges-Henri Dumont (Belgium), Mohammed El Fasi (Morocco), Dafalla El Hag Yousif (Sudan), Salvador Garcia de Pruneda (Spain), Alfredo Guevara (Cuba), Erdal Inonu (Turkey), Triloki Nath Kaul (India), Mumtaz Ali Kazi (Pakistan), Mamadi Keita (Guinea), Donald J. Kirk-

ness (United Kingdom), Donald M. Kusenha (United Republic of Tanzania), Jean-Félix Loung (United Republic of Cameroon), Mahmoud Messadi (Tunisia), Peter Mod (Hungary), Karl Moersch (Germany, Federal Republic of), Barbara W. Newell (United States), A. Bola Olaniyan (Nigeria), Masami Ota (Japan), Demodetdo Y. Pendje (Zaire), Gian France Pompel (Italy), Abdellatif Rahal (Algeria), Hubert de Ronceray (Haiti), Saeed Abdullah Salman (United Arab Emirates), Patrick K. Seddoh (Ghana), Ladislav Smid (Czechoslovakia), Sulaiman Haji Daud (Malaysia), Hanne Sondergaard (Denmark), Thomas Sohl Thelejane (Lesotho), Iba der Thiam (Senegal), Gleb N. Tsvetkov (Ukrainian SSR), Fred Turnovsky (New Zealand), Hector L. Wynter (Jamaica), Yang Bozheng (China).

### PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE SECRETARIAT

Director-General: Amadou Mahtar M'Bow.

Director, Executive Officer of the Secretary-General: Ch. Bekri.

Assistant Directors-General: G. Bolia, Abdul-Razzak Kaddoura, J. Knapp, H. Lopes, Makaminan Makagiansar, Z. L. N'Kanza, Dragoljub Najman, G. F. Saddler, Sema Tanguiane, T. C. Young.

### HEADQUARTERS AND OTHER OFFICE

HEADQUARTERS  
UNESCO House  
7 Place de Fontenoy  
75700 Paris, France  
Cable address: UNESCO PARIS  
Telephone: 577-16-10  
Telex: 204461

NEW YORK OFFICE  
United Nations Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization  
United Nations Headquarters, Room S-2401  
New York, N. Y. 10017, United States  
Cable Address: UNESCO NEW YORK  
Telephone: (212)754-5981

## Chapter V

## World Health Organization (WHO)

The thirty-fourth World Health Assembly met at Geneva, from 4 to 22 May 1981, and adopted a global strategy for health for all by the year 2000 as a step towards achieving its constitutional objective: the attainment by all peoples of the highest possible level of health.

The Assembly also considered the question of a transfer of the Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean from Alexandria, Egypt, in the light of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 20 December 1980 on the wishes of the majority of member countries of the region.<sup>a</sup> Pursuant to paragraph 51 of the advisory opinion, discussions with the Government of Egypt were held in November 1981.

The Assembly amended the International Health Regulations (1969) to remove all provisions relating to smallpox in view of its global eradication. The amendment was to come into force on 1 January 1982.

In addition, the Assembly adopted an International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes in the form of a recommendation to member States. The most important provision of the Code was that there should be no advertising or other form of promotion to the general public of the products concerned within the scope of the code.

Dominica became a member of the World Health Organization on 13 August 1981. Thus, at 31 December, the organization had 157 Members and one associate member.

## Research promotion and development

At its twenty-third session, held at Geneva in October, WHO's Advisory Committee on Medical Research noted the progress made in ethics, health services research and mental health. It recommended establishing two new sub-committees on health services research with emphasis on maternal and child health, and on health services research in health systems for the adult population. In addition, the Advisory Committee reviewed the area of research in gerontology and the utilization and protection of non-human primates and other animals in research.

## Co-ordination with other organizations

The focus for WHO's co-ordination activities during 1981 was the global strategy for health

for all by the year 2000 and its relationship to the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.<sup>b</sup> Acting on the recommendation of the Economic and Social Council, the United Nations General Assembly at its regular 1981 session unanimously adopted resolution 36/43 by which it requested all organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to collaborate fully with WHO in carrying out this global strategy (p. 802).

During the year, specific attention was given by WHO to the International Year of Disabled Persons (1981) with the organization hosting an interagency meeting in August and attending other interagency meetings in Paris (February) and Vienna (October) (p. 796).

A Health Resources Group for Primary Health Care was established to enable those interested in supporting the global health effort to discuss the international transfer of resources for health work and to have groups of donors act in unison in providing external support to individual countries. A particularly intensified effort was made to enhance technical co-operation among developing countries, including further development of collaboration with Arab, Islamic and regional funds and banks assisting socio-economic development.

## Development of comprehensive health services

## Primary health care

As a further effort to implement the main recommendations of the 1978 International Conference on Primary Health Care (Alma-Ata, USSR), the Joint Committee on Health Policy of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and WHO issued a study on national decision-making for primary health care. A plan of action was formulated for a multinational effort, with the participation of four countries (Burma, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Nepal) to further the development of primary health care in countries seriously committed to that policy and to ascertain how UNICEF and WHO could best support such development.

To strengthen national health development networks, WHO collaborated with countries in

<sup>a</sup> See YUN 1980, p. 1123.

<sup>b</sup> See YUN 1980, p. 503, text of Strategy, annexed to resolution 35/56 of 5 December 1980.

the formulation of related national plans of action and development of a framework for monitoring those networks.

In the African region, interministerial co-ordination committees, or their equivalents, were set up to promote intersectoral activities within primary health care and national action programmes were formulated in a number of countries. Priority attention was given to newly independent nations, such as Zimbabwe. In the Americas, special emphasis was placed on meeting the health needs of underserved groups of the population. In South-East Asia, activities focused on the training and utilization of community health workers. In Europe, self-care, community participation, and the integration of primary, secondary and tertiary health care were emphasized. In the Eastern Mediterranean, additional countries incorporated primary health care programmes as an integral component of their health development plans. The Western Pacific region focused its attention on the promotion of national commitment to primary health care and its translation into action plans.

#### Family health

The programme of family health exemplified the principles of primary health care in emphasizing the crucial role of the family in health promotion and in the prevention, early diagnosis and treatment of disease. During 1981, WHO was executing agency for more than 100 national family health programmes, including co-operation in managerial, training and service aspects.

Infant and young child feeding continued to generate interest and positive action by Governments and non-governmental organizations because poor infant-feeding practices and their consequences were a major problem for both the developing and the developed world, along with the common communicable diseases of early childhood. The International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes was adopted unanimously by the World Health Assembly in May 1981 and the Director-General was requested to report regularly on the status of compliance and on progress in promoting better infant-feeding practices.

Priority was given to the development of the methodology, including the necessary research, needed to strengthen the capabilities of the primary health workers for preventing the major nutritional problems, particularly of mothers and young children, through a better utilization of foods which were available and acceptable at the community level. In addition, specific attention was given to assisting many countries in further strengthening their health education services by re-examining the approaches taken in this field.

#### Human reproduction

In 1981, the special programme of research, development and research training in human reproduction involved administrators and scientists from 80 countries, 54 of which were developing countries. Guidance was made available to family planning programmes from operational studies completed during the year on the provision of family planning in the context of primary health care, and on the safety of currently used family planning methods. The special programme was largely financed by voluntary contributions. For 1981, the donors were Australia, China, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, India, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Sweden, Thailand, the United Kingdom, the United States and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA).

#### Mental health

Work proceeded along the lines of the three main objectives for the Organizations's mental health programme: to prevent or reduce psychiatric, neurological and psychosocial problems, including those related to alcohol and drug dependence; to increase effectiveness of general health services through appropriate utilization of mental health skills and knowledge; and to develop strategies for intervention based on an increased awareness of mental health aspects of social action and change.

Typical examples of collaborative country projects co-ordinated by WHO were: the project on determinants of outcome of severe mental disorders in which incidence, course and outcome of schizophrenia, in 11 areas in nine countries (Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, India, Japan, Nigeria, United Kingdom, United States, USSR) were assessed; the project on peripheral neuropathy in which field research centres in Canada, China, Italy, Mexico, Nigeria, Senegal, Spain and the United States collaborated to standardize assessment methods and to test the efficacy of drug treatment; and the projects on alcohol and drug dependence control which were implemented in Bolivia, Burma, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Mexico, Pakistan, Thailand, the United Kingdom and Zambia and in which countries collaborated to increase the effectiveness of health and social service delivery systems by developing low cost approaches through the integration of those activities in existing health and social facilities and through primary health care programmes.

#### Diagnostic, therapeutic and rehabilitative technology

The newly formed Division of Diagnostic, Therapeutic and Rehabilitative Technology brought together important aspects of clinical

and technological support for the delivery of health care. It included traditional medicine, essential surgical care and the action programme on essential drugs, which was aimed at improving the availability and utilization of drugs for primary health care at the lowest possible cost.

Under this programme, 71 countries participated in certifying the quality of internationally traded pharmaceutical products. Development of basic tests for identifying essential drugs and reorientation of the International Pharmacopoeia towards classical analytical methods helped developing countries develop their own quality control procedures.

The concept of basic radiological services continued to be promoted, and new approaches to minimize disability through prevention and rehabilitation were under evaluation.

#### Health manpower development

The emphasis in programme implementation in 1981 continued to be on the training and continuing education of front-line health workers, and their direct supervisors, and on the training of managers to ensure effective planning, implementation, supervision and evaluation of primary health care programmes. The network of institutions currently conducting innovative community oriented educational programmes, continued to promote exchanges of views and mutual support and to provide an information service on new educational methods and techniques.

#### Disease prevention and control

##### Acute respiratory infections

The programme on acute respiratory infections emphasized the development, through epidemiological and operational research, of appropriate technologies for the clinical management of those infections that could be applied as part of primary health care at the community level. This research component, being a priority at that stage, was supplemented by the development of a prototype programme of control based on existing knowledge, with emphasis on training of national staff involved in the programme.

In 1981, the programme was initiated in two countries (Kenya, Malaysia) and was continued in five countries (Brazil, China, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, United Republic of Tanzania).

##### Cancer

During 1981, a new, reoriented programme aimed at cancer control was devised and endorsed by the sub-committee on cancer of the WHO Advisory Committee on Medical Research. The programme sought to ensure in-

ternational co-ordination of cancer activities in developing and implementing national cancer control programmes in line with the global strategy for health for all. Knowledge was currently available to predict that-given the right measures, sufficient resources and continued goal-directed research-up to one third of existing cancers could be prevented, up to one third could be cured and most incurable cancer patients could be spared pain.

##### Cardiovascular diseases

The Expert Committee on Prevention of Coronary Heart Disease, meeting in December 1981, stressed that a comprehensive plan for prevention of coronary heart disease should have three components: first, a population strategy for altering the mass characteristics of life-style and environment and their social and economic determinants; second, a high-risk strategy, concerned with identification and correction of individuals' susceptibility; and, third, a secondary prevention strategy aimed against recurrences and progression of the disease in those already afflicted.

The programme stressed the need for development of methods to enable public health authorities to prevent and control cardiovascular disease integrated with their health care systems.

##### Diarrhoeal diseases

The diarrhoeal diseases control programme, carried out in close collaboration with UNICEF, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank, developed national plans of action as a part of primary health care in about 30 developing countries by the end of 1981. In some two thirds of these, national programmes were under way. An essential element of national programmes was the provision of adequate supplies of oral rehydration salts; so far, 20 developing countries undertook large-scale production, a number of them with advice or support from UNICEF. Training was provided to 152 senior-level staff from 55 developing countries, with training for trainers being provided by regional or sub-regional training centres in seven countries and seminars in some 30 countries.

##### Expanded programme on immunization

By the end of 1981, this basic element of primary health care had developed from being a WHO-sponsored initiative to an operational programme in all developing countries. Improved technology for the storage and handling of vaccines considerably reduced the major technical constraint in providing immunization coverage to peripheral areas, but managerial constraints

involving the training, motivation and supervision of staff remained. In most developing countries immunization within the first year of life against diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, measles, poliomyelitis and tuberculosis remained at less than 20 per cent. Training and evaluation efforts had currently resulted in more than 3,000 health workers being trained in the necessary techniques.

### Leprosy

With the number of registered leprosy patients worldwide having increased to 5 million in 1981 from 3.6 million in 1976 and dapsone, the main anti-leprosy drug, encountering increased therapeutic resistance, a study group on chemotherapy of leprosy for control programmes met at Geneva in October 1981 and recommended use of known anti-leprosy drugs in combination. The ability to culture large quantities of the mycobacterium that caused leprosy in armadillos made it possible to develop a comprehensive plan for using such material to produce better diagnostic tests and a vaccine.

### Malaria

The advent of multidrug resistance of *Plasmodium falciparum* in parts of Asia and South America had become the main obstacle to effective malaria control and a risk to the life of millions in these areas. In parts of East Africa, chloroquine-resistant *P. falciparum* had already taken a firm hold, but high immunity in the local population appeared to reduce its impact.

With the resurgence of malaria in Turkey, WHO co-operated with the authorities to control the disease and reduce the threat of future epidemics. In Haiti, India, Democratic Kampuchea, Mauritius and Sri Lanka, WHO also co-operated in the assessment of national antimalarial programmes.

### Prevention of blindness

A majority of the estimated 28 million blind persons in the world lived in developing countries, where infectious and nutritional disorders, together with cataract, constitute the main causes of blindness, even though much of it was preventable or curable with existing knowledge. To redress this situation, continued emphasis was placed during 1981 on the planning and establishment of national programmes for the prevention of blindness that integrated simple but essential eye care within primary health care and increased community involvement in general preventive measures against common disorders leading to blindness. Currently, 21 such national programmes had been formulated and implemented.

### Sexually transmitted diseases

In addition to setting out priorities regarding gonococcal and treponemal diseases and their complications, the WHO control programme for sexually transmitted diseases laid emphasis on other such diseases of public health importance and a technical guide was published containing up-to-date information on them and organization of control activities.

To make effective control methods available to areas with inadequate laboratory facilities, a simplified approach was developed which had an 80 to 90 per cent success rate. However, a rapid method of diagnosis remained to be developed.

Screening and systematic treatment campaigns for endemic treponematoses, yaws and endemic syphilis were carried out in a number of African countries, where several million inhabitants, mostly children, were at risk.

### Smallpox eradication surveillance

As a result of the smallpox eradication programme and the follow-up programme on its surveillance, there remained only eight countries at the end of 1981 that were still routinely providing vaccinations against smallpox, and only one other that required international certification. To heighten public confidence in the fact that smallpox had actually been eradicated, a total of 30 suspected cases were investigated in 19 countries, and research on monkeypox and orthopox was conducted in Africa. In addition, sufficient vaccine for 200 million people was stockpiled in Geneva and New Delhi, India, and was available to any country, should an emergency occur. The number of laboratories retaining variola virus stocks was reduced to four, all of them under WHO supervision for safe storage.

### Smoking and health

The action programme in the field of smoking and health became fully operational in 1981. It included the WHO international clearing-house for smoking and health information, which collected and disseminated information on smoking prevalence around the world. The programme organized workshops and international conferences on smoking and health, published a review of smoking control legislation around the world, and initiated a project to monitor tar, nicotine and carbon monoxide yields of cigarettes on sale in developing countries.

### Tropical disease research

During 1981, the special programme for research and training in tropical diseases, a WHO/UNDP/World Bank programme of interna-

tional technical co-operation, continued research and development towards controlling six tropical diseases (malaria, schistosomiasis, filariasis, trypanosomiasis-both African sleeping sickness and Chagas' disease-leishmaniasis and leprosy). The programme also pursued the strengthening of the research capabilities of tropical countries affected by the diseases.

As at 31 December 1981, the programme had supported 1,395 projects and over 2,300 scientists from 118 member States had participated in its planning, implementation, operation and evaluation. More than \$72 million was obligated for direct support to national scientists and institutions. The percentage of financial support for projects going to developing tropical countries rose from 29 per cent in 1977 to 62 per cent in 1981.

Findings of the programme's research resulted in the publication of some 1,400 scientific papers. Support to scientists and institutions of developing endemic countries has included 325 individual training grants and long-term support to 57 institutions.

#### Tuberculosis

In sharp contrast to developed countries where a spectacular decline in tuberculosis was observed, little improvement had been made in developing countries and a joint WHO/International Union Against Tuberculosis study group on tuberculosis control reconfirmed the need for comprehensive programmes on a country-wide scale through the existing health services.

An emergency programme, co-ordinated by WHO with special contributions by UNICEF and several member States, was set up to evaluate the effectiveness of BCG (*Bacillus Calmette-Guérin*) vaccination in infants and children and developing countries in all regions of the world co-operated by carrying out case-control studies and studies in contacts of newly discovered cases.

#### Vector biology and control

The December 1981 meeting of the Expert Committee on Biological Control of Vectors of Disease, concluded that biological agents played a useful role in naturally regulating vector populations and could, thus, become part of an integrated vector control programme. However, the development and use of biological control agents required specialized knowledge and hence additional training of researchers, vector control personnel and community members. The Committee recommended the development of regional centres for this purpose. It also noted that chemical pesticides were likely to remain a principal vector control agent for the foreseeable future.

Virus, rickettsial and related diseases

In the field of virus laboratory diagnosis, new, simple and rapid techniques were developed for use without sophisticated equipment and at the peripheral health level. During 1981, the need for efficacious vaccines was emphasized when dengue haemorrhagic fever reached record levels in some South-East Asian countries, and the haemorrhagic form appeared for the first time in the Americas. Rift Valley fever also continued to cause concern since its sudden appearance in Egypt in 1977 and a consultation was held to outline approaches for the disease's surveillance and control.

#### Other non-communicable diseases

Activities of WHO concerning other non-communicable diseases related to formulating and implementing community-oriented programmes in the prevention and control of diabetes, chronic respiratory and chronic rheumatic diseases. Meetings between WHO and the International Diabetes Federation, International League against Rheumatism and the International Union against Tuberculosis held in 1981 led to the establishment of jointly supported programmes in each area.

#### Promotion of environmental health

The International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade, 1981-1990, proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in November 1980,<sup>c</sup> was of major importance to WHO's effort to implement its global strategy for health based on primary health care, essential elements of which were drinking-water supply and sanitation.

At the country level, WHO pursued co-operation with more than 100 member States with emphasis on the promotion of the Decade, including the elaboration of national plans and programmes, institutional development, the development of human resources, information exchange and technology development, and the mobilization of financial resources.

Attention was also focused on similar problems in the industrial countries without a universal supply of clean drinking water and where toxic wastes represented new hazards. The evaluation and assessment of those hazards were top priorities of the international programme on chemical safety, undertaken jointly with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the International Labour Organisation.

Another active programme was that on food safety and on the control of environmental hazards. Work with the Food and Agriculture

<sup>c</sup> See YUN 1980, p. 704, resolution 35/18 of 10 November 1980.



Organization of the United Nations (FAO) continued on international food standards in the Codex Alimentarius Commission and new priorities in work on food safety emerged in WHO's attempt to enhance the control of diarrhoeal disease.

#### Secretariat

As at 31 December 1981, the total number of full-time staff employed by WHO stood at 4,379 on permanent and fixed-term contracts. Of these, 1,575 staff members, drawn from 113 nationalities, were in the Professional and higher categories and 2,804 were in the General Service category. Of the total number of staff, 222 were in posts financed by UNDP, UNEP, UNFPA and the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control.

#### Budget

The thirty-second World Health Assembly (1979) had approved an effective working budget of \$427,290,000 for 1980-1981.

It also authorized the use of casual income up

to a maximum amount of \$15 million for this period in order to meet any net additional costs arising under the regular budget resulting from differences between the exchange rate used for budgeting purposes and actual accounting rates of exchange between those currencies during the biennium. At the same time, the Director-General was requested to transfer to casual income any net savings resulting from such differences in the budgetary and accounting rates of exchange between the Swiss franc and the United States dollar, provided that such net savings need not exceed \$15 million.

Because of the more favourable exchange rate, savings accrued under the regular budget for 1980-1981 amounted to \$18,071,000 which was to be credited to casual income as and when the arrears of contributions for the 1980-1981 financial period were collected. Furthermore savings amounting to \$2,368,393 were effected during the biennium; as a result total obligations incurred during 1980-1981 were \$406,850,607.

### INTEGRATED INTERNATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAMME OBLIGATIONS BY SOURCE OF FINANCING FOR THE TWO-YEAR PERIOD 1980-1981

Source	Per-centage	Amount (In us dollars)	Source	Per-centage	Amount (In us dollars)
Regular budget	48.9	406,851	United Nations sources (continued)		
Pan American Health Organization*	14.7	121,919	UNEP	0.3	2,301
International Agency for Research on Cancer	2.1	17,810	UNFAC	0.2	1,561
			UNFPA	4.6	38,049
Other sources			UNHCR	0.1	810
Voluntary Fund for Health Promotion	9.6	80,016	United Nations Trust Fund for Assistance to Colonial Countries and Peoples	0.0	190
Trust Fund for the Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases	6.0	50,149	United Nations Trust Fund for Assistance to Lebanon	0.0	96
Onchocerciasis Control Programme	4.0	33,153	Other trust and reimbursable funds	1.9	16,489
Primary Health Care Initiative Fund	0.0	62	Special Account for Servicing Costs	0.5	3,801
Sasakawa Health Trust Fund	0.6	5,183	Revolving Sales Fund	0.2	1,834
			Real Estate Fund	0.2	2,051
United Nations sources			Special Account for Headquarters Extension and Repayment of the Swiss Loan	0.2	1,445
United Nations Capital Development Fund	0.1	378	Special Account for Operation of Concessions at Headquarters	0.0	151
UNICEF	0.1	368			
UNDP	5.6	46,520	Subtotal	34.3	285,062
UNPRO	0.0	83			
United Nations Emergency Operation	0.1	372	Total	100.0	831,642

\*Pre-audit figure.

### SERVICES AND CO-OPERATION EXTENDED BY WHO IN THE TWO-YEAR PERIOD 1980-1981, BY REGION AND COUNTRY OR TERRITORY (in US dollars)

	Regular budget	Other sources	Total		Regular budget	Other sources	Total
Africa				Africa (cont.)			
Angola	570,324	278,551	848,875	Cape Verde	531,702	-	531,702
Benin	901,918	28,044	929,962	Central African Republic	1,052,157	292,566	1,344,723
Botswana	335,316	574,917	910,233	Chad	856,185	102,240	958,425
Burundi	1,054,888	807,043	1,861,931	Comoros	1,013,448	55,291	1,068,739

	Regular budget	Other sources	Total		Regular budget	Other sources	Total
Africa (cont.)				South-East Asia			
Congo	854,692	338,714	1,193,406	Bangladesh	4,092,942	1,527,064	5,620,006
Equatorial Guinea	276,596	6,377	284,973	Bhutan	10,001	1,011,277	1,021,278
Ethiopia	2,051,263	1,323,730	3,374,993	Burma	2,967,694	2,195,747	5,163,441
Gabon	799,257	-	799,257	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	1,237,469	-	1,237,469
Gambia	817,391	307,554	1,124,945	India	7,237,457	5,663,656	12,901,113
Ghana	618,193	224,992	843,185	Indonesia	5,322,763	2,157,239	7,480,002
Guinea	1,082,609	13,204	1,095,813	Maldives	642,942	220,852	863,794
Guinea-Bissau	500,997	110,824	611,821	Mongolia	1,380,346	675,296	2,055,642
Ivory Coast	606,232	-	606,232	Nepal	3,282,379	2,610,127	5,892,506
Kenya	756,926	243	757,169	Sri Lanka	2,789,132	2,045,383	4,834,515
Lesotho	685,225	130,245	815,470	Thailand	3,247,848	3,160,027	6,407,875
Liberia	1,056,179	333,945	1,390,124	Intercountry programmes	6,206,056	2,244,332	8,450,388
Madagascar	672,483	1,171,472	1,843,955	Advisory services	3,050,901	392,005	3,442,906
Malawi	388,954	603,963	992,917				
Mali	1,217,748	129,507	1,347,255	Subtotal	41,467,930	23,903,005	65,370,935
Mauritania	958,600	204,873	1,163,473				
Mauritius	217,253	49,630	266,883	Europe			
Mozambique	627,689	1,653,088	2,280,777	Albania	16,377	-	16,377
Namibia	107,761	-	107,761	Algeria	271,686	642,842	914,528
Niger	777,865	244,150	1,022,015	Austria	17,762	-	17,762
Nigeria	2,277,809	500,662	2,778,471	Belgium	9,833	29,342	39,175
Réunion	22,228	-	22,228	Bulgaria	78,516	73,982	152,498
Rwanda	1,163,238	-	1,163,238	Czechoslovakia	18,843	66,901	85,744
St. Helena	15,550	-	15,550	Denmark	15,064	2,554	17,618
Sao Tome and Principe	434,506	63,829	498,335	Finland	15,554	-	15,554
Senegal	765,201	200,081	965,282	France	21,427	-	21,427
Seychelles	377,233	3,600	380,833	German Democratic Republic	23,378	-	23,378
Sierra Leone	580,159	366,712	946,871	Germany, Federal Republic of	20,683	-	20,683
Swaziland	156,583	136,928	293,511	Greece	20,421	136,182	156,603
Togo	726,107	-	726,107	Hungary	25,936	47,280	73,216
Uganda	747,216	30,508	777,724	Iceland	10,480	9,099	19,579
United Republic of Cameroon	511,719	105,423	617,142	Ireland	17,824	-	17,824
United Republic of Tanzania	879,901	168,194	1,048,095	Italy	19,191	55,163	74,354
Upper Volta	1,057,275	125,108	1,182,383	Luxembourg	10,597	-	10,597
Zaire	1,373,923	65,020	1,438,943	Malta	24,865	64,784	89,649
Zambia	907,436	624,066	1,531,502	Monaco	8,200	-	8,200
Zimbabwe	548,127	21,000	569,127	Morocco	374,452	412,639	787,091
Intercountry programmes	16,543,645	38,059,805	54,603,450	Netherlands	18,364	36,783	55,147
Advisory services	4,717,768	214,670	4,932,438	Norway	22,742	24,782	47,524
Subtotal	55,195,475	49,672,769	104,868,244	Poland	29,733	257,142	286,875
The Americas				Portugal	59,443	797,540	858,983
Argentina	805,648	371,668	1,177,316	Romania	20,752	246,016	266,768
Bahamas	207,586	106,083	313,669	Spain	25,137	23,780	48,917
Barbados	146,983	241,935	388,918	Sweden	15,944	-	15,944
Belize	265,032	760	265,792	Switzerland	12,816	-	12,816
Bolivia	309,563	352,329	661,892	Turkey	262,533	2,096,301	2,358,834
Brazil	1,638,625	939,519	2,578,144	USSR	44,399	16,249	60,648
Canada	89,670	-	89,670	United Kingdom	17,897	-	17,897
Chile	632,495	426,972	1,059,467	Yugoslavia	30,149	424,270	454,419
Colombia	764,156	1,755,436	2,519,592	Intercountry programmes	3,253,998	3,637,561	6,891,559
Costa Rica	354,916	31,761	386,677	Advisory services	9,061,428	34,752	9,096,180
Cuba	554,790	123,528	678,318	Subtotal	13,896,424	9,135,944	23,032,368
Dominican Republic	193,455	315,068	508,523				
Ecuador	1,120,903	1,010,133	2,131,036	Eastern Mediterranean			
El Salvador	565,219	195,331	760,550	Afghanistan	3,342,905	752,079	4,094,984
Guatemala	483,531	67,693	551,224	Bahrain	111,364	166,178	277,542
Guyana	493,220	252,864	746,084	Cyprus	725,257	637,435	1,362,692
Haiti	330,509	924,434	1,254,943	Democratic Yemen	2,378,018	1,689,090	4,067,108
Honduras	463,959	782,969	1,246,928	Djibouti	471,543	-	471,543
Jamaica	454,997	917,114	1,372,111	Egypt	1,671,935	1,418,212	3,090,147
Mexico	599,957	2,603,000	3,202,957	Iran	502,843	957,868	1,460,711
Netherlands Antilles	24,887	-	24,887	Iraq	512,643	525,837	1,038,480
Nicaragua	870,306	597,296	1,467,602	Israel	408,005	-	408,005
Panama	647,615	1,112,497	1,760,112	Jordan	844,352	507,733	1,352,085
Paraguay	294,262	44,676	338,938	Kuwait	85,682	42,643	128,325
Peru	335,559	1,007,373	1,342,932	Lebanon	1,026,613	1,470,217	2,496,830
Suriname	206,723	108,724	315,447	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	44,585	1,156,251	1,200,836
Trinidad and Tobago	597,993	271,590	869,583	Oman	767,198	326,321	1,093,519
United States	297,580	-	297,580	Pakistan	2,338,412	523,407	2,861,819
Uruguay	385,659	193,162	578,821	Qatar	3,907	14,696	18,603
Venezuela	617,308	11,989	629,297	Saudi Arabia	18,243	1,713,258	1,731,501
West Indies	373,008	1,125,065	1,498,073	Somalia	3,203,082	1,424,746	4,627,828
Intercountry programmes	12,840,745	4,465,788	17,306,533	Sudan	3,542,442	3,178,493	6,720,935
Advisory services	4,685,016	1,335,019	6,020,035	Syrian Arab Republic	1,647,386	661,888	2,309,274
Subtotal	32,651,875	21,691,776	54,343,651				

	Regular budget	Other sources	Total		Regular budget	Other sources	Total
Eastern Mediterranean (cont.)				Western Pacific (cont.)			
Tunisia	1,276,847	467,412	1,744,259	Malaysia	752,245	502,481	1,254,726
United Arab Emirates	33,789	9,367	43,156	New Zealand	98,050	-	98,050
Yemen	2,861,206	6,127,137	8,988,343	Niue	83,708	39,758	123,466
Intercountry programmes	5,396,392	737,140	6,133,532	Papua New Guinea	1,844,619	759,242	2,603,861
Advisory Services	2,982,367	161,076	3,143,443	Philippines	1,637,808	592,708	2,230,516
Subtotal	36,197,016	24,668,484	60,865,500	Republic of Korea	1,389,374	84,320	1,473,694
				Samoa	441,707	405,700	847,407
Western Pacific				Singapore	321,894	31,390	353,284
American Samoa	87,598		87,598	Solomon Islands	630,940	768,283	1,399,223
Australia	126,432		126,432	Tokelau		58,125	59,125
Brunel	2,188		2,188	Tonga	475,537	328,872	804,409
Chins	1,983,107	5,714,362	7,697,469	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	234,129	45,913	280,042
Cook Islands	315,659	151,809	467,468	Tuvalu	39,394	56,677	98,071
Democratic Kampuchea	-	2,739,114	2,739,114	Vanuatu	536,757	258,909	795,666
Fiji	1,177,565	208,811	1,386,376	Viet Nam	3,306,605	1,459,666	4,766,271
French Polynesia	37,556		37,566	Intercountry programmes	8,409,136	5,281,907	13,691,043
Guam	91,114		91,114	Advisory services	2,881,498	32,800	2,914,298
Hong Kong	161,142	7,180	168,322	Subtotal	28,454,054	19,813,103	48,267,157
Japan	90,776		90,776				
Kiribati	427,014	59,370	486,384	Global and Interregional activities	19,559,392	120,394,145	139,953,537
Lao People's Democratic Republic	861,001	224,706	1,085,707	Total	227,422,166	269,279,226	496,701,392
Macau	9,501	-	9,501				

### ASSISTANCE RENDERED BY WHO IN THE PERIOD 1980-1981, BY SECTOR AND REGION (in US dollars)

SECTOR	Head- quarters	REGION							Total
		Africa	The Americas*	South-East Asia	Europe	Eastern Mediterranean	Western Pacific	Global Inter- regional activities	
Comprehensive health services	12,933,716	18,021,925	26,276,794	19,815,456	6,195,334	17,094,184	16,366,366	51,861,944	168,565,719
Health manpower development	2,598,813	23,032,591	5,720,265	7,386,943	3,757,071	13,114,632	8,228,226	1,423,714	85,262,255
Disease prevention and control	15,520,980	48,310,594	13,135,653	22,482,987	3,541,815	18,984,246	14,191,452	74,448,953**	210,616,680**
Promotion of envi- ronmental health	6,107,964	4,830,953	4,529,788	8,244,485	6,571,409	5,796,266	4,893,353	7,287,734	48,261,952
Health Information and literature	30,423,009	2,169,966	2,953,124	1,058,659	3,480,547	1,302,100	1,205,349	1,058,716	43,651,470
Support to regional programmes	58,715,236	8,572,708	3,947,303	3,207,437	7,232,416	3,012,405	4,589,331	56,701	89,333,537

\*Excluding assistance rendered by the Pan American Health Organization: \$121,919,191.

\*\*Excluding the International Agency for Research on Cancer: \$17,809,833.

### Annex I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION AND CONTRIBUTIONS (Membership as at 31 December 1981; contributions as assessed for 1982)

CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
MEMBER	Per- centage	Amount* (in US dollars)	MEMBER	Per- centage	Amount (in US dollars)	MEMBER	Per- centage	Amount* (in us dollars)
Afghanistan	0.01	23,920	Barbados	0.01	23,920	Canada	3.22	7,719,215
Albania	0.01	23,920	Belgoum	1.20	2,870,205	Caps Verde	0.01	23,920
Algeria	0.12	287,020	Benin	0.01	23,920	Central African Republic	0.01	23,920
Angola	0.01	23,920	Bolivia	0.01	23,920	Chad	0.01	23,920
Argentina	0.77	1,841,715	Botswana	0.01	23,920	Chile	0.07	167,425
Australia	1.80	4,305,305	Brazil	1.25	2,989,795	China	1.59	3,803,020
Austria	0.70	1,674,285	Bulgaria	0.16	382,695	Colombia	0.11	263,100
Bahamas	0.01	23,920	Burma	0.01	23,920	Comoros	0.01	23,920
Bahrain	0.01	23,920	Burundi	0.01	23,920	Congo	0.01	56,920
Bangladesh	0.04	95,670	Byelorussian SSR	0.38	908,900			

CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
MEMBER	Per-centage	Amount* (In US dollars)	MEMBER	Per-centage	Amount* (In US dollars)	MEMBER	Per-centage	Amount* (In US dollars)
Costa Rica	0.02	47,835	Kenya	0.01	23,920	Saudi Arabia	0.57	1,363,345
Cuba	0.11	263,100	Kuwait	0.20	478,365	Senegal	0.01	23,920
Cyprus	0.01	23,920	Lao People's			Seychelles	0.01	23,920
Czechoslovakia	0.81	1,937,385	Democratic			Sierra Leone	0.01	23,920
Democratic			Republic	0.01	23,920	Singapore	0.08	191,345
Kampuchea	0.01	23,920	Lebanon	0.03	71,755	Somalia	0.01	23,920
Democratic People's			Lesotho	0.01	23,920	South Africa	0.41	980,650
Republic of Korea	0.05	119,590	Liberia	0.01	23,920	Spain	1.67	3,994,370
Democratic Yemen	0.01	30,420	Libyan Arab			Sri Lanka	0.02	47,835
Denmark	0.73	1,746,040	Jamahiriya	0.22	526,205	Sudan	0.01	23,920
Djibouti	0.01	23,920	Luxembourg	0.05	119,590	Suriname	0.01	23,920
Dominica**			Madagascar	0.01	23,920	Swaziland	0.01	23,920
Dominican Republic	0.03	71,755	Malawi	0.01	23,920	Sweden	1.29	3,085,470
Ecuador	0.02	47,835	Malaysia	0.09	215,265	Switzerland	1.03	2,463,590
Egypt	0.07	167,425	Maldives	0.01	23,920	Syrian Arab		
El Salvador	0.01	23,920	Mali	0.01	23,920	Republic	0.03	71,755
Equatorial Guinea	0.01	23,920	Malta	0.01	23,920	Thailand	0.10	239,180
Ethiopia	0.01	23,920	Mauritania	0.01	23,920	Togo	0.01	23,920
Fiji	0.01	23,920	Mauritius	0.01	23,920	Tonga	0.01	23,920
Finland	0.47	1,124,165	Mexico	0.75	1,793,880	Trinidad and		
France	6.15	15,105,805	Monaco	0.01	23,920	Tobago	0.03	71,755
Gabon	0.02	47,835	Mongolia	0.01	23,920	Tunisia	0.03	71,755
Gambia	0.01	23,920	Morocco	0.05	119,590	Turkey	0.29	693,630
German Democratic			Mozambique	0.01	23,920	Uganda	0.01	23,920
Republic	1.37	3,276,815	Nepal	0.01	23,920	Ukrainian SSR	1.44	3,444,250
Germany, Federal			Netherlands	1.60	3,826,940	USSR	10.91	26,094,945
Republic of	8.17	19,541,315	New Zealand	0.26	621,875	United Arab		
Ghana	0.03	71,755	Nicaragua	0.01	23,920	Emirates	0.10	239,180
Greece	0.34	813,225	Niger	0.01	23,920	United Kingdom	4.38	10,476,250
Grenada	0.01	23,920	Nigeria	0.16	382,695	United Republic		
Guatemala	0.02	47,835	Norway	0.49	1,172,000	of Cameroon	0.01	23,920
Guinea	0.01	23,920	Oman	0.01	23,920	United Republic		
Guinea-Bissau	0.01	23,920	Pakistan	0.07	167,425	of Tanzania	0.01	23,920
Guyana	0.01	23,920	Panama	0.02	47,835	United States	25.00	63,794,950
Haiti	0.01	23,920	Papua New Guinea	0.01	23,920	Upper Volta	0.01	23,920
Honduras	0.01	23,920	Paraguay	0.01	23,920	Uruguay	0.04	95,670
Hungary	0.32	765,385	Peru	0.06	143,510	Venezuela	0.49	1,172,000
Iceland	0.03	71,755	Philippines	0.10	239,180	Viet Nam	0.03	71,755
India	0.59	1,411,185	Poland	1.22	2,918,040	Yemen	0.01	23,920
Indonesia	0.16	382,695	Portugal	0.19	454,450	Yugoslavia	0.41	980,650
Iran	0.64	1,530,775	Qatar	0.03	71,755	Zaire	0.02	47,835
Iraq	0.12	287,020	Republic of Korea	0.15	358,775	Zambia	0.02	47,835
Ireland	0.16	382,695	Romania	0.20	478,365	Zimbabwe	0.01	23,920
Israel	0.24	574,040	Rwanda	0.01	23,920			
Italy	3.39	8,108,330	Saint Lucia	0.01	23,920	ASSOCIATE MEMBER		
Ivory Coast	0.03	71,755	Samoa	0.01	23,920			
Jamaica	0.02	47,835	San Marino	0.01	23,920	Namibia	0.01	23,920
Japan	9.42	22,531,110	Sao Tome and Principe	0.01	23,920	Total	100	243,635,800
Jordan	0.01	23,920						

\*Adjusted to take into account the actual amounts paid to staff as reimbursement for taxes levied by member countries on the WHO emoluments of their nationals.

\*\*New member whose assessment was to be established by the thirty-fifth (1982) World Health Assembly.

## Annex II. OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

(As at 31 December 1981)

### OFFICERS OF THE THIRTY-FOURTH WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY

President: Dr. Méropi Violaki-Paraskeva (Greece).

Vice-Presidents: Dr. J. Andonie Fernandez (Honduras), M. M. Hussain (Maldives), M. C. Jallow (Gambia), Dr. G. Rifai (Syrian Arab Republic), Dr. Qian Xinzong (China).

Chairman, Committee A: Dr. E.P.F. Braga (Brazil).

Chairman, Committee B: Dr. Z. M. Diamini (Swaziland).

### MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD\*

Chairman: Dr. H. J. H. Hiddlestone.

Vice-Chairman: Dr. Maureen M. Law, Dr. F. S. J. Oldfield, Dr. Lidia Oradean.

Rapporteurs: Dr. S. Cardorelle, M. M. Hussain.

Members were designated by: Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Congo, Gabon, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Maldives, Mongolia, Mozambique, New Zealand, Norway, Netherlands, Oman, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Spain, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Yemen.

## SENIOR OFFICERS OF THE SECRETARIAT

Director-General: Dr. Halfdan Mahler.

Deputy Director-General: Dr. T. Adeoye Lambo.

Assistant Directors-General: Warren W. Furth, Dr. J. Hamon, Dr. I. D.

Ladni, Dr. Lu Rushan, Dr. David Tejada-de-Rivero.

Director, Regional Office for Africa: Dr. Comlan A. A. Quenum.

Director, Regional Office for the Americas (Pan American Sanitary Bureau): Dr. Héctor R. Acuña.

Director, Regional Office for South-East Asia: Dr. U Kc Kc.

Director, Regional Office for Europe: Dr. Leo A. Kaprio.

Director, Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean: Dr. A. H. Taba.

Director, Regional Office for the Western Pacific: Dr. Hiroshi Nakajima.

\*The Board consists of thirty persons designated by as many Member States which have been elected for such purpose by WHO.

## HEADQUARTERS AND OTHER OFFICES

## HEADQUARTERS

World Health Organization  
Avenue Appia  
1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland  
Cable address: UNISANTE GENEVE  
Telephone: 91 21 11  
Telex: 27821

## LIAISON OFFICE WITH THE

UNITED NATIONS  
World Health Organization  
New York, N. Y. 10017, United States  
Cable address: UNISANTE NEWYORK  
Telephone: (212)754-6004,754-6005  
Telex: 224292

REGIONAL OFFICE FOR THE EASTERN  
MEDITERRANEAN

World Health Organization  
P.O. Box 1517  
Alexandria, Egypt  
Cable address: UNISANTE ALEXANDRIA  
Telephone: 802318, 807843  
Telex: 54028

## REGIONAL OFFICE FOR EUROPE

World Health Organization  
8 Scherfigsvej  
DK-2100 Copenhagen O. Denmark  
Cable address: UNISANTE COPENHAGEN  
Telephone: 29 01 11  
Telex: 15348

## REGIONAL OFFICE FOR SOUTH-EAST ASIA

World Health Organization  
World Health House  
Indraprastha Estate, Mahatma Gandhi Road  
New Delhi 110002, India  
Cable address: WHO NEW DELHI  
Telephone: 27 01 81 88  
Telex: 312241, 312195

## REGIONAL OFFICE FOR AFRICA

World Health Organization  
P. O. Box No. 6  
Brazzaville, Congo  
Cable address: UNISANTE BRAZZAVILLE  
Telephone: 81 38 60-65  
Telex: 5217, 5278

REGIONAL OFFICE FOR THE WESTERN  
PACIFIC

World Health Organization  
P.O. Box 2932  
121 15 Manila, Philippines  
Cable address: UNISANTE MANILA  
Telephone: 59 20 41, 59 37 21  
Telex: 27652, 40365, 63620

## REGIONAL OFFICE FOR THE AMERICAS/

PAN AMERICAN SANITARY BUREAU  
World Health Organization  
525 23rd Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20037, United States  
Cable address: OFSANPAN WASHINGTON  
Telephone: (202) 861-3200  
Telex: 248338

## Chapter VI

International Bank for  
Reconstruction and Development (World Bank)

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) and its affiliate, the International Development Association (IDA), continued their efforts, during the fiscal year 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981, to assist developing countries in a deteriorating world economic situation.

Lending commitments by the Bank, credit approvals from IDA, and investment commitments by another Bank affiliate, the International Finance Corporation (IFC), amounted to \$13,102 million-up \$940 million (8 per cent) from the previous year.

Membership in the Bank rose to 141 during 1981, with the admission of Bhutan and Vanuatu on 28 September.

## Lending operations

In the fiscal year ending 30 June 1981, the World Bank made 140 loans amounting to \$8,809 million to 50 countries, an increase of \$1,165 million over fiscal year 1980. This brought the cumulative total of loan commit-

ments by the Bank since its inception in 1946 to \$68,150.3 million.

The table on the following pages summarizes World Bank lending in fiscal 1981 by area and by purpose.

## Agriculture and rural development

The Bank continued its commitment to rural development, making 38 loans in fiscal 1981 amounting to 2,406 million in 22 countries. Efforts continued in support of projects directly benefiting the rural poor.

Mexico received \$628 million, of which \$280 million was for a rural development project that included establishment of agricultural research programmes and construction of farm-to-market roads, irrigation schemes, and drainage facilities to benefit more than 160,000 farm families in rainfed areas. Nigeria received a total of \$274 million for two support services projects, and the United Republic of Cameroon received \$25 million to benefit farm families in its northern

(continued on p. 1429)

**WORLD BANK LOANS APPROVED BY REGION/COUNTRY AND PURPOSE**  
(in millions of US dollars)

REGION/COUNTRY	Agriculture and rural development	Development finance companies	Education	Energy	Industry	Non-project	Population, health and nutrition	Small-scale enterprises	Technical assistance	Transportation	Urbanization	Water supply and sewerage	Total
<b>Eastern Africa</b>													
Botswana	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	17.0	—	—	17.0
Kenya	25.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	58.0	—	—	83.0
Malawi	—	—	—	—	—	45.0	—	—	1.0	—	—	—	46.0
Mauritius	—	—	—	—	—	15.0	—	—	—	—	15.0	—	30.0
Swaziland	—	—	—	10.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.0
Zambia	11.0	15.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	26.0
Zimbabwe	—	—	—	—	—	92.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	92.0
Subtotal	36.0	15.0	—	10.0	—	152.0	—	—	1.0	75.0	15.0	—	304.0
<b>Western Africa</b>													
Ivory Coast	—	—	—	33.0	—	—	—	—	—	100.0	—	—	133.0
Liberia	—	—	—	5.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.0
Nigeria	274.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	47.0	—	—	—	321.0
Senegal	—	—	—	—	19.3	30.0	—	6.5	—	—	—	—	55.8
United Republic of Cameroon	25.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.0	—	—	—	—	40.0
Subtotal	299.0	—	—	38.0	19.3	30.0	—	21.5	47.0	100.0	—	—	554.8
<b>East Asia and Pacific</b>													
China	—	—	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	100.0
Fiji	—	—	—	—	—	18.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.0
Indonesia	229.0	—	45.0	250.0	—	—	—	106.0	—	—	43.0	—	673.0
Malaysia	182.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	182.0
Papua New Guinea	—	—	6.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.0
Philippines	83.0	150.0	100.0	—	—	200.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	533.0
Republic of Korea	50.0	250.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	90.0	—	390.0
Thailand	87.0	30.0	—	100.0	8.9	—	—	—	—	100.0	—	—	325.9
Subtotal	631.0	430.0	251.0	350.0	8.9	218.0	—	106.0	—	100.0	133.0	—	2,227.9
<b>South Asia</b>													
India	30.0	—	—	400.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	430.0
Subtotal	30.0	—	—	400.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	430.0
<b>Europe, the Middle East and North Africa</b>													
Algeria	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	110.0	—	—	110.0
Cyprus	14.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.0
Egypt	—	—	—	25.0	64.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	89.0
Jordan	—	—	—	25.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.0	—	46.0
Morocco	—	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	36.0	87.0	223.0
Portugal	—	100.0	—	20.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	120.0
Romania	235.0	—	—	125.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	360.0
Syrian Arab Republic	—	—	15.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.6
Tunisia	24.0	—	26.0	41.5	18.6	—	12.5	30.0	—	—	—	—	152.6
Turkey	40.0	110.0	—	87.0	110.0	375.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	722.0
Yugoslavia	177.0	110.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	34.0	—	—	321.0
Subtotal	490.0	420.0	41.6	323.5	192.6	375.0	12.5	30.0	—	144.0	57.0	87.0	2,173.2

REGION/COUNTRY	Agriculture and rural development	Development finance companies	Education	Energy	Industry	Non-project	Population, health and nutrition	Small-scale enterprises	Technical assistance	Transportation	Urbanization	Water supply and sewerage	Total
Latin America and the Caribbean													
Argentina	—	—	58.0	10.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	68.0
Barbados	—	—	—	6.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.0
Bahamas	—	—	7.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.0
Brazil	145.0	—	—	179.0	250.0	—	—	—	—	—	90.0	180.0	844.0
Chile	36.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	42.0	—	—	78.0
Colombia	37.0	—	—	480.0	—	—	—	—	—	33.0	—	—	550.0
Costa Rica	—	—	—	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	26.0	29.0
Dominican Republic	24.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	24.0
Ecuador	20.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.0
Guyana	—	—	—	8.0	—	14.0	—	—	1.5	—	—	—	23.5
Honduras	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	28.0	—	—	28.0
Jamaica	—	37.0	—	7.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	44.5
Mexico	628.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	164.0	164.0	125.0	1,081.0
Nicaragua	—	30.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3.7	33.7
Panama	—	20.0	—	6.5	—	—	—	—	—	19.0	—	—	45.5
Paraguay	30.0	—	17.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.8	58.8
Peru	—	60.0	—	25.0	5.0	—	—	—	—	58.0	—	—	148.0
Uruguay	—	30.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30.0
Subtotal	920.0	177.0	82.0	725.0	255.0	14.0			1.5	344.0	254.0	346.5	3,119.0
Total	2,406.0	1,042.0	374.6	1,846.5	475.8	789.0	12.5	157.5	49.5	763.0	459.0	433.5	8,808.9
NUMBER OF LOANS	38	16	9	25	7	10	1	4	3	14	7	6	140

province through improved rural infrastructure, effective extension and credit services, training and agricultural research. Of credits totalling \$229 million made to Indonesia, one of \$161 million went to resettle, and improve the livelihood of, over 19,000 families in West Java and West Kalimantan through establishment of 53,000 hectares of tree crops, food crops and home gardens.

Other loans went for: agricultural research and extension services; training; integrated agricultural support services; and various rural works programmes.

#### Development finance companies

The Bank made 16 loans totalling \$1,042 million in fiscal 1981 to assist development finance companies in 13 countries. The largest borrowers were the Republic of Korea (three loans totalling \$250 million to the Korea Development Bank, the Korea Long-Term Credit Bank and the Small and Medium Industry Bank), the Central Bank of the Philippines (\$150 million) and Yugoslavia (\$110 million to be lent through four local banks).

#### Education

During fiscal 1981, the Bank granted nine loans totalling \$374.6 million for education projects in nine countries.

A \$100 million loan was made to China in the first Bank operation in that country for the initial phase of a programme to strengthen higher education and research activities in science and engineering. The Philippines received \$100 million to finance part of its three-year project aimed at improving elementary education. In Paraguay, which received \$17 million, 80,000 rural students were to benefit from the construction and equipping of 500 schools, establishment of better in-service teacher training programmes and evaluation and revision of school curricula.

Other purposes for which credits were committed included: vocational, technical and teacher training centers, and educational projects.

#### Energy

Twenty-five projects in the energy field—oil, gas, coal and power—were assisted in 21 countries during fiscal 1981 at a total cost of \$1,846.5 million.

A \$400 million loan was made to India to develop the southern and central areas of the Bombay High offshore oil field, where annual crude oil production potential was expected to reach 12 million tons by mid-1982. Colombia received three credits totalling \$480 million for construction of power facilities as well as for a rural electrification programme, while Indonesia received \$250 million for construction of a 700-

megawatt hydroelectric power facility in Java. Turkey received \$87 million, of which \$62 million went to the testing of improved oil recovery techniques, the drilling of new wells and installation of associated equipment in a newly discovered oil field, and to the evaluation of the production potential of a gas field. A \$33 million loan was made to the Ivory Coast to extend power to 43 small towns that currently received electricity from diesel stations and to 633 towns that had no electricity.

Other loans went for: improvement of electricity services, energy resources evaluation or exploration, training and construction of facilities.

#### Industry

The Bank made seven loans amounting to \$475.8 million to seven countries during the fiscal year. Brazil received \$250 million to finance a national alcohol programme, designed to increase annual alcohol production for use in gasoline and chemical feedstocks to about 10.7 billion litres (equivalent to 148,000 barrels a day of petroleum) by the end of 1985. Egypt received \$64 million to rehabilitate its largest producer of steel, while Turkey received \$110 million to increase fertilizer production. In other countries, credits were allotted for: rehabilitation of steelmaking facilities, technical assistance, improvement of railway services and textile industry rehabilitation.

#### Non-project

Ten non-project loans totalling 789.0 million were made to eight countries in fiscal 1981. Turkey received two credits totalling \$375 million, of which a \$300 million credit went to support the country's 1980 stabilization programme and to restore economic viability. The Philippines received \$200 million for an industrial development programme designed to accelerate industrial growth, expand employment, maintain rapid growth of non-traditional exports and stimulate industry outside Manila. Of two credits totalling \$92 million extended to Zimbabwe, one of \$50 million went to financing high-priority import requirements for raw materials, spare parts and equipment for the manufacturing sector.

Other purposes for which credits were committed included: structural-adjustment loans and assistance, financing of high-priority import requirements and technical assistance.

#### Population, health and nutrition

In fiscal 1981, Tunisia received \$12.5 million for its efforts to extend basic health care to all by 1990 by providing family planning, nutrition and health services to 2.25 million low-income residents.

#### Small-scale enterprises

Four credits totalling \$157.5 million were granted to four countries for small-scale enterprises. Indonesia received \$106 million for loan extension to small-scale enterprises and creation of new jobs in several sectors, while Tunisia's \$30 million went to the government's assistance programme for small industries. The United Republic of Cameroon received \$15 million for provision of technical and financial assistance and promotion of better geographical distribution of industrial activities. The \$6.5 million loan to Senegal was for investments in industrial, fisheries and tourism projects and for improvement of small- and medium-scale enterprises.

#### Technical assistance

Three countries received loans amounting to \$49.5 million in fiscal 1981 for technical assistance projects.

Nigeria received \$47 million towards establishment of an administrative structure able to co-ordinate implementation of the government's food-production plan to ease food shortages. A \$1.5 million loan to Guyana was to establish an export development fund, while Malawi received \$1 million for consultant services for a series of studies including a review of the financial position of the Malawi Development Corporation.

As in previous years, the Bank also served as executing agency for projects financed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The number of such projects in progress at the end of the fiscal year stood at 138, while 58 new projects involving commitments of \$41.7 million were approved during the year.

New projects included one for \$3.4 million to assist 60 countries assess their energy assistance needs, a first Bank/UNDP project in China for the preparation of investment projects and a technical assistance project in Bolivia to help it carry out the programme for which the Bank had made a structural-adjustment loan. The Bank also co-signed, with UNDP and Pakistan, a project document for design work on the Kalabah Dam. With UNDP contributing \$8 million, this would be the largest single UNDP-funded project for which the Bank had served as executing agency.

#### Transportation

Twelve countries received 14 loans amounting to \$763 million to help develop their transportation systems during fiscal 1981. Of two credits totalling \$164 million given to Mexico, one of \$150 million went to rehabilitation of railway equipment and machinery, and installation of a central traffic-control system. A \$110 million loan to Algeria was to finance foreign-exchange costs of road-maintenance equipment and recon-



struction of part of a national road: The Ivory Coast received \$100 million for similar purposes. Thailand received a total of two credits amounting to \$100 million for development of inland waterways, and for improvement and expansion of port facilities. To increase efficiency and reliability of its Railways Corporation, Kenya received \$58 million. A \$58 million loan to Peru was for improvement of civil aviation service to jungle highland regions and for provision of communications, navigation and aviation equipment throughout the country.

Other loans were for maintenance or improvement of roads and railway systems.

#### Urbanization

Seven loans totalling \$459 million were made to seven countries in fiscal 1981 to aid the urban poor. Mexico received \$164 million for provision of shelter-related facilities, citywide infrastructure and municipal services in three south-eastern states. To improve transport services in the low-income areas of several cities, a \$90 million loan was made to Brazil to strengthen the Brazilian Urban Transport Company through institution building and technical assistance. The Republic of Korea received \$90 million for development of 380 hectares of urban residential land in ten cities, including the construction of 8,500 housing units and community and commercial facilities for low-income households. A \$21 million loan to Jordan went to the first Bank-assisted urban development project there, including provision of housing in the Amman region for over 40,000 low-income residents.

Other loans went for provision of basic infrastructure, and housing and community facilities to benefit residents in low-income urban areas.

#### Water supply and sewerage

The Bank made six loans totalling \$433.5 million for water supply and sewerage projects in six countries in fiscal 1981.

Brazil received \$180 million for improvement of health conditions through provision of piped water as well as sewerage to residents in five states and in the Federal district. A \$125 million loan to Mexico was for construction of water-distribution networks and related facilities to provide water supply to 1.2 million people and sewerage to 1.3 million people in several cities. Morocco received \$87 million for expansion of water-supply facilities, technical assistance and training. Other loans went for improvement of water-supply services and provision of sanitation services.

#### Economic Development Institute

The fiscal 1981 programme of the Economic Development Institute, designed to train senior

officials of the Bank's member developing countries in economic management and investment, included eight courses and nine seminars in Washington, D.C. (United States) for 400 participants, and 25 regional and 18 national courses and seminars for 1,200 participants. The Institute also began training Chinese officials when a project-planning seminar for senior officials was held in Washington followed a similar course in Shanghai.

In Africa, the Institute co-sponsored six regional courses and one regional seminar, in addition to a railway course and a regional development planning seminar for French-speaking African countries. Other regional courses and seminars co-sponsored by the Institute included: one on organizational and financial aspects of power projects, with the Electricity Generating Authority of Thailand; one on metropolitan management, with the Asian Development Bank; and two courses on development banking and agroindustrial projects, with the Association of Argentine Banks.

During the fiscal year, the Institute also responded to over 1,000 requests a month for training materials such as case studies and course notes- five times as many as in fiscal 1980.

#### Development aid co-ordination

At the request of donor and recipient governments, the Bank continued to organize various aid co-ordination mechanisms for developing countries receiving assistance from bilateral and multilateral sources. During the year, the Bank sponsored meetings of 11 aid co-ordinating groups -for Bangladesh, Burma, the Caribbean nations, India (twice), Mauritius, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Zaire. The Bank also participated in a meeting of the Inter-Governmental Group for Indonesia, sponsored by the Netherlands and the Turkey Consortium, chaired by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

#### Financing activities

During fiscal 1981, the World Bank borrowed the equivalent of \$5,068.8 million: \$1,437 million in deutsche mark; \$1,111 million in United States dollars; \$1,090.6 million in Japanese yen; \$962.5 million in Swiss francs; \$251.9 million in Netherlands guilders; and \$215.8 million in pounds sterling.

Of the 44 borrowing operations conducted by the Bank, 28 were public issues or private placements throughout the world and accounted for \$3,322.6 million, or 66 per cent of total funds borrowed. The other 16 issues, totalling \$1,729.1 million, or 34 per cent of funds raised, were placed with official sources such as member

Governments of the Bank, central banks and government institutions.

As at 30 June 1981, the Bank's outstanding obligations amounted to \$27,797.8 million, denominated in 17 different currencies placed with investors in over 100 countries. Estimates indicated that 23.3 per cent was held in the Federal Republic of Germany, 17.2 per cent in the United States, 16.3 per cent in Japan, 14.9 per cent in Switzerland, 14.9 per cent by countries belonging to the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries; and the remaining 13.4 per cent in other countries.

#### Capitalization

In the Bank's Articles of Agreement, the institution's capital stock is expressed in terms of 1944 dollars- the United States dollar of the weight and fineness in effect on 1 July 1944. On 1 April 1978, when the Second Amendment of the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) became effective, currencies no longer had par values, and the basis for translating the 1944 dollar into current United States dollars no longer existed.

Thus, for the fiscal year ended 30 June 1981, the value of the Bank's capital stock was expressed on the basis of special drawing rights (SDRs) in terms of the United States dollar as computed by IMF on 30 June. On that date, the value of the SDR was set at \$1.15060.

The subscribed capital of the Bank was increased by SDR 1,650.3 million in fiscal 1981, bringing the total of subscribed capital to SDR 31,822.1 million as of 30 June.

income, expenditures and reserves

The Bank's gross revenues, generated primarily from its loans and investments, increased by \$199 million in fiscal 1981 to a record level of

\$2,999 million. Net income was \$610 million, an increase of 3.7 per cent over the previous fiscal year.

Total expenses amounted to \$2,389 million, up 8 per cent from fiscal 1980. Administrative costs totalled \$255 million, up \$57 million.

The General Reserve of the Bank amounted to \$2,859 million at the end of fiscal 1981.

#### STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSES (for the fiscal year ended 30 June 1981)

	Amount (In thousands of US dollars)
Income	
Income from Investments*	813,255
Income from loans	
Interest	1,986,529
Commitment charges	177,133
Other income**	22,135
Total income	2,999,052
Expenses	
Administrative expenses,***	254,824
Interest on borrowings	2,104,068
Bond issuance and other financial expenses	30,057
Total expenses	2,388,949
Net income	610,103

\*Includes net losses of \$110,649,000 resulting from sales of Investments.

\*\*Includes net gains of \$20,427,000 resulting from repurchases of obligations of the Bank prior to maturity pursuant to the terms of the respective borrowing agreements.

\*\*\*All administrative expenses of the Bank and IDA and a portion of those of the International Finance Corporation (IFC) are paid by the Bank. The administrative expenses are net of a management fee of \$180 million charged to IDA and of a service and support fee of \$2,874,000 charged to IFC.

#### Secretariat

As at 30 June 1981, the staff of the World Bank numbered over 5,000, of which 2,552 were in Professional or higher categories, drawn from 101 nationalities.

#### Annex I. MEMBERS OF THE WORLD BANK, SUBSCRIPTIONS AND VOTING POWER (As at 30 June 1981)

MEMBER	SUBSCRIPTION		VOTING POWER		MEMBER	SUBSCRIPTION		VOTING POWER	
	Amount (in SDRs)	Percent- age of total	Number of votes	Percent- age of total		Amount (in SDRs)	Percent- age of total	Number of votes	Percent- age of total
Afghanistan	30,000	0.09	550	0.16	Benin	10,000	0.03	350	0.10
Algeria	110,900	0.35	1,359	0.39	Bolivia	26,400	0.08	514	0.15
Argentina	470,100	1.48	4,951	1.40	Botswana	4,300	0.01	293	0.08
Australia	645,000	2.03	6,700	1.90	Brazil	540,100	1.70	5,651	1.60
Austria	269,600	0.85	2,946	0.83	Burma	59,100	0.19	841	0.24
Bahamas	17,100	0.05	421	0.12	Burundi	15,000	0.05	400	0.11
Bahrain	16,300	0.05	413	0.12	Canada	1,112,200	3.50	11,372	3.22
Bangladesh	124,200	0.39	1,492	0.42	Cape Verde	1,600	0.01	266	0.08
Barbados	13,900	0.04	389	0.11	Central African Republic	10,000	0.03	350	0.10
Belgium	726,800	2.28	7,518	2.13					

MEMBER	SUBSCRIPTION		VOTING POWER		MEMBER	SUBSCRIPTION		VOTING POWER	
	Amount (in SDRs)	Percent- age of total	Number of votes	Percent- age of total		Amount (in SDRs)	Percent- age Of total	Number of votes	Percent- age of total
Chad	10,000	0.03	350	0.10	Morocco	122,000	0.38	1,470	0.42
Chile	124,000	0.39	1,490	0.42	Nepal	14,600	0.05	396	0.11
China	1,200,000	3.77	12,250	3.47	Netherlands	767,900	2.41	7,929	2.25
Colombia	117,500	0.37	1,425	0.40	New Zealand	188,700	0.59	2,137	0.61
Comoros	1,600	0.01	266	0.08	Nicaragua	9,100	0.03	341	0.10
Congo	10,000	0.03	350	0.10	Niger	10,000	0.03	350	0.10
Costa Rica	10,700	0.03	357	0.10	Nigeria*	115,200	0.36	1,402	0.40
Cyprus	27,800	0.09	528	0.15	Norway	241,000	0.76	2,660	0.75
Democratic Kampuchea	21,400	0.07	464	0.13	Oman*	6,000	0.02	310	0.09
Democratic Yemen	24,800	0.08	498	0.14	Pakistan	251,900	0.79	2,769	0.78
Denmark	252,400	0.79	2,774	0.79	Panama	21,600	0.07	466	0.13
Djibouti	3,100	0.01	281	0.08	Papua New Guinea	17,100	0.05	421	0.12
Dominica	1,600	0.01	266	0.08	Paraguay	7,000	0.02	320	0.09
Dominican Republic	17,500	0.06	425	0.12	Peru	93,800	0.29	1,188	0.34
Ecuador	36,800	0.12	618	0.18	Philippines	171,500	0.54	1,965	0.56
Egypt	165,000	0.52	1,900	0.54	Portugal	132,400	0.42	1,574	0.45
El Salvador	12,000	0.04	370	0.10	Qatar	32,700	0.10	577	0.16
Equatorial Guinea	6,400	0.02	314	0.09	Republic of Korea	139,300	0.44	1,643	0.47
Ethiopia	11,400	0.04	364	0.10	Romania	162,100	0.51	1,871	0.53
Fiji	14,700	0.05	397	0.11	Rwanda*	15,000	0.05	400	0.11
Finland	214,000	0.67	2,390	0.68	Saint Lucia	2,900	0.01	279	0.08
France	1,756,700	5.52	17,817	5.05	Samoa	1,700	0.01	267	0.08
Gabon	12,000	0.04	370	0.10	Sao Tome and Principe	1,400	**	264	0.07
Gambia	5,300	0.02	303	0.09	Saudi Arabia	489,900	1.54	5,149	1.46
Germany, Federal Republic of	1,761,200	5.53	17,862	5.06	Senegal	36,200	0.11	612	0.17
Ghana	85,600	0.27	1,106	0.31	Seychelles	1,100	**	261	0.07
Greece	94,500	0.30	1,195	0.34	Sierra Leone	15,000	0.05	400	0.11
Grenada	1,700	0.01	267	0.08	Singapore	32,000	0.10	570	0.16
Guatemala	16,700	0.05	417	0.12	Solomon Islands	1,700	0.01	267	0.08
Guinea	20,000	0.06	450	0.13	South Africa	18,900	0.06	439	0.12
Guinea-Bissau	2,700	0.01	277	0.08	Spain	346,300	1.09	3,713	1.05
Guyana	17,100	0.05	421	0.12	Sri Lanka	455,100	1.43	4,801	1.36
Haiti	15,000	0.05	400	0.11	Sudan	96,100	0.30	1,211	0.34
Honduras	8,400	0.03	334	0.09	Suriname	60,000	0.19	850	0.24
Iceland	22,200	0.07	472	0.13	Swaziland	16,200	0.05	412	0.12
India	1,133,300	3.56	11,583	3.28	Sweden	6,800	0.02	318	0.09
Indonesia	388,800	1.22	4,138	1.17	Switzerland	367,600	1.16	3,926	1.11
Iran	158,000	0.50	1,830	0.52	Syrian Arab Republic	50,800	0.16	758	0.21
Iraq	69,800	0.22	948	0.27	Thailand	147,800	0.46	1,728	0.49
Ireland	126,600	0.40	1,516	0.43	Togo	15,000	0.05	400	0.11
Israel	110,800	0.35	1,358	0.38	Trinidad and Tobago	53,500	0.17	785	0.22
Italy	1,012,000	3.18	10,370	2.94	Tunisia	37,300	0.12	623	0.16
Ivory Coast	36,500	0.11	615	0.16	Turkey	128,600	0.40	1,536	0.44
Jamaica	44,600	0.14	696	0.20	Uganda	33,300	0.10	583	0.17
Japan	1,753,900	5.51	17,789	5.04	United Arab Emirates	98,000	0.31	1,230	0.35
Jordan	18,700	0.06	437	0.12	United Kingdom	2,600,000	8.17	26,250	7.44
Kenya*	40,000	0.13	650	0.18	United Republic of Cameroon	20,000	0.06	450	0.13
Kuwait	320,300	1.01	3,453	0.98	United Republic of Tanzania	35,000	0.11	600	0.17
Lao People's Democratic Republic	10,000	0.03	350	0.10	United States	7,330,100	23.03	73,551	20.84
Lebanon	9,000	0.03	340	0.10	Upper Volta	10,000	0.03	350	0.10
Lesotho	4,300	0.01	293	0.08	Uruguay	41,100	0.13	661	0.19
Liberia	21,300	0.07	463	0.13	Venezuela	197,200	0.62	2,222	0.63
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	20,000	0.06	450	0.13	Viet Nam	54,300	0.17	793	0.22
Luxembourg	29,700	0.09	547	0.16	Yemen	8,500	0.03	335	0.09
Madagascar	21,900	0.07	469	0.13	Yugoslavia*	117,800	0.37	1,428	0.40
Malawi*	15,000	0.05	400	0.11	Zaire	96,000	0.30	1,210	0.34
Malaysia	206,600	0.65	2,316	0.66	Zambia*	64,800	0.20	898	0.25
Maldives	600	**	256	0.07	Zimbabwe	81,700	0.26	1,067	0.30
Mali	17,300	0.05	423	0.12					
Mauritania	10,000	0.03	350	0.10					
Mauritius	22,100	0.07	471	0.13					
Mexico	228,000	0.72	2,530	0.72	Total	31,822,100	100.00***	352,971	100.00***

NOTE: Bhutan and Vanuatu became members on 28 September.

\*Amounts aggregating the equivalent Of \$6,971,000. In current United States dollars, had been received from members on account of increases in subscriptions, which were in process of completion: Kenya \$1,479,000, Malawi \$275,000, Nigeria \$2,158,000, Oman \$125,000, Rwanda \$29,000, Yugoslavia \$2,298,000 and Zambia \$607,000.

\*\*Less than 0.005 percent.

\*\*\*May differ from the sum of the individual percentages because of rounding

## Annex II. EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS AND ALTERNATES OF THE WORLD BANK (As at 30 June 1981)

Appointed Director	Appointed Alternate	Casting the vote of
Vacant	Vacant	United States
John Anson	Derek F. Smith	United Kingdom
Eberhard Kurth	Norbert Schmidt-Gerritzen	Germany, Federal Republic of
Paul Mentré de Loye	Marthe Parent*	France
Seiji Morioka	Kimiaki Nakajima	Japan
Elected Director	Elected Alternate	Casting the votes of
Said E. El-Naggar (Egypt)	Saleh A. Al-Hegelan (Saudi Arabia)	Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Maldives, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Yemen
Earl G. Drake (Canada)	Reno J. Brown (Bahamas)	Bahamas, Barbados, Canada, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Ireland, Jamaica, Saint Lucia
H. N. Ray (India)	M. Syeduz-Zaman (Bangladesh)	Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka
Giorgio Ragazzi (Italy)	Rodrigo M. Guimarães (Portugal)	Greece. Italy. Portugal
Anthony IJ. A. Looijen (Netherlands)	Miodrag M. Stojiljkovic (Yugoslavia)	Cyprus. Israel, Netherlands. Romania, Yugoslavia
Jacques de Groote (Belgium)	Turan Kivanc (Turkey)	Austria, Belgium, Luxembourg. Turkey
Joaquin Muns (Spain)	Roberto Mayorga-Cortés (Nicaragua)	Costa Rica. El Salvador. Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Spain, Suriname, Venezuela
Wang Liansheng (China)	Chen Hui (China)	China
Hans Lundstrom (Sweden)	Ole L. Poulsen (Denmark)	Denmark. Finland. Iceland. Norway, Sweden
Zain Azraal (Malaysia)	Aung Pe (Burma)	Burma. Fiji, Indonesia, Leo People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Nepal, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam
S. A. McLeod (New Zealand)	Anthony S. Cole (Australia)	Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Solomon Islands
Y. S. M. Abdulai (Nigeria)	William Smith (Liberia)	Botswana, Burundi, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Nigeria, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe
Jaime Garcia-Parra (Colombia)	José G. Cárdenas (Ecuador)	Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic. Ecuador, Haiti, Philippines
Armand Razafindrabé (Madagascar)	Nicéphore Sogio (Benin)	Benin, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Somalia, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Zaire
David Blanco (Bolivia)	Alberto Sola (Argentina)	Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay
Ismail Khelli (Tunisia)	Saad Zerhouni (Algeria)	Afghanistan, Algeria, Democratic Yemen, Ghana, Iran. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Oman, Tinsia

NOTE: Democratic Kampuchea and South Africa did not participate in the 1980 regular election of Executive Directors. Bhutan and Vanuatu became members after that election.

\*Resigned effective 31 July; succeeded by Robert Hudry.

## Annex III. PRINCIPAL OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE WORLD BANK (As at 1 July 1981)

### PRINCIPAL OFFICERS

President: A. W. Clausen.	Vice-President and General Counsel: Heribert Golsong.
Senior Vice-President, Finance: Moeen A. Qureshi.	Vice-President and Controller: Masaya Hattori.
Senior Vice-President, Operations: Ernest Stern.	Regional Vice-President, South Asia: W. David Hopper.
Regional Vice-President, Latin America and the Caribbean: Nicolás Ardito Barletta.	Regional Vice-President, East Asia and Pacific: S. Shahid Husain.
Vice-President, Projects Staff: Warren C. Baum.	Regional Vice-President, Western Africa: A. David Knox.
Vice-President, External Relations: Munir P. Benjenk.	Vice-President, Administration, Organization, Personnel Management: Martijn J. W. M. Pajmans.
Regional Vice-President, Europe, Middle East and North Africa: Roger Chaufournier.	Vice-President and Treasurer: Eugene H. Rotberg.
Vice-President, Development Policy: Hollis B. Chenery.	Vice-President and Secretary: Timothy T. Thahane.
Vice-President, Programming and Budgeting, and Vice-President, Pension Fund: K. Georg Gabriel.	Regional Vice-President, Eastern Africa: Willi A. Wapenhans.
	Director-General, Operations Evaluation: Mervyn L. Weiner.

\*The World Bank and IDA had the same officers and staff.

## HEADQUARTERS AND OTHER OFFICES

## HEADQUARTERS

The World Bank  
1818 H Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20433, United States  
Cable address: INTBAFRAD WASHINGTONDC  
Telephone: (202) 477-1234  
Telex: RCA 248423 WORLDDBK,  
WUI 64145 WORLDDBANK

## NEW YORK OFFICE

The World Bank Mission to the United Nations  
747 Third Avenue, 26th floor  
New York, N.Y. 10017, United States  
Cable address: INTBAFRAD NEWYORK  
Telephone: (212) 754-6008

## REGIONAL MISSION IN EASTERN AFRICA

The World Bank  
Reinsurance Plaza, 5th and 6th floor  
Talfa Road  
(P. O. Box 30577)  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Cable address: INTBAFRAD NAIROBI  
Telephone: 24391  
Telex: 22022

## GENEVA OFFICE

The World Bank  
ITC Building  
54 Rue de Montbrillant  
(Post Office Box 104)  
1211 Geneva 20 CIC, Switzerland  
Telephone: 33 21 20  
Telex: 28883

## LONDON OFFICE

The World Bank  
New Zealand House, 15th floor, Haymarket  
London SW1 Y4TE, England  
Cable address: INTBAFRAD LONDON  
Telephone: (01) 930-8511  
Telex: 919462

## REGIONAL MISSION IN THAILAND

The World Bank  
Udom Vidhaya Building, 956 Rama IV Road  
Sala Daeng  
Bangkok 5, Thailand  
Cable address: INTBAFRAD BANGKOK  
Telephone: 235-5300-7  
Telex: 82817

## EUROPEAN OFFICE

The World Bank  
66 Avenue d'Iéna  
75116 Paris, France  
Cable address: INTBAFRAD PARIS  
Telephone: (1) 723-54-21  
Telex: 620628

## TOKYO OFFICE

The World Bank  
Kokusai Building, Room 918  
1-1 Marunouchi 3-chome, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo 100, Japan  
Cable address: INTBAFRAD TOKYO  
Telephone: (03) 214-5001,5002  
Telex: 26838

## REGIONAL MISSION IN WESTERN AFRICA

The World Bank  
Immeuble Shell, 64 Avenue Lamblin  
(Boite Postale 1850)  
Abidjan 01, Ivory Coast  
Cable address: INTBAFRAD ABIDJAN  
Telephone: 32-24-01,32-42-40  
Telex: 3533

## Chapter VII

## International Finance Corporation (IFC)

The International Finance Corporation (IFC) was established in 1956 as an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) to assist developing member countries by helping them to promote the private sector of their economies. The principal objectives of IFCare: to provide risk capital for productive private enterprise, in association with private investors and management; to encourage the development of local capital markets; and to stimulate the international flow of private capital.

In the fiscal year ending on 30 June 1981—the Corporation's twenty-fifth year of operation—the Board of Directors approved 56 projects with an equity and loan commitment value of over \$810 million; an increase of 19 per cent over the previous year (\$681 million). Operating income for the current year rose 11 per cent to over \$100 million while net income was \$19.5 million compared with the previous year's \$20.7 million. Syndications, a measure of IFC's ability to attract others to help finance projects in which it is involved, reached \$374 million and embraced over 50 financial institutions—as against the 1980 figure of \$266.8 million.

Of the total financing approved, \$396.9 million went to establish new operations; \$344.2 million to expand and modernize existing plants; and \$61.4 million to support financial institutions. The balance, \$8.5 million, involved the exercise of stock rights.

The total cost of approved investment was about \$3,300 million as compared with \$2,400 million in the previous year. Of this, IFC Provided \$811 million so that of every dollar of project cost, IFC contributed approximately 24 cents of which about half, or 11 cents, was raised from other financial institutions through syndications of IFC loans. Of the balance of project costs, \$1,940 million was raised through other financial institutions, mainly commercial banks, and \$589 million was provided by the sponsors and through cash generation.

With respect to the investments approved, agroindustrial, hotel, cement, and pulp and paper ventures were more prominent than in the recent past. Manufacturing, at about 44 per cent of the total number of projects approved, dropped below 50 per cent for the first time.

The Corporation continued to place greater emphasis on its activities in some of the smaller and low-income countries so that 29 ventures, roughly half, were in countries with per capita income of less than \$626 per year. The Corporation undertook investments in 34 countries, six of them for the first time.

Including approvals for two major projects, a coal mine in Zimbabwe and a fertilizer plant in Senegal, the year's investment in Africa exceeded \$100 million for the first time with costs totaling over \$800 million. In view of the importance of Africa in IFC's operations, the position of Vice-

President for investment operations in Africa was established in 1981.

At the end of 1981, following the admission during the year of the Congo, Seychelles and Vanuatu, membership in IFC was 120.

IFC COMMITMENTS BY TYPE OF BUSINESS  
(1 July 1980-30 June 1981)

Sector	Amount (in millions of US dollars)
Cement and construction materials	724.9
Mining	413.7
General manufacturing	385.2
Iron and steel	341.6
Pulp and paper products	303.0
Chemicals and petrochemicals	295.8
Textiles and fibres	258.5
Development financing	204.3
Food and food processing	192.0
Motor vehicles and accessories	168.7
Fertilizer	160.1
Money and capital markets	144.1
Tourism	117.5
Non-ferrous metals	46.0
Machinery	33.5
Utilities	31.5
Others	16.6

IFC INVESTMENTS  
(1 July 1980-30 June 1981)

Recipient	Sector	Amount (in thousands of US dollars)
Argentina	Cement and construction materials	65,000
Bangladesh	Leather	2,272
Bolivia	Food and food processing	5,700
Brazil	Cement and construction materials	143,500
	Chemicals and petrochemicals	62,000
	Food and food processing	18,500
	Iron and steel	3,727
	Money and capital markets	1,500
Burundi	Glass containers	5,634
Colombia	Chemicals and petrochemicals	15,574
	Development finance companies	10,000
	Money and capital markets	9,181
Congo	Logging and veneer	3,500
Dominican Republic	Cement and construction material	360
Ecuador	Palm oil	10,810
	Development finance companies	29
Egypt	Tourism	5,267
Haiti	Food and food processing	3,150
India	Iron and steel	45,274
	Fertilizer	15,875
	Motor vehicles and accessories	15,000
Jamaica	Glass containers	2,250
Jordan	Fertilizers	2,232
	Money and capital markets	298
Kenya	Money and capital markets	5,000
	Pulp and paper products	5,000
Malawi	Chemicals and petrochemicals	1,945
	Food and food processing	945
Mauritius	Tourism	1,750
Mexico	Pulp and paper products	60,335
	Tourism	896
Morocco	Cement and construction materials	15,800
Nigeria	Tourism	9,730
Pakistan	Food and food processing	3,352
Paraguay	Tourism	1,180
Peru	Utilities	8,500
Philippines	Money and capital markets	19,235
	Cement and construction materials	16,000
	Mining	5,000

Recipient	Sector	Amount (in thousands of US dollars)
Portugal	Development finance companies	11,184
Republic of Korea	Grain bulk terminal	9,500
Senegal	Fertilizers	25,000
	Development finance companies	175
Somalia	Food and food processing	375
Sri Lanka	Tourism	18,000
	Money and capital markets	5,000
	Textiles and fibres	79
Thailand	Cement and construction materials	27,000
	Mining	604
Turkey	Glass tableware	13,547
United Republic of Cameroon	Glass containers	1,831
	Food and food processing	1,495
Yugoslavia	Pulp and paper products	57,577
Zimbabwe	Mining	38,000
Total		810,668

### Financial operations

The Corporation's total operating income in fiscal year 1981 was 98.4 million. This included \$82.9 million in interest and commitment charges on loans and in other income, and \$13.9 million in dividends and profit participations. After administrative expenses and financial charges on borrowings (\$68.9 million), income from operations amounted to \$29.5 million. Net income was \$19.5 million compared with \$20.7 million for the previous year.

STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURE  
(for fiscal year ending 30 June 1981)

	Amount (in US dollars)
Income	
Income from obligations of Governments	1,817,556
Income from loan and equity investments and underwriting commitments:	
Interest	75,969,033
Interest recovered from Investment written off	2,367,395
Dividends and profit participation	13,897,013
Commitment charges	3,628,463
Commissions	958,919
Other income	(223,112)
Total income	98,415,267
Expenditure	
Charges on borrowings	34,607,563
Administrative expenses*	34,289,812
Total expenditure	68,897,375
Income from operations	29,517,892
Realized gain on sales of loan and equity Investments	1,918,581
Provision for losses	(19,009,327)
Recovery of investment previously written off	7,051,083
Net income-transferred to accumulated earnings	19,478,229

\*The World Bank charges IFC an annual service and support fee which for the year ending 30 June 1981 was fixed at \$2,874,000

## Capital and reserves

The capital increase approved by the Board of Governors in November 1977 resulted in additional subscriptions during fiscal year 1981 of \$373.2 million.

As at 30 June 1981, total Capital and General Reserve of IFC amounted to \$551.3 million; accumulated earnings totalled \$159.2 million. Reserve against losses was increased to \$61.5 million-5.5 per cent of disbursed investments.

## Technical Assistance

The Corporation provided two types of technical assistance. The first was project-related, un-

dertaken in connection with the appraisal of new ventures and supervision of past investments and was an integral part of IFC's on-going programme. The second was non-project-related assistance, such as financial sector surveys, advisory missions to member Governments and training. It included studies and policy analysis to assist member Governments or international or regional institutions in stimulating private investment.

## Secretariat

As at 30 June 1981, IFC staff numbered 388, drawn from 66 nationalities.

# Annex I. MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION, SUBSCRIPTIONS AND VOTING POWER (As at June 1981)

MEMBER	SUBSCRIPTION		VOTING POWER		MEMBER	SUBSCRIPTION		VOTING POWER	
	Amount (in thousands of US dollars)	Percent-age of total	Number of votes	Percent-age of total		Amount (in thousands of US dollars)	Percent-age of total	Number of votes	Percent-age of total
Afghanistan	111	0.03	361	0.09	Jordan	271	0.07	521	0.12
Argentina	6,558	1.67	6,808	1.61	Kenya	870	0.22	1,120	0.27
Australia	2,215	0.56	2,465	0.58	Kuwait	2,867	0.73	3,117	0.74
Austria	3,273	0.83	3,523	0.84	Lebanon	50	0.01	300	0.07
Bangladesh	1,682	0.43	1,932	0.46	Lesotho	18	-	268	0.06
Barbados	93	0.02	343	0.08	Liberia	83	0.02	333	0.08
Belgium	11,477	2.93	11,727	2.78	Libyan Arab	-	-	-	-
Bolivia	242	0.06	492	0.12	Jamahiriyah	55	0.01	305	0.07
Botswana	29	0.01	279	0.07	Luxembourg	375	0.10	625	0.15
Brazil	6,566	1.67	6,816	1.62	Madagascar	111	0.03	361	0.09
Burma	666	0.17	916	0.22	Malawi	311	0.08	561	0.13
Burundi	100	0.03	350	0.08	Malaysia	3,192	0.81	3,442	0.82
Canada	17,480	4.46	17,730	4.20	Mali	116	0.03	366	0.09
Chile	1,552	0.40	1,802	0.43	Mauritania	55	0.01	305	0.07
China	4,154	1.06	4,404	1.04	Mauritius	95	0.02	345	0.08
Colombia	1,405	0.36	1,655	0.39	Mexico	720	0.18	970	0.23
Congo	67	0.02	317	0.08	Morocco	1,940	0.49	2,190	0.52
Costa Rica	200	0.05	450	0.11	Nepal	206	0.05	456	0.11
Cyprus	363	0.09	613	0.15	Netherlands	9,894	2.52	10,144	2.40
Denmark	753	0.19	1,003	0.24	New Zealand	923	0.24	1,173	0.28
Djibouti	21	0.01	271	0.06	Nicaragua	114	0.03	364	0.09
Dominica	11	-	261	0.06	Niger	67	0.02	317	0.08
Dominican Republic	250	0.06	500	0.12	Nigeria	369	0.09	619	0.15
Ecuador	674	0.17	924	0.22	Norway	3,738	0.95	3,988	0.95
Egypt	2,618	0.67	2,868	0.68	Oman	252	0.06	502	0.12
El Salvador	11	-	261	0.06	Pakistan	3,750	0.96	4,000	0.95
Ethiopia	33	0.01	283	0.07	Panama	2	-	252	0.06
Fiji	74	0.02	324	0.08	Papua New Guinea	206	0.05	456	0.11
Finland	2,595	0.66	2,845	0.67	Paraguay	123	0.03	373	0.09
France	10,467	2.67	10,717	2.54	Peru	1,145	0.29	1,395	0.33
Gabon	55	0.01	305	0.07	Philippines	2,631	0.67	2,881	0.68
Germany, Federal	-	-	-	-	Portugal	1,804	0.46	2,054	0.49
Republic of	27,295	6.96	27,545	6.53	Republic of Korea	1,988	0.51	2,238	0.53
Ghana	1,306	0.53	1,556	0.37	Rwanda	224	0.06	474	0.11
Greece	1,177	0.30	1,427	0.34	Samoa	9	-	259	0.06
Grenada	11	-	261	0.06	Saudi Arabia	9,251	2.36	9,501	2.25
Guatemala	249	0.06	499	0.12	Senegal	184	0.05	434	0.10
Guinea-Bissau	18	-	268	0.06	Seychelles	7	-	257	0.06
Guyana	257	0.07	507	0.12	Sierra Leone	83	0.02	333	0.06
Haiti	249	0.06	499	0.12	Singapore	177	0.05	427	0.10
Honduras	115	0.03	365	0.09	Solomon Islands	11	-	261	0.06
Iceland	11	-	261	0.06	Somalia	83	0.02	333	0.08
India	13,646	3.48	13,896	3.29	South Africa	1,108	0.28	1,358	0.32
Indonesia	6,125	1.56	6,375	1.51	Spain	4,046	1.03	4,296	1.02
Iran	372	0.09	622	0.15	Sri Lanka	1,503	0.38	1,753	0.42
Iraq	67	0.02	317	0.08	Sudan	111	0.03	361	0.09
Ireland	332	0.08	582	0.14	Swaziland	184	0.05	434	0.10
Israel	50	0.01	300	0.07	Sweden	1,108	0.28	1,358	0.32
Italy	15,646	3.99	15,896	3.77	Syrian Arab	-	-	-	-
Ivory coast	459	0.12	709	0.17	Republic	72	0.02	322	0.08
Jamaica	912	0.23	1,162	0.28	Thailand	2,282	0.58	2,532	0.60
Japan	16,435	4.19	16,685	3.95	Togo	311	0.08	561	0.13

SUBSCRIPTION					VOTING POWER				
MEMBER	Amount (in thousands of US dollars)	Percent-age of total	Number of votes	Percent-age of total	MEMBER	Amount (in thousands of US dollars)	Percent-age of total	Number of votes	Percent-age of total
Trinidad and Tobago	376	0.10	626	0.15	United States	124,363	37.71	124,613	29.54
Tunisia	133	0.03	383	0.09	Upper Volta	167	0.04	417	0.10
Turkey	2,028	0.52	2,278	0.54	Uruguay	919	0.23	1,169	0.28
Uganda	184	0.05	434	0.10	Venezuela	116	0.03	366	0.09
United Arab Emirates	86	0.02	336	0.08	Viet Nam	166	0.04	416	0.10
United Kingdom	37,900	9.66	38,150	9.04	Yemen	156	0.04	406	0.10
United Republic of Cameroon	414	0.11	664	0.16	Yugoslavia	1,964	0.50	2,214	0.52
United Republic of Tanzania	589	0.15	839	0.20	Zaire	1,530	0.39	1,780	0.42
					Zambia	890	0.23	1,140	0.27
					Zimbabwe	546	0.14	796	0.19
					Total	392,149	100.00**	421,899	100.00**

NOTE: Vanuatu become a member on 28 September.

\*Less than 0.005 per cent.

\*\*May differ from the sum of the individual percentages because of rounding

## Annex II. EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS AND ALTERNATES OF THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION (As at 30 June 1981)

Appointed Director	Appointed Alternate	Casting the vote of
Vacant	Vacant	United States
John Anson	Derek F. Smith	United Kingdom
Eberhard Kurth	Norbert Schmidt- Gerritzen	Germany, Federal Republic of
Seiji Norioka	Kimiaki Nakajima	Japan
Paul Mentré de Loye	Marthe Parent <sup>1</sup>	France
Elected Director	Elected Alternate	Casting the votes of
Said E. El-Naggar (Egypt)	Saleh A. Al-Hegelan (Saudi Arabia)	Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Yemen
Earl G. Drake (Canada)	Reno J. Brown (Bahamas)	Barbados, Canada, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Ireland, Jamaica
Giorgio Ragazzi (Italy)	Rodrigo M. Guimarães (Portugal)	Greece, Italy, Portugal
Jacques de Groote (Belgium)	Turan Kivanc (Turkey)	Austria, Belgium, Luxembourg, Turkey
H. N. Ray (India)	M. Syeduz-Zaman (Bangladesh)	Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka
Zain Azraal (Malaysia)	Aung Pe (Burma)	Burma, Fiji, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam
Jaime Garcia-Parra (Colombia)	José G. Cárdenas (Ecuador)	Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Haiti, Philippines
Anthony H. A. Looijen (Netherlands)	Miodrag M. Stojlikovic (Yugoslavia)	Cyprus, Israel, Netherlands, Yugoslavia
David Blanco (Bolivia)	Alberto Sola (Argentina)	Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay
Hans Lundstrom (Sweden)	Ole L. Poulsen (Denmark)	Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden
Y. S. M. Abdulal (Nigeria)	William Smith (Liberia)	Botswana, Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Nigeria, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe
Armand Razafindrabe (Madagascar)	Nicéphore Sogio (Benin)	Congo, Djibouti, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Zaire
Joaquin Muns (Spain)	Roberto Mayorga-Cortés (Nicaragua)	Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Spain, Venezuela
S. A. McLeod (New Zealand)	Anthony S. Cole (Australia)	Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Solomon Islands
Ismail Khelil (Tunisia)	Saad Zerhouni (Algeria)	Afghanistan, Ghana, Iran, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Oman, Tunisia
Wang Liansheng (China)	Chen Hui (China)	China

<sup>1</sup>Resigned 31 July 1981; succeeded by Robert Hudry.

NOTE: South Africa did not participate in the 1980 regular election of Executive Directors.



Annex III. PRINCIPAL OFFICERS AND OFFICES  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION  
(As at 30 June 1981)

## PRINCIPAL OFFICERS

President: A. W. Clausen.  
Executive Vice-President: Hans A. Wuttke.  
Vice-President and General Counsel: Jose E. Camacho.  
Vice-President, Engineering and Technical Assistance: Makarand V. Dehejia.  
Vice-President, Administration and Finance: James M. Kearns.  
Vice-President, Asia, Europe and Middle East: Judhvir Parmar.  
Vice-President, Latin America and the Caribbean: Jose M. Ruisanchez.  
Vice-President, Africa (acting): Judhvir Parmar.  
Director, Finance and Management Department: Marshall Burkes.  
Secretary: Timothy T. Thahane.\*  
Director-General, Operations Evaluation: Mervyn L. Weiner.  
Director, Corporate Planning Department: Richard W. Richardson.  
Director, Department of Investments, Africa I: Gunter H. Kreuter.  
Director, Department of Investments, Africa II: M. Azam K. Allai.  
Director, Department of Investments, Asia: Torstein Stephansen.  
Director, Department of Investments, Europe and Middle East: Douglas Gustafson.  
Director, Department of Investments, Latin America and Caribbean I: Giovanni Vacchelli

Director, Department of Investments, Latin America and Caribbean II: Daniel F. Admas.  
Director, Capital Markets Department: David G. III.  
Director of Syndications: Rolf Th. Lundberg.  
Chief, Information Office: T. Bell.  
Director, Compensation Department: R. A. Clarke.\*  
Director, Personnel Management Department: Hans Pollan.  
Director, Internal Auditing Department: Lawrence N. Rapley.\*  
Director, Administrative Services Department: James E. Twining.\*  
Director, Programming and Budgeting Department: Heinz Vergin.  
Special Representative, Middle East: Cherif Hassan.  
Special Representative, Far East: Naokado Nishihara.  
Special Representative, Europe: J. W. Strobi.  
Regional Mission in East Asia: Sakdylam Kupasrlmonkol.  
Regional Mission in Eastern Africa: V. S. Raghavan.  
Regional Mission in Western Africa: Guy C. Antoine.  
Senior Adviser, Portfolio: Fawzi Habib.  
Senior Adviser, Technical: H. Geoffrey Hilton.  
Special Adviser for African Affairs: Pierre C. Damiba.\*\*

\*Held the same position in the World Bank.

\*\*Effective 1 October 1981.

## HEADQUARTERS AND OTHER OFFICES

## HEADQUARTERS

International Finance Corporation  
1818 H Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20433, United States  
Cable address: CORINTFIN  
WASHINGTON DC  
Telephone: (202) 477-1234  
Telex: ITT 440098, RCA 248423, WU 64145

## NEW YORK OFFICE

International Finance Corporation  
747 Third Avenue, 26th floor  
New York, N. Y. 10017, United States  
Cable address: CORINTFIN NEWYORK  
Telephone: (212) 754-6008

## LONDON OFFICE

International Finance Corporation  
New Zealand House, 15th floor, Haymarket  
London SW1 Y4TE, England  
Cable address: CORINTFIN LONDON  
Telephone: (01) 930-8741  
Telex: 919462

## EUROPEAN OFFICE

International Finance Corporation  
66 Avenue d'Iéna  
75116 Paris, France  
Cable address: CORINTFIN PARIS  
Telephone: (1) 723-54-21  
Telex: 620628

## TOKYO OFFICE

International Finance Corporation  
5-1 Nibancho, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo 102, Japan  
Cable address: SPCORINTFIN TOKYO  
Telephone: (03) 261-3626  
Telex: 26554

## REGIONAL MISSION IN EAST ASIA

World Bank Group  
Central Bank of the Philippines  
Manila, Philippines  
Cable address: CORINTFIN MANILA  
Telephone: 58-93-12  
Telex: 40541

## REGIONAL MISSION IN EASTERN AFRICA

International Finance Corporation  
Reinsurance Plaza, Talfa Road  
(P. O. Box 30577)  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Cable address: CORINTFIN NAIROBI  
Telephone: 24726  
Telex: 22022

## REGIONAL MISSION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

International Finance Corporation  
3 Elbergas Street, Garden City  
Cairo, Egypt  
Cable address: IFCAI CAIRO  
Telephone: 982914  
Telex: 93110

## REGIONAL MISSION IN WESTERN AFRICA

International Finance Corporation  
Immeuble Alpha 2000, Rue Gourgass  
Abidjan, Ivory Coast  
Cable address: CORINTFIN ABIDJAN  
Telephone: 32-65-97  
Telex: 969-3533

## Chapter VIII

## International Development Association (IDA)

Established in 1960 as an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), the International Development Association (IDA), promotes economic development by supporting productive, high-priority projects in developing member countries.

The Association lends for the same purposes

as the World Bank, using the same staff and appraisal criteria, but its capital and assets are entirely separate from those of the Bank.

The Bank obtains the larger part of its funds, called credits to distinguish them from Bank loans, in the capital markets and lends on roughly conventional terms. The bulk of the resources

of IDA are contributed by member Governments, enabling it to lend to the poorest countries on more flexible terms that bear less heavily on their balance of payments.

In general, a country eligible to receive IDA credits must have an annual per capita gross national product of less than \$681; in the fiscal year ending on 30 June 1981 over 70 countries were eligible under this criterion.

The Association's credits are interest-free, with a service charge of 0.75 per cent on disbursed and outstanding credit balances. The credits are repayable over 50 years, with an initial grace period of 10 years before repayment begins.

Unlike the Bank, which may lend to public and private entities with Government guarantees, IDA lends only to Governments. In the case of revenue-producing projects, IDA credits are lent by the Governments on terms reflecting the local cost of capital. Thus, IDA terms help Governments to finance economic development without distorting the local credit structure.

At the end of fiscal 1981, IDA's resources totalled the equivalent of \$22,331 million.

The bulk of IDA funds for lending is provided by its Part I (richer) member countries and several Part II (developing) countries under a series of replenishment agreements. As at the end of fiscal 1981, however, the agreement on the sixth replenishment of IDA, covering fiscal years 1981-1983 and providing the equivalent of \$12,000 million in funding, had not yet become

effective. Pending effectiveness of the agreement, IDA made credit commitments against advance contributions amounting to some 1,837 million special drawing rights (\$2,409 million) provided by 22 countries.

Membership of IDA rose to 128 during the year, with the admission of Bhutan and Vanuatu on 28 September and the United Arab Emirates on 23 December.

### Lending operations

By 30 June 1981, IDA had made cumulative net commitments totalling \$24,051 million. Commitments in fiscal year 1981 amounted to \$3,482.1 million, of which \$2,101.2 million went to six countries in South Asia and \$570.1 million to 13 countries in East Africa. India, with 11 credits amounting to \$1,281 million, was the largest borrower from IDA during the year, followed by Bangladesh with 8 credits of \$334 million.

The table below summarizes IDA lending in fiscal year 1981 by area and by purpose.

### Agriculture and rural development

As in previous years, credits for agriculture and rural development accounted for the largest portion of IDA lending in fiscal 1981. Forty-seven credits totalling the equivalent of \$1,357 million were committed in 27 countries.

Of credits totalling \$490 million made to India, one of \$140 million was to increase food

(continued on p. 1442)

IDA CREDITS APPROVED BY REGION/COUNTRY AND PURPOSE  
(including IDA share of joint Bank/IDA operations; in millions of US dollars)

REGION/COUNTRY	Agriculture and rural development	Development finance companies	Education	Energy	Industry	Non-project	Small-scale enterprises	Technical assistance	Telecommunications	Transportation	Urbanization	Water supply and sewerage	Total
<b>Eastern Africa</b>													
Burundi	19.3	—	—	—	4.0	—	—	—	7.7	25.0	—	—	56.0
Ethiopia	40.0	—	35.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	75.0
Kenya	10.0	—	40.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	50.0
Lesotho	—	—	10.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.0
Madagascar	33.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.5	—	—	—	—	45.3
Malawi	—	—	41.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	33.0	—	—	74.0
Rwanda	15.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.5	—	—	—	22.5
Somalia	—	—	10.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.2
Sudan	67.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.0	—	—	—	—	73.0
Uganda	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8.0	—	—	—	9.0	17.0
United Republic of Tanzania	6.8	—	25.0	—	—	50.0	—	11.0	—	—	—	—	92.8
Zaire	26.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	2.9	—	—	—	—	29.3
Zimbabwe	—	—	—	—	—	15.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>218.3</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>161.2</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>65.0</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>39.4</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>570.1</b>

REGION/COUNTRY	Agriculture and rural development	Development finance companies	Education	Energy	Industry	Non-project	Small-scale enterprises	Technical assistance	Telecommunications	Transportation	Urbanization	Water supply and sewerage	Total
Western Africa													
Benin	20.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.3	—	5.0	43.3
Central African Republic	—	—	0.9	—	—	—	—	4.0	—	4.5	—	—	9.4
Ghana	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29.0	—	—	29.0
Guinea	17.5	—	—	28.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	46.0
Guinea-Bissau	—	—	—	6.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.8
Liberia	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.0	—	—	—	—	—	4.0
Mali	—	—	—	3.7	—	—	—	—	—	17.0	—	—	20.7
Mauritania	15.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.0
Niger	—	—	21.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.5
Senegal	9.3	—	—	—	—	30.0	2.5	5.3	—	—	—	—	47.1
Sierra Leone	20.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.0	—	—	30.5
Togo	—	—	—	—	5.7	—	—	—	—	20.0	—	—	25.7
United Republic of Cameroon	12.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.0	—	—	—	—	22.5
Upper Volta	16.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	46.0	—	—	62.0
Subtotal	110.8	—	22.4	39.0	5.7	30.0	6.5	19.3	—	144.8	—	5.0	383.5
East Asia and Pacific													
China	—	—	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	100.0
Papua New Guinea	15.0	—	12.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	27.0
Samoa	2.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2.0
Solomon Islands	—	1.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.5
Subtotal	17.0	1.5	112.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	130.5
South Asia													
Bangladesh	58.0	50.0	—	85.0	—	65.0	35.0	16.0	—	25.0	—	—	334.0
Burma	55.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	55.0
India	490.0	—	—	—	400.0	—	—	—	314.0	35.0	42.0	—	1,281.0
Nepal	35.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	27.0	62.2
Pakistan	97.0	—	25.0	—	—	50.0	30.0	—	—	—	—	—	202.0
Sri Lanka	153.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.5	—	—	167.0
Subtotal	888.7	50.0	25.0	85.0	400.0	115.0	65.0	16.0	314.0	73.5	42.0	27.0	2,101.2
Europe, the Middle East and North Africa													
Democratic Yemen	8.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.5	—	3.5	24.0
Egypt	94.0	—	40.1	—	—	—	—	6.9	—	—	—	56.6	197.6
Yemen	17.0	12.0	—	12.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	41.0
Subtotal	119.0	12.0	40.1	12.0	—	—	—	6.9	—	12.5	—	60.1	262.6
Latin America and the Caribbean													
Guyana	—	—	—	—	—	8.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	8.0
Haiti	3.2	7.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.0	—	—	21.2
Nicaragua	—	—	—	—	—	5.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.0
Subtotal	3.2	7.0	—	—	—	13.0	—	—	—	11.0	—	—	34.2
Total	1,357.0	70.5	360.7	136.0	409.7	223.0	71.5	81.6	329.2	299.8	42.0	101.1	3,482.1
NUMBER OF LOANS	47	4	12	5	3	7	4	10	3	15	1	5	116.0

grain production and raise living standards of farmers in Madhya Pradesh state.

To benefit 4,000 low-income farm families in West Nubariya, Egypt received \$94 million, of which \$80 million was for desert reclamation, including irrigation and drainage, economic and social infrastructure, farm machinery, consultant services and training.

Other purposes for which credits were committed included: agricultural credit, irrigation and drainage, area development, agroindustry, forestry, fisheries, livestock, perennial crops, and research and extension.

#### Development finance companies

Of four credits totalling \$70.5 million granted in fiscal 1981, \$50 million went to Bangladesh for industrial projects and to expand private industrial investment. The Solomon Islands received \$1.5 million for projects in agriculture, manufacturing and transport. Haiti's \$7 million was to finance industrial projects, as was the \$12 million allotted to Yemen.

#### Education

Credits totalling \$360.7 million were granted during fiscal 1981 for educational projects in 12 countries.

China received \$100 million, in addition to a \$100 million World Bank loan, for the initial phase of a programme to strengthen higher education and research activities in science and engineering. A \$10 million credit to Lesotho was for the construction of 150 primary-school classrooms and 1.9 million textbooks and workbooks.

Other loans went for: vocational, agricultural and handicrafts training centres; primary education; veterinary, school management, teacher, agricultural and industrial training; educational materials; and school buildings.

#### Energy

Five countries received credits totalling \$136 million for energy-related projects. Bangladesh received \$85 million to reduce its dependence on imported oil over a three-year period through replacement of liquid hydrocarbons with indigenous natural gas. A \$28.5 million credit was made to Guinea to finance part of a programme to rehabilitate and expand power facilities in and around Conakry and to strengthen management and operations of the Société Nationale d'Electricité. In other countries credits were allotted for: electrification programmes; evaluation of hydrocarbon potential, and petroleum and mineral research and exploration.

#### Industry

Three credits totalling \$409.7 million were made for industrial development during fiscal

1981. India received \$400 million for the construction of a fertilizer plant in Gujarat state that will produce 2,700 tons of ammonia and 4,400 tons of urea a day thereby reducing fertilizer imports. Togo received \$5.7 million for a phosphate fertilizer feasibility study and Burundi, \$4 million to analyse development of nickel deposits.

#### Non-project

In the non-project sector, seven credits totalling \$223 million were made during the fiscal year. To help meet fertilizer demand, a \$50 million credit was made to Pakistan to finance fertilizer imports and improve fertilizer production. Loans to other countries were for funds to cover cost of essential imports to improve agricultural production, the industrial sector and identify high-priority investment areas.

#### Small-scale enterprises

A total of \$71.5 million was granted to four countries for small-scale enterprises.

Bangladesh received \$35 million to increase productivity, employment and cottage industry exports. Pakistan's \$30 million was to refinance commercial bank subloans for development of small-scale industries and to provide extension services to woodworking and leather goods enterprises, to promote export of handicrafts and to initiate project development in Baluchistan. In addition to \$6.5 million from the World Bank, \$2.5 million was provided by IDA to Senegal for investments in industrial, fisheries and tourism projects and to improve small- and medium-scale enterprises—a purpose for which Liberia also received \$4 million.

#### Technical assistance

Of ten credits totalling \$81.6 million \$10 million was granted to the United Republic of Cameroon to improve the organization and operation of current systems of national planning and external debt management. An \$11.5 million credit was made to Madagascar to establish an instructional programme to provide professional accountants and auditors, industrial management consulting and audit services, and to create a legislative framework.

#### Telecommunications

Three credits totalling \$329.2 million were made for telecommunications projects during fiscal 1981. To benefit 40 million people without access to public telephones, India received \$314 million for additional direct-exchange lines, public call offices, telex facilities and related equipment, and upgrading production facilities of telecommunications equipment. Burundi received \$7.7 million to improve long-distance

transmission networks and extend coverage by installation of public call boxes. Rwanda's \$7.5 million was for expansion of the urban cable network.

#### Transportation

Fifteen credits totalling \$299.8 million were made for transportation projects in 14 countries during fiscal 1981. Upper Volta received \$46 million to rehabilitate and maintain 6,000 kilometres of paved and gravel roads and construct 1,640 kilometres of feeder roads for better access to rural areas. Democratic Yemen received \$12.5 million for a 92-kilometre road to improve access to three towns in the isolated Shabwah governorate. Credits approved for other countries went to improve highways, transportation, ports and waterways, airlines and airports, and railways.

#### Urbanization

The only credit in the urbanization sector (\$42 million) was given to India for a Madras project that included development of 15,000 residential and 200 industrial plots, provision of basic infrastructure and land tenure to 50,000 slum households, home improvement loans and grants to 80,000 slum households, the procurement of 550 buses, road construction and maintenance, and improvement of solid waste management.

#### Water supply and sewerage

Of five credits totalling \$101.1 million made for water supply and sewerage projects, Egypt received a \$56.6 million credit for expansion and rehabilitation of water-supply facilities in Beheira to improve water supplies for the current two million consumers and to provide safe drinking water for another 800,000.

#### Secretariat

The principal officers, staff, headquarters and other offices of IDA are the same as those of the World Bank.

#### STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSES (for fiscal year ending 30 June 1981)

	Amount (in thousands of US dollars)
Income	
From development credits	90,144
From investments	16,343
Miscellaneous income	1
Exchange adjustments	(937)
Total income	105,551
Expenses	
Management fee to World Bank	180,092
Operating loss (income less expenses)	(74,541)
Translation adjustments as a result of currency fluctuations	11,531
Net loss	(63,010)

#### Annex I. MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, SUBSCRIPTIONS, VOTING POWER AND SUPPLEMENTARY RESOURCES (As at 30 June 1981)

TOTAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTARY RESOURCES (in thousands of US dollars)					TOTAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTARY RESOURCES (in thousands of US dollars)				
		VOTING POWER					VOTING POWER		
MEMBER	Amount (in current US dollars)*	Percent- age of total	Number of votes	Percent- age of total	MEMBER	Amount (in current US dollars)*	Percent- age of total	Number of votes	Percent- age of total
Part I countries					Part II countries				
Australia	446,922	2.13	52,652	1.46	Afghanistan	1,271	0.01	10,084	0.28
Austria	130,317	0.62	21,822	0.61	Algeria	5,026	0.02	18,481	0.51
Belgium	300,976	1.44	42,397	1.18	Argentina	30,631	0.15	59,655	1.66
Canada	1,157,522	5.52	137,025	3.80	Bangladesh	6,619	0.03	22,239	0.62
Denmark	243,837	1.16	34,353	0.95	Benin	578		600	0.02
Finland	107,059	0.51	18,404	0.51	Bolivia	1,318	0.01	10,230	0.26
France	1,131,457	5.40	138,669	3.85	Botswana	199		7,747	0.22
Germany, Federal Republic of	2,469,183	11.78	236,831	6.57	Brazil	23,404	0.11	59,655	1.66
Iceland	1,892	0.01	7,802	0.22	Burma	2,507	0.01	12,922	0.36
Ireland	26,924	0.13	10,393	0.29	Burundi	949	**	9,407	0.26
Italy	583,472	2.78	91,861	2.55	Cape Verde	92		516	0.01
Japan	2,521,393	12.03	201,476	5.59	Central African Republic	614	**	6,685	0.19
Kuwait	328,889	1.57	37,613	1.04	Chad	601	**	2,093	0.06
Luxembourg	10,964	0.05	8,363	0.23	Chile	4,266	0.02	17,113	0.48
Netherlands	617,097	2.95	70,182	1.95	China	37,669	0.18	91,311	2.53
New Zealand	24,152	0.12	10,413	0.29	Colombia	4,438	0.02	17,132	0.48
Norway	221,933	1.06	30,464	0.85	Comoros	96	**	5,774	0.16
South Africa	42,092	0.20	12,445	0.35	Congo	614	**	6,685	0.19
Sweden	763,316	3.64	93,315	2.59	Costa Rica	247	**	7,844	0.22
United Kingdom	2,556,846	12.20	263,576	7.32	Cyprus	946	**	9,407	0.26
United States	6,405,109	30.56	769,139	21.35	Democratic Kampuchea	1,231	0.01	7,826	0.22
Subtotal	20,091,352	95.86	2,289,195	63.53	Democratic Yemen	1,480	0.01	10,591	0.29

TOTAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTARY RESOURCES (in thousands of US dollars)					TOTAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTARY RESOURCES (in thousands of US dollars)				
VOTING POWER					VOTING POWER				
MEMBER	Amount fin current US dollars)*	Percent- age of total	Number of votes	Percent- age of total	MEMBER	Amount (in current US dollars)*	Percent- age of total	Number of votes	Percent- age of total
Part II countries (cont.)					Part II countries (cont.)				
Djibouti	187	**	532	0.01	Nigeria	4,059	0.02	4,057	0.11
Dominica	93	**	516	0.01	Oman	395		6,244	0.17
Dominican Republic	570	**	8,426	0.23	Pakistan	12,760	0.06	35,355	0.98
Ecuador	877	**	2,200	0.06	Panama	26		5,657	0.16
Egypt	6,248	0.03	21,403	0.59	Papua New Guinea	1,081	0.01	9,698	0.27
El Salvador	394	**	6,244	0.17	Paraguay	375		8,124	0.23
Equatorial Guinea	384	**	1,967	0.05	Peru	2,046	0.01	854	0.02
Ethiopia	649	**	8,691	0.24	Philippines	6,376	0.03	16,583	0.46
Fiji	672	**	2,130	0.06	Republic of Korea	2,884	0.01	10,932	0.30
Gabon	602	**	2,093	0.06	Rwanda	949	0.01	9,407	0.26
Gambia	333		8,044	0.22	Samoa	111		7,537	0.21
Ghana	2,868	0.01	10,711	0.30	Sao Tome and Principe	81	**	514	0.01
Greece	3,201	0.02	14,288	0.40	Saudi Arabia	476,078	2.27	46,843	1.30
Grenada	112	**	7,537	0.21	Senegal	2,086	0.01	11,960	0.33
Guatemala	501		8,417	0.23	Sierra Leone	942	**	9,407	0.26
Guinea	1,262	0.01	10,084	0.28	Solomon Islands	105	**	518	0.01
Guinea-Bissau	162		528	0.01	Somalia	941	**	7,246	0.20
Guyana	1,005	0.01	9,553	0.27	Spain	41,064	0.20	40,084	1.11
Haiti	953	0.01	9,407	0.26	Sri Lanka	3,695	0.02	15,705	0.44
Honduras	378		8,124	0.23	Sudan	1,256	0.01	10,084	0.28
India	51,467	0.02	119,375	3.31	Swaziland	398		8,193	0.23
Indonesia	13,711	0.07	38,128	1.06	Syria" Arab Republic	1,175	0.01	7,651	0.21
Iran	5,832	0.03	15,455	0.43	Thailand	3,790	0.02	15,705	0.44
Iraq	953	0.01	9,407	0.26	Togo	934		7,246	0.20
Israel	2,398	0.01	9,386	0.26	Trinidad and Tobago	1,561	0.01	770	0.02
Ivory coast	1,240	0.01	7,771	0.22	Tunisia	1,814	0.01	2,793	0.08
Jordan	385		6,242	0.17	Turkey	7,090	0.03	23,450	0.65
Kenya	2,094	0.01	11,960	0.33	Uganda	2,100	0.01	11,960	0.33
Lao People's Democratic Republic	603	**	8,688	0.24	United Arab Emirates***	-	-	-	-
Lebanon	555	**	8,562	0.24	United Republic of Cameroon	1,242	0.01	7,771	0.22
Lesotho	199	**	7,747	0.22	United Republic of Tanzania	2,095	0.01	11,960	0.33
Liberia	953	0.01	9,407	0.26	Upper Volta	614	**	6,685	0.19
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	1,249	0.01	7,771	0.22	Viet Nam	1,839	0.01	8,889	0.25
Madagascar	1,168	0.01	702	0.02	Yemen	539		8,494	0.24
Malawi	950	0.01	9,407	0.26	Yugoslavia	21,799	0.10	20,711	0.57
Malaysia	3,160	0.02	14,288	0.40	Zaire	3,637	0.02	12,164	0.34
Maldives	38		7,382	0.20	Zambia	3,110	0.01	1,038	0.03
Mali	1,068	0.01	7,479	0.21	Zimbabwe	4,812	0.02	1,324	0.04
Mauritania	617	**	6,685	0.19					
Mauritius	1,099	**	9,702	0.27	Subtotal	868,250	4.14	1,313,912	36.47
Mexico	10,389	0.05	9,253	0.26	Total	20,959,602	100.00	3,603,107	100.00
Morocco	4,384	0.02	17,113	0.48					
Nepal	625	**	8,688	0.24					
Nicaragua	390	**	8,124	0.23					
Niger	615	**	6,685	0.19					

\*Includes amounts aggregating \$369, 173,000 equivalent in current United States dollars receivable from members, of which at 30 June 1981 \$122,305,000 equivalent was past due and \$246,868,000 equivalent was not yet due.

\*\*Less than 0.005 per cent.

\*\*\*The equivalent of \$5,582,000 in current United States dollars was received from the United Arab Emirates on account of its subscription pending completion of membership formalities.

## Annex II. EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS AND ALTERNATES OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION (As at 30 June 1981)

Appointed Director	Appointed Alternate	Casting the vote of
Vacant	vacant	United States
John Anson	Derek F. Smith	United Kingdom
Eberhard Kurth	Norbert Schmidt-Gerritzen	Germany, Federal Republic of
Paul Mentré de Loye	Marthe Parent*	France
Seiji Morioka	Kimiaki Nakajima	Japan

Elected Director	Elected Alternate	Casting the votes of
Said E. El-Naggar (Egypt)	Saleh A. Al-Hegelan (Saudi Arabia)	Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Maldives, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen
Earl G. Drake (Canada)	Reno J. Brown (Bahamas)	Canada, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Ireland
H. N. Ray (India)	M. Syeduz-Zaman (Bangladesh)	Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka
Giorgio Ragazzi (Italy)	Rodrigo M. Guimarães (Portugal)	Greece, Italy
Anthony IJ. A. Looijen (Netherlands)	Miodrag M. Stojiljkovic (Yugoslavia)	Cyprus, Israel, Netherlands, Yugoslavia
Jacques de Groote (Belgium)	Turan Kivanc (Turkey)	Austria, Belgium, Luxembourg, Turkey
Joaquin Muns (Spain)	Roberto Mayorga-Cortés (Nicaragua)	Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Spain
Wang Liansheng (China)	Chen Hui (China)	China
Hans Lundstrom (Sweden)	Ole L. Poulsen (Denmark)	Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden
Zain Azraal (Malaysia)	Aung Pe (Burma)	Burma, Fiji, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Nepal, Thailand, Viet Nam
S. A. McLeod (New Zealand)	Anthony S. Cole (Australia)	Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Solomon Islands
Y. S. M. Abdulai (Nigeria)	William Smith (Liberia)	Botswana, Burundi, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe
Jaime Garcia-Parra (Colombia)	Jose G. Cárdenas (Ecuador)	Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Haiti, Philippines
Armand Razafindrabé (Madagascar)	Nicéphore Sogio (Benin)	Benin, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Somalia, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Zaire
David Blanco (Bolivia)	Alberto Sola (Argentina)	Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, Peru
Ismail Khelil (Tunisia)	Saad Zerhouni (Algeria)	Afghanistan, Algeria, Democratic Yemen, Ghana, Iran, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Oman, Tunisia

NOTE: Democratic Kampuchea and South Africa did not participate in the 1980 regular election of Executive Directors. Bhutan, United Arab Emirates and Vanuatu became members after that election.

\*Resigned effective 31 July; succeeded by Robert Hudry.

### Annex III. PRINCIPAL OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION (As at 1 July 1981)

#### PRINCIPAL OFFICERS

President: A. W. Clausen.  
 Senior Vice-President, Finance: Moeen A. Qureshi.  
 Senior Vice-President, Operations: Ernest Stern.  
 Regional Vice-President, Latin America and the Caribbean: Nicolás Ardito Barletta.  
 Vice-President, Projects Staff: Warren C. Baum.  
 Vice-President, External Relations: Munir P. Benjenk.  
 Regional Vice-President, Europe, Middle East and North Africa: Roger Chaufournier.  
 Vice-President, Development Policy: Hollis B. Chenery.  
 Vice-President, Programming and Budgeting, and Vice-President, Pen-  
 sion Fund: K. Georg Gabriel.

Vice-President and General Counsel: Heribert Golsong.  
 Vice-President and Controller: Masaya Hattori.  
 Regional Vice-President, South Asia: W. David Hopper.  
 Regional Vice-President, East Asia and Pacific: S. Shahid Husain.  
 Regional Vice-President, Western Africa: A. David Knox.  
 Vice-President, Administration, Organization, Personnel Management:  
 Martijn J. W. M. Pajmans.  
 Vice-President and Treasurer: Eugene H. Rotberg.  
 Vice-President and Secretary: Timothy T. Thahane.  
 Regional Vice-President, Eastern Africa: Willi A. Wapenhans.  
 Director-General, Operations Evaluation: Mervyn L. Weiner.

\*The World Bank and IDA had the same Officers and staff.

#### HEADQUARTERS AND OTHER OFFICES

HEADQUARTERS  
 International Development Association  
 1818 H Street, N. W.  
 Washington, D. C. 20433, United States  
 Cable address: INDEVAS WASHINGTONDC  
 Telephone: (202) 477-1234  
 Telex: RCA 248423 INDEVAS.  
 WUI 64145 INDEVAS

GENEVA OFFICE  
 International Development Association  
 ITC Building  
 54 Rue de Montbrillant  
 (P. O. Box 104)  
 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland  
 Telephone: 33 21 20  
 Telex: 28883

EUROPEAN OFFICE  
 International Development Association  
 66 Avenue d'Iéna  
 75116 Paris, France  
 Cable address: INDEVAS PARIS  
 Telephone: 723-54-21  
 Telex: 620628

## NEW YORK OFFICE

International Development Association  
747 Third Avenue, 26th floor  
New York, N.Y. 10017, United States  
Cable address: INDEVAS NEWYORK  
Telephone: (212) 754-6008

## LONDON OFFICE

International Development Association  
New Zealand House, 15th floor, Haymarket  
London SW1 Y4TE England  
Cable address: INDEVAS LONDON  
Telephone: (01) 930-8511  
Telex: 919462

## TOKYO OFFICE

International Development Association  
Kokusai Building, Room 916  
1-1 Marunouchi 3-chome, Chivoda-ku  
Tokyo 100, Japan  
Cable address: INDEVAS TOKYO  
Telephone: (03) 214-5001, 214-5001,5002  
Telex: 26838

## REGIONAL MISSION IN EASTERN AFRICA

International Development Association  
Reinsurance Plaza, 5th 6th Floor  
Talfa Road  
(P. O. Box 30577)  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Cable address: INDEVAS NAIROBI  
Telephone: 24391  
Telex: 22022

## REGIONAL MISSION IN THAILAND

International Development Association  
Udom Vidhya Building, 956 Rama IV Road  
Sala Daeng  
Bangkok 5, Thailand  
Cable address: INDEVAS BANGKOK  
Telephone: 235-5300-7  
Telex: 82817

## REGIONAL MISSION IN WESTERN AFRICA

International Development Association  
Immeuble Shell, 64 Avenue Lamblin  
(Boite Postale 1850)  
Abidjan 01, Ivory Coast  
Cable address: INDEVAS ABIDJAN  
Telephone: 32-24-01, 32-42-40  
Telex: 3533

## Chapter IX

## International Monetary Fund (IMF)

The financial activity of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) reached a new peak in 1981 in terms of the number of arrangements with members involving high conditionality in the use of Fund resources, the total amount of resources committed under existing arrangements, and the magnitude of actual purchases. In addition, the Fund took a number of major decisions to make special drawing rights (SDRs) the principal reserve asset in the international monetary system. With effect from 1 January 1981, the valuation "basket" of the SDR—the unit of account of IMF—was reduced from 16 international currencies to five. The Fund also adopted guidelines on multiple currency practices and on enlarged access to Fund resources, and decided to assist members encountering balance-of-payments difficulties owing to excessive cost of their cereal imports.

New loan commitments approved under stand-by and extended arrangements in 1981 amounted to an unprecedented SDR 15.2 billion—more than twice the previous high of SDR 7 billion attained in 1980, all for non-oil developing countries. Members' purchases (drawings) from the Fund in 1981 reached a record high of SDR 7.1 billion (excluding reserve tranche purchases), all drawn by non-oil developing countries. Repurchases of SDR 2.1 billion in 1981, less than in any of the four previous years, yielded net purchases of SDR 5 billion—a new record and the second year in which purchases exceeded repurchases after three consecutive years of net repurchases. This increased financial activity over previous years reflected the large and widespread payments imbalances of IMF members and the Fund's policy of enlarged access under its stand-by and extended arrangements.

The Fund's regular resources, consisting pri-

marily of quota subscriptions by members, rose from SDR 39 billion to SDR 60 billion, as a result of the coming into effect in November 1980 of the quota increase proposed under the Seventh General Review of Quotas, initiated in 1976. Preliminary work began on the Eighth General Review, to be completed by December 1983, with special attention being paid to the overall size of the Fund and selective adjustments in members' quotas so as to reflect in the quota structure the developments in members' positions in the world economy, world economic conditions and the Fund's liquidity.

Substantial borrowings, required to supplement the Fund's regular resources, were forecast at SDR 6 to 7 billion a year for the next three years. These borrowings would enable the Fund to play a suitable role in recycling increases in reserves, concentrated among a small number of members.

In 1981, IMF concluded arrangements with the Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency (SAMA) to enable it to borrow up to SDR 4 billion in each of the next two years. In addition, the Fund made arrangements for short-term financing of SDR 1.3 billion from the central banks of 16 industrial countries with one-half available under a borrowing agreement with the Bank of International Settlements (BIS) and the remainder under direct bilateral arrangements with four central banks.

In anticipation of the full commitment of resources from the supplementary financing facility, the Executive Board adopted in March a policy of enlarged access to the Fund's resources, to be used until the Eighth General Review of Quotas became effective. The policy became operative with the completion of borrowing agreements with SAMA, BIS and the central



banks. It was expected to help provide supplementary financing in conjunction with the use of the Fund's ordinary resources to members facing payments imbalances large in relation to their quotas.

Like its predecessor, the supplementary financing facility, the enlarged access policy was intended to support economic programmes under stand-by arrangements reaching into the upper credit tranches or under extended arrangements. Such drawings were subject to relevant Fund policies, including those on conditionality, phasing and performance criteria, and the period of arrangement was normally to exceed one year and could extend up to three years in exceptional cases. While the amount of assistance under the policy was determined according to guidelines adopted by the Fund from time to time, current guidelines specified limits of 150 per cent of quota annually or 450 per cent over a three-year period; at the same time, a limit of 600 per cent of quota, net of scheduled repurchases, applied to the cumulative use of Fund resources. These limits, however, excluded drawings under the compensatory and buffer stock financing facilities as well as outstanding drawings under the oil facility, whose operations concluded in 1976.

The Fund entered into borrowing agreements with various members or institutions within their territories, as well as with BIS and the Swiss National Bank, under which they agreed to make resources available to the Fund to finance purchases by members under the Fund's policy of enlarged access.

Ten members or institutions within their territories had adhered to the General Arrangement to Borrow (GAB), under which the Fund could borrow their currencies up to specified amounts when supplementary resources were needed to forestall or cope with an impairment of the international monetary system. Any calls made by the Fund under GAB, which first became effective on 24 October 1962 and were renewed until 23 October 1985, were repayable within five years, with 4 per cent annual interest rate.

The Fund's Executive Board took a number of major decisions during the year to enhance further the role of SDRs as an international reserve asset. With effect from 1 January 1981, the SDR valuation basket was reduced from 16 currencies to five (the United States dollar, the deutsche mark, the French franc, the Japanese yen and pound sterling), and unified with the basket used to determine the interest rate on SDRs. The SDR interest rate was raised from 80 per cent to 100 per cent of the combined market interest rate, effective as of 1 May. The reconstitution requirement whereby each member was

obliged to maintain over time a minimum average holding of 15 per cent of its net cumulative SDR allocation was abrogated with effect from 30 April.

By agreement between participants, SDRs became freely transferable in transactions and operations that included SDR purchases and sales, loans, donations (grants), swaps and SDR pledges. The first use of SDRs in loans and in settlement of financial obligations took place during the year. The unit was also increasingly accepted for private-contract use as well as by other international and interregional organizations.

The third and final allocation of SDRs (SDR 4,053 million) in the third basic period (1 January 1978-31 December 1981) was made as of 1 January 1981 to all Fund members, bringing total SDR allocations to 21.4 billion. Four more institutions were prescribed as "other holders" of SDRs, and the first transactions and operations in SDRs involving "other holders" took place in 1981.

The Fund's Executive Board also decided in 1981, after a comprehensive review, to simplify the structure of the Fund's charges by introducing a single charge rate of 6.25 per cent on members' use of the Fund's ordinary resources, together with provision for periodic reviews of the Fund's income position. While the level of charges had been raised somewhat, charges for the use of ordinary resources still contained an important element of concessionality. Charges on Fund assistance financed with borrowed resources, however, would reflect the cost of borrowed funds.

In May, the Executive Board adopted a decision aimed at assisting members with balance-of-payments difficulties due to excess in their cereal import cost for factors beyond their control. This assistance was to be integrated with that already available under the compensatory financing facility for shortfalls in export earnings, with an overall purchase limit of 125 per cent of quota. The integrated facility, while available to all Fund members, was expected to be particularly beneficial to low-income countries.

Under other Executive Board decisions, effective 1 May, Fund members using the credit tranches or the extended Fund facility now had the option either to use or retain a reserve tranche position, thus gaining greater flexibility in timing the use of their reserve tranche position. In conjunction with the raising of the rate of remuneration on Fund creditor positions from 72 per cent to 85 per cent of the combined market interest rate, the decisions also improved the attractiveness of the reserve tranche position for members.

Membership of the Fund rose to 143 in 1981, with the admission on 28 September of Bhutan and Vanuatu.

#### Supplementary financing facility

The supplementary financing facility, for which financing was provided by 14 lenders for a total of SDR 7.8 billion (see table below), enabled the Fund to provide supplementary financing under stand-by and extended arrangements, in conjunction with the use of the Fund's ordinary resources.

The borrowed resources available under the facility were fully committed by 30 March, except that resources could become available again in the event of cancellation of an arrangement involving supplementary financing, and were, in principle, to be made from borrowing by the Fund under the new policy of enlarged access.

In accordance with the loan agreements, supplementary financing facility funds could not be committed after 22 February 1982. However, the Fund decided that, in the period up to that date, supplementary financing released under a cancelled arrangement by a member would be committed if another arrangement that replaced that arrangement was entered into by the same member.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY FINANCING FACILITY BORROWING

(amounts agreed as at 31 December 1981,  
in millions of SDRs)

World	7,784
Industrial countries	4,550
Austria	50
Belgium	150
Canada	200
Germany, Federal Republic of	1,050
Japan	900
Netherlands	100
Switzerland	650
United States	1,450
Oil-exporting countries	3,204
Kuwait	400
Nigeria	220
Saudi Arabia	1,934
United Arab Emirates	150
Venezuela	500
Non-oil-exporting developing countries	30
Guatemala	30

#### Stand-by and extended arrangements

At the end of 1981 the Fund had 24 stand-by and 15 extended arrangements in effect with members (all but three under highly conditional facilities) totalling SDR 17.9 billion agreed under ordinary, supplementary financing and enlarged access resources, with an undrawn balance of SDR 13.1 billion.

#### STAND-BY AND EXTENDED FACILITY ARRANGEMENTS

(as at 31 December 1981, in millions of SDRs)

Member	Stand-by		Extended fund facility	
	Amount agreed	Amount agreed	Amount purchased	Undrawn balance
Bangladesh	-	800.00	220.00	580.00
Burma	27.00	-	-	-
Costa Rica	-	276.75	22.50	254.25
Dominica	-	8.55	2.85	5.70
Ethiopia	67.50	-	-	-
Gabon	-	34.00	-	34.00
Grenada	3.43	-	-	-
Guatemala	19.10	-	-	-
Guyana	-	150.00	51.73	98.27
Honduras	-	47.60	23.90	23.70
India	-	5,000.00	300.00	4,700.00
Ivory coast	-	484.50	176.72	307.78
Jamaica	-	477.70	144.80	332.90
Kenya	241.50	-	-	-
Liberia	55.00	-	-	-
Madagascar	109.00	-	-	-
Malawi	49.88	-	-	-
Mauritania	25.80	-	-	-
Mauritius	30.00	-	-	-
Morocco	-	817.05	136.50	680.55
Pakistan	-	919.00	170.00	749.00
Republic of Korea	576.00	-	-	-
Romania	1,102.50	-	-	-
Samoa	0.01	-	-	-
Senegal	63.00	-	-	-
Sierra Leone	-	186.00	33.50	152.50
Solomon Islands	1.60	-	-	-
Somalia	43.13	-	-	-
Sudan	-	427.00	251.00	176.00
Thailand	814.50	-	-	-
Togo	47.50	-	-	-
Turkey	1,250.00	-	-	-
Uganda	112.50	-	-	-
United Republic of Tanzania	179.60	-	-	-
Uruguay	31.50	-	-	-
Yugoslavia	1,662.00	-	-	-
Zaire	-	912.00	175.00	737.00
Zambia	-	800.00	300.00	500.00
Zimbabwe	37.50	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,549.55</b>	<b>11,340.15</b>	<b>2,008.50</b>	<b>9,331.65</b>

#### DRAWINGS IN 1981

(in millions SDRs)

	Drawings
World	8,927.2*
Industrial countries	
Non-oil developing countries	8,927.2*
Africa	2,325.4*
Central African Republic	17.0
Chad	7.1
Comoros	0.3
Equatorial Guinea	7.2
Ethiopia	78.0
Gambia	9.0
Guinea	1.2
Guinea-Bissau	2.9
Ivory Coast	373.0
Kenya	30.0
Liberia	59.4
Madagascar	39.0
Malawi	30.0
Mauritania	10.3
Mauritius	75.5
Morocco	192.8
Senegal	65.7
Sierra Leone	33.9
Somalia	36.7
Sudan	165.6
Togo	7.3

	Drawings		Currencies drawn <sup>a</sup>	Repurchases by currency of repurchase
Africa (cont.)				
Uganda	162.5			
United Republic of Tanzania	15.9			
Zaire	269.6	Oil-exporting countries (cont.)		
Zambia	598.6	Omanirials	4.0	
Zimbabwe	37.5	Saudi Arabian riyals	872.9	30.8
		United Arab Emirates dirhams	25.4	
		Venezuelan bolivares	197.2	51.5
Asia	4,316.6*			
Bangladesh	106.0	Non-oil developing countries	144.7	108.0*
Burma	41.0			
China	600.0	Africa	4.0	22.2
India	600.0	Botswana pula	4.0	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	6.0	Rwanda francs		1.1
Malaysia	189.8	South African rand		21.1
Pakistan	652.9			
Papua New Guinea	93.8	Asia	24.1	
Philippines	250.0	Singapore dollars	24.1	
Republic of Korea	720.0			
Samoa	2.8	Europe	9.9	
Solomon Islands	1.5	Maltese pounds	9.9	
Sri Lanka	288.5			
Thailand	726.0	Western Hemisphere	106.7*	85.9*
Viet Nam	38.4	Argentine pesos		23.3
Europe	1,525.7	Bahamian dollars		2.2
Romania	345.7	Brazilian cruzeiros	14.0	48.9
Turkey	500.0	Colombian pesos	46.0	2.8
Yugoslavia	680.0	Ecuadorian sucres	3.0	
		Guatemalan quetzales		0.6
		Mexican pesos		6.0
Middle East	45.9*	Paraguayan guaranies	10.8	
Democratic Yemen	9.4	Trinidad and Tobago dollars	21.3	2.2
Israel	25.6	Uruguayan new pesos	1.6	
Yemen	10.8			
Western Hemisphere	713.5	Total	2,424.1	1,017.4
Costa Rica	52.6			
Dominica	6.2			
El Salvador	32.3			
Grenada	5.6			
Guatemala	212.3			
Guyana	16.1			
Haiti	34.0			
Honduras	20.7			
Jamaica	246.4			
Panama	83.3			
Saint Lucia	2.7			
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1.3			

\*Differs from sum of individual figures because of rounding.

CURRENCIES DRAWN AND REPURCHASES BY  
CURRENCY OF REPURCHASE IN 1981  
(in millions of SDRs)

	Currencies drawn	Repurchases by currency of repurchase
World	8,927.2*	2,582.6*
Industrial countries	4,863.5*	1,353.7*
Australian dollars		5.6
Austrian schillings	21.5	10.3
Belgian francs	-	59.5
Canadian dollars	-	112.0
Danish kroner	-	7.6
Deutsche marks	241.0	335.5
French francs	30.0	0.4
Irish pounds		2.1
Italian lire	-	15.0
Japanese yen	603.1	140.3
Netherlands guilders	48.4	29.0
Norwegian kroner	43.4	4.7
Swedish kronor	-	23.4
United Kingdom pounds sterling	206.0	
United States dollars	3,670.3	608.8
Developing countries		
Oil-exporting countries	1,494.8*	103.7
Algerian dinars	15.0	-
Indonesian rupiahs	47.0	6.5
Kuwaiti dinars	144.9	3.9
Libyan dinars	51.1	-
Nigerian naira	137.4	11.0

\*Differs from sum of individual figures because of rounding.

OUTSTANDING PURCHASES (DRAWINGS)  
(as at 31 December 1981, in millions of SDRs)

Reserve tranche	30
Regular facilities	3,198
Compensatory financing	3,272
Extended fund facility	1,764
Oil facility	935
Supplementary financing facility:	
Under stand-by arrangements	2,617
Under extended arrangements	947
Enlarged access resources:	
Under stand-by arrangements	306
Under extended arrangements	481
Total	13,550

## Publications

Publications issued by IMF in 1981 included the Annual Report, the Annual Report on Exchange Arrangements and Exchange Restrictions, Balance of Payments Statistics (monthly and Yearbook), Government Finance Statistics Yearbook, Direction of Trade Statistics (monthly and Yearbook), International Financial Statistics (monthly, Yearbook and biannual supplement). Periodicals included the quarterlies Staff Papers and Finance Development (published jointly with the World Bank), the IMF Survey (published 23 times a year) and IMF Memorandum. Also published were explanatory pamphlets on the working of the Fund.

## Secretariat

As at 31 January 1982 the total of full-time staff of IMF under permanent, fixed-term and short-term appointments was 1,623, drawn from 99 nationalities.

Annex I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
MONETARY FUND, QUOTAS AND VOTING POWER  
(As at 31 December 1981)

MEMBER	QUOTA		VOTING POWER		MEMBER	QUOTA		VOTING POWER	
	Amount (in millions of SDRs)	General and SDR Departments percentage of total*	Number of votes**	General and SDR Departments percentage of total		Amount (in millions of SDRs)	General and SDR Departments percentage of total*	Number Of votes**	General and SDR Departments percentage of total
Afghanistan	67.50	0.11	925	0.14	Kenya	103.50	0.17	1,285	0.20
Algeria	427.50	0.70	4,525	0.70	Kuwait	393.30	0.64	4,183	0.65
Argentina	802.50	1.31	8,275	1.28	Lao People's Democratic Republic	24.00	0.04	490	0.06
Australia	1,185.00	1.94	12,100	1.87	Lebanon	27.90	0.05	529	0.06
Austria	495.00	0.81	5,200	0.80	Lesotho	10.50	0.02	355	0.05
Bahamas	49.50	0.08	745	0.12	Liberia	55.50	0.09	805	0.12
Bahrain	30.00	0.05	550	0.08	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	298.40	0.49	3,234	0.50
Bangladesh	228.00	0.37	2,530	0.39	Luxembourg	46.50	0.08	715	0.11
Barbados	25.50	0.04	505	0.08	Madagascar	51.00	0.08	760	0.12
Belgium	1,335.00	2.19	13,600	2.10	Malawi	28.50	0.05	535	0.06
Benin	24.00	0.04	490	0.08	Malaysia	379.50	0.62	4,045	0.63
Bhutan	1.70	0.003	267	0.04	Maldives	1.40	0.002	264	0.04
Bolivia	67.50	0.11	925	0.14	Mali	40.50	0.07	655	0.10
Botswana	13.50	0.02	385	0.06	Malta	30.00	0.05	550	0.08
Brazil	997.50	1.63	10,225	1.58	Mauritania	25.50	0.04	505	0.08
Burma	109.50	0.18	1,345	0.21	Mauritius	40.50	0.07	655	0.10
Burundi	34.50	0.06	595	0.09	Mexico	802.50	1.31	8,275	1.26
Canada	2,035.50	3.33	20,605	3.18	Morocco	225.00	0.37	2,500	0.39
Cape Verde	3.00	0.005	280	0.04	Nepal	28.50	0.05	535	0.06
Central African Republic	24.00	0.04	490	0.08	Netherlands	1,422.00	2.33	14,470	2.24
Chad	24.00	0.04	490	0.08	New Zealand	348.00	0.57	3,730	0.58
Chile	325.50	0.53	3,505	0.54	Nicaragua	51.00	0.08	760	0.12
China	1,800.00	2.95	18,250	2.82	Niger	24.00	0.04	490	0.08
Colombia	289.50	0.47	3,145	0.49	Nigeria	540.00	0.88	5,650	0.87
Comoros	3.50	0.01	285	0.04	Norway	442.50	0.72	4,675	0.72
Congo	25.50	0.04	505	0.08	Oman	30.00	0.05	550	0.08
Costa Rica	61.50	0.10	865	0.13	Pakistan	427.50	0.70	4,525	0.70
Cyprus	51.00	0.08	760	0.12	Panama	67.50	0.11	925	0.14
Democratic Kampuchea	25.00	0.04	500	0.06	Papua New Guinea	45.00	0.07	700	0.11
Democratic Yemen	61.50	0.10	865	0.13	Paraguay	34.50	0.06	595	0.09
Denmark	465.00	0.76	4,900	0.76	Peru	246.00	0.40	2,710	0.42
Djibouti	5.70	0.01	307	0.05	Philippines	315.00	0.52	3,400	0.53
Dominica	2.90	0.005	279	0.04	Portugal	258.00	0.42	2,830	0.44
Dominican Republic	82.50	0.14	1,075	0.17	Qatar	66.20	0.11	912	0.14
Ecuador	105.00	0.17	1,300	0.20	Republic of Korea	255.90	0.42	2,809	0.43
Egypt	342.00	0.56	3,670	0.57	Romania	367.50	0.60	3,925	0.61
El Salvador	64.50	0.11	895	0.14	Rwanda	34.50	0.06	595	0.09
Equatorial Guinea	15.00	0.02	400	0.06	Saint Lucia	5.40	0.01	304	0.05
Ethiopia	54.00	0.09	790	0.12	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	2.60	0.004	276	0.04
Fiji	27.00	0.04	520	0.08	Samoa	4.50	0.01	295	0.05
Finland	393.00	0.64	4,180	0.65	Sao Tome and Principe	3.00	0.005	280	0.04
France	2,878.50	4.71	29,035	4.49	Saudi Arabia	2,100.00	3.44	21,250	3.28
Gabon	45.00	0.07	700	0.11	Senegal	63.00	0.10	880	0.14
Gambia	13.50	0.02	385	0.06	Seychelles	2.00	0.003	270	0.04
Germany, Federal Republic of	3,234.00	5.30	32,590	5.04	Sierra Leone	46.50	0.08	715	0.11
Ghana	159.00	0.26	1,840	0.28	Singapore	92.40	0.15	1,174	0.18
Greece	277.50	0.45	3,025	0.47	Solomon Islands	3.20	0.005	282	0.04
Grenada	4.50	0.01	295	0.05	Somalia	34.50	0.06	595	0.09
Guatemala	76.50	0.13	1,015	0.16	South Africa	636.00	1.04	6,610	1.02
Guinea	45.00	0.07	700	0.11	Spain	835.50	1.37	8,605	1.33
Guinea-Bissau	5.90	0.01	309	0.05	Sri Lanka	178.50	0.29	2,035	0.31
Guyana	37.50	0.06	625	0.10	Sudan	132.00	0.22	1,570	0.24
Haiti	34.50	0.06	595	0.09	Swaziland	37.50	0.06	625	0.10
Honduras	51.00	0.08	760	0.12	Sweden	675.00	1.11	7,000	1.08
Iceland	43.50	0.07	685	0.11	Syrian Arab Republic	94.50	0.15	1,195	0.18
India	1,717.50	2.81	17,425	2.69	Thailand	271.50	0.44	2,965	0.46
Indonesia	720.00	1.18	7,450	1.15	Togo	28.50	0.05	535	0.06
Iran	660.00	1.08	6,850	1.06	Trinidad and Tobago	123.00	0.20	1,480	0.23
Iraq	234.10	0.38	2,591	0.40	Tunisia	94.50	0.15	1,195	0.18
Ireland	232.50	0.38	2,575	0.40	Turkey	300.00	0.49	3,250	0.50
Israel	307.50	0.50	3,325	0.51	Uganda	75.00	0.12	1,000	0.15
Italy	1,860.00	3.05	18,850	2.91					
Ivory Coast	114.00	0.19	1,390	0.21					
Jamaica	111.00	0.18	1,360	0.21					
Japan	2,488.50	4.08	25,135	3.88					
Jordan	45.00	0.07	700	0.11					

QUOTA					VOTING POWER				
MEMBER	Amount (In millions of SDRs)	General and SDR Departments percentage of total*	Number Of votes**	General and SDR Departments percentage of total	MEMBER	Amount (In millions of SDRs)	General and SDR Departments percentage of total*	Number of votes**	General and SDR Departments percentage of total
United Arab Emirates	202.60	0.33	2,276	0.35	Vanuatu	6.90	0.01	319	0.05
United Kingdom	4,387.50	7.19	44,125	6.82	Venezuela	990.00	1.62	10,150	1.57
United Republic of Cameroon	67.50	0.11	925	0.14	Viet Nam	135.00	0.22	1,600	0.25
United Republic of Tanzania	82.50	0.14	1,075	0.17	Yemen	19.50	0.03	445	0.07
United States	12,607.50	20.65	126,325	19.52	Yugoslavia	415.50	0.68	4,405	0.68
Upper Volta	24.00	0.04	490	0.08	Zaire	228.00	0.37	2,530	0.39
Uruguay	126.00	0.21	1,510	0.23	Zambia	211.50	0.35	2,365	0.37
					Zimbabwe	150.00	0.25	1,750	0.27
					Total	60,674.00	100.00***	642,490	100.00***

\*All members were participants in the SDR Department.

\*\*Voting power varies on certain matters pertaining to the General Department with use of the Fund's resources in that Department, which comprised four accounts: the General Resources Account, the Borrowed Resources Suspense Account, the Special Disbursement Account and the investment Account.

\*\*\*May differ from the sum of the Individual percentages because of rounding.

## Annex II. EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS AND ALTERNATES OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND (As at 31 December 1981)

Appointed Director	Appointed Alternate	Casting the vote of
Richard D. Erb	Vacant	United States
John Anson	Christopher Taylor	United Kingdom
Gerhard Laske	Guenter Winkelmann	Germany, Federal Republic of
Bruno de Maulde	Anne Le Lorier	France
Teruo Hirao	Tadaie Yamashita	Japan
Yusuf A. Nimatallah	Samir El-Khourl	Saudi Arabia
Elected Director	Elected Alternate	Casting the votes of
Ariel Buira (Mexico)	Miguel A. Senior (Venezuela)	Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Spain, Venezuela
Robert K. Joyce (Canada)	Michael Casey (Ireland)	Bahamas, Barbados, Canada, Dominica, Grenada, Ireland, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
J. J. Polak (Netherlands)	Tom de Vries (Netherlands)	Cyprus, Israel, Netherlands, Romania, Yugoslavia
Giovanni Lovato (Italy)	Costa P. Caranicas (Greece)	Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal
A. R. G. Prowse (Australia)	Benito Legarda (Philippines)	Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Seychelles, Solomon Islands
Mohamed Finaish (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)	Tariq Alhaimus (Iraq)	Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Maldives, Pakistan, Qatar, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Yemen
Jacques de Groote (Belgium)	Heinrich G. Schneider (Austria)	Austria, Belgium, Luxembourg, Turkey
M. Narasimham (India)	A. S. Jayawardena (Sri Lanka)	Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka
Jón Sigurdsson (Iceland)	Leiv Vldvei (Norway)	Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden
Semyano Klingi (Uganda)	N'faly Sangare (Guinea)	Botswana, Burundi, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe
Byanti Kharmawan (Indonesia)	Vijit Supinit (Thailand)	Burma, Fiji, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Nepal, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam
Alexandre Kafka (Brazil)	José Gabriel-Pena (Dominican Republic)	Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guyana, Haiti, Panama, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago
Morteza Abdollahi (Iran)	Omar Kabbaj (Morocco)	Afghanistan, Algeria, Ghana, Iran, Morocco, Oman, Tunisia
Zhang Zicun (China)	Tai Qinding (China)	China
Juan Carlos Iarezza (Argentina)	Raúl Salazar (Peru)	Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay

Elected Director	Elected Alternate	Casting the votes of
Samuel Nana-Sinkam (United Republic of Cameroon)	Abderrahmane Alfidja (Niger)	Benin, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Niger, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, upper Volta, Zaïre

NOTE: Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, Rwanda and South Africa did not participate in the 1980 regular election of Executive Directors. Bhutan and Vanuatu became members after that election.

### Annex III. PRINCIPAL OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND (As at 31 December 1981)

#### PRINCIPAL OFFICERS

Managing Director: J. de Larosière.	Director, Legal Department: George Nicoletopoulos.
Deputy Managing Director: William B. Dale.	Director, Middle Eastern Department: A. Shakour Shaalan.
Counsellor: Walter O. Habermeler.*	Director, Research Department: William C. Hood.
Economic Counsellor: William C. Hood.'	Secretary, Secretary's Department: Leo Van Houtven.
Counsellor: L. A. Whittome.*	Treasurer, Treasurer's Department: Walter O. Habermeler.
Director, Adjustment Studies: Charles F. Schwartz.	Director, Western Hemisphere Department: E. Walter Roblček.
Director, Administration Department: Roland Tenconi.	Director, Office of External Relations: Azizall F. Mohammed.
Director; African Department: J. B. Zulu.	Director, Bureau of Language Services: Andrew J. Beith.
Director, Asian Department: Tun Thin.	Director, Bureau of Statistics: Werner Dannemann.
Director, Central Banking Department: P. N. Kaul.	Director, Office in Europe (Paris): Aldo Guetta.
Director, European Department: L. A. Whittome.	Director, Office in Geneva: Fernando A. Vera.
Director, Exchange and Trade Relations Department: C. David Finch.	Internal Auditor: Peter A. Whipple.
Director, Fiscal Affairs Department: Vito Tanzi.	Special Representative to the United Nations: Jan-Maarten Zegers.
Director, IMF Institute: Gérard M. Teyssier.	

\*Alphabetical listing.

#### HEADQUARTERS AND OTHER OFFICES

##### HEADQUARTERS

International Monetary Fund  
700 19th Street N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20431, United States  
Cable address: INTERFUND WASHINGTONDC  
Telephone: (202) 477-7000  
Telex: (RCA) 248331 IMF, (ITT) 440040 UI,  
(TRT) 197677 FUND UT. (WU) 89524,  
(WUI) 64111 INTREFUND WSH

##### OTHER OFFICES

International Monetary Fund  
European Office  
64-66 Avenue d'Iéna  
75116 Paris, France  
Cable address: INTERFUND PARIS  
Telephone: 723-54-21  
Telex: 610712 INTERFUND PARIS

International Monetary Fund  
58, Rue de Moillebeau  
1209 Geneva, Switzerland  
Cable address: INTERFUND GENEVA  
Telephone: 34 30 00  
Telex: 23503 IMF CH

International Monetary Fund Office  
United Nations Headquarters, Room DC-1145  
New York, N.Y. 10017, United States  
Telephone: (212) 754-6009

## Chapter X

# International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)

The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) estimated total traffic of the world's scheduled airlines to be close to 134 billion tonne-kilometres during 1981, an increase of 2.5 per cent above 1980. The airlines carried almost 745 million passengers at a load factor of 64 per cent, an improvement over the previous year's 63 per

cent. Air freight increased by a little over 4 per cent to some 30 billion tonne-kilometres, the third lowest rate recorded during the last decade. Air mail traffic amounted to 3.08 billion tonne-kilometres, an increase of about 4 per cent, close to the average rate of increase in 10 years.

During 1980, membership of ICAO rose to 150 with the admission of Antigua and Barbuda (10 December), Grenada (30 September), Kiribati (14 May) and Zimbabwe (13 March).

#### Activities in 1981

##### Air navigation

During 1981, ICAO'S main efforts in the air navigation field continued to be directed towards updating and implementing ICAO Specifications and Regional Plans. The Specifications consisted of International Standards and Recommended Practices contained in 17 technical Annexes to the Convention on International Civil Aviation (Chicago, 1944), and of Procedures for Air Navigation Services (PANS) contained in three PANS documents. The Regional Plans set forth air navigation facilities and services required for international air navigation in the nine ICAO regions.

The Specifications in nine Annexes and two PANS documents were amended and one new Annex was adopted. Amendments were also made to Regional Plans.

Nine air navigation meetings were held in 1981; they covered a wide range of subjects and made recommendations for changes to ICAO Specifications.

To promote uniform application of the Specifications, ICAO made available guidance material in the form of new and revised technical manuals and ICAO circulars.

The regional offices of ICAO assisted States in implementing Regional Plans. This work was supplemented by that of experts sent to advise States on the installation of new facilities and services and the operation of existing ones.

Special attention was given to: aircraft airworthiness, operations, noise, engine emissions, and accident investigation and prevention; aerodromes; air traffic control; aeronautical charts, communications, information services and meteorology; personnel licensing and training; aviation medicine and security; and transport of dangerous goods.

##### Air transport

In the air transport field during 1981, ICAO continued its programmes of economic studies, collection and publication of air transport statistics and promotion of greater facilitation in international air transport.

The Conference on Airport and Route Facility Economics (19 May to 5 June), attended by participants from 59 countries and seven international organizations, reviewed the general economic situation of international airports and route facilities in relation to that of the air carriers, considered the financing of airport security

and airport noise alleviation measures and ICAO activities in the field of airport and route air navigation facility economics. The Conference developed 18 recommendations.

The seventh session of the Statistics Division, held from 1 to 18 September, was attended by representatives from 41 countries and two international organizations. It reviewed the organization's statistical programme and made 13 recommendations, some in the fields of commercial air carrier, airport and route facility statistics.

The fifth meeting of the expert panel on regulation of air transport services, held in July, gave preliminary consideration to the regulation of non-scheduled air transport and the feasibility of amending certain Articles of the Convention on International Civil Aviation. Another panel of experts, on machinery for establishment of international fares and rates, held its fifth meeting in December, and considered rules and conditions associated with international scheduled passenger fares, and made a preliminary examination of rules and practices concerning denied boarding compensation and baggage allowances and charges. It also reviewed draft material for a manual on tariff matters and exchanged views concerning the currency conversion system of the International Air Transport Association for specification of fares and rates in national currencies.

Informal regional workshop meetings were held during 1981 in the fields of aviation forecasting and economic planning (Mexico City, April), statistics (Dakar, Senegal, May), and airport and route facility economics (Bangkok, Thailand, December).

A study of air passenger and freight transport for the Middle East was completed for publication in January 1982. Other publications in 1981 included the regular series of digests of civil aviation statistics, the yearbook on world civil aviation statistics, manuals on ICAO'S statistical programme and on airport and air navigation facility tariffs, a study of regional differences in fares, rates and costs for international air transport in 1979 and a survey of international air transport fares and rates in 1980.

The organization continued secretariat services to three independent regional civil aviation bodies- the African Civil Aviation Commission, the European Civil Aviation Conference and the Latin American Civil Aviation Commission.

A 1956 joint financing agreement for air navigation services in Greenland and the Faeroe Islands, and another in Iceland, also continued to be administered by ICAO.

##### Legal matters

A Panel of Experts met at Montreal, Canada, from 8 to 16 June 1981 to make recommenda-

lions to the ICAO Council on the general work programme of the Legal Committee in the light of a decision of the twenty-third (1980) session of the ICAO Assembly that the Council should propose a revised programme reflecting the needs of international civil aviation in the 1980s. After studying replies from States and international organizations to questionnaires on the legal status of the aircraft commander, on the liability of air traffic control agencies, on aerial collision and on the status of the legal instruments of the "Warsaw System" (the Warsaw Convention of 1929 for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air, as amended by subsequent Protocols, dated 1955, 1971 and 1975), the Panel recommended that the questions of liability of air traffic control agencies, and the study of the status of the Warsaw System should remain in the Legal Committee's general work programme.

In October, the ICAO Council requested detailed studies on those subjects as well as on the legal implications of aircraft accident and incident investigation and on the development of standard contracts on lease, charter and interchange of aircraft.

The Committee on Unlawful Interference with International Civil Aviation and its Facilities held three meetings during the year and re-examined proposals for the amendment of certain specifications in Annex 17 (security and safeguarding international aviation against acts of unlawful interference), in the light of comments made by contracting States and interested international organizations. On 15 June 1981, the Council consequently adopted Amendment 4 to the Annex which introduced a new element in Chapter 6 of Annex 17, namely the concept of lease, charter and interchange of aircraft in international operations and it added a specification on the transportation of persons in custody.

The Committee also made recommendations to the Council concerning implementation of a resolution of the Assembly's 1980 session on the refusal to allow unlawfully seized aeroplanes to land.

During the year, the ICAO Council adopted three resolutions (26 June, 23 November and 17 December 1981) relating to acts of unlawful interference with international civil aviation and its facilities.

The following conventions and protocols on international air law concluded under ICAO auspices were ratified or adhered to during 1981:

Convention on International Civil Aviation (Chicago, 1944)

Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, Kiribati, Zimbabwe

Convention on International Recognition of Rights in Aircraft (Geneva, 1948)

Iraq

Protocol to Amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air signed at Warsaw on 12 October 1929 (The Hague, 1955)  
Solomon Islands, Vanuatu

Convention, Supplementary to the Warsaw Convention, for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air Performed by a Person other than the Contracting Carrier (Guadalajara, 1961)  
Israel, Solomon Islands

Convention on Offences and Certain other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft (Tokyo, 1963)  
United Arab Emirates, Qatar

Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft (The Hague, 1970)  
Afghanistan, Qatar, Tunisia

Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation (Montreal, 1971)  
Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Tunisia, Viet Nam

Protocol to Amend the Convention on Damage Caused by Foreign Aircraft to Third Parties on the Surface signed at Rome on 1 October 1952 (Montreal, 1978) (not in force):  
Brazil

### Technical assistance

During 1981, ICAO provided technical assistance to 106 States; in 81 of these there were resident missions consisting of one or more experts. In addition to resident expertise, assistance was provided in the form of equipment, fellowships and scholarships and through short missions by experts.

Twenty new large-scale projects, each costing more than \$500,000, for which ICAO was to be the executing agency, were approved by the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Two large-scale projects were financed under trust funds assistance.

The organization employed 804 experts from 51 countries during all or part of 1981, 458 on assignments under UNDP, 369 on trust fund projects and eight under the associate experts programme. There were also 21 United Nations volunteers. The number of experts in the field at the end of 1981 was 415 as compared with 401 at the end of 1980.

A total of 1,180 fellowships were awarded in 1981 as compared with 1,354 for 1980.

Equipment purchases and subcontracts were a substantial proportion of the technical assistance programme in 1981; the total sum committed during 1980 increased to \$19.9 million. Twenty-nine Governments or organizations had registered with ICAO under the Civil Aviation Purchasing Service.

The following countries and territories were aided:



Africa: Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Americas: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Cayman Islands, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Montserrat, Multiple Islands (Caribbean), Netherlands Panama, Peru, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos Islands, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Asia/Pacific: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Burma, China, Cook Islands, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Nauru, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Viet Nam.

Europe, Mediterranean and Middle East: Algeria, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Greece, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Oman, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Yemen.

Included in the above were the following, aided during the year under trust fund arrangements: Argentina, Bolivia, Cape Verde, Chile,

Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nauru, Nigeria, Panama, Saudi Arabia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela.

#### Secretariat

As at 31 December 1981, the total number of staff members employed in the ICAO secretariat stood at 869; 312 in the Professional and higher categories drawn from 69 nationalities, and 557 in the General Service and related categories. Among them were 186 persons employed at regional offices. In addition, there were 216 in the professional category serving as technical experts on UNDP projects in the field.

#### Budget

The appropriations for the 1981 financial year totalled \$27,806,000. Modifications were approved by the ICAO Council, and are reflected below (in United States dollars):

	Appropriations	Revised appropriations	Actual obligations
Meetings	669,000	268,700	268,422
Secretariat	21,040,000	24,172,400	24,172,399
General service	3,321,000	3,471,300	3,471,215
Equipment	190,000	160,100	160,014
other budgetary provisions	126,000	24,500	24,426
Contingencies	2,460,000	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>27,806,000</b>	<b>28,097,000</b>	<b>28,096,476</b>

### Annex I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION AND CONTRIBUTIONS

(Membership as at 31 December 1981; contributions as assessed for 1981)

CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
MEMBER	Percent-age	Net amount (in US dollars)	MEMBER	Percent-age	Net amount fin US dollars)	MEMBER	Percent-age	Net amount (in US dollars)
Afghanistan	0.06	12,708	Costs Rica	0.06	12,708	Guinea-Bissau	0.06	12,708
Algeria	0.18	38,124	Cuba	0.13	27,534	Guyana	0.06	12,708
Angola	0.06	12,708	Cyprus	0.06	12,708	Haiti	0.06	12,708
Antigua and Barbuda*	-	-	Czechoslovakia	0.61	129,198	Honduras	0.06	12,708
Argentina	0.87	184,266	Democratic Kampuchea	0.06	12,708	Hungary	0.33	69,894
Australia	1.89	400,302	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.07	14,826	Iceland	0.08	16,944
Austria	0.54	114,372	Democratic Yemen	0.06	12,708	India	0.90	190,620
Bahamas	0.06	12,708	Denmark	0.65	137,670	Indonesia	0.29	61,422
Bahrain	0.06	12,708	Djibouti	0.06	12,708	Iran	0.49	103,782
Bangladesh	0.08	16,944	Dominican Republic	0.06	12,708	Iraq	0.18	38,124
Barbados	0.06	12,708	Ecuador	0.06	12,708	Ireland	0.19	40,242
Belgium	1.11	235,098	Egypt	0.19	40,242	Israel	0.37	78,366
Benin	0.06	12,708	El Salvador	0.06	12,708	Italy	2.91	616,338
Bolivia	0.06	12,708	Equatorial Guinea	0.06	12,708	Ivory coast	0.06	12,708
Botswana	0.06	12,708	Ethiopia	0.06	12,708	Jamaica	0.07	14,826
Brazil	1.42	300,756	Fiji	0.06	12,708	Japan	7.99	1,692,282
Bulgaria	0.18	38,124	Finland	0.41	86,838	Jordan	0.09	19,062
Burma	0.06	12,708	France	5.68	1,203,024	Kenya	0.06	12,708
Burundi	0.06	12,708	Gabon	0.06	12,708	Kiribati	0.06	7,413
Canada	3.16	669,288	Gambia	0.06	12,708	Kuwait	0.23	46,714
Cape Verde	0.06	12,708	Germany, Federal Republic of	6.68	1,414,824	Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.06	12,708
Central African Republic	0.06	12,708	Ghana	0.06	12,708	Lebanon	0.28	59,304
Chad	0.06	12,708	Greece	0.47	99,546	Lesotho	0.06	12,708
Chile	0.15	31,770	Grenada*	-	-	Liberia	0.06	12,708
China	1.17	247,806	Guatemala	0.06	12,708	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.19	40,242
Colombia	0.25	52,950	Guinea	0.06	12,708	Luxembourg	0.06	12,708
Congo	0.06	12,708						

CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
MEMBER	Percent- age	Net amount fin US dollars)	MEMBER	Percent- age	Net amount (in us dollars)	MEMBER	Percent- age	Net amount (in us dollars)
Madagascar	0.06	12,708	Philippines	0.26	55,068	Thailand	0.27	57,186
Malawi	0.06	12,708	Poland	1.05	222,390	Togo	0.06	12,708
Malaysia	0.17	36,006	Portugal	0.36	76,248	Trinidad and Tobago	0.06	12,708
Maldives.	0.06	12,708	Qatar	0.06	12,708	Tunisia	0.07	14,826
Mali	0.06	12,708	Republic of Korea	0.50	105,900	Turkey	0.38	80,484
Malta	0.06	12,708	Romania	0.28	59,304	Uganda	0.06	12,708
Mauritania	0.06	12,708	Rwanda	0.06	12,708	USSR	10.44	2,211,192
Mauritius	0.06	12,708	Saint Lucia	0.06	12,708	United Arab Emirates	0.09	19,062
Mexico	0.97	205,446	Sao Tome and Principe	0.06	12,708	United Kingdom	4.86	1,029,348
Monaco	0.06	12,708	Saudi Arabia	0.36	76,248	United Republic of Cameroon	0.06	12,708
Morocco	0.14	29,652	Senegal	0.06	12,708	United Republic of Tanzania	0.06	12,708
Mozambique	0.06	12,708	Seychelles	0.06	12,708	United States	25.00	5,295,000
Neuru	0.06	12,708	Sierra Leone	0.06	12,708	Upper Volta	0.06	12,708
Nepal	0.06	12,708	Singapore	0.40	84,720	Uruguay	0.06	12,708
Netherlands	1.81	383,358	Somalia	0.06	12,708	Venezuela	0.52	110,136
New Zealand	0.37	78,366	South Africa	0.62	131,316	Viet Nam	0.06	12,708
Nicaragua	0.06	12,708	Spain	1.82	385,476	Yemen	0.06	12,708
Niger	0.06	12,708	Sri Lanka	0.06	12,708	Yugoslavia	0.47	99,546
Nigeria	0.21	44,478	Suds"	0.06	12,708	Zaire	0.06	12,708
Norway	0.49	103,782	Suriname	0.06	12,708	Zambia	0.06	12,708
Oman	0.06	12,708	Swaziland	0.06	12,708	Zimbabwe*	-	-
Pakistan	0.30	63,540	Sweden	1.11	235,098			
Panama	0.06	12,708	Switzerland	1.20	254,160			
Papua New Guinea	0.06	12,708	Syrian Arab Republic	0.08	16,944	Total**	100.06	21,187,413
Paraguay	0.06	12,708						
Peru	0.12	25,416						

\*New member not assessed.

\*\*Includes assessment for Kiribati which became a contracting State after current assessment rates were set.

## Annex II. OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION (As at 31 December 1981)

### ICAO COUNCIL

#### OFFICERS

President: Assad Kotaite (Lebanon).

First Vice-President: J. Macia (Colombia).

Second Vice-President: Wang Qinwu (China).

Third Vice-President: M. K. H. Al-Deeri (Iraq).

Secretary: Yves Lambert (France).

#### MEMBERS

Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic Of, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Spain, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Venezuela.

### PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE SECRETARIAT

Secretary-General: Yves Lambert.

Director,, Air Navigation Bureau: D. W. Freer.

Director, Air Transport Bureau: R. A. Bickley.

Director, Legal Bureau: B.S. Gidwani.

Director, Technical Assistance Bureau: M. J. Challons

Chief,, Public Information Office: Eugene Sochor.

### OFFICES

#### HEADQUARTERS

International Civil Aviation Organization  
Post Office Box 400, Succursale: Place de  
L'Aviation Internationale  
1000 Sherbrooke Street West  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2R2  
Cable address: ICAO MONTREAL  
Telephone: (514) 285-8219  
Telex: 05-24513

#### REGIONAL OFFICES

International Civil Aviation Organization  
African Office  
P. O. Box 2356  
Dakar, Senegal  
Cable address: ICAOREP DAKAR  
Telephone: 21-54-52  
Telex: 906676

International Civil Aviation Organization  
North American and Caribbean Office  
Apartado postal 5-377  
Mexico 5, D. F., Mexico  
Cable address: ICAOREP MEXICO  
Telephone: 250-32-11  
Telex: 1777598

International Civil Aviation Organization  
South American Office  
Apartado postal 4127  
Lima 100, Peru  
Cable address: ICAOREP LIMA  
Telephone: 51-5414, 51-53525, 51-5497  
Telex: 25689PEICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization  
European Office  
3 bis Villa Emile-Bergerat  
92522 Neuilly-sur-Seine (Cedex)  
France  
Cable address: ICAOREP PARIS  
Telephone: 745-13-26  
Telex: 610075

International Civil Aviation Organization  
Asia and Pacific Office  
P. O. Box 614  
Bangkok, Thailand  
Cable address: ICAOREP BANGKOK  
Telephone: 281-5366, 261-5571,  
281-0136  
Telex: 87969 ICAOBKK TH

International Civil Aviation Organization  
Middle East and Eastern African Office  
16 Hassan Sabri  
Zamelek  
Cairo, Egypt  
Cable address: ICAOREP CAIRO  
Telephone: 650163, 650463, 650532  
Telex: 92459 ICAOR UN

## Chapter XI

# Universal Postal Union (UPU)

The Universal Postal Union (UPU), established at Berne, Switzerland, in 1874 for the reciprocal exchange of postal services between nations, is one of the oldest international intergovernmental organizations. Its aim is to promote the organization and improvement of postal services and to further the development of international collaboration in this sphere. It also participates in various forms of postal technical assistance requested by its member States.

In 1981, the number of UPU members increased from 160 to 164, following the admission of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Tuvalu (3 February), South Africa (19 June)<sup>a</sup> and Zimbabwe (31 July).

## Activities of UPU organs in 1981

### Universal Postal Congress

The Universal Postal Congress, composed of all UPU member States, is the supreme legislative authority of UPU. It normally meets every five years. The most recent Congress—the eighteenth—was held at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1979 and the next is scheduled to meet at Hamburg, Federal Republic of Germany, in 1984.

### Executive Council

At its 1981 session, held at Berne from 27 April to 14 May 1981, the 40-member Executive Council—responsible for carrying out the work of UPU between sessions of the Congress—considered administrative matters and several studies concerning international mail which had been referred to it by the 1979 Congress.

Among other matters taken up by the Council were: technical assistance for developing countries; relations with the United Nations, other international organizations and restricted postal

unions; UPU finances; international high-speed mail (Datapost, Express Mail, Postadex, etc.); customs treatment of postal items; transit charges and terminal dues; development of postal financial services; revising rates and supplementary charges for parcel post; and various matters relating to airmail such as basic rates, calculating internal dues, priority given by airlines, maximizing air conveyance, shipment of biological substances and the settlement of accounts.

### Consultative Council for Postal Studies

The 35-member Consultative Council for Postal Studies, was responsible for organizing the study of technical, operational and economic and technical co-operation problems of the postal administrations of UPU member States including matters of particular interest to new and developing countries.

During its annual session, held at Berne from 22 to 29 October 1981, the Council examined such questions as the future of postal services in a time of telecommunications; improvement of postal operations; mechanization, buildings, and motor transport; financial services and accounting; personnel; postal management; international post; and technical co-operation.

### International Bureau

Under the general supervision of the Government of the Swiss Confederation, the International Bureau—the Secretariat of UPU—continued to serve member States' postal administrations as an organ for liaison, information and consultation.

The Bureau remained responsible for collecting, co-ordinating, publishing and disseminating

<sup>a</sup>South Africa had been excluded from the Union in 1979 by the Universal Postal Congress.

international postal service information, continued conducting inquiries requested by postal administrations and acted as a clearing house for the settlement of certain accounts between them.

In connection with the International Year of Disabled Persons (1981) (p. 795), the Bureau was informed by some 100 postal administrations that they had decided to issue special postage stamps to mark the occasion; a number of administrations also announced measures applied to take account of disabled persons' needs such as improved access to post offices.

As at 31 December 1981, the total number of permanent and temporary staff members employed at the Bureau was 133, of whom 53 were in the Professional or higher category (drawn from 42 countries) and 80 in the General Service category. Also, 13 officials were employed in the Arabic, English, Spanish and Russian translation services.

#### Technical co-operation

In 1981, UPU technical co-operation was financed mainly by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) with expenditure amounting to some \$3 million.

Assistance was also provided through the UPU Special Fund and the regular budget of UPU. Total expenditures from these two sources in 1981 amounted to approximately \$950,000. In addition, the postal administrations provided assistance on a bilateral basis.

Training of postal instructors continued to be given priority; several training courses were organized in France, the United Kingdom and other regional training centres. An interregional course was held in the German Democratic Republic and four similar courses were organized in developing countries (India, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Malawi).

Fifty national and regional projects concerning postal services were carried out under UNDP. Fifty-nine expert missions were undertaken and 260 scholarships were awarded, three quarters of which were for study courses. Several projects received assistance in the form of equipment. The projects dealt with all main branches of postal service, including national or regional vocational training centres.

The UPU Special Fund, with voluntary contributions in cash and kind from member States, in the form of scholarships, training courses and equipment continued operation. Projects financed under the Special Fund and the regular budget accounted for 46 consultants who completed 52 missions, and 141 scholarships, the majority for participation in training courses or

technical meetings. In addition, the Special Fund assisted a project for the drought-stricken Sahelian region of Africa. Other technical assistance activities such as scholarships and training courses, were also offered by several countries during the year.

The Union continued its programme of technical assistance subject to payment, under which member States could finance assistance themselves by funds on deposit.

#### Budget

Whereas previously the Government of the Swiss Confederation had advanced the necessary funds for UPU's activities, the 1979 Universal Postal Congress decided, beginning in 1981, that member countries should pay in advance on the basis of the following year's budget, instead of on the basis of actual expenditure.

At its 1981 April/May session, the Executive Council approved the following budget for 1982:

	Amount fin Swiss francs)
<b>Income</b>	
Contributions from member States	18,532,500
Contributions allocated by UNDP for support of projects of technical co-operation	788,500
Sales of publications	180,000
Other receipts	719,600
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,220,600</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	
Staff	15,284,500
General expenses	4,556,100
Other budgetary provisions	380,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,220,600</b>
Equal to \$11,233,670 on the basis of Swiss francs 1.80 = us \$1.00.	

Each member State of UPU chooses its class of contribution, on a scale of 1 to 50 units. For 1982, the Executive Council fixed the amount of the contributory unit at 17,500 Swiss francs on the basis of a total of 1,059 units. The table below gives assessments in Swiss francs by class of contribution.

ASSESSMENTS		
CLASS OF CONTRIBUTION	Swiss francs	US dollar equivalents
50 units	875,000	486,111.11
25 units	437,500	243,055.55
20 units	350,000	194,444.44
15 units	262,500	145,833.33
10 units	175,000	97,222.22
5 units	87,500	48,611.11
3 units	52,500	29,166.66
1 unit	17,500	9,722.22

\*Calculated on the basis of Swiss francs 1.80 = US \$1.00.

# Annex I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION AND CLASS OF CONTRIBUTION (Membership as at 31 December 1981; contributions as assessed for 1982)

	Class of contri- bution:*	Class of contri- bution:*	Class of contri- bution:*	Class of contri- bution:*	Class of contri- bution:*	Class of contri- bution:*	Class of contri- bution:*
Member	no. of units	Member	no. of units	Member	no. of units	Member	no. of units
Afghanistan	1	Congo	1	Germany.	Libyan Arab	Peru	3
Albania	1	Costa Rica	1	Federal	Jamahiriyah	Philippines	1
Algeria	5	Cuba	3	Republic of	Liechtenstein	Poland	10
Angola	1	Cyprus	1	Ghana	Luxembourg	Portugal	5
Argentina	20	Czechoslovakia	10	Greece	Madagascar	Qatar	5
Australia	25	Democratic		Grenada	Malawi	Republic of Korea	1
Austria	5	Kampuchea	1	Guatemala	Malaysia		1
Bahamas	1	Democratic		Guinea	Maldives	Romania	5
Bahrain	1	People's		Guinea-Bissau	Mali	Rwanda	1
Bangladesh	15	Republic		Guyana	Malta	Saint Lucia	1
Barbados	1	of Korea	5	Haiti	Mauritania	Saint Vincent	
Belgium	15	Democratic		Honduras	Mauritius	end the	
Benin	1	Yemen	1	Hungary	Mexico	Grenadines	1
Bhutan	1	Denmark	10	Iceland	Monaco	San Marino	1
Bolivia	1	Djibouti	1	India	Mongolia	Sao Tome	
Botswana	1	Dominica	1	Indonesia	Morocco	and Principe	1
Brazil	25	Dominican	3	Iran	Mozambique	Saudi Arabia	25
Bulgaria	3	Republic	3	Iraq	Nauru	Senegal	1
Burma	3	Ecuador	3	Ireland	Nepal	Seychelles	1
Burundi	1	Egypt	15	Israel	Netherlands	Sierra Leone	1
Byelorussian		El Salvador	1	Italy	Netherlands	Singapore	1
SSR	3	Equatorial	3	Ivory Coast	Antilles	Somalia	1
Canada	50	Guinea	3	Jamaica	New Zealand	South Africa	1
Cape Verde	1	Ethiopia	1	Japan	Nicaragua	Spain	25
Central		Fiji	1	Jordan	Niger	Sri Lanka	5
African		Finland	10	Kenya	Nigeria	Sudan	1
Republic	1	France	50	Kuwait	Norway	Suriname	1
Chad	1	Gabon	1	Lao People's	Oman	Swaziland	1
Chile	5	Gambia	1	Democratic	Pakistan	Sweden	15
China	50	German		Republic	Panama	Switzerland	15
Colombia	3	Democratic		Lebanon	Papua New	Syrian Arab	
Comoros	1	Republic	15	Lesotho	Guinea	Republic	1
				Liberia	Paraguay	Thailand	3

NOTE: The UPU nomenclature differs from that of the United Nations.

\*For amount of contributions from members, see table under BUDGET above.

## Annex II. ORGANS, OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION

### EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(Elected to hold office until the nineteenth (1984) Universal Postal Congress)

Chairmen: Brazil.

Vice-Chairman: China, Liberia, Spain, USSR.

Secretary-General: Mohamed I. Sobhi, Director-General of the International Bureau.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, France.

Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, Honduras, India, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia.

### CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL FOR POSTAL STUDIES

(Elected to hold office until the nineteenth (1984) Universal Postal Congress)

Chairman: United Kingdom.

Vice-Chairman: Tunisia.

Secretary-General: Mohamed I. Sobhi, Director-General of the International Bureau.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium,

Brazil, China, Colombia, Egypt, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States.

### INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

#### HEADQUARTERS

Bureau international del 'Union postale universelle  
Weltpoststrasse 4

Berne, Switzerland

Postal address: Union postale universelle

Case postale

3000 Berne 15 (Suisse)

Cable address: UPU BEANE

Telephone: (031) 43 22 11

Telex: 32842

#### OFFICERS

Director-General: Mohamed I. Sobhi.

Deputy Director-General: Thomas Scott.

Assistant Directors-General: Félix Cicerón, El Mostafa Gharbi, Abdel Kader Baghdadi.

## Chapter XII

## International Telecommunication Union (ITU)

As at 31 December 1981, 157 countries were members of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), including three new members admitted during the year: Zimbabwe (10 February), Grenada (17 November) and Belize (16 December).

## Administrative Council

The thirty-sixth session of the Administrative Council of ITU was held from 1 to 19 June 1981 at ITU headquarters, Geneva. It reviewed administrative matters, approved a revised schedule of conferences and drew up the agenda for a regional administrative conference for the planning of the Broadcasting Satellite Service in region 2 (the Americas).

## Administrative radio conferences

The second session of the Regional Administrative Medium-Frequency Broadcasting Conference for region 2, held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 9 November to 19 December 1981, adopted a regional agreement on medium-wave broadcasting service in that region.

## International consultative committees

Study groups of the two ITU international consultative committees- the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR) and the International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT) - held numerous meetings during the year.

At its meetings, CCIR was engaged in: preparing technical information for future world and regional administrative radio conferences; studying spectrum utilization, especially frequency-sharing between different services, and efficient use of the geo-stationary satellite orbit; drawing up standards for satellite broadcasting, digital microwave radio relay, digital television transmission and new television broadcasting-data and still-image services; and radiowave propagation studies.

Activities during 1981, the first year of a new study period for CCITT following the seventh plenary assembly in 1980, included publication of telecommunications standards based on the previous four years of work, and division of work for 1981-1984 among the 15 major and several other specialized study groups. The new standards, together with all previously approved standards remaining in force, comprised some

6,000 pages of recommendations covering all aspects of telecommunications, except radio-communications.

Topics covered in the principal study groups included: transmission systems; data transmission on public-switched telephone network and public data networks; digital networks; switching and signalling; maintenance and protection; and general tariff principles. Special study groups produced manuals and case studies of interest to developing countries on such subjects as general network planning, primary sources of energy, rural telecommunications, regional satellite communications, choice of transmission systems and transition from analogue to digital telecommunication networks.

## Regional plan committee meeting

The Regional Plan Committee for Latin America, at its 1981 meeting, co-ordinated development of telecommunications facilities and revised a definite plan for 1981-1984 and an estimated plan for 1985-1988.

## International Frequency Registration Board

The International Frequency Registration Board continued to implement the decisions taken at the 1979 World Administrative Radio Conference, including development of a method for placing a large number of frequency assignments currently in the fixed service to appropriate bands, development of a method for conversion of designation of emissions and preparation of a handbook on procedures.

The Board also studied adaptation of its working methods to increased use of the computer, made preparations for and also participated in the medium-wave broadcasting conference, in region 2 (the Americas), and provided assistance to member administrations in application of the provisions and obligatory procedures of the Radio Regulations. In addition, it examined and recorded some 147,000 frequency assignment notices received from member countries, in the Master International Frequency Register.

## Technical co-operation

In 1981, under various ITU programmes of technical co-operation in developing countries, 727 expert missions were carried out, 726 fellows were undergoing training abroad and equipment valued at \$12,011,143 was delivered, mainly to

telecommunication training centres. The total cost of this assistance amounted to \$40,293,069, an increase of 21 per cent over the previous year. Countries and territories aided were the following:

Africa: Algeria, Angola, Burundi, Botswana, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Malawi, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Zaire.

The Americas: Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Netherlands Antilles, St. Christopher/Nevis, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay.

Asia and the Pacific: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Burma, China, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tonga.

Europe and the Middle East: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

The three main objectives of ITU technical co-operation activity continued to be: promoting development of regional telecommunication networks in Africa, the Americas, Asia and the Pacific, and the Middle East; strengthening telecommunication technical and administrative services in developing countries; and vocational training.

The Union continued its efforts to promote development of regional telecommunication networks and their integration into the world-wide telecommunication system, in accordance with objectives established by the World Plan Committee and regional plan committees. In this connection, 147 expert missions were carried out during the year.

Progress continued to be made in 1981 in the implementation of the Pan-African Telecommunications Network comprising high-grade large-capacity terrestrial, submarine and space systems. Fifteen countries in the region possessed modern international automatic exchanges and six more were under installation, while nearly all countries in Africa were equipped with modern automatic telex exchanges.

In west Africa, the initial stage of the five-country project linking Benin, Upper Volta, Mali, Niger and Senegal was implemented in September. Progress was also made on the coastal routes along the sections linking Guinea and Sierra Leone, Sierra Leone and Liberia, and Liberia and the Ivory Coast. The submarine cable along the coast from Casablanca (Morocco) to Lagos (Nigeria) via Dakar (Senegal) and Abidjan

(Ivory Coast) also went into service on all sections. In eastern and southern Africa, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania became linked by broad-band systems, and Djibouti was connected to that network by a small-capacity ultra high-frequency (UHF) link which was projected to be upgraded.

The Union continued to collaborate with the Central American Telecommunication Commission towards completion of the planning of the third phase of a regional network development, including preparation of technical specifications and execution of studies on the traffic routing between various international switching centres.

The Inter-American Telecommunication Conference continued to receive co-operation in its programme for development and integration of telecommunication systems.

In Asia, geo-political factors were largely responsible for delays in implementation of links in the subregion, involving Afghanistan, India, Iran and Pakistan. However, significant progress was made in resolving a technical question concerning the link between India and Pakistan, and agreement was reached on setting up a trans-border coaxial cable link in the subregion covering India and Nepal.

Completion of the microwave link between Chuadanga (Bangladesh) and Krishnanagar (India) in May closed the trans-border gap in that subregion. Problems of signalling compatibility, which prevented full commissioning of multiplex equipment in the area, were satisfactorily resolved, and maintenance and operational procedures, together with a programme for circuit utilization, had been established.

A satellite system for telecommunications purposes was being used by the countries belonging to the Association of South-East Asian Nations, and steady progress was made in the planning of submarine cables to connect these countries among themselves.

Improvement and expansion of telecommunications for Pacific island countries included: assistance in implementation of projects funded by the European Community for gateway telephone exchanges for Tonga and Samoa; installation and testing in Tuvalu of equipment acquired with funds provided by the United Nations Development Programme for the high-frequency (HF) radio link to Fiji, providing good-quality telephone and telegraph services; establishment of an HF radio link between Kiribati and Australia; and aid to Fiji, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Tonga and Tuvalu for development of a regional network.

In the Middle East and Mediterranean region, ITU continued to assist in implementation of the 1978 Middle East and Mediterranean telecommunication network master plan, including stud-

ies and supervision of the execution of various network components for Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Somalia and Yemen. With assistance from ITU and financing from the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development, these countries met for the purpose of establishing a sub-regional microwave network linking them with each other and with international switching exchanges. Experts who prepared the general conditions and technical specifications for the project, also assessed the tenders received. Studies were also made on national extensions needed in Somalia and Yemen; progress was made in a pilot project ITU was completing in collaboration with the Gulf Television Company for the planning of a subregional television network; and efforts continued to be made for development of regional telecommunications networks.

The Union continued to advise developing countries on administrative and technical measures; 287 expert missions were devoted to assistance of this type.

More than half of the total ITU field expenditure in 1981 was spent on training telecommunications personnel in developing countries.

#### Publications

Publications issued by ITU are either trilingual or separate English, French and Spanish editions. Those issued in 1981 included:

- Report on the Activities of the Union, 1980
- Financial Operating Report for 1980
- Twentieth Report by the International Telecommunication Union on Telecommunication and the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, Information Booklet No. 28
- Radio Regulations, 1982 ed.
- List of International Telephone Routes, 21st ed., 1981
- Bureaufax Table, 1st ed., 1981
- Table of Rates for Telegrams, 1981 ed.
- Table of International Telex Relations and Traffic, 1981
- General Information Relating to the Operation of the International Telegraph and Telematic Services, 2nd ed., 1981
- List of Coast Stations, 8th ed., 1980, Vol. I and Supplements Nos. 1 and 2; 1981, Vol. II
- List of Ship Stations, 21st ed., 1981 and Supplements Nos. 1 to 3
- Instructions for the International Telephone Service, 1981 ed.

- Manual for Use by the Maritime Mobile and Maritime Mobile-Satellite Services, 1982 ed.
- Documents of the VIIth Plenary Assembly of the CCITT, 1980, Geneva

#### Secretariat

As at 31 December 1981, the total staff of ITU numbered 688 officials (excluding staff on short-term contracts). Of these, nine were elected officials, 526 had permanent contracts and 153 had fixed-term contracts; 50 nationalities were represented in posts subject to geographical distribution.

#### Budget

The following budget for 1981 was adopted by the Administrative Council's session in 1980.

	Amount (In Swiss francs)
<b>Income</b>	
Contribution by members and private operating agencies	65,477,150
Contributions by UNDP for technical co-operation administrative expenses	9,417,000
Sales of publications	10,212,000
Miscellaneous	250,850
<b>Total</b>	<b>85,357,000</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	
Administrative Council	700,000
Common headquarters expenditure	52,591,500
Mission expenses	164,000
Miscellaneous	135,000
Conferences and meetings	11,937,500
Other expenses	200,000
<b>Total general expenses</b>	<b>65,728,000</b>
Technical co-operation	9,417,000
Publications	10,212,000
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>85,357,000</b>

Each member of ITU chooses the class of contribution in which it wishes to be included and pays in advance its annual contributory share to the budget on the basis of the budgetary provision. The classes of contribution for 1982 for members are listed in ANNEX I below.

As at the end of 1981, the total of units for members was 429. The amount of the contributory unit for 1981 was 135,700 Swiss francs and the contributory unit for 1982 was to be 161,800 Swiss francs.

#### Annex I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION AND CONTRIBUTIONS (Membership as at 31 December 1981; contributions as assessed for 1982)

CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
MEMBER	Class of contribution; no. of units	In Swiss francs*	MEMBER	Class of contribution; no. units	In Swiss francs*	MEMBER	Class of contribution; no. of units	In SWISS francs*
Afghanistan	1/2	80,900	Angola	1/2	80,900	Austria	1	161,800
Albania	1/2	80,900	Argentina	3	485,400	Bahamas	1/2	80,900
Algeria	1	161,800	Australia	18	2,912,400	Bahrain	1/22	80,900



CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
MEMBER	Class of contribution; no. of units	In Swiss francs*	MEMBER	Class of contribution; no. of units	I" Swiss francs*	MEMBER	Class of contribution; no. of units	I" SWISS francs*
Bangladesh	1	161,800	Guyana	1/2	80,900	Peru	1/2	80,900
Barbados	1/2	80,900	Haiti	1/2	80,900	Philippines	1	161,800
Belgium	5	809,000	Honduras	1/2	80,900	Poland	3	485,400
Belize**	-	-	Hungary	1	161,800	Portugal	1/2	80,900
Benin	1/2	80,900	Iceland	1/2	80,900	Qatar	1/2	80,900
Bolivia	1/2	80,900	India	13	2,103,400	Republic of Korea	1	161,800
Botswana	1/2	80,900	Indonesia	1	161,800	Romania	1	161,800
Brazil	5	809,000	Iran	1	161,800	Rwanda	1/2	80,900
Bulgaria	1	161,800	Iraq	1/2	80,900	San Marino	1/2	80,900
Burma	1/2	80,900	Ireland	2	323,600	Sac Tome		
Burundi	1/2	80,900	Israel	1	161,800	and Principe	1/2	80,900
Byelorussian SSR	1	161,800	Italy	10	1,618,000	Saudi Arabia	1	161,800
Canada	18	2,912,400	Ivory Coast	1	161,800	Senegal	1	161,800
Cape Verde	1/2	80,900	Jamaica	1/2	80,900	Sierra Leone	1/2	80,900
Central African Republic	1/2	80,900	Japan	20	3,236,000	Singapore	1	161,800
Chad	1/2	80,900	Jordan	1/2	80,900	Somalia	1/2	80,900
Chile	1	161,800	Kenya	1/2	80,900	South Africa	8	1,294,400
China	20	3,236,000	Kuwait	1	161,800	Spain	3	485,400
Colombia	3	485,400	Lao People's Democratic Republic	1/2	80,900	Sri Lanka	1/2	80,900
Comoros	1/2	80,900	Lebanon	1	161,800	Sudan	1	161,800
Congo	1/2	80,900	Lesotho	1/2	80,900	Suriname	1/2	80,900
Costa Rica	1/2	80,900	Liberia	1	161,800	Swaziland	1/2	80,900
Cuba	1	161,800	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	1 1/2	242,700	Swede"	10	1,618,000
Cyprus	1/2	80,900	Liechtenstein	1/2	80,900	Switzerland	10	1,618,000
Czechoslovakia	3	485,400	Luxembourg	1/2	80,900	Syrian Arab -Republic	1/2	80,900
Democratic Kampuchea	1/2	80,900	Madagascar	1	161,800	Thailand	1/2	242,700
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	1/2	80,900	Malawi	1/2	80,900	Togo	1/2	80,900
Democratic Yemen	1/2	80,900	Malaysia	3	485,400	Tonga	1/2	80,900
Denmark	5	809,000	Maldives	1/2	80,900	Trinidad and Tobago	1	161,800
Djibouti	1/2	80,900	Mali	1/2	80,900	Tunisia	2	323,600
Dominican Republic	1/2	80,900	Malta	1/2	80,900	Turkey	2	323,600
Ecuador	1	161,800	Mauritania	1/2	80,900	Uganda	1/2	80,900
Egypt	2	323,600	Mauritius	1/2	80,900	Ukrainian SSR	3	485,400
El Salvador	1/2	80,900	Mexico	3	485,400	USSR	30	4,854,000
Equatorial Guinea	1/2	80,900	Monaco	1/2	80,900	United Arab Emirates	1	161,800
Ethiopia	1	161,800	Mongolia	1/2	80,900	United Kingdom	30	4,854,000
Fiji	1/2	80,900	Morocco	1	161,800	United Republic of Cameroon	1/2	80,900
Finland	3	485,400	Mozambique	1/2	80,900	United Republic of Tanzania	1/2	80,900
France	30	4,854,000	Nauru	1/2	80,900	United States	30	4,854,000
Gabon	1/2	80,900	Nepal	1/2	80,900	Upper Volta	1/2	80,900
Gambia	1/2	80,900	Netherlands	10	1,618,000	Uruguay	1/2	80,900
German Democratic Republic	3	485,400	New Zealand	3	485,400	Vatican City State	1/2	80,900
Germany, Federal Republic of	25	4,045,000	Nicaragua	1	161,800	Venezuela	3	485,400
Ghana	1	161,800	Niger	1/2	80,900	Viet Nam	1/2	80,900
Greece	1	161,800	Nigeria	2	323,600	Yemen	1/2	80,900
Grenada	1/2	80,900	Norway	5	809,000	Yugoslavia	1	161,800
Guatemala	1	161,800	Oman	1/2	80,900	Zaire	1	161,800
Guinea	1/2	80,900	Pakistan	2	323,600	Zambia	1/2	80,900
Guinea-Bissau	1/2	80,900	Panama	1/2	80,900	Zimbabwe	1	161,800
			Papua New Guinea	1/2	80,900			
			Paraguay	1/2	80,900	Total	429	69,412,200

NOTE: The ITU nomenclature differs from that of the United Nations.

\*For the equivalent amounts I" United States dollars. the rate of exchange that was to be applicable on 1 January 1982 was Swiss francs 1.80 = US\$1.00.

\*\*By 31 December 1981, Belize had not notified the choice of its class of contribution to ITU.

## Annex II. OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

### ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL, INTERNATIONAL FREQUENCY REGISTRATION BOARD AND PRINCIPAL OFFICERS

#### PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE UNION

Secretary-General: Mohamed Mill.  
Deputy Secretary-General: Richard E. Butler.

#### ITU ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, India, Iran, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mexico (Vice-Chairman), Morocco, Nigeria, Poland, Romania (Chairman), Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Venezuela, Zaire.

#### INTERNATIONAL FREQUENCY REGISTRATION BOARD

Chairman: Petr Sergeevich Kurakov (USSR).  
Vice-Chairman: Abderrazak Berrada (Morocco), Sakae Fujiki (Japan).  
Francis G.Perrin (Canada), William Sowton (United Kingdom).

#### OFFICERS OF THE

#### INTERNATIONAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

Director, International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR): Richard C. Kirby (United States).  
Director, International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT): Léon Burtz (France).

## HEADQUARTERS

General Secretariat of the International Telecommunication Union  
 Place des Nations  
 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland  
 Cable address: BURINTERNA GENEVA  
 Telephone: 99 51 11  
 Telex: 421000

## Chapter XIII

## World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

Membership of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) increased to 154 in 1981-149 States and five territories. New members admitted in 1981 were Zimbabwe (11 February) and Saint Lucia (1 April).

The programme and financial resources of WMO for 1980-1983 had been adopted by the Eighth (1979) Meteorological Congress, the highest body of WMO, which meets at least once every four years.

The 29-member Executive Committee, which supervises Congress resolutions and regulations, held its thirty-third session at Geneva from 1 to 17 June 1981.

The twenty-sixth International Meteorological Organization Prize was awarded to Bert Bolin (Sweden) for outstanding contributions to the science of the atmosphere, especially his work in dynamic meteorology, atmospheric chemistry and biochemistry, and services to international collaboration in meteorology.

## Activities in 1981

## World Weather Watch

The World Weather Watch (www), the basic programme of WMO, continued as an integrated global system designed to make available to member States observational data and processed information required for their operational and research purposes. Its essential elements were: the Global Observing System (GOS), whereby observational data were obtained; the Global Data-Processing System (GDPS), providing for processing, storage and retrieval of observational data and making available processed information; and the Global Telecommunication System (GTS), offering telecommunication facilities and arrangements for rapid, reliable collection, exchange and distribution of observational data and processed information.

During 1981, under the two GOS sub-systems, one surface-based and the other space-based, the

main activities continued towards maintaining and improving System operations at global, regional and national levels. The surface-based sub-system provided conventional basic data from regional basic synoptic networks, other observational networks of stations on land and at sea, and aircraft meteorological observations required for operation and research. Within the space-based sub-system, meteorological satellites in both near-polar orbiting and geostationary systems took direct observations, accomplishing data collection and dissemination missions. These satellite systems made a major contribution to operations and research in meteorology, hydrology and other related environmental activities by providing to member States additional quantitative data and qualitative information such as: vertical profiles of temperature and humidity; temperatures of sea, land and cloud top surfaces; wind field derived from cloud displacements; cloud amounts, type and height of cloud tops; snow and ice cover, as well as radiance balance data.

Upgrading to high-speed data transmission was accomplished on some additional GTS circuits during 1981 and more high-frequency point-to-point circuits were replaced by satellite circuits.

## Ocean affairs

The quadrennial meeting of the Commission for Marine Meteorology whose eighth session was held at Hamburg, Federal Republic of Germany, during September, took action on a number of issues including means of improving data coverage of the world oceans using the latest advances in marine telecommunications, satellite systems and automation techniques, and maintenance of high standards of marine meteorological services. To this end, the Commission approved publication of the second edition of a guide to marine meteorological services, established a new plan for the production of

marine climatological summaries and adopted a new punch card and tape format for the international exchange of marine meteorological data, proposed projects for sea-ice services, adopted a new international system of sea-ice symbols and revised WMO sea-ice nomenclature.

The development of a joint WMO/International Oceanographic Commission (IOC) Integrated Global Ocean Services System received increasing attention in view of its global ocean monitoring functions. Operational oceanographic data exchanged through GTS was extensively used for both operational and research purposes, such as for climate studies.

#### Aviation

Up-to-date revisions of regulatory material for the provision of service to international civil aviation were prepared for consideration by the appropriate WMO technical commission. Efforts were also made to evaluate and improve short-range aerodrome forecasting to provide better service to civil aviation and meet operational requirements of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

#### World Climate Programme

The World Climate Programme Office continued the research and co-ordination activities of the Programme. Technical and expert meetings in individual problem areas were held to provide guidance as to data requirements and applications. A large-scale Technical Conference on Climate for Asia and the Western Pacific was held in December 1981. Another technical conference was scheduled for January 1982 at Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania. The 1981 conference resulted in the initiation of a series of actions to improve the availability and accessibility of climate data and their optimum utilization in the socio-economic and resource management activities of the countries of the region.

#### Research and development

The research and development programme included weather prediction research, tropical meteorology, weather modification, environmental prediction research and climate change.

In weather prediction research during 1981, a data study intercomparison project proceeded well with 15 numerical weather prediction centres participating and the Finnish Meteorological Institute undertaking data collection and processing. A summary report of the first phase (January 1979-December 1980) was widely distributed. Developments in dynamical/statistical weather prediction were also reviewed and standard procedures for local weather forecast verification considered.

Research continued in tropical meteorology and a Symposium on Meteorological Aspects of Tropical Droughts was held in New Delhi, India, from 7 to 11 December for meteorologists, agrometeorologists and climatologists to exchange experiences. The symposium was followed by an expert meeting on tropical disturbances and associated rainfall which reviewed current knowledge of tropical rain-bringing systems (other than cyclones). Based on the review, detailed implementation proposals for specific priority projects were developed and initiatives identified to promote further research by member States.

In the weather modification programme, WMO continued to provide advice and support. Guidance was provided by the Executive Committee's Panel of Experts on Cloud Physics and Weather Modification, which met twice in 1981. Among other things, it recommended ways to analyse data collected during three seasons of the precipitation enhancement project field investigations, established criteria to determine the suitability of a site in Spain for a randomized statistical experiment and considered future international development of weather modification projects. The sixth annual register of national weather modification projects containing information for the year 1980 was also issued.

The third in a series of WMO meetings of experts dealing with questions concerning hail suppression was held at Geneva in February 1981 and an expert meeting to review the current status of warm cloud modification and to assess future prospects was held at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, in March.

Concerning global ozone research and monitoring, efforts continued to upgrade and standardize the observing network upon which most activities in the World Plan of Action on the Ozone Layer depended.

In December, a meeting of experts on meteorological aspects of the long-range transport of pollutants was convened at the headquarters of the Atmospheric Environment Service (Downsview, Ontario, Canada) where such problems as research developments in long-range transport modelling and research questions relating to large-scale deposition were reviewed.

#### Meteorological applications and environment

The meteorological applications and environment programme included activities aimed at applying meteorology to various human activities and problem areas such as agriculture, aviation, atmospheric and marine pollution, production and use of energy (in particular new and renewable sources of energy), urban and regional land-

use planning, engineering, building and human settlements, human health and well-being, transport and tourism.

In carrying out agrometeorological activities, emphasis was placed on transfer of techniques and methods. Short- and medium-term expert missions to a number of developing countries were organized for this purpose; training seminars and courses in agrometeorology were held; a revised guide to agricultural meteorological practices and a number of technical notes on various aspects of agricultural meteorology were published.

Activities relating to energy included a Technical Conference on Meteorology and Energy (Mexico City, November). Experts were also sent to developing countries to advise on the applications of meteorology to energy problems.

The first volume of the Climatic Atlas of Asia, containing maps of mean temperature and precipitation, was prepared by the Geophysical Observatory in Leningrad, USSR, and published there by *Gidrometeoizdat* for WMO with financial support from the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

The Commission for Climatology and Applications of Meteorology continued its preparatory work for a new edition of the Guide to Climatological Practices and other publications including technical notes on human biometeorology and on applications of meteorology to atmospheric pollution problems on local, urban and regional scales.

In the environmental pollution field, WMO's background air pollution monitoring network again expanded and currently consisted of 116 stations in 74 countries. Another 72 stations were being considered or prepared.

An assessment report on the first phase of the Economic Commission for Europe/UNEP/WMO co-operative programme on monitoring and evaluation of the long-range transmission of air pollutants in Europe became available and, on 1 January 1981, the second phase commenced. Other activities involved problems of the interchange of pollutants between atmosphere and oceans, on transport and deposition of air pollutants into the Mediterranean and the impact of atmospheric pollution on terrestrial and fresh-water ecosystems.

#### Hydrology and water resources development

The hydrology and water resources programme focused on the operational hydrology programme whose aims were, *inter alia*: efficient transfer of operational hydrological technology; to improve the quantity and quality of hydrological data; and an international and systematic framework of the integration of techniques and procedures for the collection and processing of hydrological data.

A large part of WMO's activities in the field of hydrology and water resources were carried out by the Commission for Hydrology which meets every four years. The Commission had approved a plan for the period 1980-1983 at its sixth (1980) session.

The programme for hydrology in environmental management and development included technical support for the hydrological components of other WMO activities dealing with environmental problems such as the tropical cyclone programme, the world climate programme, and drought and desertification control.

#### Education and training

The main activities of the education and training programme in 1981 were the award of fellowships, strengthening of regional meteorological training centres, organization and cosponsorship of courses, seminars and workshops, preparation of training publications and other aids, studies and surveys of training needs, provision of information education and training, and collaboration with other organizations.

Among 20 training events organized or co-sponsored by WMO during 1981 were: courses on climatological data processing, Asheville, North Carolina, USA and Paris, France; seminar on the use of meteorological data with implications for forecasting and research in tropical countries, Reading, England; technical conference on management of meteorological services in Regional Association I (Africa), Nairobi, Kenya; seminar/workshop on maintenance and repair of conventional meteorological and hydrological instruments for Regional Associations II and V (Asia and South-West Pacific), Dacca, Bangladesh; seminar on mathematical models for hydrological forecasting, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand; seminar on agrometeorology in Regional Association II, Bangladesh, Burma, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Thailand; course for technicians on the control of general pollution in the atmosphere, Buenos Aires, Argentina; course for meteorological technicians, Guatemala; and seminar on meteorological telecommunications, Barbados.

Over 500 participants, mainly from developing countries, benefited from WMO training and a further 260 from training awards under fellowship funds administered by WMO from various sources.

#### Technical co-operation

In 1981, under the technical co-operation programme, assistance was provided through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Voluntary Co-operation Programme,

from funds-in-trust and from WMO's regular budget.

Under UNDP, assistance was provided to 92 countries to a value of approximately \$11.5 million, compared to \$9.8 million for 1980. Assistance was provided for meteorological and hydrological services development, and in training of personnel at all levels: experts, fellowships for training abroad and support for training seminars.

In 1981, two sectoral advisers (one in meteorology and one in hydrology) assigned by UNDP to WMO, visited 19 countries to advise on requirements for, and application of, meteorological information of all types in various national economic sectors.

Total value of assistance provided under the Voluntary Co-operation Programme for 1981 was slightly over \$5 million. The Programme gave support mainly to the GOS element of WWV and long-term fellowships for training of meteorological personnel were also awarded.

Under WMO's regular budget, a number of fellowships were awarded in 1981 and substantial financial assistance provided for participants in special training courses and technical conferences.

Seven trust fund projects were under implementation during the year-three funded by countries receiving assistance and four by others.

To meet the need of the meteorological and hydrological services of developing countries for trained personnel, long-term fellowships were awarded by WMO. In 1981, 499 fellows received meteorological or hydrological training. The number of students who started training under fellowships awarded in 1981 under UNDP was 140; under the Voluntary Co-operation Programme, 74; under the regular budget, 20; and under trust funds, 10.

#### Secretariat

As at 31 December 1981, the total number of full-time staff employed by WMO (excluding 85

professionals on technical assistance projects) on permanent and fixed-term contracts stood at 297: 125 in the Professional and higher categories (drawn from 45 nationalities) and 172 in the General Service and related categories.

#### Budget

The year 1981 was the second year of the eighth financial period (1980-1983), for which the 1979 World Meteorological Congress had established a maximum expenditure of \$74,400,000, and authorized additional expenditures, not to exceed \$1 million, to provide for such circumstances as losses from currency exchange rate changes or urgent unforeseen programme activities.

The regular budget for 1981 amounted to \$18,663,800; while the budget for technical co-operation activities, financed from overhead allocations and other extrabudgetary sources amounted to an additional \$2,596,100.

At its June 1981 session, the Executive Committee approved the following regular budget of \$17,516,800 for 1982:

	Amount fin US Dollars)
Income	
Contributions	15,666,300
As for General Fund	1,850,500
Total	17,516,800
Expenditure	
Policy-making organs	518,400
Executive management	827,200
Scientific and technical programmes	
World Weather Watch	2,627,200
Meteorological applications and environment	1,311,300
Research and development	1,469,300
World Climate Programme	986,400
Hydrology and water resources	775,300
Supporting programmes	
Technical co-operation	208,700
Regional	1,231,500
Education and training	944,400
Programme supporting activities	3,345,900
Administration and common services	2,837,900
Other budgetary provisions	432,300
Total	17,516,800

## Annex I. MEMBERSHIP OF WMO AND CONTRIBUTIONS

(Membership as at 31 December 1981; contributions as assessed for 1982)

CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
STATE	Unit*	Net amount fin US dollars)	STATE	Unit*	Net amount fin US dollars)	STATE	Unit*	Net amount fin US dollars)
Afghanistan	1	7,025	Barbados	1	7,025	Canada	59	414,490
Albania	1	7,025	Belgium	28	196,707	Cape Verde	1	7,025
Algeria	2	14,051	Benin	1	7,025	Central African		
Angola	2	14,051	Bolivia	5	35,126	Republic	1	7,025
Argentina	30	210,758	Botswana	1	7,025	Chad	1	7,025
Australia	40	261,010	Brazil	30	210,758	Chile	8	56,202
Austria	13	91,328	Bulgaria	8	56,202	China	86	604,172
Bahamas	1	7,025	Burma	4	28,101	Colombia	7	49,177
Bahrain	1	7,025	Burundi	1	7,025	Comoros	1	7,025
Bangladesh	1	7,025	Byelorussian SSR	11	77,278	Congo	1	7,025

CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
STATE	Unit*	Net amount (in US dollars)	STATE	Unit*	Net amount (in US dollars)	STATE	Unit*	Net amount (in US dollars)
Costa Rica	2	14,051	Kenya	1	7,025	Senegal	1	7,025
Cuba	6	42,151	Kuwait	3	21,076	Seychelles	1	7,025
Cyprus	1	7,025	Lao People's			Sierra Leone	1	7,025
Czechoslovakia	21	147,530	Democratic			Singapore	2	14,051
Democratic			Republic	1	7,025	Somalia	1	7,025
Kampuchea	1	7,025	Lebanon	2	14,051	South Africa**	18	126,454
Democratic People's			Lesotho	1	7,025	Spain	28	196,707
Republic of Korea	2	14,051	Liberia	1	7,025	Sri Lanka	5	35,126
Democratic Yemen	1	7,025	Libyan Arab			Sudan	3	21,076
Denmark	16	112,404	Jamahiriyi	2	14,051	Suriname	1	7,025
Djibouti	1	7,025	Luxembourg	2	14,051	Sweden	31	217,783
Dominica	1	7,025	Madagascar	1	7,025	Switzerland	26	182,657
Dominican Republic	2	14,051	Malawi	1	7,025	Syrian Arab Republic	4	28,101
Ecuador	2	14,051	Malaysia	8	56,202	Thailand	7	49,177
Egypt	10	70,252	Maldives	1	7,025	Togo	1	7,025
El Salvador	1	7,025	Mall	1	7,025	Trinidad and Tobago	2	14,051
Ethiopia	1	7,025	Malta	1	7,025	Tunisia	2	14,051
Fiji	1	7,025	Mauritania	1	7,025	Turkey	12	84,303
Finland	12	84,303	Mauritius	1	7,025	Uganda	1	7,025
France	104	730,626	Mexico	19	133,480	Ukrainian SSR	36	252,909
Gabon	1	7,025	Mongolia	1	7,025	USSR	231	1,622,833
Gambia	1	7,025	Morocco	1	28,101	United Kingdom	128	899,232
German Democratic			Mozambique	2	14,051	United Republic		
Republic	31	217,783	Nepal	1	7,025	of Cameroon	1	7,025
Germany, Federal			Netherlands	25	175,631	United Republic		
Republic of	110	772,778	New Zealand	12	84,303	of Tanzania		7,025
Ghana	3	21,076	Nicaragua	1	7,025	United States	548	3,849,837
Greece	6	42,151	Niger	1	7,025	Upper Volta	1	7,025
Guatemala	2	14,051	Nigeria	6	42,151	Uruguay	7	49,177
Guinea	1	7,025	Norway	14	98,353	Venezuela	12	84,303
Guinea-Bissau	1	7,025	Oman	1	7,025	Viet Nam	2	14,051
Guyana	1	7,025	Pakistan	5	35,126	Yemen	1	7,025
Haiti	1	7,025	Panama	2	14,051	Yugoslavia	12	84,303
Honduras	1	7,025	Papua New Guinea	1	7,025	Zaire	4	26,101
Hungary	12	84,303	Paraguay	1	7,025	Zambia	2	14,051
Iceland	2	14,051	Peru	7	49,177	Zimbabwe	1	7,025
India	41	288,035	Philippines	9	63,227			
Indonesia	14	98,353	Poland	29	203,732	TERRITORY		
Iran	9	63,227	Portugal	6	42,151	British Caribbean		
Iraq	2	14,051	Qatar	2	14,051	Territory	1	7,025
Ireland	6	42,151	Republic of Korea	4	28,101	French Polynesia	1	7,025
Israel	6	42,151	Romania	9	63,227	Hong Kong	1	7,025
Italy	50	351,263	Rwanda	1	7,025	Netherlands Antilles	1	7,025
Ivory Coast	2	14,051	Saint Lucia	1	7,025	New Caledonia	1	7,025
Jamaica	2	14,051	Sao Tome and					
Japan	57	400,439	Principe	1	7,025			
Jordan	1	7,025	Saudi Arabia	4	26,101	Total	2,231	15,673,325

\*Exact unit value was \$7,025.25.

\*\*Suspended by the seventh (1975) WMO Congress from exercising the rights and privileges of a member

## Annex II. OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF WMO

### MEMBERS OF THE WMO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President: R. L. Kintanar (Philippines).

First Vice-President: C. A. Abayomi (Nigeria).

Second Vice-President: Ju. A. Izrael (USSR).

Third Vice-President: J. E. Echevaste (Argentina).

Members: A. G. J. Al-Sultan' (Iraq), S. Aguilar Angulano\* (Mexico), C. H. Arias (Colombia), M. A. Badran (Egypt) (acting), J. P. Bruce (Canada) (acting), P. K. Das (India), J. Djigbenou (Ivory Coast) (acting), F. Roll Fuenzailda\* (Chile), R. E. Hallgren (United States)

(acting), Zou Jingmeng (China) (acting), A. W. Kabakibo (Syrian Arab Republic), K. Langlo (Norway), E. Lingelbach (Germany, Federal Republic of), G. Mankedi (Congo) (acting), Sir John Mason (United Kingdom), J. Masuzawa (Japan) (acting), R. Mittner (France), S. B. Mpata\* (Malawi), J. K. Murithi (Kenya), C. Padilha (Brazil), M. Rahmatullah (Pakistan), V. Richter (Czechoslovakia) (acting), M. Seck (Senegal), H. Tong Yuen\* (Malaysia), J. W. Zillman (Australia).

Note: The Executive Committee is composed of four elected officers, the six Presidents of the regional associations (Indicated by \*), who are ex-officio members, and 19 elected members. Members serve in their personal capacities, not as representatives of Governments.

### SENIOR MEMBERS OF THE WMO SECRETARIAT

Secretary-General: A. C. Wlin-Nielsen.

Deputy Secretary-General R. Schneider.

Director, Scientific and Technical Programmes: R. Czelina.

Director, World Weather Watch Department: G. K. Weiss.

Director, Research and Applications Department: A. Zaitsev.

Director, Hydrology and Water Resources Department: J. Nemec.

Director,, Technical Co-Operations Department: J. Rasmussen.

Director, Education and Training Department: G. O. P. Obasi.

Director,, Administration Department: M. J. Connaughton.

Director, Languages, Publications and Conferences Department: H. Tabatabay.

Director, World Climate Programme Office: B. R. Doos.

Regional Director for Africa: S.. Mbele-Mbong.

Regional Director for Latin America: I. G. Meira-Filho.

Regional Director for Asia: K. Rajendram.

Director. Regional Affairs Office: A. K. Elamly.

## PRESIDENTS OF REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND TECHNICAL COMMISSIONS

## REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

I. Africa: S. B. Mpata (Malawi) (acting).  
 II. Asia: A. G. J. Al-Sultan (Iraq).  
 III. South America: F. Roll Fuenzallda (Chile).

IV. North and Central America: S. Aguilar Anguiano (Mexico).  
 V. South-West Pacific: Ho Tong Yuen (Malaysia).  
 VI. Europe: A. W. Kabakibo (Syrian Arab Republic) (acting).

## TECHNICAL COMMISSIONS

Aeronautical Meteorology: R. R. Dodds (Canada).  
 Agricultural Meteorology: M. N. Gerbier (France).  
 Atmospheric Sciences: A. Villeveille (France).  
 Basic Systems: J. R. Nellon (United States).

Climatology and Applications of Meteorology: M. K. Thomas (Canada).  
 Hydrology: R. H. Clark (Canada).  
 Instruments and Methods of Observation: S. Huovila (Finland).  
 Marine Meteorology: K. P. Vasillev (USSR).

## HEADQUARTERS

World Meteorological Organization  
 41 Avenue Giuseppe-Motta  
 Case Postale No. 5  
 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland  
 Cable address: METEOMOND GENEVA  
 Telephone: 346400  
 Telex: 23260

## Chapter XIV

## The Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO)

During 1981, the activities of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) were concentrated principally on measures to promote effective global implementation of standards and regulations for the improvement of maritime safety and the prevention and control of marine pollution from ships.

Membership of the organization, as at 31 December 1981, stood at 121, with one associate member. New members admitted during the year were: El Salvador (12 February), Costa Rica (4 March), and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (29 April).

## International Conventions

The organization performed depositary and relating functions in respect of the following international conventions and other treaty instruments almost all of which were adopted under its auspices:

International Conventions for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1948, 1960  
 International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1974 and the 1978 Protocol relating thereto. (These replaced and superseded the earlier instruments of 1948 and 1960.)  
 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, as amended in 1962 and 1969  
 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, and the 1978 Protocol

relating thereto. (These replaced and superseded the earlier instrument of 1954.)

International Convention on Load Lines, 1966

International Convention on Tonnage Measurement of Ships, 1969

International Convention Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 1969-

Protocol Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Pollution by Substances Other Than Oil, 1973

International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage, 1969

Protocol to the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage, 1969

Convention on Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims, 1976

International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage, 1971

Protocol to the International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage, 1971

Convention Relating to Civil Liability in the Field of Maritime Carriage of Nuclear Materials, 1971

Special Trade Passenger Ships Agreement, 1971

Protocol on Space Requirements for Special Trade Passenger Ships, 1973

Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972, and amended in 1981

International Convention for Safe Containers, 1972, as amended in 1981

Athens Convention Relating to the Carriage of Passengers and Their Luggage by Sea, 1974

Protocol to the Athens Convention Relating to the Carriage of Passengers and Their Luggage by Sea, 1974

Convention on the International Maritime Satellite Organization, 1976

Operating Agreement on the International Maritime Satellite Organization, 1976

Torremolinos International Convention for the Safety of Fishing Vessels, 1977

International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978

International Convention on Maritime Search and Rescue, 1979

Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, 1972

#### Activities in 1981

##### Safety of life at sea

The 1978 Protocol to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1974 (SOLAS Convention) entered into force on 1 May 1981 and introduced provisions chiefly designed to improve the safety of tankers. The Maritime Safety Committee also adopted a number of amendments to the Convention which were expected to enter into force on 1 September 1984.

##### Safe containers

The 1973 amendments to the International Convention for Safe Containers, 1972, entered into force on 1 December 1981. The amendments extended the time limit for the fixing of safety approval plates on containers to 1 December 1985 and deferred, until 1 January 1987, the date for marking the container's next examination..

##### Civil liability for oil pollution damage

The 1976 Protocol to the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage, 1969, entered into force on 8 April. The Protocol provided for the use of a new unit of account, based on the special drawing rights of the International Monetary Fund, for calculating the limits of liability under the Convention.

##### Collision regulations

A number of amendments to the Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972, were adopted by the IMCO Assembly at its twelfth session in November 1981. These amendments were expected to enter into force on 1 June 1983.

##### Technical assistance

In 1981 the technical assistance programme continued to expand with IMO contributing to projects in Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin,

Brazil, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Tuvalu and the United Arab Emirates.

Inter-regional advisers travelled extensively advising on technical port operations and management, marine pollution, various fields of maritime training and safety administration and legislation. Regional maritime advisers provided assistance in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America.

During the year, 78 awards were made under the fellowship programme; the trainees included nationals from Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Chile, Cape Verde, Cyprus, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malawi, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka and Togo. Fields of study included naval architecture, marine survey and engineering, navigation, oil pollution, fire fighting, port administration, radar simulator training, study tours of training facilities, and hydrographic survey and equipment training.

Among seminars held during the year was a two-week maritime training course at the Dalian Marine College, Dalian, China, in March.

##### World Maritime Day

The theme for World Maritime Day (25 September 1981) was the effective global implementation of IMO's technical standards for safer shipping and cleaner oceans. On that day, Modolv Hareide, former Director-General of Shipping and Navigation of Norway who was associated with IMO from 1959 to 1978, was presented with the International Maritime Prize for 1980.

#### Publications

New publications issued by IMO during 1981 included the IMCO Search and Rescue Manual; Guidelines on Surveys under the 1978 SOLAS Protocol, Recommendations on the Safe Transport, Handling and Storage of Dangerous Substances in Port Areas; and a Pocket Guide Book to Cold Water Survival.

Among other publications were: the 1981 edition of the Code of Safe Practice for Solid Bulk Cargoes; a new consolidated edition of the International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code, Merchant Ship Search and Rescue Manual, 3rd ed.; amendment no. 2 to Ship's Routeing, 4th ed.; Code of Safe Practice for Ships Carrying Timber Deck Cargoes, new ed.; a supplement relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea



by Oil 1954, as amended in 1962 and 1969; Amendments to the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization; Recommendations on the Safe Use of Pesticides in Ships, revised ed.; and a supplement relating to the International Convention on Load Lines, 1966.

#### Decisions of IMCO Assembly

The 1981 IMCO Assembly adopted 49 resolutions, the majority dealing with maritime safety and the prevention of marine pollution, which included a code for noise levels in ships and a code of safety for nuclear merchant ships.

#### Secretariat

As at 31 December 1981, the secretariat of IMCO consisted of 232 full-time staff members (excluding those on technical assistance projects). Of these, 79 were in the Professional and higher categories (drawn from 33 nationalities) and 153 were in the General Service and related category. There were 56 Professional staff employed on technical assistance projects in the field.

#### Budget

The 1981 IMCO Assembly adopted a budget of \$25.7 million for the 1982-1983 biennium (\$11.4 million allocated to 1982; \$14.3 million to 1983).

### Annex 1. MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTER-GOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION AND CONTRIBUTIONS (Membership as at 31 December 1981; contributions as assessed-for 1981)

CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION			CONTRIBUTION		
MEMBER	Percent- age of total	Net amount (in US dollars)	MEMBER	Percent- age of total	Net amount (in US dollars)	MEMBER	Percent- age of total	amount (in US dollars)
Algeria	0.30	44,191	Greece	9.39	1,368,182	Portugal	0.34	48,933
Angola	0.03	4,284	Guinea	0.02	2,208	Qatar	0.04	5,184
Argentina	0.62	90,121	Guinea-Bissau	0.01	2,035	Republic of		
Australia	0.40	58,867	Guyana	0.02	2,623	Korea	1.05	152,352
Austria	0.03	5,080	Haiti	0.01	2,035	Romania	0.46	66,239
Bahamas	0.03	5,011	Honduras	0.08	9,372	Saint Lucia	0.01	2,069
Bahrain	0.02	2,346	Hungary	0.03	4,596	Saint Vincent and		
Bangladesh	0.10	14,253	Iceland	0.06	8,507	the Grenadines	0.01	1,795
Barbados	0.01	2,173	India	1.42	206,588	Saudi Arabia	0.39	57,032
Belgium	0.44	64,647	Indonesia	0.35	50,871	Senegal	0.02	3,177
Benin	0.01	2,173	Iran	0.32	48,441	Seychelles	0.01	2,173
Brazil	1.09	158,928	Iraq	0.36	52,740	Sierra Leone	0.01	2,138
Bulgaria	0.31	44,676	Ireland	0.06	9,234	Singapore	1.83	267,262
Burma	0.03	5,046	Israel	0.12	17,575	Somalia	0.02	3,592
Canada	0.78	114,064	Italy	2.66	388,048	Spain	1.94	282,768
Cape Verde	0.02	2,381	Ivory Coast	0.08	8,438	Sri Lanka	0.04	5,219
Chile	0.16	23,251	Jamaica	0.02	2,450	Sudan	0.04	5,634
China	1.65	239,919	Japan	9.76	1,421,684	Suriname	0.02	2,519
Colombia	0.08	11,795	Jordan	0.01	2,000	Sweden	1.02	148,545
Congo	0.02	2,242	Kenya	0.02	2,588	Switzerland	0.09	12,764
Costa Rica	0.01	2,019	Kuwait	0.61	89,532	Syrian Arab		
Cuba	0.22	32,493	Lebanon	0.08	11,276	Republic	0.02	3,350
Cyprus	0.51	74,373	Liberia	19.08	2,780,777	Thailand	0.11	15,533
Czechoslovakia	0.05	7,365	Libyan Arab			Trinidad and		
Democratic			Jamahiriya	0.23	32,804	Tobago	0.02	2,588
Kampuchea	0.01	2,138	Madagascar	0.04	5,150	Tunisia	0.05	8,534
Democratic			Malaysia	0.18	26,297	Turkey	0.36	52,360
Yemen	0.02	2,415	Maldives	0.05	6,707	USSR	5.64	821,430
Denmark	1.29	188,556	Malta	0.05	6,603	United Arab		
Djibouti	0.01	2,104	Mauritania	0.01	2,035	Emirates	0.05	7,469
Dominica	0.01	2,000	Mauritius	0.02	3,315	United Kingdom	8.47	943,181
Dominican			Mexico	0.25	36,819	United Republic		
Republic	0.02	3,315	Morocco	0.10	14,460	of Cameroon	0.03	4,146
Ecuador	0.08	11,518	Mozambique	0.02	3,315	United Republic		
Egypt	0.15	21,244	Nepal	0.01	2,000	of Tanzania	0.03	3,938
El Salvador	0.01	1,696	Netherlands	1.37	200,116	United States	4.45	649,065
Equatorial Guinea	0.02	2,208	New Zealand	0.08	11,137	Uruguay	0.08	8,853
Ethiopia	0.02	2,831	Nigeria	0.13	19,237	Venezuela	0.22	31,385
Finland	0.82	89,567	Norway	5.24	763,693	Yemen	0.01	2,104
France	2.86	416,741	Oman	0.02	2,242	Yugoslavia	0.80	87,386
Gabon	0.03	4,665	Pakistan	0.13	18,544	Zaire	0.04	5,184
Gambia	0.01	2,138	Panama	5.76	839,285			
German Democratic			Papua New			Associate Member		
Republic	0.38	55,025	Guinea	0.02	2,865			
Germany, Federal			Peru	0.19	27,647	Hong Kong	0.21	30,731
Republic of	2.01	293,213	Philippines	0.47	68,731			
Ghana	0.07	10,653	Poland	0.88	127,951	Total	100.03	14,579,110

Annex II. OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE  
INTER-GOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION  
(As at 31 December 1981)

IMCO COUNCIL AND MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE

IMCO COUNCIL

Chairman: W. A. O'Neill (Canada).

Members: Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, India, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Spain, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE

Chairman: Per Eriksson (Sweden)

Membership In the Maritime Safety Committee was opened to all member States with effect from 1 April 1978.

OFFICERS AND OFFICES

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF IMCO SECRETARIAT

Secretary-General: Chandrika Prasad Srivastava.

Assistant Secretary-General: A. Mensah.

Secretary, Maritime Safety Committee: G. P. Kostylev.

HEADQUARTERS

Intern-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization  
101-104 Piccadilly  
London. W1 VOA, England  
Cable address: INMARCOR LONDON  
Telephone: 01-499-9040  
Telex: 23588

Chapter XV

## World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

During 1981, membership of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) rose to 97 with the admission of Costa Rica and Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe announced its succession, and Guinea acceded, to the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, bringing membership of the Paris Union to 91. Berne Union membership increased to 73 as a result of Zimbabwe's announcement of its succession to the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. At the end of the year, total membership in WIPO and its various Unions, taken together, was 117.

Fifteen intergovernmental unions in the two main fields of intellectual property were administered by WIPO in 1980. They were founded on the multilateral treaties, conventions and agreements listed below in order of adoption:

Industrial property: Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property; Madrid Agreement for the Repression of False or Deceptive Indications of Source on Goods; Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks; The Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs; Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purpose of the Registration of Marks; Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and their International Registration; Locarno Agreement Establishing an International Classification for Industrial Designs;

Patent Co-operation Treaty; International Patent Classification Agreement; Trademark Registration Treaty; Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure.

Copyright and neighbouring rights: Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works; Rome Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations; Geneva Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms Against Unauthorized Duplication of Their Phonograms; Brussels Convention Relating to the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite.

At the twelfth series of meetings, held at Geneva in November 1981, the governing bodies of WIPO and the Unions administered by it reviewed the activities of the International Bureau, WIPO's secretariat, and approved the programme and budget for 1982 and 1983.

### Activities in 1981

#### Development co-operation activities

Two WIPO permanent programmes, supervised by intergovernmental permanent committees, provided the framework for development co-operation relating to industrial property and to copyright and neighbouring rights.

In the field of industrial property, WIPO organized or participated in the meetings of a Group

of Consultants on Questions Relating to Trade-marks and Developing Countries, at Geneva; a Working Group on the Establishment of a Guide on the Organization of Industrial Property Activities of Enterprises in Developing Countries, at Geneva; and an International Conference on Inventive Activity as a Factor for Development of Technology in the Developing Countries, in Belgrade (Yugoslavia). Medals and prizes for inventors were awarded by WIPO at exhibitions and competitions held in India (March), the Philippines (April) and at Geneva (November).

In continuation of the programme initiated in 1975, nearly 200 state-of-the-art search reports on technology disclosed in patent documents and related literature were furnished to developing countries, free of charge, under agreements concluded between WIPO and contributing industrial property offices in developed countries.

An industrial property glossary, previously published in five languages (Arabic, English, French, Russian, Spanish), was published also in a version containing Chinese, English and French. A general summary of the industrial property situation in Latin America was also published on the basis of fact-finding missions carried out in 1979 and 1980.

Development co-operation activities in copyright and neighbouring rights included the convening, jointly with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) of working groups and expert committees on model provisions for national legislation on the protection of folklore, and on the problems posed for developing countries by access to works protected under copyright conventions.

The WIPO training programmes in industrial property and in copyright continued to grow, with 173 fellowships granted in 1981 to nationals of 82 developing countries. Twenty-six countries, including eight developing countries, provided individual training, in addition to study opportunities and courses for groups organized in Canberra (Australia), Geneva (Switzerland), The Hague (Netherlands), London (United Kingdom), Madrid (Spain), Moscow (USSR), Strasbourg (France), Vienna (Austria) and Zurich (Switzerland). Regional and national meetings and seminars were organized by WIPO in Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, China, Congo, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Guinea, Honduras, Jamaica, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Thailand and Zimbabwe.

During 1981, WIPO co-operated with Governments of 63 developing countries and with three intergovernmental organizations in their development projects relating to intellectual property, by providing assistance in the preparation of

legislation, or establishment or modernization of national or regional institutions, including patent documentation and information services.

#### Industrial property

The second session of the Diplomatic Conference on the Revision of the Paris Convention was held at Nairobi, Kenya, from 28 September to 24 October; in November, the Paris Union Assembly decided that a third session of the Conference should be held at Geneva in October/November 1982. The objective of the revision was to introduce special provisions to meet the needs of developing countries more effectively, and to incorporate new provisions giving full recognition to inventors' certificates, a form of protection of inventions existing in socialist countries. At a separate diplomatic conference held in Nairobi from 24 to 26 September, the Nairobi Treaty on the Protection of the Olympic Symbol-anticipated to provide revenue for national Olympic committees-was adopted and opened for signature.

Work continued on keeping up to date the International Patent Classification and other classifications relating to industrial designs or registration of trade marks and service marks. As in the past, WIPO assisted the International Patent Documentation Centre and remained on its Supervisory Board, while efforts continued towards early conclusion of the Computerized Administration of Patent Documents Reclassified According to the International Patent Classification.

At the end of 1981, thirty-two States were party to the Patent Co-operation Treaty (PCT). During the year, record copies of 4,606 international applications were transmitted to WIPO by 20 receiving offices. Thirty issues of the PCT Gazette were published during the year, containing information on 3,734 published international applications.

At the recommendation of a group of consultants, a questionnaire was sent to member Governments and interested organizations on the feasibility of an international treaty on the protection and international registration of computer software. A group of consultants, meeting at Geneva in June, gave advice on the protection of inventions made in the course of international joint ventures; the International Association for the Advancement of Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property was created and its Constitution adopted at a meeting of university professors organized by WIPO at Geneva in July; and a study on the industrial property aspects of consumer protection was issued in March for comments by States members of WIPO and of the Paris Union and by interested organizations.

Publications in the industrial property field included those on industrial property statistics, industrial property laws and treaties, the monthly review *Industrial Property*, and the first issue of the WIPO Handbook on Patent Information and Documentation.

#### Copyright and neighbouring rights

The Permanent Committee for Development Co-operation Related to Copyright and Neighbouring Rights met at Geneva in March. Among the proposals made for new activities was a study of the problems of home taping and private copying of recordings and broadcasts, as well as the convening of a worldwide meeting on this question under WIPO auspices.

The WIPO Worldwide Forum on the Piracy of Sound and Audiovisual Recordings, held at Geneva in March, focused on the dangers posed by the growth of commercial piracy-unauthorized copying and sale of recordings for profit—and urged the organization to intensify efforts towards combating and eliminating such practices. At joint WIPO/UNESCO meetings, recommendations were made by experts on the impact of cable television in the sphere of copyright and neighbouring rights (Geneva, May), and the text of model provisions for national laws on the protection of expressions of folklore was approved by a working group (Paris, February).

Publications in the copyright field in 1981 included two further multilingual editions of a glossary of terms of the law of copyright and neighbouring rights (Arabic/English/French and English/French/Russian), the WIPO Guide to the Berne Convention (in German and Hindi), the WIPO Guide to the Rome Convention and the Phonograms Convention (in English and French), supplements to the WIPO Copyright Law Survey, and the monthly periodical *Copyright*.

#### Budget

The principal sources of the budget of WIPO expected to approximate Swiss francs 72 million for the biennium 1982-1983—are ordinary and special contributions from member States and income derived from international registration services.

Ordinary contributions are paid on the basis of a class-and-unit system by members of the Paris, Berne, Nice and Locarno Unions and by member States of WIPO that are not members of any of the Unions.<sup>a</sup>

States members of those four Unions were placed in seven classes (I to VII) to determine the amounts of their ordinary contributions. States members of WIPO not members of any of

the Unions are placed in three classes (A, B or C) for the same purpose. States in Class I or A pay the highest contributions of their group and those in Class VII or C the lowest. The class in which a State is placed is solely a matter for the State itself to decide. The rights of each State are the same, irrespective of class chosen.

The contribution class for each member State of WIPO and of the Paris or Berne Unions, together with the amount of the ordinary contribution of each State, is given in Annex I to this chapter (the class indicated for the Paris Union also applies to the Nice, Locarno and International Patent Classification Unions). The members of one or more Unions do not pay separate contributions to WIPO; the Unions themselves contribute towards the costs of WIPO's International Bureau.

The amounts of ordinary contributions for 1981 are given in the table on the page opposite.

#### Income and expenditure

Summary figures for income and expenditure for 1981 are shown in the table below.

	In thousands of SWISS francs	Equivalent In thousands of US dollars*
<b>Income</b>		
Ordinary contributions	15,051	8,552
Special contributions	1,500	852
Income from registration services	14,264	8,104
Publications and miscellaneous	2,976	1,691
<b>Total</b>	<b>33,791</b>	<b>19,199</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>		
Staff	21,043	11,956
Travel	1,180	670
Meetings	973	553
Publications	2,043	1,161
Buildings**	4,431	2,518
Other	4,717	2,680
<b>Total</b>	<b>34,387</b>	<b>19,538</b>

\*At the United Nations rate of exchange for December 1961: Swiss francs 1.76 = US \$1.00.

\*\*Includes maintenance, rental and amortization of the building loan.

#### Secretariat

As at 31 December 1981, WIPO employed 265 full-time staff members. Of these, 89 were in the Professional and higher categories (drawn from 36 member States) and 176 were in the General Service category. In addition, 34 experts were employed by WIPO on technical assistance projects.

<sup>a</sup> Nine of the 15 Unions in 1981 had independent administrative budgets. While the Madrid Union had an administrative budget, its costs were met by fees paid by applications for the international registration of trade marks rather than by contributions.

## CONTRIBUTION SCALES FOR 1982

(Swiss francs 1.76 = US \$1.00: United Nations rate as at December 1981)

WIPO*	Equivalent In		IPC UNION	Equivalent in	
	In SWISS francs	US dollars		In Swiss francs	US dollars
Class	**	**	Class		
A			II	199,757	113,498
B	18,750	10,653	III	**	**
C	6,250	3,551	IV	119,853	68,098
			V	79,903	45,399
			VI	**	**
			VII	23,970	13,619
				7,990	4,540
PARIS UNION			PCT UNION		
Class			Countries		
I	405,530	230,415	Australia	60,300	34,261
II	**	**	Austria	26,400	15,000
III	243,318	138,249	Belgium***	-	-
IV	162,212	92,166	Brazil	26,800	16,364
V	81,106	46,083	Central African Republic***	-	-
VI	48,664	27,650	Chad***	-	-
VII	16,221	9,216	Congo***	-	-
			Democratic People's	-	-
			Republic of Korea***	-	-
			Denmark	37,650	21,392
			Finland	31,050	17,642
			France	94,650	53,778
			Gabon***	-	-
			Germany. Federal Republic of	143,100	61,307
			Hungary	16,800	9,545
			Japan	172,200	97,841
			Liechtenstein	2,500	1,420
			Luxembourg***	-	-
			Madagascar***	-	-
			Malawi***	-	-
			Monaco***	-	-
			Netherlands	40,200	22,841
			Norway	24,450	13,892
			Romania***	-	-
			Senegal***	-	-
			Sri Lanka***	-	-
			Sweden	99,300	56,420
			Switzerland	64,800	36,818
			Togo***	-	-
			USSR	92,550	52,585
			United Kingdom	116,850	66,392
			United Republic	-	-
			of Cameroon***	-	-
			United States	450,900	256,193
			Total	1,502,500	853,691
NICE UNION					
Class					
I	39,789	22,607			
II					
III	23,873	13,564			
IV	15,916	9,043			
V	7,959	4,522			
VI	4,775	2,713			
VII	1,591	904			
LOCARNO UNION					
Class					
II	14,205	8,071			
III	**	**			
IV	8,523	4,843			
V	5,682	3,228			
VI	2,839	1,613			
VII	**	**			
BEANE UNION					
Class					
I	238,719	135,636			
II	190,974	108,508			
III	143,232	81,382			
IV	95,487	54,254			
V	47,744	27,127			
VI	28,646	16,276			
VII	9,549	5,426			

\*The amounts indicated are payable by member States of WIPO which are not members of any of the Unions (see ANNEX I).

\*\*No State currently belonged to this class.

\*\*\*No contributions are paid by States which, while members of the PCT Union, have fewer than ten international application filed in a year.

## Annex I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION AND UNIONS ADMINISTERED TO WHICH CONTRIBUTIONS ARE PAYABLE

(As at 31 December 1981; ordinary contributions payable in 1982)

STATE*									CONTRIBUTION**	
	MEMBER								In SWISS francs	Equivalent In US dollars***
	W	P	B	N	-	-	-	-		
Algeria	W	P	-	N	-	-	-	-	60,251	34,233
Argentina	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	383,372	217,824
Australia	W	P	S	N	-	IPC	PCT	-	644,730	366,323
Austria	W	P	B	N	-	IPC	PCT	-	339,799	193,067
Bahamas	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	29,188	16,584
Barbados	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	6,250	3,551
Belgium	W	P	B	N	-	IPC	PCT	-	584,430	332,062
Benin	W	P	B	N	-	-	-	-	30,779	17,488

STATE*	MEMBER							CLASS			CONTRIBUTION**	
								W	P	B	In Swiss francs	Equivalent in US dollars***
Brazil	W	P	B	-	-	IPC	PCT	-	III	III	586,470	333,221
Bulgaria	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VI	VI	87,563	49,751
Burundi	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VII	-	16,221	8,216
Byelorussian SSR	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	-	6,250	3,551
Canada	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	III	III	437,817	248,759
Central African Republic	W	P	B	-	-	-	PCT	-	VII	VII	27,848	15,822
Chad	W	P	B	-	-	-	PCT	-	VII	VII	29,188	16,584
Chile	W	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	32,664	18,559
China	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	B	-	-	18,750	10,653
Colombia	w	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	-	6,250	3,551
Congo	w	P	B	-	-	-	PCT	-	VII	VII	29,188	16,584
Costa Rica	W	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	VII	9,549	5,425
Cuba	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	-	54,899	31,192
Cyprus	-	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VI	VI	87,563	49,751
Czechoslovakia	W	P	B	N	LO	IPC	-	-	IV	IV	395,299	224,601
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	W	P	-	-	-	PCT	-	-	VII	-	16,221	9,216
Denmark	W	P	B	N	LO	IPC	PCT	-	IV	IV	432,949	245,993
Dominican Republic	-	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	-	54,899	31,192
Egypt	W	P	B	-	-	IPC	-	-	VI	VII	88,418	50,237
El Salvador	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	-	6,250	3,551
Fiji	W	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	VII	10,889	6,186
Finland	W	P	B	N	LO	IPC	PCT	-	IV	IV	426,349	242,243
France	W	P	B	N	LO	IPC	PCT	-	I	-	1,082,903	615,285
G a b o n	W	P	B	-	-	-	PCT	-	VII	VII	29,188	16,584
Gambia	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	-	6,250	3,551
German Democratic Republic	W	P	B	N	LO	IPC	-	-	III	IV	538,508	305,970
Germany, Federal Republic of	W	P	B	N	-	IPC	PCT	-	-	I	1,117,148	634,743
Ghana	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VII	-	18,299	10,397
Greece	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	V	VI	124,159	70,544
Guinea	W	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	VII	9,549	5,425
Haiti	-	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	-	54,899	31,192
Holy See	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VII	VII	29,188	16,584
Hungary	W	P	B	N	LO	-	PCT	-	V	VI	152,719	86,772
Iceland	-	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VI	VI	87,563	49,751
India	W	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	IV	108,882	61,864
Indonesia	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	-	54,899	31,192
Iran	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	IV	-	182,991	103,972
Iraq	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	-	54,899	31,192
Ireland	W	P	B	N	LO	IPC	-	-	IV	IV	395,299	224,601
Israel	W	P	B	N	-	IPC	-	-	VI	VI	116,885	66,411
Italy	W	P	B	N	LO	IPC	-	-	III	III	592,953	336,905
Ivory coast	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VII	VI	50,963	28,956
Jamaica	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	-	6,250	3,551
Japan	W	P	B	-	-	IPC	PCT	-	I	II	1,047,204	595,002
Jordan	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VII	-	18,299	10,397
Kenya	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	-	54,899	31,192
Lebanon	-	P	B	N	-	-	-	-	VI	VI	92,915	52,792
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VI	VI	87,563	49,751
Liechtenstein	W	P	B	N	-	-	PCT	-	VII	VII	33,471	19,017
Luxembourg	W	P	B	N	-	IPC	PCT	-	VII	VII	38,961	22,136
Madagascar	-	P	B	-	-	-	PCT	-	VII	VI	50,963	28,956
Malawi	W	P	-	-	-	-	PCT	-	VII	-	18,299	10,397
Mall	-	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	VII	10,889	6,186
Malta	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VII	VII	29,188	16,584
Mauritania	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VII	VII	29,188	16,584
Mauritius	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VII	-	18,299	10,397
Mexico	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	IV	IV	291,873	165,836
Monaco	W	P	B	N	-	IPC	PCT	-	VII	VII	38,961	22,136
Mongolia	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	-	6,250	3,551
Morocco	W	P	B	N	-	-	-	-	VI	VI	92,915	52,792
Netherlands	W	P	B	N	LO	IPC	PCT	-	III	III	633,153	359,745
New Zealand	-	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	V	V	145,937	82,918
Niger	W	P	q	-	-	-	-	-	VII	VII	29,188	16,584

STATE*	MEMBER							CLASS			CONTRIBUTION	
								W	P	B	In Swiss francs	Equivalent In US dollars***
Nigeria	-	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	V	I	54,899	31,192
Norway	W	P	B	N	LO	IPC	PCT	-	IV	IV	419,749	238,493
Pakistan	W	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	32,664	18,559
Peru	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	6,250	3,551
Philippines	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VI	VI	87,563	49,751
Poland	W	P	B	N	-	-	-	-	III	V	188,052	106,847
Portugal	W	P	B	N	-	IPC	-	-	IV	V	335,177	190,441
Qatar	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	B	-	18,750	10,653
Republic of Korea	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	-	48,664	27,650
Romania	W	P	B	-	-	-	PCT	-	IV	V	152,261	86,511
San Marino	-	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	-	54,899	31,192
Senegal	W	P	B	-	-	-	PCT	-	VII	VI	50,963	28,956
South Africa	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	IV	IV	291,873	165,836
Spain	W	P	B	N	LO	IPC	-	-	IV	II	504,182	286,467
Sri Lanka	W	P	B	-	-	-	PCT	-	VII	VII	29,188	16,584
Sudan	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	6,250	3,551
Suriname	W	P	B	-	-	IPC	-	-	VII	VII	35,838	20,362
Sweden	W	P	B	N	LO	IPC	PCT	-	III	III	692,253	393,325
Switzerland	W	P	B	N	LO	IPC	PCT	-	III	III	657,753	373,723
Syrian Arab Republic	-	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	-	54,899	31,192
Thailand	-	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	10,889	6,186
Togo	W	P	B	-	-	-	PCT	-	VII	VII	29,188	16,584
Trinidad and Tobago	-	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	-	54,899	31,192
Tunisia	W	P	B	N	-	-	-	-	VI	VI	92,915	52,792
Turkey	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VI	VI	87,563	49,751
Uganda	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VII	-	18,299	10,397
Ukrainian SSR	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	6,250	3,551
USSR	W	P	-	N	LO	IPC	PCT	-	I	-	808,594	459,428
United Arab Emirates	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	B	-	18,750	10,653
United Kingdom	W	P	B	N	-	IPC	PCT	-	I	I	1,090,898	619,828
United Republic of Cameroon	W	P	B	-	-	-	PCT	-	VII	VI	50,963	28,956
United Republic of Tanzania	-	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	-	54,899	31,192
United States	W	P	-	N	LO	IPC	PCT	-	I	-	1,166,944	663,036
Upper Volta	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VII	VII	29,188	16,584
Uruguay	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VII	VII	29,188	16,584
Viet Nam	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VI	-	27,322	15,523
Yemen	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	6,250	3,551
Yugoslavia	W	P	B	N	LO	-	-	-	V	V	157,697	89,600
Zaire	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VI	VI	87,563	49,751
Zambia	W	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	VII	-	18,299	10,397
Zimbabwe	W	P	B	-	-	-	-	-	VII	VII	25,770	14,642
Total	97	91	73	32	16	27	32				20,117,557	11,430,379

NOTE: Membership In WIPO Is indicated by "W": In the Paris Union by "P": In the Berne Union by "B": In the Nice Union by "N": In the Locarno Union by "LO": In the Strasbourg (IPC) Union by "IPC": in the Patent Co-operation Treaty Union by "PCT". The class indicated for the Paris Union applies equally to the Nice, Locarno and IPC Unions.

\*In addition to the States listed. Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua. Panama and Paraguay were members of one or more Unions which did not require payment of contributions.

\*\*The amount of ordinary contributions of each member State includes--where applicable--32 per cent of the contributions for 1981 and 85 per cent of the contributions for 1982 to the Paris, Berne and Nice Unions. In addition, It includes ordinary contributions payable In 1982 to the other Unions and the supplementary contribution to the PCT Union for 1981, payable In 1982.

\*\*\*Calculated on the basis of the United Nations rate of exchange for December 1981; Swiss francs 1.76 = US \$1.00.

## Annex II. OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (As at 31 December 1981)

### CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

#### OFFICERS

Chairman: J. Fernandez de Ybarra Y Moreno (Spain).

First Vice-Chairman: Dragutin Boskovic (Yugoslavia).

Second Vice-Chairman: Joachim Hammerling (German Democratic Republic).

#### MEMBERS

Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of. Haiti, Hungary, India, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

## SENIOR OFFICERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

Director General: Arpad Bogsch.  
 Deputy Directors General: Lev Kostikov, Klaus Planner, Marino Porzio.  
 Director, Public Information and Copyright Department: Claude Masouyé.  
 Director, Developing Countries Division (Copyright): Shahid Alikhan.  
 Director, Public Information Division: Roger Harben.

Director, External Relations Division: Ibrahima Thiam.  
 Director, Industrial Property Division: Ludwig Baeumer.  
 Director, Classifications and Patent Information Division: Paul Claus.  
 Director, Patent Co-operation Treaty Division: François Curchod.  
 Director, Administrative Division: Thomas Keefer.  
 Legal Counsel: Gust Ledakis.

## HEADQUARTERS OTHER OFFICE

HEADQUARTERS  
 World Intellectual Property Organization  
 34 Chemin des Colombettes  
 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland  
 Cable address: WIPO GENEVA or OMPI GENÈVE  
 Telephone: 99 91 11  
 Telex: 22376

LIAISON OFFICE WITH THE UNITED NATIONS IN NEW YORK  
 World Intellectual Property Organization  
 821 United Nations Plaza, 6th floor  
 New York, N. Y. 10017, United States  
 Telephone: (212) 867-0029. (212) 754-6813  
 Telex: 420544

## Chapter XVI

## International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), created in 1977 to provide concessional-term resources for the agricultural development and reduction of rural poverty in its developing member States, completed its fourth year of operation in 1981. The Fund's lending policies continued to reflect its conviction that food problems could be solved only if the rural poor were enabled to participate in the development process.

Membership of IFAD remained at 135 during 1981. Of these, 20 were in Category I (developed countries), 12 in Category II (oil-exporting developing countries) and 103 in Category III (other developing countries).

With the approval of 30 additional projects in 1981, total assistance provided by the Fund to 76 member countries since 1978 amounted to some \$1,190 million, with about \$1,150 million committed for 89 projects, and over \$42 million provided as technical assistance grants.

Of the 89 loans approved in this four-year period, 36 loans were for projects in Africa, 33 in Asia and 20 in Latin America. Most of the loans were provided on highly concessional terms, with 50-year maturity periods, including a 10-year grace period and a service charge of 1 per cent per annum. Of the total loan commitments of \$1,150 million, 71 per cent were provided to low-income countries with per capita gross national product (GNP) of less than \$300: about half of the total financial assistance provided to this group went to the least developed countries. Loans to those countries with above \$300 per capita income were made available on intermediate terms (at 4 per cent, 20 years maturity with a five- or eight-year grace period) or on ordinary

terms (8 per cent, 15 years maturity with three years' grace).

Since 1979 approved loans have been denominated in special drawing rights (SDRs), an international unit of account. Dollar figures in this chapter are based on the SDR/United States dollar conversion rate at 31 December 1981 (SDR 1 = US \$1.16396).

## Resources

Of the total initial resources of \$1,015 million pledged by members, \$931 million had been paid as of 31 December 1981-\$508 million in cash and the balance of \$423 million in irrevocable, non-interest-bearing demand promissory notes.

In recognition of the need to replenish the Fund's resources, the Governing Council, in January 1980, invited members to make additional contributions at a level sufficient to provide for an increase in real terms in the level of IFAD operations.

## Investments

Investments of the Fund's liquid assets continued to be restricted to obligations issued or fully guaranteed by Governments or by major banks. While 69 per cent (\$315 million) of such assets was held on deposit with, or in obligations issued by, commercial banks, IFAD continued to build up the percentage of its portfolio of bonds and similar obligations issued by developing country members.

At the end of 1981, IFAD's liquid assets totalled \$459 million. Although the average rate of return earned on these assets for 1981 was 12.8 per cent- significantly higher than the 11.8 per cent



for 1980-investment income fell as a result of currency realignments and disbursements on loans and grants.

#### Activities in 1981

During 1981, IFAD approved financial assistance totalling some \$355 million for 30 projects in 30 countries, compared with 27 projects in 1980, 23 in 1979 and 10 in 1978. Of these 30 projects, 12 were in Africa, 11 in Asia and seven in Latin America: seventeen of them were initiated by IFAD, and 13 were co-financed projects from the pipelines of other institutions.

The Fund continued to concentrate on increasing the food-crop production, and on improving the living conditions of the poor. Some of the projects were aimed at improving the storage and marketing elements to meet the anticipated increase in production, while others provided credit for seasonal inputs or on-farm investments as an important means for achieving increased production.

As regards technical assistance, the Fund provided some \$2.31 million in support of project preparation activities to assist 12 member States. Grant financing also continued to be provided, in appropriate cases, for certain elements of technical assistance forming part of a project such as training, agricultural extension and special studies. Gambia, Haiti, Rwanda, Uganda and Upper Volta received such grants, totalling \$4.39 million.

The tables below show the technical assistance grants approved during 1981 for project preparation and those for research. For technical assistance grants as components within loans, see table on PROJECT LOANS on page 1480.

As in previous years, irrigation continued to be an important element in IFAD lending. It featured in projects benefiting Bolivia, China, the Gambia, India, Indonesia, Mauritius, Nepal and Pakistan and in a number of these the main effort was directed towards rehabilitating or improving existing irrigation works. Livestock development received increased attention during 1981 with projects being approved for China, the Philippines and Samoa.

Loans were made for credit projects in Jordan and Panama, along with 16 other projects with a credit element. The Fund continued efforts to ensure that agricultural credit would reach small farmers, rather than large- and medium-scale farmers as in the past.

Four special missions- to Bangladesh, Guinea, Peru and Zambia-analysed the food production and nutrition situation and explored the nature and extent of rural poverty, and identified specific assistance programmes suitable for IFAD financing.

#### Project loans

The table on p. 1480 summarizes project loans approved and related technical assistance granted during 1981. Loans were all made on highly concessional terms except in the case of Bolivia, Botswana, Colombia, Grenada, Jordan, Liberia, Mauritius, Nicaragua, Paraguay, the Philippines and Zambia (intermediate terms), and Panama (ordinary terms).

#### Income and expenditures

Total revenue for 1981 was \$61.4 million-some \$60.3 accruing from investment income and the rest (over \$1 million) interest from loans. Expenses for the year amounted to \$15.3 million compared with a budget of \$18.5 million approved by the Governing Council at its fourth session, in December 1980. The excess of revenue over expenses for 1981 was \$46.1 million.

#### Secretariat

As at December 1981, the secretariat of IFAD totalled 158, of whom 67, were executive or technical staff (Professional category and above), drawn from 45 countries, and 91 were support staff (General Service category).

#### PROJECT PREPARATION GRANTS

Country	Amount (in thousands of US dollars)
Bolivia	200
Congo	50
Democratic Yemen	350
Egypt	391
Kenya	200
Madagascar	150
Sudan	150
Swaziland	200
Tunisia	150
Uganda	150
United Republic of Tanzania	70
Zimbabwe	250
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,311</b>

#### RESEARCH GRANTS

Recipient	Amount (in thousands of US dollars)
Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, Call, Colombia	900
International Centre for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas, Beirut, Lebanon (two grants)	1,440
International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics, Hyderabad, India	300
International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C., United States	100
International Institute for Tropical Agriculture, Ibadan, Nigeria (two grants)	1,610
International Livestock Centre for Africa, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	650
International Rice Research Institute, Los Banos, Philippines	1,700
International Potato Centre, Lima, Peru	517
West African Rice Development Association, Monrovia, Liberia	600
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,817</b>

## PROJECT LOANS APPROVED AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTED DURING 1981

COUNTRY	Purpose	AMOUNT*		COUNTRY	Purpose	AMOUNT*	
		Loan (in thou- sands of US dollars)	Technical assistance (in thou- sands of SDRs)			Loan (in thou- sands of US dollars)	Technical assistance (in thou- sands of SDRs)
Bangladesh**	Rural development In Jessore and Faridpur districts	23,800	-	Approved subject to availability of funds			
Benin	Rural development in Borgou province	12,800	-	Bolivia**	Agricultural development In the Chuquisaca region	13,600	-
Burundi	Rural development In Ngozi province	7,300	-	Botswana**	Agricultural development	7,800	-
China**	Livestock development In northern China	33,400	-	Colombia	Rural development In Arauca	7,900	
Grenada**	Artisanal Fisheries development	1,600	-	Gambia**	Agricultural development in Jahaly and Pacharr	4,700	430
Democratic Yemen	Agricultural development In Wadi Beihan	5,700	-	Haiti**	Agricultural development in north-western and central-eastern regions	14,000	1,220
Jordan**	Agricultural development and credit for rain-fed farming areas	10,800	-	India	Irrigation in Madhya Pradesh	25,500	-
Liberia**	Agricultural development	7,800	-	Indonesia**	Land development In central Sulawesi	35,000	
Malawi**	Rural development	11,200	-	Mauritius**	Agricultural development	6,100	-
Paraguay	Rural development in Paraguari department	4,100	-	Nepal	Agricultural development	11,400	
Samoa**	Livestock development	1,600	-	Nicaragua**	Rural development in the Pronorte region	11,200	
Sierra Leone	Agricultural development in northern region	5,700	-	Pakistan	Agricultural development through on-farm water management	12,200	-
Upper Volta**	Rural development	13,800	330	Panama	Agricultural credit for small farmers	8,600	-
Zambia	Agricultural development in eastern province	10,500		Philippines	Livestock development	8,300	-
				Rwanda**	Rural development in Byumba prefecture	10,600	920
				Sri Lanka	Agricultural development for smallholder coconut growers	8,300	
				Uganda**	Agricultural rehabilitation in eastern and northern regions	19,300	875
Subtotal		150,100	330	Subtotal		204,500	3,445
				Total		354,600	3,775***

\*Dollar equivalent based on the rate effective on 31 December 1981.

\*\*Projects initiated by IFAD.

\*\*\*As at 31 December 1981, the SDR/United States dollar conversion rate stood at SDR 1 = US \$1.16396.

### Annex I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND CONTRIBUTIONS PLEDGED AND PAID (As at 31 December 1981)

MEMBER	CONTRIBUTION (in US dollar equivalents)		MEMBER	CONTRIBUTION (in US dollar equivalents)	
	Pledged	Paid		Pledged	Paid
Category I			Category I (cont.)		
Australia	9,019,166	9,019,166	United States	200,000,000	200,000,000
Austria	4,800,000	4,800,000	Subtotal	561,170,863	561,170,863
Belgium	14,000,520	14,000,520	Category II		
Canada	27,731,092	27,731,092	Algeria	10,000,000	10,000,000
Denmark	7,500,000	7,500,000	Gabon	500,000	500,000
Finland	2,752,294	2,752,294	Indonesia	1,250,000	1,250,000
France	22,173,913	22,173,913	Iran	124,750,000	41,583,333
Germany, Federal Republic of	55,000,000	55,000,000	Iraq	20,000,000	20,000,000
Ireland	1,087,786	1,087,786	Kuwait	36,000,000	36,000,000
Italy	25,000,000	25,000,000	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	20,000,000	20,000,000
Japan	55,000,000	55,000,000	Nigeria	26,000,000	26,000,000
Luxembourg	372,467	372,467	Qatar	9,000,000	9,000,000
Netherlands	43,485,830	43,485,830	Saudi Arabia	105,500,000	105,500,000
New Zealand	1,652,893	1,652,893	United Arab Emirates	16,500,000	16,500,000
Norway	22,375,215	22,375,215	Venezuela	66,000,000	66,000,000
Spain	2,000,000	2,000,000	Subtotal	435,500,000	352,333,333
Sweden	20,646,320	20,646,320			
Switzerland	12,222,222	12,222,222			
United Kingdom	34,351,145	34,351,145			

## International Fund for Agricultural Development

1481

MEMBER	CONTRIBUTION (in US dollar equivalents)		MEMBER	CONTRIBUTION (in US dollar equivalents)	
	Pledged	Paid		Pledged	Paid
Category III			Category III (cont.)		
Afghanistan	8,696	8,696	Maldives	-	-
Angola*			Mali	{ 10,000**	{ 10,000**
Argentina	{ 22,695 899,799**	{ 22,695 899,799**	Malta	-	-
Bangladesh	{ 377,834 100,000**	{ 377,834 100,000**	Mauritania	-	-
Barbados	1,000	1,000	Mauritius		
Benin			Mexico	{ 5,000,000 2,277,950**	{ 5,000,000 2,277,950**
Bhutan	{ 1,000**	{ 1,000**	Morocco	405,643	405,643
Bolivia	-	-	Mozambique	{ 33,333 66,667**	{ 33,333 66,667**
Botswana	{ 5,000**	{ 5,000**	Nepal	{ 5,000 5,000**	{ 5,000 5,000**
Brazil	-	-	Nicaragua	28,571	28,571
Burundi	-	-	Niger	52,174	52,174
Cape Verde	1,000	1,000	Oman*	-	-
Central African Republic	3,478	3,478	Pakistan	{ 1,005,051 433,334**	{ 1,005,051 433,334**
Chad			Panama	{ 25,000**	{ 25,000**
Chile	50,000	50,000	Papua New Guinea	20,000	20,000
China	942,857	942,857	Paraguay	-	-
Colombia			Peru	{ 60,000**	{ 60,000**
Comoros	34,843	17,421	Philippines	250,000	250,000
Congo	-	-	Portugal	-	-
Costa Rica	-	-	Republic of Korea	{ 174,681 84,000**	{ 174,681 84,000**
Cuba			Romania	331,333	331,333
Cyprus	{ 25,000 12,000**	{ 25,000 12,000**	Rwanda	-	-
Democratic Yemen	-	-	Saint Lucia	-	-
Djibouti	-	-	Samoa	10,000	10,000
Dominica	{ 3,681**	{ 3,681**	Sao Tome and Principe	-	-
Dominican Republic	25,000	25,000	Senegal	10,000	10,000
Ecuador	{ 25,047 14,024**	{ 25,047 14,024**	Seychelles	5,000	1,667
Egypt	171,429	171,429	Sierra Leone	{ 18,296 18,430**	{ 18,296 18,430**
El Salvador	40,000	40,000	Solomon Islands	-	-
Equatorial Guinea	-	-	Somalia	10,000	10,000
Ethiopia	23,623	23,623	Sri Lanka	878,102	878,102
Fiji	{ 10,000 10,000**	{ 10,000 10,000**	Sudan	10,000	10,000
Gambia	-	-	Swaziland	-	-
Ghana	100,000	100,000	Syrian Arab Republic	127,226	42,408
Greece	150,000	150,000	Thailand	100,000	100,000
Grenada	-	-	Togo	10,435	10,435
Guatemala			Tunisia	96,154	96,154
Guinea	1,178,689	1,178,689	Turkey	18,657	18,657
Guinea-Bissau	-	-	Uganda	2,339	2,339
Guyana	-	-	United Republic of Cameroon	{ 50,000 3,413**	{ 50,000 3,413**
Haiti	60,000		United Republic of Tanzania	36,058	36,058
Honduras	25,000	25,000	Upper Volta	10,000	10,000
India	4,732,584	4,732,584	Uruguay	-	-
Israel	150,000	150,000	Viet Nam	56,054	56,054
Ivory Coast*	-	-	Yemen	50,000	50,000
Jamaica	{ 5,085 10,000**	{ 5,085 10,000**	Yugoslavia	129,125	129,125
Jordan	30,000	30,000	Zaire	30,000	-
Kenya	769,231	769,231	Zambia	44,952	44,952
Lao People's Democratic Republic	10,000	10,000	Zimbabwe	-	-
Lebanon					
Lesotho	15,000	15,000	Subtotal	22,055,573	21,860,000
Liberia	10,000	10,000	Total	1,018,726,436	935,364,196
Madagascar					
Malawi	{ 5,000 5,000**	{ 5,000 5,000**			

NOTE: According to article 4, section 2 (c), of the Agreement establishing IFAD, members' initial contributions are payable in cash or promissory notes, either in a single sum or in three equal annual instalments. Contributions have been translated on the basis of International Monetary Fund exchange rates as at 31 December 1981.

\*Had not completed the required membership formalities.

\*\*Pledged and paid towards IFAD replenishment.

## Annex II. OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

### EXECUTIVE BOARD

Chairman: Abdelmuhsin M. Al-Sudeary.

#### MEMBERS

Category I: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Japan, Netherlands, Sweden, United States. Alternates: Austria, Canada, Denmark, Switzerland, United Kingdom.

Category II: Iran, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Alternates: Algeria, Gabon, Indonesia, Iraq, Qatar, United Arab Emirates.

Category III: Argentina, Bangladesh, Guinea, Mexico, Philippines, Tunisia, Alternates: Honduras, Lesotho, Malta, Peru, Republic of Korea, United Republic of Tanzania.

### SENIOR SECRETARIAT OFFICERS

President: Abdelmuhsin M. Al-Sudeary.

Vice-President: Philip Birnbaum.

Assistant President, Head of Economic and Planning Department: Sartaj Aziz.

Assistant President, Head of Project Management Department: Moise Mensah.

Assistant President, Head of General Affairs Department: Abbas Ordoobadi.

Treasurer, Financial Services Division: Alan Molyneux.

Director, Personnel Services Division: John Sykes.

Director, Legal Services Division: Mohammed Nawaz.

### HEADQUARTERS AND OTHER OFFICE

#### HEADQUARTERS

International Fund for Agricultural Development  
107 Via del Serafico  
00142 Rome, Italy  
Cable address: IFAD ROME  
Telephone: 54591  
Telex: 614160, 614162

#### ACTING LIAISON OFFICE WITH UNITED NATIONS IN NEW YORK

International Fund for Agricultural Development  
Room S-2455  
United Nations Headquarters  
New York, N. Y. 10017, United States  
Telephone: (212) 754-6015

## Chapter XVII

# Interim Commission for the International Trade Organization (ICITO) and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, held at Havana, Cuba, between November 1947 and March 1948, drew up a charter for an International Trade Organization (ITO) and established an Interim Commission for the International Trade Organization (ICITO). Since the charter itself was never accepted, ITO was not established. However, while they drew up the Charter, the Preparatory Committee's members negotiated on tariffs among themselves, and also drew up the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The Agreement—a multilateral treaty embodying reciprocal rights and obligations—entered into force on 1 January 1948, with 23 Contracting Parties. Since then, ICITO has provided the GATT secretariat.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which had been progressively amended and supplemented since 1948, remained the only multilateral instrument that set out agreed rules for international trade.

At the end of 1981, the number of Contracting

Parties to GATT had risen to 86 with the addition of Colombia; one other country—Tunisia—had acceded provisionally. The Contracting Parties conducted about 85 per cent of all international trade and 30 other countries applied the rules of GATT.

#### Multilateral trade negotiations

#### Implementation of the Tokyo Round agreements

With the entry into force on 1 January 1981 of agreements on customs valuation and government procurement, all agreements resulting from the so-called Tokyo Round of multilateral trade negotiations had taken effect. These negotiations, concluded in 1979,<sup>a</sup> had been launched in Japan, in 1973.

The second of the annual tariff cuts agreed upon by Tokyo Round participating countries also became effective on 1 January 1981. This

<sup>a</sup>See YUN 1979, p. 1328.

series of eight annual reductions in customs duties was to extend to 1 January 1987, and would result in an average cut of about one third in the level of tariffs imposed by industrialized countries on imports of manufactured goods. Further reductions were being made on agricultural products, and many developing countries had also agreed to make tariff cuts, or to bind tariffs against increase.

By the end of 1981, 47 countries, including 19 developing nations, had accepted one or more of the Tokyo Round agreements.

The committees or councils set up to oversee operation of each agreement or code met regularly during 1981 to monitor implementation of the agreements in national legislation, regulations and procedures, and to discuss interpretation and application of agreements, including disputes arising over these matters between signatories.

Various substantive questions arose in the committees and councils concerning coverage of the agreements. For example, the Committee on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures and the Committee on Anti-Dumping Practices asked a group of experts to define objective criteria for determining when a producer and an exporter or importer were considered to be "related"; the group set out such criteria in a report, later adopted by both committees.

The Committee on Anti-Dumping Practices discussed the extent to which basic price systems might be used in conformity with the provisions of the Anti-Dumping Code. The main purpose of basic prices was to facilitate the imposition of anti-dumping duties when several foreign countries were involved. The Committee adopted an understanding by which it recognized that the wording of the relevant provision of the Code contained ambiguities and, in the light of different possible interpretations, was not essential to the Code's operation and should not provide the basis for any anti-dumping investigation or for the imposition and collection of anti-dumping duties.

The Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade took up international and regional standardizing activities, and decided to undertake a study on private standardizing and certifying bodies. The Committee also organized a discussion among persons responsible for national enquiry points on standards-related activities that had been established in each signatory country, in order to determine practical arrangements for improving the notification and information system set up under the agreement.

The Committee on Government Procurement considered inclusion of taxes and customs duties in the minimum value of procurement contracts, and also the identification of contracts published

in accordance with the Agreement on Government Procurement. As there was disagreement in the Committee over the extent to which leasing and similar arrangements were subject to the Agreement, its members were asked to communicate their current practices, with a detailed description of the types of contracts considered to fall within the coverage of the Agreement. In March 1981, GATT published complete lists of the purchasing agencies or entities covered by the Agreement on Government Procurement.

New tasks were given to some Committees, such as a study in the Committee on Tariff Concessions of tariff escalation in relation to the degree of processing of products, and an examination entrusted to a technical sub-committee of the Committee on Trade in Civil Aircraft of a list of products which might be added to the coverage of the Agreement on Civil Aircraft.

The Councils overseeing the Arrangement Regarding Bovine Meat and the International Dairy Arrangement met during 1981 to supervise both agreements and to evaluate the world market situation for meat and dairy products on the basis of annual secretariat reports.

In June 1981, the International Meat Council set up a meat market analysis group to assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the Arrangement Regarding Bovine Meat, in particular to help evaluate and analyse reports on meat market trends.

In September 1981, the three Committees responsible for implementing the Protocol Regarding Certain Milk Powders, the Protocol Regarding Milk Fat and the Protocol Regarding Certain Cheeses examined the minimum price level of the products covered. These minimum prices were fixed for pilot products defined in the International Dairy Arrangement taking account of the current market situation, dairy prices in participating producer countries, the need to ensure equitable prices to consumers, and the desirability of maintaining a minimum return to the most efficient producers in order to ensure stability of supply over the longer term. They were not to be considered as market prices. It was decided to increase the minimum prices as from 1 October 1981 to the following levels (free on board per metric ton): skimmed milk powder and buttermilk powder: \$600; whole milk powder: \$950; butter: \$1,200; anhydrous milk fat: \$1,440; certain cheeses: \$1,000.

#### Other GATT Activities

##### Council of Representatives

During 1981, the Council of Representatives, GATT's highest body, meeting between sessions of the Contracting Parties, acted on some 50

different international trade policy issues, including reports from panels of independent experts set up to examine and make recommendations on trade disputes between GATT's member Governments. Eleven of the 17 international trade disputes brought before the Council during the year concerned agricultural products.

#### Ministerial session

At their annual session in November 1981, GATT's member States decided that their next session, in November 1982, should be convened at ministerial level to examine the functioning of the multilateral trading system, and to reinforce the common efforts of the contracting parties to support and improve the system for the benefit of all nations. It was further agreed that the ministerial session would address the implementation of the results of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations, problems affecting the trading system, the position of developing countries in world trade and future prospects for the development of trade. In the context of their consideration of the work programme of GATT for the 1980s, the Ministers would also determine future priorities for co-operation among contracting parties. A preparatory committee for the session, open to all the member States of GATT was also set up.

#### Committee on Trade and Development

The Committee on Trade and Development, continued to review issues of trade interest to developing countries as did its two sub-committees established in 1980.

#### Preferential arrangements among developing countries

Possibilities for a further round of negotiations to increase trade among developing nations continued to be explored in 1981. The developing countries taking part included signatories to the 18-nation Protocol Relating to Trade Negotiations Among Developing Countries concluded in 1973.

#### Balance-of-payments restrictions

Consultations with countries whose balance-of-payments difficulties had led them to restrict imports were held in 1981 with Brazil, Egypt, Greece, Italy, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Turkey and Yugoslavia.

#### Textiles Arrangement

As the result of negotiations in GATT during 1981, agreement was reached, on 22 December, that the Arrangement Regarding International

Trade in Textiles (the Multifibre Arrangement (MFA)) should be extended for a further period of four years and seven months, from 1 January 1982 until 31 July 1986. The Arrangement, whose signatories accounted for four fifths (about \$80 billion worth) of world trade in textiles and clothing, was originally negotiated in 1973 under GATT auspices. Although no changes were made in the original MFA text, the Protocol of Extension mentioned certain understandings recorded in the adopted conclusions.

#### Technical assistance

In 1981, a number of GATT missions were dispatched to developing countries and officials participated in seminars and training courses on GATT and the Tokyo Round agreements held in Barbados, Colombia, Ecuador, Ghana, Honduras, Kenya, Malawi, the Philippines, Romania, Uruguay, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Discussions on certain of the Tokyo Round agreements and other specific issues were also held by GATT officials with Colombia, Nigeria, Thailand, Tunisia and Yugoslavia.

#### Training programme

Two trade policy courses with a total of 42 participants were held at Geneva during 1981. The biannual courses, begun in 1955, aimed at deepening developing country officials' knowledge of trade policy issues and at improving their skills in international trade negotiations.

#### International Trade Centre

Established by GATT in 1964, but jointly operated by GATT and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development since 1968, the International Trade Centre continued to provide trade information and trade promotion advisory services for developing countries. The Centre's work was directed to helping developing countries to formulate and implement trade promotion programmes and activities, and to become progressively self-reliant.

#### Publications

Publications issued in 1981 included the annual volumes of GATT Activities and International Trade, and a new monthly newsletter, launched in February, GATT Focus.

#### Secretariat

As at 31 December 1981, the GATT secretariat employed 269 staff; of these 120 were in the Professional and higher categories, and 149 were in the General Service category. They were drawn from 39 nationalities.

## Financial arrangements

The member countries of GATT contribute to the budget in accordance with a scale assessed on the basis of each country's share in the total trade of the Contracting Parties and associated

governments. The budget for 1981 was 41,864,000 Swiss francs. The scale of contributions for 1982 is given below. (The United Nations rate of exchange for December 1981 was Swiss francs 1.76 = US \$1.00).

Annex I. CONTRACTING PARTIES TO THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON  
TARIFFS AND TRADE AND SCALE OF CONTRIBUTIONS FOR 1982  
(As at December 1981)

Contracting Party	Net contribution (in Swiss francs)	Contracting Party	Net contribution (in Swiss francs)	Contracting Party	Net contribution (in Swiss francs)
Argentina	181,670	Hungary	257,000	Romania	283,590
Australia	580,460	Iceland	53,170	Rwanda	53,170
Austria	553,880	India	257,000	Senegal	53,170
Bangladesh	53,170	Indonesia	305,740	Sierra Leone	53,170
Barbados	53,170	Ireland	261,430	Singapore	354,480
Belgium	1,670,490	Israel	186,100	South Africa	283,590
Benin	53,170	Italy	2,304,120	Spain	682,380
Brazil	562,740	Ivory Coast	70,900	Sri Lanka	53,170
Burma	53,170	Jamaica	53,170	Suriname	53,170
Burundi	53,170	Japan	3,465,040	Sweden	855,180
Canada	1,781,260	Kenya	53,170	Switzerland	886,200
Central African Republic	53,170	Kuwait	345,620	Togo	53,170
Chad	53,170	Luxembourg	146,230	Trinidad and Tobago	84,190
Chile	124,070	Madagascar	53,170	Turkey	115,210
Colombia	110,780	Malawi	53,170	Uganda	53,170
Congo	53,170	Malaysia	292,450	United Kingdom	3,597,970
Cuba	128,500	Malta	53,170	United Republic of Cameroon	53,170
Cyprus	53,170	Mauritania	53,170	United Republic of Tanzania	53,170
Czechoslovakia	447,530	Mauritius	53,170	United States	6,358,490
Denmark	505,140	Netherlands	2,118,020	Upper Volta	53,170
Dominican Republic	53,170	New Zealand	141,790	Uruguay	53,170
Egypt	106,350	Nicaragua	53,170	Yugoslavia	310,170
Finland	358,910	Niger	53,170	Zaire	53,170
France	3,292,230	Nigeria	496,270	Zimbabwe	53,170
Gabon	53,170	Norway	443,100		
Gambia	53,170	Pakistan	97,480	Associated Governments	
Germany, Federal Republic of	5,113,380	Peru	66,470		
Ghana	53,170	Philippines	177,240	Democratic Kampuchea	53,170
Greece	181,670	Poland	545,020	Tunisia	70,900
Guyana	53,170	Portugal	137,360		
Haiti	53,170	Republic of Korea	540,580	Total	44,310,000

Annex II. OFFICERS AND OFFICES OF THE  
GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE  
(As at 31 December 1981)

## OFFICERS

## OFFICERS OF THE CONTRACTING PARTIES\*

Chairman of the Contracting Parties: Donald S. McPhail (Canada).

Vice-Chairmen of the Contracting Parties: K. G. Anthony Hill (Jamaica).

Andre Onkelinx (Belgium), Marko Vrhunec (Yugoslavia).

Chairman of the Council of Representatives: Bhagirath Lal Das (India).

Chairman of the Committee on Trade and Development: Felipe Jaramillo (Colombia).

## SENIOR OFFICERS OF THE SECRETARIAT

Director-General: Arthur Dunkel.

Deputy Directors-General: Madan G. Mathur, William B. Kelly, Jr.

Assistant Director-General: Sermet R. Pasin.

## SENIOR OFFICERS OF THE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE CENTRE UNCTAD/GATT

Executive Director: Goran Engbolm.

Deputy Executive Director: Said Harb.

\*Elected at the end of the November 1981 session, to hold office until the end of the next session.

## HEADQUARTERS

GATT Secretariat  
Centre William Rappard  
Rue de Lausanne 154  
1211 Geneva 21, Switzerland  
Cable address: GATT GENEVA  
Telephone: 310231  
Telex: 28787

# Appendices



## Appendix I

## Roster of the United Nations

(As at 31 December 1981)

MEMBER	DATE OF ADMISSION	MEMBER	DATE OF ADMISSION	MEMBER	DATE OF ADMISSION
Afghanistan	19 Nov. 1946	G h a n a	8 Mar. 1957	Philippines	24 Oct. 1945
Albania	14 Dec. 1955	Greece	25 Oct. 1945	Poland	24 Oct. 1945
Algeria	8 Oct. 1962	Grenada	17 Sep. 1974	Portugal	14 Dec. 1955
Angola	1 Dec. 1976	Guatemala	21 Nov. 1945	Qatar	21 Sep. 1971
Antigua and Barbuda	11 Nov. 1981	Guinea	12 Dec. 1958	Romania	14 Dec. 1955
Argentina	24 Oct. 1945	Guinea-Bissau	17 Sep. 1974	Rwanda	18 Sep. 1962
Australia	1 Nov. 1945	Guyana	20 Sep. 1966	Saint Lucia	18 Sep. 1979
Austria	14 Dec. 1955	Haiti	24 Oct. 1945	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	16 Sep. 1980
Bahamas	18 Sep. 1973	Honduras	17 Dec. 1945	Samoa	15 Dec. 1976
Bahrain	21 Sep. 1971	Hungary	14 Dec. 1955	Sao Tome and Principe	16 Sep. 1975
Bangladesh	17 Sep. 1974	Iceland	19 Nov. 1946	Saudi Arabia	24 Oct. 1945
Barbados	9 Dec. 1966	India	30 Oct. 1945	Senegal	28 Sep. 1960
Belgium	27 Dec. 1945	Indonesia <sup>2</sup>	28 Sep. 1950	Seychelles	21 Sep. 1976
Belize	25 Sep. 1981	Iran (Islamic Republic of) <sup>3</sup>	24 Oct. 1945	Sierra Leone	27 Sep. 1961
Benin	20 Sep. 1960	Iraq	21 Dec. 1945	Singapore <sup>4</sup>	21 Sep. 1965
Bhutan	21 Sep. 1971	Ireland	14 Dec. 1955	Solomon Islands	19 Sep. 1978
Bolivia	14 Nov. 1945	Israel	11 May 1949	Somalia	20 Sep. 1960
Botswana	17 Oct. 1966	Italy	14 Dec. 1955	South Africa	7 Nov. 1945
Brazil	24 Oct. 1945	Ivory Coast	20 Sep. 1960	Spain	14 Dec. 1955
Bulgaria	14 Dec. 1955	Jamaica	18 Sep. 1962	Sri Lanka	14 Dec. 1955
Burma	19 Apr. 1948	Japan	18 Dec. 1956	Sudan	12 Nov. 1956
Burundi	18 Sep. 1962	Jordan	14 Dec. 1955	Suriname	4 Dec. 1975
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	24 Oct. 1945	Kenya	16 Dec. 1963	Swaziland	24 Sep. 1968
Canada	9 Nov. 1945	Kuwait	14 May 1963	Sweden	19 Nov. 1946
Cape Verde	16 Sep. 1975	Lao People's Democratic Republic	14 Dec. 1955	Syrian Arab Republic <sup>7</sup>	24 Oct. 1945
Central African Republic	20 Sep. 1960	Lebanon	24 Oct. 1945	Thailand	16 Dec. 1946
Chad	20 Sep. 1960	Lesotho	17 Oct. 1966	Togo	20 Sep. 1960
Chile	24 Oct. 1945	Liberia	2 Nov. 1945	Trinidad and Tobago	18 Sep. 1962
China	24 Oct. 1945	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	14 Dec. 1955	Tunisia	12 Nov. 1956
Colombia	5 Nov. 1945	Luxembourg	24 Oct. 1945	Turkey	24 Oct. 1945
Comoros	12 Nov. 1975	Madagascar	20 Sep. 1960	Uganda	25 Oct. 1962
Congo	20 Sep. 1960	Malawi	1 Dec. 1964	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	24 Oct. 1945
Costa Rica	2 Nov. 1945	Malaysia <sup>4</sup>	17 Sep. 1957	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	24 Oct. 1945
Cuba	24 Oct. 1945	Maldives	21 Sep. 1965	United Arab Emirates	9 Dec. 1971
Cyprus	20 Sep. 1960	Mali	28 Sep. 1960	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	24 Oct. 1945
Czechoslovakia	24 Oct. 1945	Malta	1 Dec. 1964	United Republic of Cameroon	20 Sep. 1960
Democratic Kampuchea	14 Dec. 1955	Mauritania	27 Oct. 1961	United Republic of Tanzania <sup>5</sup>	14 Dec. 1961
Democratic Yemen	14 Dec. 1967	Mauritius	24 Apr. 1968	United States of America	24 Oct. 1945
Denmark	24 Oct. 1945	Mexico	7 Nov. 1945	Upper Volta	20 Sep. 1960
Djibouti	20 Sep. 1977	Mongolia	27 Oct. 1961	Uruguay	16 Dec. 1945
Dominica	18 Dec. 1978	Morocco	12 Nov. 1956	Vanuatu	15 Sep. 1981
Dominican Republic	24 Oct. 1945	Mozambique	16 Sep. 1975	Venezuela	15 Nov. 1945
Ecuador	21 Dec. 1945	Nepal	14 Dec. 1955	Viet Nam	20 Sep. 1977
Egypt <sup>1</sup>	24 Oct. 1945	Netherlands	10 Dec. 1945	Yemen	30 Sep. 1947
El Salvador	24 Oct. 1945	New Zealand	24 Oct. 1945	Yugoslavia	24 Oct. 1945
Equatorial Guinea	12 Nov. 1968	Nicaragua	24 Oct. 1945	Zaire	20 Sep. 1960
Ethiopia	13 Nov. 1945	Niger	20 Sep. 1960	Zambia	1 Dec. 1964
Fiji	13 Oct. 1970	Nigeria	7 Oct. 1960	Zimbabwe	25 Aug. 1980
Finland	14 Dec. 1955	Norway	27 Nov. 1945		
France	24 Oct. 1945	Oman	7 Oct. 1971		
Gabon	20 Sep. 1960	Pakistan	30 Sep. 1947		
Gambia	21 Sep. 1965	Panama	13 Nov. 1945		
German Democratic Republic	18 Sep. 1973	Papua New Guinea	10 Oct. 1975		
Germany, Federal		Paraguay	24 Oct. 1945		
Republic of	18 Sep. 1973	Peru	31 Oct. 1945		

(footnotes on next page)

(Footnotes for preceding page)

<sup>1</sup>Egypt and Syria, both of which became Members of the United Nations on 24 October 1945, joined together following a plebiscite held in those countries on 21 February 1958 to form the United Arab Republic. On 13 October 1961, Syria, having resumed its status as an independent State, also resumed its separate membership in the United Nations; it changed its name to the Syrian Arab Republic on 14 September 1971. The United Arab Republic continued as a Member of the United Nations and reverted to the name of Egypt on 2 September 1971.

<sup>2</sup>By a letter of 20 January 1965, Indonesia informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw from the United Nations. By a telegram of 19 September 1966, it notified the Secretary-General of its decision to resume participation. On 28 September 1966, the General Assembly took note of that decision and the President invited the representatives of Indonesia to take their seats in the Assembly.

<sup>3</sup>By a communication of 5 March 1981, Iran informed the Secretary-General that it should be referred to by its complete name of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

<sup>4</sup>On 16 September 1963, Sabah (North Borneo), Sarawak and Singapore joined with the Federation of Malaya (which became a United Nations Member on 17 September 1957) to form Malaysia. On 9 August 1965, Singapore became an independent State and on 21 September 1965 it became a Member of the United Nations.

<sup>5</sup>Tanganyika was admitted to the United Nations on 14 December 1961, and Zanzibar, on 16 December 1963. Following ratification, on 26 April 1964, of the Articles of Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar, the two States became represented as a single Member: the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar; it changed its name to the United Republic of Tanzania on 1 November 1964.

Appendix II

# Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice

## Charter of the United Nations

NOTE: The Charter of the United Nations was signed on 26 June 1945, in San Francisco, at the conclusion of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, and came into force on 24 October 1945. The Statute of the International Court of Justice is an integral part of the Charter.

Amendments to Articles 23, 27 and 61 of the Charter were adopted by the General Assembly on 17 December 1963 and came into force on 31 August 1965. A further amendment to Article 61 was adopted by the General Assembly on 20 December 1971, and came into force on 24 September 1973. An amendment to Article 109, adopted by the General Assembly on 20 December 1965, came into force on 12 June 1968.

The amendment to Article 23 enlarges the membership of the Security Council from 11 to 15. The amended Article 27 provides that decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members (formerly seven) and on all other matters by an affirmative vote of nine members (formerly seven), including the concurring

votes of the five permanent members of the Security Council.

The amendment to Article 61, which entered into force on 31 August 1965, enlarged the membership of the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27. The subsequent amendment to that Article, which entered into force on 24 September 1973, further increased the membership of the Council from 27 to 54.

The amendment to Article 109, which relates to the first paragraph of that Article, provides that a General Conference of Member States for the purpose of reviewing the Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any nine members (formerly seven) of the Security Council. Paragraph 3 of Article 109, which deals with the consideration of a possible review conference during the tenth regular session of the General Assembly, has been retained in its original form in its reference to a "vote of any seven members of the Security Council," the paragraph having been acted upon in 1955 by the General Assembly, at its tenth regular Session, and by the Security Council.

### WE THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS DETERMINED

to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our life-time has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and  
to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and  
to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and  
to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.,

### AND FOR THESE ENDS

to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and  
to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and  
to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and  
to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples,

### HAVE RESOLVED TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS TO ACCOMPLISH THESE AIMS

Accordingly, our respective Governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations.

### Chapter I PURPOSES AND PRINCIPLES

#### Article 1

The Purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;
2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;
3. To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and
4. To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

#### Article 2

The Organization and its Members, in pursuit of the Purposes stated in Article 1, shall act in accordance with the following Principles.

1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members.
2. All Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter.

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

4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

5. All Members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

6. The Organization shall ensure that states which are not Members of the United Nations act in accordance with these Principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

7. Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII.

#### Chapter II MEMBERSHIP

##### Article 3

The original Members of the United Nations shall be the states which, having participated in the United Nations Conference on international Organization at San Francisco, or having previously signed the Declaration by United Nations of 1 January 1942, sign the present Charter and ratify it in accordance with Article 110.

##### Article 4

1. Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

2. The admission of any such state to membership in the United Nations will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

##### Article 5

A Member of the United Nations against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored by the Security Council.

##### Article 6

A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

#### Chapter III ORGANS

##### Article 7

1. There are established as the principal organs of the United Nations: a General Assembly, a Security Council, an Economic and Social Council, a Trusteeship Council, an International Court of Justice, and a Secretariat.

2. Such subsidiary organs as may be found necessary may be established in accordance with the present Charter.

##### Article 8

The United Nations shall place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in its principal and subsidiary organs.

#### Chapter IV THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

##### Composition

##### Article 9

1. The General Assembly shall consist of all the Members of the United Nations.

2. Each Member shall have not more than five representatives in the General Assembly.

##### Functions and powers

##### Article 10

The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter, and, except as provided in Article 12, may make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or to both on any such questions or matters.

##### Article 11

1. The General Assembly may consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and may make recommendations with regard to such principles to the Members or to the Security Council or to both.

2. The General Assembly may discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any Member of the United Nations, or by the Security Council, or by a state which is not a Member of the United Nations in accordance with Article 35, paragraph 2, and, except as provided in Article 12, may make recommendations with regard to any such questions to the state or states concerned or to the Security Council or to both. Any such question on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion.

3. The General Assembly may call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security.

4. The powers of the General Assembly set forth in this Article shall not limit the general scope of Article 10.

##### Article 12

1. While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the present Charter, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests.

2. The Secretary-General, with the consent of the Security Council, shall notify the General Assembly at each session of any matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security which are being dealt with by the Security Council and shall similarly notify the General Assembly, or the Members of the United Nations if the General Assembly is not in session, immediately the Security Council ceases to deal with such matters.

##### Article 13

1. The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of:

- a. promoting international co-operation in the political field and encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification;
- b. promoting international co-operation in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields, and assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

2. The further responsibilities, functions and powers of the General Assembly with respect to matters mentioned in paragraph 1 (b) above are set forth in Chapters IX and X.

Article 14

Subject to the provisions of Article 12, the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the present Charter setting forth the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.

Article 15

1. The General Assembly shall receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council; these reports shall include an account of the measures that the Security Council has decided upon or taken to maintain international peace and security.

2. The General Assembly shall receive and consider reports from the other organs of the United Nations.

Article 16

The General Assembly shall perform such functions with respect to the international trusteeship system as are assigned to it under Chapters XII and XIII, including the approval of the trusteeship agreements for areas not designated as strategic.

Article 17

1. The General Assembly shall consider and approve the budget of the Organization.

2. The expenses of the Organization shall be borne by the Members as apportioned by the General Assembly.

3. The General Assembly shall consider and approve any financial and budgetary arrangements with specialized agencies referred to in Article 57 and shall examine the administrative budgets of such specialized agencies with a view to making recommendations to the agencies concerned.

Voting

Article 18

1. Each member of the General Assembly shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. These questions shall include: recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, the election of the non-permanent members of the Security Council, the election of the members of the Economic and Social Council, the election of members of the Trusteeship Council in accordance with paragraph 1 (c) of Article 86, the admission of new Members to the United Nations, the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership, the expulsion of Members, questions relating to the operation of the trusteeship system, and budgetary questions.

3. Decisions on other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

Article 19

A Member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years. The General Assembly may, nevertheless, permit such a Member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the Member.

Procedure

Article 20

The General Assembly shall meet in regular annual sessions and in such special sessions as occasion may require. Special sessions shall be convoked by the Secretary-General at the request of the Security Council or of a majority of the Members of the United Nations.

Article 21

The General Assembly shall adopt its own rules of procedure. It shall elect its President for each session.

Article 22

The General Assembly may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

Chapter V

THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Composition

Article 23<sup>1</sup>

1. The Security Council shall consist of fifteen Members of the United Nations. The Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America shall be permanent members of the Security Council. The General Assembly shall elect ten other Members of the United Nations to be non-permanent members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution.

2. The non-permanent members of the Security Council shall be elected for a term of two years. In the first election of the non-permanent members after the increase of the membership of the Security Council from eleven to fifteen, two of the four additional members shall be chosen for a term of one year. A retiring member shall not be eligible for immediate re-election.

3. Each member of the Security Council shall have one representative.

Functions and powers

Article 24

1. In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.

2. In discharging these duties the Security Council shall act in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. The specific powers granted to the Security Council for the discharge of these duties are laid down in Chapters VI, VII, VIII, and XII.

3. The Security Council shall submit annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration.

<sup>1</sup> Amended text of Article 23 which came into force on 31 August 1965.

(The text of Article 23 before it was amended read as follows:

1. The Security Council shall consist of eleven Members of the United Nations. The Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America shall be permanent members of the Security Council. The General Assembly shall elect six other Members of the United Nations to be non-permanent members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution.

2. The non-permanent members of the Security Council shall be elected for a term of two years. In the first election of non-permanent members, however, three shall be chosen for a term of one year. A retiring member shall not be eligible for immediate re-election.

3. Each member of the Security Council shall have one representative.)

## Article 25

The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.

## Article 26

In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Article 47, plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.

## Voting

Article 27<sup>2</sup>

1. Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.
2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members.
3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.

## Procedure

## Article 28

1. The Security Council shall be so organized as to be able to function continuously. Each member of the Security Council shall for this purpose be represented at all times at the seat of the Organization.
2. The Security Council shall hold periodic meetings at which each of its members may, if it so desires, be represented by a member of the government or by some other specially designated representative.
3. The Security Council may hold meetings at such places other than the seat of the Organization as in its judgment will best facilitate its work.

## Article 29

The Security Council may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

## Article 30

The Security Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.

## Article 31

Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council may participate, without vote, in the discussion of any question brought before the Security Council whenever the latter considers that the interests of that Member are specially affected.

## Article 32

Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council or any state which is not a Member of the United Nations, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute. The Security Council shall lay down such conditions as it deems just for the participation of a state which is not a Member of the United Nations.

## Chapter VI

## PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

## Article 33

1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settle-

ment, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

## Article 34

The Security Council may investigate any dispute or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute. In order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

## Article 35

1. Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly.

2. A state which is not a Member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly any dispute to which it is a party if it accepts in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the present Charter.

3. The proceedings of the General Assembly in respect of matters brought to its attention under this Article will be subject to the provisions of Articles 11 and 12.

## Article 36

1. The Security Council may, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 or of a situation of like nature, recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

2. The Security Council should take into consideration any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted by the parties.

3. In making recommendations under this Article the Security Council should also take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court.

## Article 37

1. Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that Article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.

2. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under Article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

## Article 38

Without prejudice to the provisions of Articles 33 to 37, the Security Council may, if all the parties to any dispute so request, make recommendations to the parties with a view to a pacific settlement of the dispute.

## Chapter VII

## ACTION WITH RESPECT TO THREATS TO THE PEACE, BREACHES OF THE PEACE, AND ACTS OF AGGRESSION

## Article 39

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

<sup>2</sup> Amended text of Article 27 which came into force on 31 August 1965. (The text of Article 27 before it was amended read as follows:

1. Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.

3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.)

Article 40

In order to prevent an aggravation of the situation, the Security Council may, before making the recommendations or deciding upon the measures provided for in Article 39, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable. Such provisional measures shall be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.

Article 41

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Article 42

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

Article 43

1. All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Article 44

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a Member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfilment of the obligations assumed under Article 43, invite that Member, if the Member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces.

Article 45

In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in Article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 46

Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 47

1. There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament.

2. The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any Member of the United Nations not permanently represented on the Committee shall be invited by the Committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires the participation of that Member in its work.

3. The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. Questions relating to the command of such forces shall be worked out subsequently.

4. The Military Staff Committee, with the authorization of the Security Council and after consultation with appropriate regional agencies, may establish regional sub-committees.

Article 48

1. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

2. Such decisions shall be carried out by the Members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.

Article 49

The Members of the United Nations shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

Article 50

If preventive or enforcement measures against any state are taken by the Security Council, any other state, whether a Member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those measures shall have the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems.

Article 51

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence. If an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security, Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Chapter VIII

REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Article 52

1. Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.

2. The Members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.

3. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

4. This Article in no way impairs the application of Articles 34 and 35.

#### Article 53

1. The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council, with the exception of measures against any enemy state, as defined in paragraph 2 of this Article, provided for pursuant to Article 107 or in regional arrangements directed against renewal of aggressive policy on the part of any such state, until such time as the Organization may, on request of the Governments concerned, be charged with the responsibility for preventing further aggression by such a state.

2. The term enemy state as used in paragraph 1 of this Article applies to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the present Charter.

#### Article 54

The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

#### Chapter IX

#### INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CO-OPERATION

#### Article 55

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

- a. higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;
- b. solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational co-operation; and
- c. universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

#### Article 56

All Members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55.

#### Article 57

1. The various specialized agencies, established by inter-governmental agreement and having wide international responsibilities, as defined in their basic instruments, in economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields, shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of Article 63.

2. Such agencies thus brought into relationship with the United Nations are hereinafter referred to as specialized agencies.

#### Article 58

The Organization shall make recommendations for the co-ordination of the policies and activities of the specialized agencies.

#### Article 59

The Organization shall, where appropriate, initiate negotiations among the states concerned for the creation of any new specialized agencies required for the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in Article 55.

#### Articles 60

Responsibility for the discharge of the functions of the Organization set forth in this Chapter shall be vested in the General Assembly and, under the authority of the General Assembly, in the Economic and Social Council, which shall have for this purpose the powers set forth in Chapter X.

#### Chapter X

#### THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

#### Composition

#### Article 61<sup>3</sup>

1. The Economic and Social Council shall consist of fifty-four Members of the United Nations elected by the General Assembly.

2. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3, eighteen members of the Economic and Social Council shall be elected each year for a term of three years. A retiring member shall be eligible for immediate re-election.

3. At the first election after the increase in the membership of the Economic and Social Council from twenty-seven to fifty-four members, in addition to the members elected in place of the nine members whose term of office expires at the end of that year, twenty-seven additional members shall be elected. Of these twenty-seven additional members, the term of office of nine members so elected shall expire at the end of one year, and of nine other members at the end of two years, in accordance with arrangements made by the General Assembly.

4. Each member of the Economic and Social Council shall have one representative.

#### Functions and powers

#### Article 62

1. The Economic and Social Council may make or initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters and may make recommendations with respect to any such matters to the General Assembly, to the Members of the United Nations, and to the specialized agencies concerned.

2. It may make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

3. It may prepare draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly, with respect to matters falling within its competence.

4. It may call, in accordance with the rules prescribed by the United Nations, international conferences on matters falling within its competence.

#### Article 63

1. The Economic and Social Council may enter into agreements with any of the agencies referred to in Article 57, defin-

<sup>3</sup>Amended text of Article 61, which came into force on 24 September 1973.

(The text of Article 61 as previously amended on 31 August 1965 read as follows:

1. The Economic and Social Council shall consist of twenty-seven Members of the United Nations elected by the General Assembly.

2. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3, nine members of the Economic and Social Council shall be elected each year for a term of three years. A retiring member shall be eligible for immediate re-election.

3. At the first election after the increase in the membership of the Economic and Social Council from eighteen to twenty-seven members, in addition to the members elected in place of the six members whose term of office expires at the end of that year, nine additional members shall be elected. Of these nine additional members, the term of office of three members so elected shall expire at the end of one year, and of three other members at the end of two years, in accordance with arrangements made by the General Assembly.

4. Each member of the Economic and Social Council shall have one representative.)



ing the terms on which the agency concerned shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations. Such agreements shall be subject to approval by the General Assembly.

2. It may co-ordinate the activities of the specialized agencies through consultation with and recommendations to such agencies and through recommendations to the General Assembly and to the Members of the United Nations.

#### Article 64

1. The Economic and Social Council may take appropriate steps to obtain regular reports from the specialized agencies. It may make arrangements with the Members of the United Nations and with the specialized agencies to obtain reports on the steps taken to give effect to its own recommendations and to recommendations on matters falling within its competence made by the General Assembly.

2. It may communicate its observations on these reports to the General Assembly.

#### Article 65

The Economic and Social Council may furnish information to the Security Council and shall assist the Security Council upon its request.

#### Article 66

1. The Economic and Social Council shall perform such functions as fall within its competence in connexion with the carrying out of the recommendations of the General Assembly.

2. It may, with the approval of the General Assembly, perform services at the request of Members of the United Nations and at the request of specialized agencies.

3. It shall perform such other functions as are specified elsewhere in the present Charter or as may be assigned to it by the General Assembly.

#### Voting

#### Article 67

1. Each member of the Economic and Social Council shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Economic and Social Council shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

#### Procedure

#### Article 68

The Economic and Social Council shall set up commissions in economic and social fields and for the promotion of human rights, and such other commissions as may be required for the performance of its functions.

#### Article 69

The Economic and Social Council shall invite any Member of the United Nations to participate, without vote, in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that Member,

#### Article 70

The Economic and Social Council may make arrangements for representatives of the specialized agencies to participate, without vote, in its deliberations and in those of the commissions established by it, and for its representatives to participate in the deliberations of the specialized agencies.

#### Article 71

The Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence. Such arrangements may be made with international organizations and, where appropriate, with national organizations after consultation with the Member of the United Nations concerned.

#### Article 72

1. The Economic and Social Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.

2. The Economic and Social Council shall meet as required in accordance with its rules, which shall include provision for the convening of meetings on the request of a majority of its members.

#### Chapter XI

#### DECLARATION REGARDING NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

#### Article 73

Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end:

- a. to ensure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses;
- b. to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement;
- c. to further international peace and security;
- d. to promote constructive measures of development, to encourage research, and to co-operate with one another and, when and where appropriate, with specialized international bodies with a view to the practical achievement of the social, economic, and scientific purposes set forth in this Article; and
- e. to transmit regularly to the Secretary-General for information purposes, subject to such limitation as security and constitutional considerations may require, statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories for which they are respectively responsible other than those territories to which Chapters XII and XIII apply.

#### Article 74

Members of the United Nations also agree that their policy in respect of the territories to which this Chapter applies, no less than in respect of their metropolitan areas, must be based on the general principle of good-neighbourliness, due account being taken of the interests and well-being of the rest of the world, in social, economic, and commercial matters.

#### Chapter XII

#### INTERNATIONAL TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM

#### Article 75

The United Nations shall establish under its authority an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent individual agreements. These territories are hereinafter referred to as trust territories,

#### Article 76

The basic objectives of the trusteeship system, in accordance with the Purposes of the United Nations laid down in Article 1 of the present Charter, shall be:

- a. to further international peace and security;

- b. to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement;
- c. to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world; and
- d. to ensure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all Members of the United Nations and their nationals, and also equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice, without prejudice to the attainment of the foregoing objectives and subject to the provisions of Article 80.

#### Article 77

1. The trusteeship system shall apply to such territories in the following categories as may be placed thereunder by means of trusteeship agreements:

- a. territories now held under mandate;
- b. territories which may be detached from enemy states as a result of the Second World War; and
- c. territories voluntarily placed under the system by states responsible for their administration.

2. It will be a matter for subsequent agreement as to which territories in the foregoing categories will be brought under the trusteeship system and upon what terms.

#### Article 78

The trusteeship system shall not apply to territories which have become Members of the United Nations, relationship among which shall be based on respect for the principle of sovereign equality.

#### Article 79

The terms of trusteeship for each territory to be placed under the trusteeship system, including any alteration or amendment, shall be agreed upon by the states directly concerned, including the mandatory power in the case of territories held under mandate by a Member of the United Nations, and shall be approved as provided for in Articles 83 and 85.

#### Article 80

1. Except as may be agreed upon in individual trusteeship agreements, made under Articles 77, 79, and 81, placing each territory under the trusteeship system, and until such agreements have been concluded, nothing in this Chapter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which Members of the United Nations may respectively be parties.

2. Paragraph 1 of this Article shall not be interpreted as giving grounds for delay or postponement of the negotiation and conclusion of agreements for placing mandated and other territories under the trusteeship system as provided for in Article 77.

#### Article 81

The trusteeship agreement shall in each case include the terms under which the trust territory will be administered and designate the authority which will exercise the administration of the trust territory. Such authority, hereinafter called the administering authority, may be one or more states or the Organization itself.

#### Article 82

There may be designated, in any trusteeship agreement, a strategic area or areas which may include part or all of the trust territory to which the agreement applies, without prejudice to any special agreement or agreements made under Article 43.

#### Article 83

1. All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendments, shall be exercised by the Security Council.

2. The basic objectives set forth in Article 76 shall be applicable to the people of each strategic area.

3. The Security Council shall, subject to the provisions of the trusteeship agreements and without prejudice to security considerations, avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council to perform those functions of the United Nations under the trusteeship system relating to political, economic, social, and educational matters in the strategic areas.

#### Article 84

It shall be the duty of the administering authority to ensure that the trust territory shall play its part in the maintenance of international peace and security. To this end the administering authority may make use of volunteer forces, facilities, and assistance from the trust territory in carrying out the obligations towards the Security Council undertaken in this regard by the administering authority, as well as for local defence and the maintenance of law and order within the trust territory.

#### Article 85

1. The functions of the United Nations with regard to trusteeship agreements for all areas not designated as strategic, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the General Assembly.

2. The Trusteeship Council, operating under the authority of the General Assembly, shall assist the General Assembly in carrying out these functions.

### Chapter XIII

### THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

#### Composition

#### Article 86

1. The Trusteeship Council shall consist of the following Members of the United Nations:

- a. those Members administering trust territories;
- b. such of those Members mentioned by name in Article 23 as are not administering trust territories; and
- c. as many other Members elected for three-year terms by the General Assembly as may be necessary to ensure that the total number of members of the Trusteeship Council is equally divided between those Members of the United Nations which administer trust territories and those which do not.

2. Each member of the Trusteeship Council shall designate one specially qualified person to represent it therein.

#### Functions and powers

#### Article 87

The General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council, in carrying out their functions, may:

- a. consider reports submitted by the administering authority;
- b. accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the administering authority;
- c. provide for periodic visits to the respective trust territories at times agreed upon with the administering authority; and
- d. take these and other actions in conformity with the terms of the trusteeship agreements.

#### Article 88

The Trusteeship Council shall formulate a questionnaire on the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of each trust territory, and the admin-

istering authority for each trust territory within the competence of the General Assembly shall make an annual report to the General Assembly upon the basis of such questionnaire.

#### Voting

##### Article 89

1. Each member of the Trusteeship Council shall have one vote.
2. Decisions of the Trusteeship Council shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

#### Procedure

##### Article 90

1. The Trusteeship Council shall adopt Its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.
2. The Trusteeship Council shall meet as required in accordance with Its rules, which shall include provision for the convening of meetings on the request of a majority of its members.

##### Article 91

The Trusteeship Council shall, when appropriate, avail itself of the assistance of the Economic and Social Council and of the specialized agencies In regard to matters with which they are respectively concerned.

#### Chapter XIV

#### THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

##### Article 92

The International Court of Justice shall be the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. It shall function In accordance with the annexed Statute, which is based upon the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and forms an Integral part of the present Charter.

##### Article 93

1. All Members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.
2. A state which is not a Member of the United Nations may become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice on conditions to be determined In each case by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

##### Article 94

1. Each Member of the United Nations undertakes to comply with the decision of the International Court of Justice in any case to which It is a party.
2. If any party to a case fails to perform the obligations Incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by the Court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may, if it deems necessary, make recommendations or decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment.

##### Article 95

Nothing in the present Charter shall prevent Members of the United Nations from entrusting the solution of their differences to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future.

##### Article 96

1. The General Assembly or the Security Council may request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question.
2. Other organs of the United Nations and specialized agencies, which may at any time be so authorized by the General Assembly, may also request advisory opinions of the Court on legal questions arising within the scope of their activities.

#### Chapter XV

#### THE SECRETARIAT

##### Article 97

The Secretariat shall comprise a Secretary-General and such staff as the Organization may require. The Secretary-General shall be appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. He shall be the chief administrative officer of the Organization.

##### Article 98

The Secretary-General shall act In that capacity in all meetings of the General Assembly, of the Security Council, of the Economic and Social Council, and of the Trusteeship Council, and shall perform such other functions as are entrusted to him by these organs. The Secretary-General shall make an annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization.

##### Article 99

The Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security.

##### Article 100

1. In the performance of their duties the Secretary-General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the Organization.
2. Each Member of the United Nations undertakes to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary-General and the staff and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities.

##### Article 101

1. The staff shall be appointed by the Secretary-General under regulations established by the General Assembly.
2. Appropriate staffs shall be permanently assigned to the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and, as required, to other organs of the United Nations. These staffs shall form a part of the Secretariat.
3. The paramount consideration in the employment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity. Due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

#### Chapter XVI

#### MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

##### Article 102

1. Every treaty and every international agreement entered into by any Member of the United Nations after the present Charter comes into force shall as soon as possible be registered with the Secretariat and published by it.
2. No party to any such treaty or international agreement which has not been registered in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article may invoke that treaty or agreement before any organ of the United Nations.

##### Article 103

In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail.

##### Article 104

The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its Members such legal capacity as may be necessary for the exercise of its functions and the fulfilment of its purposes.

## Article 105

1. The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its Members such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the fulfilment of its purposes.

2. Representatives of the Members of the United Nations and officials of the Organization shall similarly enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connexion with the Organization.

3. The General Assembly may make recommendations with a view to determining the details of the application of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article or may propose conventions to the Members of the United Nations for this purpose.

## Chapter XVII

## TRANSITIONAL SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS

## Article 106

Pending the coming into force of such special agreements referred to in Article 43 as in the opinion of the Security Council enable it to begin the exercise of its responsibilities under Article 42, the parties to the Four-Nation Declaration, signed at Moscow, 30 October 1943, and France, shall, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 5 of that Declaration, consult with one another and as occasion requires with other Members of the United Nations with a view to such joint action on behalf of the Organization as may be necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

## Article 107

Nothing in the present Charter shall invalidate or preclude action, in relation to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory to the present Charter, taken or authorized as a result of that war by the Governments having responsibility for such action.

## Chapter XVIII

## AMENDMENTS

## Article 108

Amendments to the present Charter shall come into force for all Members of the United Nations when they have been adopted by a vote of two thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two thirds of the Members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

Article 109<sup>4</sup>

1. A General Conference of the Members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any nine members of the Security Council. Each Member of the United Nations shall have one vote in the conference.

2. Any alteration of the present Charter recommended by a two-thirds vote of the conference shall take effect when ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two thirds of the Members of the United Nations including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

3. If such a conference has not been held before the tenth annual session of the General Assembly following the coming

into force of the present Charter, the proposal to call such a conference shall be placed on the agenda of that session of the General Assembly, and the conference shall be held if so decided by a majority vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council.

## Chapter XIX

## RATIFICATION AND SIGNATURE

## Article 110

1. The present Charter shall be ratified by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

2. The ratifications shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, which shall notify all the signatory states of each deposit as well as the Secretary-General of the Organization when he has been appointed.

3. The present Charter shall come into force upon the deposit of ratifications by the Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, and by a majority of the other signatory states. A protocol of the ratifications deposited shall thereupon be drawn up by the Government of the United States of America which shall communicate copies thereof to all the signatory states.

4. The states signatory to the present Charter which ratify it after it has come into force will become original Members of the United Nations on the date of the deposit of their respective ratifications.

## Article 111

The present Charter, of which the Chinese, French, Russian, English, and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of the other signatory states.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the representatives of the Governments of the United Nations have signed the present Charter.

DONE at the city of San Francisco the twenty-sixth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and forty-five.

<sup>4</sup>Amended text of Article 109 which came into force on 12 June 1968.

(The text of Article 109 before it was amended read as follows:

1. A General Conference of the Members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council. Each Member of the United Nations shall have one vote in the conference.

2. Any alteration of the present Charter recommended by a two-thirds vote of the conference shall take effect when ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two thirds of the Members of the United Nations including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

3. If such a conference has not been held before the tenth annual session of the General Assembly following the coming into force of the present Charter, the proposal to call such a conference shall be placed on the agenda of that session of the General Assembly, and the conference shall be held if so decided by a majority vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council.)

## Statute of the International Court of Justice

## Article 1

THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE established by the Charter of the United Nations as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations shall be constituted and shall function in accordance with the provisions of the present Statute.

## Chapter I

## ORGANIZATION OF THE COURT

## Article 2

The Court shall be composed of a body of independent judges, elected regardless of their nationality from among

persons of high moral character, who possess the qualifications required in their respective countries for appointment to the highest judicial offices, or are jurisconsults of recognized competence in International law.

#### Article 3

1. The Court shall consist of fifteen members, no two of whom may be nationals of the same state.

2. A person who for the purposes of membership in the Court could be regarded as a national of more than one state shall be deemed to be a national of the one in which he ordinarily exercises civil and political rights.

#### Article 4

1. The members of the Court shall be elected by the General Assembly and by the Security Council from a list of persons nominated by the national groups in the Permanent Court of Arbitration, in accordance with the following provisions.

2. In the case of Members of the United Nations not represented in the Permanent Court of Arbitration, candidates shall be nominated by national groups appointed for this purpose by their governments under the same conditions as those prescribed for members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration by Article 44 of the Convention of The Hague of 1907 for the pacific settlement of international disputes.

3. The conditions under which a state which is a party to the present Statute but is not a Member of the United Nations may participate in electing the members of the Court shall, in the absence of a special agreement, be laid down by the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council.

#### Article 5

1. At least three months before the date of the election, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall address a written request to the members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration belonging to the states which are parties to the present Statute, and to the members of the national groups appointed under Article 4, paragraph 2, inviting them to undertake, within a given time, by national groups, the nomination of persons in a position to accept the duties of a member of the Court.

2. No group may nominate more than four persons, not more than two of whom shall be of their own nationality. In no case may the number of candidates nominated by a group be more than double the number of seats to be filled.

#### Article 6

Before making these nominations, each national group is recommended to consult its highest court of justice, its legal faculties and schools of law, and its national academies and national sections of international academies devoted to the study of law.

#### Article 7

1. The Secretary-General shall prepare a list in alphabetical order of all the persons thus nominated. Save as provided in Article 12, paragraph 2, these shall be the only persons eligible.

2. The Secretary-General shall submit this list to the General Assembly and to the Security Council.

#### Article 8

The General Assembly and the Security Council shall proceed independently of one another to elect the members of the Court.

#### Article 9

At every election, the electors shall bear in mind not only that the persons to be elected should individually possess the qualifications required, but also that in the body as a whole the representation of the main forms of civilization and of the principal legal systems of the world should be assured.

#### Article 10

1. Those candidates who obtain an absolute majority of votes in the General Assembly and in the Security Council shall be considered as elected.

2. Any vote of the Security Council, whether for the election of judges or for the appointment of members of the conference envisaged in Article 12, shall be taken without any distinction between permanent and non-permanent members of the Security Council.

3. In the event of more than one national of the same state obtaining an absolute majority of the votes both of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, the eldest of these only shall be considered as elected.

#### Article 11

If, after the first meeting held for the purpose of the election, one or more seats remain to be filled, a second and, if necessary, a third meeting shall take place.

#### Article 12

1. If, after the third meeting, one or more seats still remain unfilled, a joint conference consisting of six members, three appointed by the General Assembly and three by the Security Council, may be formed at any time at the request of either the General Assembly or the Security Council, for the purpose of choosing by the vote of an absolute majority one name for each seat still vacant, to submit to the General Assembly and the Security Council for their respective acceptance.

2. If the joint conference is unanimously agreed upon any person who fulfils the required conditions, he may be included in its list, even though he was not included in the list of nominations referred to in Article 7.

3. If the joint conference is satisfied that it will not be successful in procuring an election, those members of the Court who have already been elected shall, within a period to be fixed by the Security Council, proceed to fill the vacant seats by selection from among those candidates who have obtained votes either in the General Assembly or in the Security Council.

4. In the event of an equality of votes among the judges, the eldest judge shall have a casting vote.

#### Article 13

1. The members of the Court shall be elected for nine years and may be re-elected; provided, however, that of the judges elected at the first election, the terms of five judges shall expire at the end of three years and the terms of five more judges shall expire at the end of six years.

2. The judges whose terms are to expire at the end of the above-mentioned initial periods of three and six years shall be chosen by lot to be drawn by the Secretary-General immediately after the first election has been completed.

3. The members of the Court shall continue to discharge their duties until their places have been filled. Though replaced, they shall finish any cases which they may have begun.

4. In the case of the resignation of a member of the Court, the resignation shall be addressed to the President of the Court for transmission to the Secretary-General. This last notification makes the place vacant.

#### Article 14

Vacancies shall be filled by the same method as that laid down for the first election, subject to the following provision: the Secretary-General shall, within one month of the occurrence of the vacancy, proceed to issue the invitations provided for in Article 5, and the date of the election shall be fixed by the Security Council.

#### Article 15

A member of the Court elected to replace a member whose term of office has not expired shall hold office for the remainder of his predecessor's term.

## Article 16

1. No member of the Court may exercise any political or administrative function, or engage in any other occupation of a professional nature.

2. Any doubt on this point shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

## Article 17

1. No member of the Court may act as agent, counsel, or advocate in any case.

2. No member may participate in the decision of any case in which he has previously taken part as agent, counsel, or advocate for one of the parties, or as a member of a national or international court, or of a commission of enquiry, or in any other capacity.

3. Any doubt on this point shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

## Article 18

1. No member of the Court can be dismissed unless, in the unanimous opinion of the other members, he has ceased to fulfil the required conditions.

2. Formal notification thereof shall be made to the Secretary-General by the Registrar.

3. This notification makes the place vacant.

## Article 19

The members of the Court, when engaged on the business of the Court, shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities.

## Article 20

Every member of the Court shall, before taking up his duties, make a solemn declaration in open court that he will exercise his powers impartially and conscientiously.

## Article 21

1. The Court shall elect its President and Vice-President for three years; they may be re-elected.

2. The Court shall appoint its Registrar and may provide for the appointment of such other officers as may be necessary.

## Article 22

1. The seat of the Court shall be established at The Hague. This, however, shall not prevent the Court from sitting and exercising its functions elsewhere whenever the Court considers it desirable.

2. The President and the Registrar shall reside at the seat of the Court.

## Article 23

1. The Court shall remain permanently in session, except during the judicial vacations, the dates and duration of which shall be fixed by the Court.

2. Members of the Court are entitled to periodic leave, the dates and duration of which shall be fixed by the Court, having in mind the distance between The Hague and the home of each judge.

3. Members of the Court shall be bound, unless they are on leave or prevented from attending by illness or other serious reasons duly explained to the President, to hold themselves permanently at the disposal of the Court.

## Article 24

1. If, for some special reason, a member of the Court considers that he should not take part in the decision of a particular case, he shall so inform the President.

2. If the President considers that for some special reason one of the members of the Court should not sit in a particular case, he shall give him notice accordingly.

3. If in any such case the member of the Court and the President disagree, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

## Article 25

1. The full Court shall sit except when it is expressly provided otherwise in the present Statute.

2. Subject to the condition that the number of judges available to constitute the Court is not thereby reduced below eleven, the Rules of the Court may provide for allowing one or more judges, according to circumstances and in rotation, to be dispensed from sitting.

3. A quorum of nine judges shall suffice to constitute the Court.

## Article 26

1. The Court may from time to time form one or more chambers, composed of three or more judges as the Court may determine, for dealing with particular categories of cases; for example, labour cases and cases relating to transit and communications.

2. The Court may at any time form a chamber for dealing with a particular case. The number of judges to constitute such a chamber shall be determined by the Court with the approval of the parties.

3. Cases shall be heard and determined by the chambers provided for in this Article if the parties so request.

## Article 27

A judgment given by any of the chambers provided for in Articles 26 and 29 shall be considered as rendered by the Court.

## Article 28

The chambers provided for in Articles 26 and 29 may, with the consent of the parties, sit and exercise their functions elsewhere than at The Hague.

## Article 29

With a view to the speedy dispatch of business, the Court shall form annually a chamber composed of five judges which, at the request of the parties, may hear and determine cases by summary procedure. In addition, two judges shall be selected for the purpose of replacing judges who find it impossible to sit.

## Article 30

1. The Court shall frame rules for carrying out its functions. In particular, it shall lay down rules of procedure.

2. The Rules of the Court may provide for assessors to sit with the Court or with any of its chambers, without the right to vote.

## Article 31

1. Judges of the nationality of each of the parties shall retain their right to sit in the case before the Court.

2. If the Court includes upon the Bench a judge of the nationality of one of the parties, any other party may choose a person to sit as judge. Such person shall be chosen preferably from among those persons who have been nominated as candidates as provided in Articles 4 and 5.

3. If the Court includes upon the Bench no judge of the nationality of the parties, each of these parties may proceed to choose a judge as provided in paragraph 2 of this Article.

4. The provisions of this Article shall apply to the case of Articles 26 and 29. In such cases, the President shall request one or, if necessary, two of the members of the Court forming the chamber to give place to the members of the Court of the nationality of the parties concerned, and, failing such, or if they are unable to be present, to the judges specially chosen by the parties.

5. Should there be several parties in the same interest, they shall, for the purpose of the preceding provisions, be reckoned as one party only. Any doubt upon this point shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

6. Judges chosen as laid down in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of this Article shall fulfil the conditions required by Articles 2,

17 (paragraph 2), 20, and 24 of the present Statute. They shall take part in the decision on terms of complete equality with their colleagues.

#### Article 32

1. Each member of the Court shall receive an annual salary.

2. The President shall receive a special annual allowance.

3. The Vice-President shall receive a special allowance for every day on which he acts as President.

4. The judges chosen under Article 31, other than members of the Court, shall receive compensation for each day on which they exercise their functions.

5. These salaries, allowances, and compensation shall be fixed by the General Assembly. They may not be decreased during the term of office.

6. The salary of the Registrar shall be fixed by the General Assembly on the proposal of the Court.

7. Regulations made by the General Assembly shall fix the conditions under which retirement pensions may be given to members of the Court and to the Registrar, and the conditions under which members of the Court and the Registrar shall have their travelling expenses refunded.

8. The above salaries, allowances, and compensation shall be free of all taxation.

#### Article 33

The expenses of the Court shall be borne by the United Nations in such a manner as shall be decided by the General Assembly.

### Chapter II

#### COMPETENCE OF THE COURT

#### Article 34

1. Only states may be parties in cases before the Court.

2. The Court, subject to and in conformity with its Rules, may request of public international organizations information relevant to cases before it, and shall receive such information presented by such organizations on their own initiative.

3. Whenever the construction of the constituent instrument of a public international organization or of an international convention adopted thereunder is in question in a case before the Court, the Registrar shall so notify the public international organization concerned and shall communicate to it copies of all the written proceedings.

#### Article 35

1. The Court shall be open to the states parties to the present Statute.

2. The conditions under which the Court shall be open to other states shall, subject to the special provisions contained in treaties in force, be laid down by the Security Council, but in no case shall such conditions place the parties in a position of inequality before the court.

3. When a state which is not a Member of the United Nations is a party to a case, the Court shall fix the amount which that party is to contribute towards the expenses of the Court. This provision shall not apply if such state is bearing a share of the expenses of the Court.

#### Article 36

1. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force.

2. The states parties to the present Statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory *Ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

- a. the interpretation of a treaty;
- b. any question of international law;
- c. the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

d. the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

3. The declarations referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain states, or for a certain time.

4. Such declarations shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the parties to the Statute and to the Registrar of the Court.

5. Declarations made under Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and which are still in force shall be deemed, as between the parties to the present Statute, to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the period which they still have to run and in accordance with their terms.

6. In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

#### Article 37

Whenever a treaty or convention in force provides for reference of a matter to a tribunal to have been instituted by the League of Nations, or to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the matter shall, as between the parties to the present Statute, be referred to the International Court of Justice.

#### Article 38

1. The Court, whose function is to decide in accordance with international law such disputes as are submitted to it, shall apply:

- a. international conventions, whether general or particular, establishing rules expressly recognized by the contesting states;
- b. international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law;
- c. the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations;
- d. subject to the provisions of Article 59, judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations, as subsidiary means for the determination of rules of law.

2. This provision shall not prejudice the power of the Court to decide a case *ex aequo et bono*, if the parties agree thereto.

### Chapter III

#### PROCEDURE

#### Article 39

1. The official languages of the Court shall be French and English. If the parties agree that the case shall be conducted in French, the judgment shall be delivered in French. If the parties agree that the case shall be conducted in English, the judgment shall be delivered in English.

2. In the absence of an agreement as to which language shall be employed, each party may, in the pleadings, use the language which it prefers; the decision of the Court shall be given in French and English. In this case the Court shall at the same time determine which of the two texts shall be considered as authoritative.

3. The Court shall, at the request of any party, authorize a language other than French or English to be used by that party.

#### Article 40

1. Cases are brought before the Court, as the case may be either by the notification of the special agreement or by a written application addressed to the Registrar. In either case the subject of the dispute and the parties shall be indicated.

2. The Registrar shall forthwith communicate the application to all concerned.

3. He shall also notify the Members of the United Nations through the Secretary-General, and also any other states entitled to appear before the Court.

## Article 41

1. The Court shall have the power to indicate, if it considers that circumstances so require, any provisional measures which ought to be taken to preserve the respective rights of either party.

2. Pending the final decision, notice of the measures suggested shall forthwith be given to the parties and to the Security Council.

## Article 42

1. The parties shall be represented by agents.
2. They may have the assistance of counsel or advocates before the Court.
3. The agents, counsel, and advocates of parties before the Court shall enjoy the privileges and immunities necessary to the independent exercise of their duties.

## Article 43

1. The procedure shall consist of two parts: written and oral.
2. The written proceedings shall consist of the communication to the Court and to the parties of memorials, counter-memorials and, if necessary, replies; also all papers and documents in support.
3. These communications shall be made through the Registrar, in the order and within the time fixed by the Court.
4. A certified copy of every document produced by one party shall be communicated to the other party.
5. The oral proceedings shall consist of the hearing by the Court of witnesses, experts, agents, counsel, and advocates.

## Article 44

1. For the service of all notices upon persons other than the agents, counsel, and advocates, the Court shall apply direct to the government of the state upon whose territory the notice has to be served.
2. The same provision shall apply whenever steps are to be taken to procure evidence on the spot.

## Article 45

The hearing shall be under the control of the President or, if he is unable to preside, of the Vice-President; if neither is able to preside, the senior judge present shall preside.

## Article 46

The hearing in Court shall be public, unless the Court shall decide otherwise, or unless the parties demand that the public be not admitted.

## Article 47

1. Minutes shall be made at each hearing and signed by the Registrar and the President.
2. These minutes alone shall be authentic.

## Article 48

The Court shall make orders for the conduct of the case, shall decide the form and time in which each party must conclude its arguments, and make all arrangements connected with the taking of evidence.

## Article 49

The Court may, even before the hearing begins, call upon the agents to produce any document or to supply any explanations. Formal note shall be taken of any refusal.

## Article 50

The Court may, at any time, entrust any individual, body, bureau, commission, or other organization that it may select, with the task of carrying out an enquiry or giving an expert opinion.

## Article 51

During the hearing any relevant questions are to be put to the witnesses and experts under the conditions laid down by the Court in the rules of procedure referred to in Article 30.

## Article 52

After the Court has received the proofs and evidence within the time specified for the purpose, it may refuse to accept any further oral or written evidence that one party may desire to present unless the other side consents.

## Article 53

1. Whenever one of the parties does not appear before the Court, or fails to defend its case, the other party may call upon the Court to decide in favour of its claim.
2. The Court must, before doing so, satisfy itself, not only that it has jurisdiction in accordance with Articles 36 and 37, but also that the claim is well founded in fact and law.

## Article 54

1. When, subject to the control of the Court, the agents, counsel, and advocates have completed their presentation of the case, the President shall declare the hearing closed.
2. The Court shall withdraw to consider the judgment.
3. The deliberations of the Court shall take place in private and remain secret.

## Article 55

1. All questions shall be decided by a majority of the judges present.
2. In the event of an equality of votes, the President or the judge who acts in his place shall have a casting vote.

## Article 56

1. The judgment shall state the reasons on which it is based.
2. It shall contain the names of the judges who have taken part in the decision.

## Article 57

If the judgment does not represent in whole or in part the unanimous opinion of the judges, any judge shall be entitled to deliver a separate opinion.

## Article 58

The judgment shall be signed by the President and by the Registrar. It shall be read in open court, due notice having been given to the agents.

## Article 59

The decision of the Court has no binding force except between the parties and in respect of that particular case.

## Article 60

The judgment is final and without appeal. In the event of dispute as to the meaning or scope of the judgment, the Court shall construe it upon the request of any party.

## Article 61

1. An application for revision of a judgment may be made only when it is based upon the discovery of some fact of such a nature as to be a decisive factor, which fact was, when the judgment was given, unknown to the Court and also to the party claiming revision, always provided that such ignorance was not due to negligence.
2. The proceedings for revision shall be opened by a judgment of the Court expressly recording the existence of the new fact, recognizing that it has such a character as to lay the case open to revision, and declaring the application admissible on this ground.
3. The Court may require previous compliance with the terms of the judgment before it admits proceedings in revision.
4. The application for revision must be made at latest within six months of the discovery of the new fact.
5. No application for revision may be made after the lapse of ten years from the date of the judgment.



## Article 62

1. Should a state consider that it has an interest of a legal nature which may be affected by the decision in the case, it may submit a request to the Court to be permitted to intervene.

2. It shall be for the Court to decide upon this request.

## Article 63

1. Whenever the construction of a convention to which states other than those concerned in the case are parties is in question, the Registrar shall notify all such states forthwith.

2. Every state so notified has the right to intervene in the proceedings; but if it uses this right, the construction given by the judgment will be equally binding upon it.

## Article 64

Unless otherwise decided by the Court, each party shall bear its own costs.

Chapter IV  
ADVISORY OPINIONS

## Article 65

1. The Court may give an advisory opinion on any legal question at the request of whatever body may be authorized by or in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations to make such a request.

2. Questions upon which the advisory opinion of the Court is asked shall be laid before the Court by means of a written request containing an exact statement of the question upon which an opinion is required, and accompanied by all documents likely to throw light upon the question.

## Article 66

1. The Registrar shall forthwith give notice of the request for an advisory opinion to all states entitled to appear before the Court.

2. The Registrar shall also, by means of a special and direct communication, notify any state entitled to appear before the Court or international organization considered by the Court, or, should it not be sitting, by the President, as likely to be able to furnish information on the question, that the Court will be prepared to receive, within a time limit to be fixed by the President, written statements, or to hear, at a public sitting to be held for the purpose, oral statements relating to the question.

3. Should any such state entitled to appear before the Court have failed to receive the special communication referred to in paragraph 2 of this Article, such state may express a desire to submit a written statement or to be heard; and the Court will decide.

4. States and organizations having presented written or oral statements or both shall be permitted to comment on the statements made by other states or organizations in the form, to the extent, and within the time limits which the Court, or, should it not be sitting, the President, shall decide in each particular case. Accordingly, the Registrar shall in due time communicate any such written statements to states and organizations having submitted similar statements.

## Article 67

The Court shall deliver its advisory opinions in open court, notice having been given to the Secretary-General and to the representatives of Members of the United Nations, of other states and of International organizations immediately concerned.

## Article 68

In the exercise of its advisory functions the Court shall further be guided by the provisions of the present Statute which apply in contentious cases to the extent to which it recognizes them to be applicable.

Chapter V  
AMENDMENT

## Article 69

Amendments to the present Statute shall be effected by the same procedure as is provided by the Charter of the United Nations for amendments to that Charter, subject however to any provisions which the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council may adopt concerning the participation of states which are parties to the present Statute but are not Members of the United Nations.

## Article 70

The Court shall have power to propose such amendments to the present Statute as it may deem necessary, through written communications to the Secretary-General, for consideration in conformity with the provisions of Article 69.

## Appendix III

## Structure of the United Nations

## General Assembly

The General Assembly is composed of all the Members of the United Nations.

## SESSIONS

Resumed thirty-fifth session: 15 and 16 January,<sup>1</sup> 2-6 March, 11 May and 14 September 1981.

Eighth emergency special session: 3-14 September 1981.

Thirty-sixth session;<sup>2</sup> 15 September-18 December 1981 (suspended).

## OFFICERS

Resumed thirty-fifth session and eighth emergency special session

President: Rüdiger von Wechmar (Federal Republic of Germany).

Vice-Presidents: Bahrain, Bolivia, China, Ecuador, France, Greece, Honduras, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mongolia, Niger, Oman, Romania, Senegal, Thailand, Tunisia, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

## Thirty-sixth session

President: Ismat T. Kittani (Iraq).

Vice-Presidents: Australia, Benin, Botswana, China, Cuba, Cyprus, France, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Seychelles, Sweden, Togo, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

The Assembly has four types of committees: (1) Main Committees; (2) procedural committees; (3) standing committees; (4) subsidiary and ad hoc bodies. In addition, it convenes conferences to deal with specific subjects.

## Main Committees

Seven Main Committees have been established as follows:

Political and Security Committee (disarmament and related international security questions) (First Committee)

Special Political Committee

Economic and Financial Committee (Second Committee)

Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Committee (Third Committee)

Trusteeship Committee (including non-self-governing territories) (Fourth Committee)

Administrative and Budgetary Committee (Fifth Committee)

Legal Committee (Sixth Committee)

The General Assembly may constitute other committees, on which all Members of the United Nations have the right to be represented.

## OFFICERS OF THE MAIN COMMITTEES

## Resumed thirty-fifth session

Fifth Committee<sup>a</sup>

Chairman: Enrique Buj-Flores (Mexico).<sup>b</sup>

Vice-Chairmen: Hamed Arabi El-Houderi (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), A. B. Golovko (Ukrainian SSR).

Rapporteur: Carl C. Pedersen (Canada).

<sup>a</sup> The only Main Committee which met at the resumed thirty-fifth session.

<sup>b</sup> Did not attend the resumed thirty-fifth session: the Acting Chairman was Carl C. Pedersen (Canada) for the March meeting and Hamed Arabi El-Houderi (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) for the May meeting.

## Thirty-sixth session

## First Committee

Chairman: Ignac Golob (Yugoslavia).

Vice-Chairmen: Mario Caries Zapata (Honduras), Alejandro D. Yango (Philippines).

Rapporteur: Alemayehu Makonnen (Ethiopia).

## Special Political Committee

Chairman: Nathan Iumba (Uganda).

Vice-Chairmen: Eva Nowotny (Austria), Michael E. Sherifis (Cyprus).

Rapporteur: Zahary Radoukov (Bulgaria).

## Second Committee

Chairman: Leandro I. Verceles (Philippines).

Vice-Chairmen: Gerben Ringnalda (Netherlands), Enrique G. ter Horst (Venezuela).

Rapporteur: Ahmed Ould Sid'Ahmed (Mauritania).

## Third Committee

Chairman: Declan P. O'Donovan (Ireland).

Vice-Chairmen: Mario A. Esquivel Tobar (Costa Rica), Dordana Masmoudi (Tunisia).

Rapporteur: Naoharu Fujii (Japan).

## Fourth Committee

Chairman: Jasim Yousif Jamal (Qatar).

Vice-Chairmen: Isselmou Ould Sidi Ahmed Vall (Mauritania), Gerhard Schröter (German Democratic Republic).

Rapporteur: Ibrahim O. Addabashi (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).

## Fifth Committee

Chairman: Abdel-Rahman Abdalla (Sudan).

Vice-Chairmen: Soemadi Djoko Moerdjono Brotodiningrat (Indonesia), Michael F. Godfrey (New Zealand).

Rapporteur: Mario Martorell (Peru).

## Sixth Committee

Chairman: Juan José Calley Calle (Peru).

Vice-Chairmen: Mohamed Said El-Banhawy (Egypt), Jargalsaikhany Enkhasaikhan (Mongolia).

Rapporteur: Antonio Vinal (Spain).

<sup>1</sup> See YUN 1980 for coverage of January 1981 meetings.

<sup>2</sup> The thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly resumed in 1982 from 16 to 29 March, on 28 April and on 20 September.

## Procedural committees

## General Committee

The General Committee consists of the President of the General Assembly, as Chairman, the 21 Vice-Presidents and the chairmen of the seven Main Committees.

## Credentials Committee

The Credentials Committee consists of nine members appointed by the General Assembly on the proposal of the President.

Resumed thirty-fifth session and eighth emergency special session

Angola, China, Costa Rica (Chairman), Haiti, Kenya, Singapore, Spain, USSR, United States.

Thirty-sixth session

China, Ghana, Netherlands, Niger (Chairman), Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, USSR, United States.

## Standing committees

The two standing committees consist of experts appointed in their Individual capacity for three-year terms.

Advisory Committee on Administrative  
and Budgetary Questions

## Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Hamed Arabi El-Houderi (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); Lucio Garcia del Solar (Argentina); Jobst Holborn (Federal Republic of Germany);<sup>a</sup> Virginia C. Housholder (United States);<sup>a</sup> V. K. Palamarchuk (USSR).

To serve until 31 December 1982: Andrzej Abraszewski (Poland); Mohamed Malloum Fall (Mauritania); Anwar Kemal (Pakistan); C. S. M. Mselle, Chairman (United Republic of Tanzania); Christopher R. Thomas (Trinidad and Tobago).

To serve until 31 December 1983: Henrik Amneus (Sweden); Michel Brochard (France); Ernesto C. Garrido (Philippines); Sumihiro Kuyama (Japan); Tang Jianwen (China); Norman Williams (Panama).

<sup>a</sup> Appointed by the General Assembly on 7 October and 22 September 1981, (decisions 36/305 B and A) respectively, to fill the vacancies resulting from the resignations of Rudolf Schmidt (Federal Republic of Germany) in September and of George F. Saddler (United States) on 15 July.

On 30 November 1981 (decision 36/305 C), the General Assembly appointed the following five members for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Lucio García del Solar (Argentina), A. V. Grodsky (USSR), Virginia C. Housholder (United States), Rachid Lahlou (Morocco), Carl C. Pedersen (Canada).

## Committee on Contributions

## Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Syed Amjad Ali, Chairman (Pakistan); Denis Bauchard (France); A. S. Chistyakov (USSR); Miguel Angel Dávila Mendoza (Mexico); Wilfried Koschorreck (Federal Republic of Germany); Sung Hsin-chung (China).

To serve until 31 December 1982: Mohammed Sadiq Al-Mahdi (Iraq); Fathin Khaouane Bouayad-Agha (Algeria); Richard V. Hennes (United States); Katsumi Sezaki (Japan); Ladislav Smid (Czechoslovakia); Jozsef Tardos (Hungary).

To serve until 31 December 1983: Hélio de Burgos Cabal (Brazil); Leoncio Fernández Maroto (Spain); Lance Louis E. Joseph (Australia); Japhet Gideon Kiti (Kenya); Rachid Lahlou (Morocco); Atilio Norberto Molteni, Vice-Chairman (Argentina).

On 30 November 1981 (decision 36/318), the General Assembly appointed the following six members for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Syed Amjad Ali (Pakistan). A. S. Chistyakov (USSR), Miguel Angel Dávila Mendoza (Mexico), Wilfried Koschorreck (Federal Republic of Germany), Yang Hushan (China), Philippe Zeller (France).

## Subsidiary, ad hoc and related bodies

The following subsidiary, ad hoc and related bodies were in existence or functioning in 1981, or were established during the General Assembly's thirty-sixth session, held from 15 September to 18 December 1981.

Ad Hoc Committee of the General Assembly for the  
Announcement of Voluntary Contributions to the  
1982 Programme of the United Nations  
High Commissioner for Refugees

As soon as practicable after the opening of each regular session of the General Assembly, an ad hoc committee of the whole of the Assembly meets, under the chairmanship of the President of the session, to enable Governments to announce pledges of voluntary contributions to the programme of UNHCR for the following year. Also invited to announce their pledges are States which are members of specialized agencies but not Members of the United Nations. In 1981, the Ad Hoc Committee met on 20 November.

Ad Hoc Committee of the General Assembly for the  
Announcement of Voluntary Contributions to the  
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for  
Palestine Refugees in the Near East

As soon as practicable after the opening of each regular session of the General Assembly, an ad hoc committee of the whole of the Assembly meets, under the chairmanship of the President of the session, to enable Governments to announce pledges of voluntary contributions to the programme of UNRWA for the following year. Also invited to announce their pledges are States which are members of specialized agencies but not Members of the United Nations. In 1981, the Ad Hoc Committee met on 16 November.

Ad Hoc Committee of the International  
Conference on Kampuchea

On 21 October 1981, the General Assembly adopted a resolution of the International Conference on Kampuchea (p. 1525), by which the Conference established an ad hoc committee of seven members and at the same time authorized the President of the Conference to appoint additional members.

The Committee was to assist the Conference in seeking a comprehensive political settlement of the Kampuchean problem, to undertake missions, where appropriate, towards that end, to act as an advisory body to the Secretary-General between Conference sessions and to advise the President when to reconvene the Conference.

The Committee, authorized by the Assembly to convene during its regular sessions, held one meeting during the year, on 28 October.

Members:<sup>a</sup> Japan, Malaysia, Nigeria, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand.

<sup>a</sup> No additional members were appointed in 1981.

Chairman: Massamba Sarré (Senegal).

Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International  
Convention against Apartheid in Sports

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports held two meetings in 1981: on 5 February and 31 August, both at United Nations Headquarters.

Members:<sup>a</sup> Algeria, Barbados, Canada, Congo, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian SSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia.

<sup>a</sup> One seat remained unfilled in 1981.

Chairman: Ernest Besley Maycock (Barbados).

Vice-Chairmen: Kumar Prasad Gyawali (Nepal), Laszlo Hadas (Hungary), Crispin Duncan Mbapila (United Republic of Tanzania).

Rapporteur: Stafford O. Neil (Jamaica).

Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries, which was to be composed of 35 members, held its first session at United Nations Headquarters from 20 January to 13 February 1981.

Members:<sup>a</sup> Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Canada, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guyana, India, Italy,<sup>b</sup> Jamaica, Japan, Mongolia, Nigeria, Panama,<sup>b,c</sup> Portugal, Senegal, Seychelles,<sup>b</sup> Spain, Suriname, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

<sup>a</sup> Appointed by the President of the General Assembly's thirty-fifth session, as stated in his communications of 15 January and (with respect to Italy) 30 June 1981 to the Secretary-General. One seat remained unfilled in 1981.

<sup>b</sup> Not represented at the first session.

<sup>c</sup> Replaced by Uruguay from 10 February 1981, as stated by the President of the General Assembly's thirty-fifth session in his communication of the same date to the Secretary-General.

Chairman: Mohammed Bedjaoui (Algeria).

Vice-Chairmen: Philippe Kirsch (Canada), Ernest Besley Maycock (Barbados), A. A. Ozadovsky (Ukrainian SSR).

Rapporteur: Waliur Rahman (Bangladesh).

Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean

During 1981, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, undertaking the preparatory work for the Conference on the Indian Ocean (to be held at Colombo, Sri Lanka), held two series of preparatory meetings at United Nations Headquarters: between 17 February and 6 March and between 1 and 19 June. It further held two series of regular meetings, also at Headquarters, between 17 and 28 August and between 21 October and 16 November.

Members: Australia, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mozambique, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Romania, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand,<sup>a</sup> USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Sweden, a major maritime user of the Indian Ocean, continued to participate in the meetings as an observer.

<sup>a</sup> Appointed by the President of the General Assembly's thirty-fifth session on the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee, as stated in his communication of 5 March 1981 to the Secretary-General.

Chairman: Nadarajah Balasubramaniam (Sri Lanka) (until 1 June), Ignatius Benedict Fonseka (Sri Lanka) (from 1 June).

Vice-Chairmen: Siegfried Kahn (German Democratic Republic); F. Perry Nolan (Australia); Hipólito Zozimo Patricia (Mozambique) (until 6 March), José Carlos Lobo (Mozambique) (from 6 March); Wirjono Sastrohandoyo (Indonesia).

Rapporteur: Henri Rasolondraibe (Madagascar).

Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference

The 40-member Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference held two sessions in 1981, at United Nations Headquarters: the first on 6 and 8 April; and the second from 6 to 10 July.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

The USSR participated in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, while China, France, the United Kingdom and the United States maintained contact with it through its Chairman, pursuant to a 1973 General Assembly resolution.<sup>3</sup>

Chairman: Nadarajah Balasubramaniam (Sri Lanka) (until 6 July), Ignatius Benedict Fonseka (Sri Lanka) (from 6 July).

Vice-Chairmen: Juan José Calle y Calle (Peru), Ryszard Frelek (Poland), Artémon Simbananiye (Burundi).

Rapporteur: Fermín Zelada (Spain).

WORKING GROUP

Members: Burundi, Egypt, Hungary, India, Iran, Italy, Mexico, Peru, Poland, Spain (Chairman), Sri Lanka.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Became a member by a decision of 6 April 1981 of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Group on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development

On 17 December 1981, the General Assembly established an ad hoc intergovernmental group to prepare recommendations on the long-term institutional, organizational and financial arrangements of the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development.

The Group, to be open to the participation of all States as full members, was to hold two sessions in 1982 and submit its recommendations to the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development at its fourth (1982) session. (See also p. 1512)

Advisory Committee for the International Year of Disabled Persons

The 23-member Advisory Committee for the International Year of Disabled Persons held its third session at Vienna, Austria, from 3 to 12 August 1981.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados,<sup>a</sup> Belgium, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, German Democratic Republic, India, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Nigeria, Oman, Panama,<sup>a</sup> Philippines, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Viet Nam,<sup>a</sup> Yugoslavia, Zaire.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the third session.

Chairman: Ali Sunni Muntasser (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).

Vice-Chairmen: Alicia Amate de Esquivel (Argentina), Antonio O. Periquet (Philippines), Karlheinz Renker (German Democratic Republic).

Rapporteur: André LeBlanc (Canada).

<sup>3</sup>See YUN 1973, p. 18, resolution 3183(XXVIII) of 18 December 1973.

## Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year

The 24-member Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year held its first session at Vienna, Austria, from 30 March to 7 April 1981.

Members: Algeria, Chile, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen,<sup>a</sup> Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Guinea,<sup>a</sup> Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica,<sup>a</sup> Japan, Lebanon, Morocco,<sup>a</sup> Mozambique,<sup>a</sup> Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, USSR, United States, Venezuela.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the first session.

Chairman: Nicu Ceausescu (Romania).

Vice-Chairmen: Oumar Dlarso (Guinea), J. F. Gonzales Morales (Guatemala), Mr. Soenaryo (Indonesia).

Rapporteur: Frans L. Schlingemann (Netherlands).

## Advisory Committee for the World Assembly on Aging

The 22-member Advisory Committee for the World Assembly on Aging held its first session at Vienna, Austria, from 17 to 21 August 1981.

Members:<sup>a</sup> Benin,<sup>b</sup> Byelorussian SSR, Chile, Costa Rica,<sup>b</sup> Dominican Republic,<sup>b</sup> France, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco,<sup>b</sup> Nigeria, Philippines, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Togo,<sup>b</sup> USSR, United States, Venezuela,<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Appointed by the Chairman of the General Assembly's Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, as stated in his communications of 30 June and (with respect to the Philippines) 13 August 1981 to the secretary-General.

<sup>b</sup> Not represented at the first session.

Chairman: A. H. B. de Bono (Malta).

Vice-Chairmen: Ryoko Akamatsu (Japan), M. Lantzev (USSR), Olajumoke Oladayo Obafemi (Nigeria).

Rapporteur: Lucien Johan Henar (Suriname).

## Advisory Committee on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa

Members: Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Denmark, India, Japan, Liberia, Nigeria, Norway, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

Chairman: Michel Dupuy (Canada).

Vice-Chairman: Kasuka Simwinjl Mutukwa (Zambia).

## Advisory Committee on the United Nations Programme of Assistance In the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law

During 1981, the Advisory Committee held two sessions at United Nations Headquarters: Its fifteenth on 13 January: and its sixteenth on 26 October.

Members (until 31 December 1983): Barbados,<sup>a,b</sup> Cyprus, Egypt, El Salvador,<sup>b</sup> France, Ghana, Hungary, Netherlands, Sierra Leone,<sup>a</sup> Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, USSR, United Kingdom.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the fifteenth session.

<sup>b</sup> Not represented at the sixteenth session.

Chairman: Kwabena O. Kumi (Ghana).

## Board of Auditors

The Board of Auditors consists of three members appointed by the General Assembly for three-year terms.

Members:

To serve until 30 June 1982: Auditor-General of Ghana.

To serve until 30 June 1983: Senior President of the Audit Office of Belgium.

To serve until 30 June 1984: Comptroller and Auditor-General of Bangladesh.

On 9 November 1981 (decision 38/310), the General Assembly reappointed the Auditor-General of Ghana for a three-year term beginning on 1 July 1982.

## Collective Measures Committee

The Collective Measures Committee did not meet in 1981.

Members: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Egypt, France, Mexico, Philippines, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

## Commission on Human Settlements

The Commission on Human Settlements reports to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council. For details of the Commission's membership and session in 1981, see p. 1534.

## Committee for Programme and Co-ordination

The Committee for Programme and Co-ordination is the main subsidiary organ of the Economic and Social Council and of the General Assembly for planning, programming and co-ordination; it reports to both.

For details of the Committee's membership and session in 1981, see p. 1535.

## Committee for the United Nations Population Award

On 17 December 1981, the General Assembly established the United Nations Population Award, to be presented yearly from 1983, for the most outstanding contribution to the awareness of population questions or to their solutions, by an individual or individuals, or by an institution. Selection of the recipient or recipients from among nominees was to be made by a Committee for the United Nations Population Award, to convene every February for the purpose.

The Committee was to include:

Ten representatives of United Nations Member States elected by the Economic and Social Council for a three-year period, with due regard for equitable geographical representation and the need to include Member States that had made contributions for the Award;

The Secretary-General and the UNFPA Executive Director, to serve ex officio;

Five individuals eminent for their significant contributions to population-related activities, selected by the Committee, to serve as honorary members in an advisory capacity for a renewable three-year term.

The Committee had not been constituted by the end of 1981.

## Committee of Governmental Experts to Evaluate the

## Present Structure of the Secretariat in the Administrative, Finance and Personnel Areas

During 1981, the 17-member Committee of Governmental Experts to Evaluate the Present Structure of the Secretariat in the Administrative, Finance and Personnel Areas held organizational meetings on 14 and 16 September and substantive meetings between 12 October and 5 November, all at United Nations Headquarters.

Members:<sup>a</sup> Abdel-Rahman Abdalla (Sudan);<sup>b</sup> Laurent Denis (France);<sup>c</sup> Michael F. Gepp (Brazil); Apollinaire Hachème, Vice-Chairman (Benin); Teresa Ivars Benalcázar (Colombia); Kamanda wa Kamanda (Zaire);<sup>b</sup> Anwar Kemal (Pakistan); E. V. Kudryavtsev (USSR); Humphrey B. Kunda (Zambia); Sumihiro Kuyama (Japan); Satyabrata Pal (India); Rudolf Schmidt (Federal Republic of Germany);<sup>d</sup> Leif Skare, Vice-Chairman (Norway); Henryk J. Sokalski (Poland); Winthrop M. Southworth (United States); Tang

Jianwen (China); Christopher R. Thomas, Chairman/  
Rapporteur (Trinidad and Tobago).

<sup>a</sup> Appointed by the Secretary-General on 14 September 1981.

<sup>b</sup> Did not attend the 1981 meetings.

<sup>c</sup> Resigned on 19 October 1981; replaced by Antoine Mérieux (France), who was appointed by the Secretary-General the following day.

<sup>d</sup> Resigned on 30 September 1981; replaced by Herald Löschner (Federal Republic of Germany), who was appointed by the Secretary-General on 6 October.

Committee of Trustees of the United Nations  
Trust Fund for South Africa

Members: Chile, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sweden.

Chairman: Anders I. Thunborg (Sweden).

Vice-Chairman: Alhaji Yusuff Maitama-Sule (Nigeria).

Committee on Applications for Review of  
Administrative Tribunal Judgements

The Committee on Applications for Review of Administrative Tribunal Judgements held its twentieth session at United Nations Headquarters on 9 and 13 July 1981.

Members (until 14 September 1981) (based on the composition of the General Committee at the General Assembly's thirty-fifth session): Bahrain, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada,<sup>a</sup> China, Ecuador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Thailand, Tunisia, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

<sup>a</sup> Replaced Sierra Leone, whose representative was unable to attend the twentieth session.

Chairman: Philippe Kirsch (Canada).

Vice-Chairman: A. W. Oardin (Malaysia).

Rapporteur: Michael F. H. Stuart (United Kingdom).

Members (from 15 September 1981) (based on the composition of the General Committee at the General Assembly's thirty-sixth session): Australia, Benin, Botswana, China, Cuba, Cyprus, France, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Seychelles, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia.

Committee on Arrangements for a Conference  
for the Purpose of Reviewing the Charter

All Members of the United Nations are members of the Committee on Arrangements for a Conference for the Purpose of Reviewing the Charter.

The Committee did not meet in 1981.

Committee on Conferences

The Committee on Conferences consists of 22 Member States appointed by the President of the General Assembly on the basis of equitable geographical balance, to serve for a three-year term.

Members (until 31 December 1983): Algeria, Austria, Chile, Cyprus, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia.

Chairman: Michael G. Okeyo (Kenya).

Vice-Chairman: Tibor Gubcsi (Hungary), Mario Martorell (Peru), D. E. Nihal Rodrigo (Sri Lanka).

Rapporteur: Richard J. Martin (New Zealand).

Committee on Information

In 1981, the 67-member Committee on Information held, at United Nations Headquarters, an organizational session on 3 and 4 March and its third session from 27 April to 15 May, on 30 May and on 26 August.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Chairman: Miguel A. Albornoz (Ecuador).

Vice-Chairmen: Patrice H. Houngavou (Benin); Altemur Kilic (Turkey) (until 26 August), Monique P. A. Frank (Netherlands) (from 26 August); Willi Schlegel (German Democratic Republic).

Rapporteur: Vasant Vishnu Nevrekar (India).

Committee on Relations with the Host Country

Members: Bulgaria, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Cyprus, France, Honduras, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Senegal, Spain, USSR, United Kingdom, United States (host country).

Chairman: Andreas V. Mavrommatis (Cyprus).

Vice-Chairmen: Bulgaria, Canada, Ivory Coast.

Rapporteur: Emilia Castro de Barish (Costa Rica).

WORKING GROUP

On 28 January 1981, the Committee decided to abolish the Working Group and to transfer its responsibilities to the Bureau, on the understanding that representatives of the host country would attend Bureau meetings ex officio.

Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was established under the terms of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.<sup>4</sup> It consists of 18 experts elected by the States parties to the Convention to serve in their personal capacity, with due regard for equitable geographical distribution and for representation of the different forms of civilization and principal legal systems. Members of the Committee serve for four-year terms.

The Committee held two sessions in 1981: its twenty-third from 23 March to 10 April at Geneva; and its twenty-fourth from 4 to 21 August at United Nations Headquarters.

Members:

To serve until 19 January 1982:<sup>a</sup> Abdel Moneim M. Ghoneim (Egypt); Ousmane Goundiam, Vice-Chairman (Senegal);<sup>b</sup> George O. Lamptey (Ghana); Karl Josef Partsch, Rapporteur (Federal Republic of Germany); Agha Shahi (Pakistan); Georges Tenekides (Greece); Luis Valencia Rodriguez, Vice-Chairman (Ecuador);<sup>c</sup> Shuaib Uthman Yolah (Nigeria).<sup>c,d</sup>

To serve until 19 January 1984: Yuli Bahnev, Chairman (Bulgaria); S. A. Bessonov (USSR);<sup>e</sup> Pedro Brin Martínez (Panama); André Dechezelles (France); Silvo Devetak (Yugoslavia); José D. Ingles, Vice-Chairman (Philippines);

<sup>4</sup>See YUN 1965, p. 440, text of Convention, annexed to resolution 2106 A (XX) of 21 December 1965, esp. article 8.

Erik Nettel (Austria); Manuel V. Ordóñez (Argentina);<sup>c,d</sup> Shanti Sadiq Ali (India).

<sup>a</sup> One seat remained unfilled in 1981.

<sup>b</sup> Resigned by a telegram of 10 August 1981; replaced by Jacques Baudin (Senegal), whose appointment was approved by the Committee on 11 August.

<sup>c</sup> Did not attend the twenty-third session.

<sup>d</sup> Did not attend the twenty-fourth session.

<sup>e</sup> Resigned by a letter transmitted to the Secretary-General by the USSR on 15 July 1981; replaced by G. B. Starushenko (USSR), whose appointment was approved by the Committee on 6 August.

#### Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People

Members: Afghanistan, Cuba, Cyprus, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, Yugoslavia.

Chairman: Falilou Kane (Senegal) (until 4 May), Massamba Sarré (Senegal) (from 4 May).

Vice-Chairmen: Raúl Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mohammad Farid Zarif (Afghanistan).

Rapporteur: Victor J. Gauci (Malta).

#### WORKING GROUP<sup>a</sup>

Members: Afghanistan, Cuba, Guinea, Guyana, India, Malta (Chairman), Senegal, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR;<sup>b</sup> Palestine Liberation Organization.

<sup>a</sup> In addition, the German Democratic Republic served on the Working Group in 1980 and 1981, the period of its membership in the Security Council.

<sup>b</sup> From 8 December 1981.

#### Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

In 1981, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, whose membership rose from 48 to 53 pursuant to a 1980 General Assembly decision,<sup>5</sup> held its twenty-fourth session at United Nations Headquarters from 22 June to 2 July.

Members: Albania,<sup>a</sup> Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chad,<sup>b</sup> Chile, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece,<sup>b,c</sup> Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran,<sup>a</sup> Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon,<sup>a</sup> Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain,<sup>b,c</sup> Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic,<sup>b</sup> USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United States, Upper Volta,<sup>b</sup> Uruguay,<sup>b</sup> Venezuela, Viet Nam,<sup>b</sup> Yugoslavia.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the twenty-fourth session.

<sup>d</sup> Appointed by the President of the General Assembly's thirty-fifth session, as stated in his communication of 12 January 1981 to the Secretary-General.

<sup>c</sup> In submitting nominations for the Committee's enlargement, the Group of Western European and other States agreed that Greece, which replaced Turkey, would serve in rotation with it, and Spain with Portugal, every three years, the rotation to begin at the end of 1983 when the first three-year period expired.

Chairman: Peter Jankowitsch (Austria).

Vice-Chairman: Teodor Marinescu (Romania).

Rapporteur: Carlos Antonio Bettencourt Bueno (Brazil).

#### LEGAL SUB-COMMITTEE

The Legal Sub-Committee, a committee of the whole, held its twentieth session at Geneva from 16 March to 10 April 1981.

Chairmen: Eugeniusz Wyzner (Poland).

#### SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SUB-COMMITTEE

The Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, a committee of the whole, held its eighteenth session at United Nations Headquarters from 2 to 13 February 1981.

Chairman: J. H. Carver (Australia).

#### Consultative Panel on Public Information

The Consultative Panel on Public Information did not meet in 1981.

Members: Experts from the following United Nations Member States: Canada, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, France, India, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Netherlands, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Chairman: The Secretary-General.

#### Disarmament Commission

The Disarmament Commission, composed of all the Members of the United Nations, held one series of meetings between 18 May and 5 June and organizational meetings on 10 and 11 December 1981, all at United Nations Headquarters.

Chairman: Peter Michaelsen (Denmark).

Vice-Chairmen: Bahamas, Czechoslovakia, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Syrian Arab Republic, Zambia.

Rapporteur: Mahmoud Karem Mahmoud (Egypt).

#### High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries

The High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries, composed of all States participating in UNDP, held its second session at United Nations Headquarters from 1 to 8 June 1981.

President: Natarajan Krishnan (India).

Vice-Presidents: José Luis Pardos Pérez (Spain), Ion Popescu (Romania), José Ramón Sanchis Munoz (Argentina).

Rapporteur: Francis R. C. Blain (Gambia).

#### Human Rights Committee

The Human Rights Committee was established under the terms of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.<sup>6</sup> It consists of 18 experts elected by the States parties to the Covenant to serve in their personal capacity for four-year terms.

The Committee, which reports annually to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council, held three sessions in 1981: its twelfth at United Nations Headquarters from 23 March to 10 April; its thirteenth at Geneva from 13 to 31 July; and its fourteenth at Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany, from 19 to 30 October.

#### Members

To serve until 31 December 1982: Néjib Bouziri (Tunisia); Abdoulaye Diéye (Senegal); Bernhard Graefrath, Vice-Chairman (German Democratic Republic); Dejan Janca (Yugoslavia); Rajsoomer Lallah, Rapporteur (Mauritius);<sup>a</sup> Torkel Opsahl (Norway); Julio Prado Vallejo, Vice-Chairman (Ecuador); Waleed M. Sadi (Jordan); Christian Tomuschat, Vice-Chairman (Federal Republic of Germany). To serve until 31 December 1984: Andrés Aguilar (Venezuela); Mohammed Abdullah Ahmed Al Douri (Iraq);

<sup>5</sup>See YUN 1980, p. 135, resolution 35/16 of 3 November 1980, esp. section II.

<sup>6</sup>See YUN 1966, p. 423, text of Covenant, annexed to resolution 2200 A (XXI) of 16 December 1966, esp. part IV.

Felix Ermacora (Austria); Sir Vincent Evans (United Kingdom); Vladimir Hanga (Romania); Leonte Herdocia Ortega (Nicaragua); Andreas V. Mavrommatis, Chairman (Cyprus); A. P. Movchan (USSR);<sup>a</sup> Walter Surma Tarnopolsky (Canada).

<sup>a</sup> Did not attend the fourteenth session.

<sup>b</sup> Did not attend the twelfth session.

#### Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development

The Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development open to the participation of all States as full members, held two sessions in 1981, at United Nations Headquarters: its resumed second on 29 January; the first part of its third from 26 May to 5 June; and its resumed third from 25 to 31 August.

#### Resumed second session

Chairman: Thomas Klestil (Austria).

Vice-Chairmen: Slawomir Cytrycki (Poland), Saliah Ben Kouyaté (Guinea), Mohan Prasad Lohani (Nepal).

Rapporteur: Anne-Marie de Grant (Venezuela).

#### Third session

Chairman: Manzoor Ahmed Sheikh (Pakistan).

Vice-Chairmen: Slawomir Cytrycki (Poland), Awad Mohamed Elhassan (Sudan), Alfredo Ramírez Araiza (Mexico).

Rapporteur: Arjan P. Hamburger (Netherlands).

#### ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

On 29 January 1981, the Intergovernmental Committee decided that the advisory body it established in 1980 be named the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology for Development. The Advisory Committee held its first session at United Nations Headquarters from 23 to 27 February 1981.

#### Members:<sup>a</sup>

To serve until 31 December 1982: Daniel Adzei Bekoe (Ghana); Umberto Colombo, Vice-Chairman (Italy); Bernard M. J. Delapalme (France);<sup>b</sup> Jan Gabel (Czechoslovakia); Henri Hogbe-Nlend, Vice-Chairman (United Republic of Cameroon); Jorge Katz (Argentina);<sup>b</sup> Abdelsalam Majali (Jordan); Cyril Agodi Onwumechili (Nigeria); Keichi Oshima (Japan);<sup>b</sup> Armando Samper (Colombia); Sitali Mundia Silangwa (Zambia); M. S. Swaminathan, Chairman (India); José Israel Vargas (Brazil); Rudolf Witzenzellner (Federal Republic of Germany).

To serve until 31 December 1983: Sadak Ben Jamaa, Vice-Chairman (Tunisia); Just Faaland (Norway);<sup>b</sup> Edmundo Flores (Mexico); Peter Gacii (Kenya);<sup>b</sup> Dennis Irvine (Jamaica); Lin Hua (China); Loretta Makasiar-Sicat (Philippines); Rodney W. Nichols (United States); V. I. Popkov (USSR);<sup>b</sup> Hamida Radouane (Algeria); Bachtiar Rifai (Indonesia); Leopold Schmetterer (Austria); Adnan Shihab-Eldin (Kuwait); Klaus Stubenrauch, Vice-Chairman (German Democratic Republic).

<sup>a</sup> Appointed by the Intergovernmental Committee on 29 January 1981.

<sup>b</sup> Did not attend the first session.

#### INTERGOVERNMENTAL GROUP OF EXPERTS ON THE UNITED NATIONS FINANCING SYSTEM FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

The 27-member Intergovernmental Group of Experts on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development held two sessions in 1981: its third at Geneva from 6 to 16 April; and its fourth and final session at United Nations Headquarters from 8 to 19 June. (See also p. 1508.)

Members: Experts from the following United Nations Member States: Australia, Austria, Chile, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, India, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Chairman: Lars Anell (Sweden).

Vice-Chairmen: Mirko Bunc (Yugoslavia), Francisco Sagasti (Peru), Manzoor Ahmed Sheikh (Pakistan).

Rapporteur: Sadig Rasheed (Sudan).

#### Interim Committee of the General Assembly

The Interim Committee of the General Assembly, on which each Member of the United Nations has the right to be represented, did not meet in 1981.

#### Interim Committee of the United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology

On 16 December 1981, the General Assembly established an Interim Committee of the United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology, to consider those issues in the draft code of conduct that remained unresolved at the conclusion of the fourth session of the Conference and to propose solutions thereon to the fifth (1983) session.

The Interim Committee, open to the participation of all States members of UNCTAD, was to convene in the first quarter of 1982.

#### Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy

On 17 December 1981, the General Assembly established an Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, patterned on the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 1515), and entrusted with the immediate launching of the implementation of the 1981 Nairobi Programme of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy.

The Interim Committee was to hold one session in the first half of 1982 and report to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh (1982) session through the Economic and Social Council.

#### International Civil Service Commission

The International Civil Service Commission consists of 15 members who serve in their personal capacity as individuals of recognized competence in public administration or related fields, particularly in personnel management. They are appointed by the General Assembly, with due regard for equitable geographical distribution, for four-year terms.

The Commission held two sessions in 1981, at United Nations Headquarters: its thirteenth from 23 February to 13 March; and its fourteenth from 6 to 31 July.

#### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Jean-Claude Fortuit (France); Arthur H. M. Hillis (United Kingdom); Akira Matsui (Japan); António Fonseca Pimentel (Brazil); Ersä H. Poston (United States).

To serve until 31 December 1982: Richard M. Akwei, Chairman (Ghana); Gastón de Prat Gay, Vice-Chairman (Argentina); Moulaye El Hassen (Mauritania); Pascal Frochaux (Switzerland); Jiri Nosek (Czechoslovakia).

To serve until 31 December 1984: Syed Amjad Ali (Pakistan); Michael O. Ani (Nigeria); A. S. Chistyakov (USSR); M. A. Vellodi (India); Halima Embarek Warzazi (Morocco).

On 18 December 1981 (decision 36/324), the General Assembly appointed the following members for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Ralph Enckell (Finland), Jean-Claude Fortuit (France), Helmut Kitschenberg (Federal Republic Of



Germany), Akira Matsui (Japan), António Fonseca Pimentel (Brazil).

#### ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POST ADJUSTMENT QUESTIONS

The Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions consists of six members, of whom five are chosen from the geographical regions of Africa, Asia, Latin America, Eastern Europe, and Western Europe and other States; and one, from ICSC, who serves ex officio as Chairman. Members are appointed by the ICSC Chairman to serve for four-year terms.

The Advisory Committee held its sixth session in Paris from 11 to 25 May 1981.

#### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Nana Wereko Ampem II (also known as Emmanuel Noi Omaboe) (Ghana); Janes A. de Souza (Brazil).

To serve until 31 December 1982: Stephen Van Dyke Baer (United States).

To serve until 31 December 1983: A. F. Revenko (USSR).

To serve until 31 December 1984: G. K. Nair (Malaysia).<sup>a</sup>

Ex-officio member: Pascal Frochoux, Chairman (Switzerland).

<sup>a</sup> Appointed In March 1981.

#### International Law Commission

The International Law Commission consisted of 25 persons of recognized competence in international law, elected by the General Assembly to serve in their individual capacity for a five-year term. Vacancies occurring within the five-year period are filled by the Commission.

The Commission held its thirty-third session at Geneva from 4 May to 24 July 1981.

Members (until 31 December 1981): George H. Aldrich (United States);<sup>a</sup> Julio Barboza (Argentina); Mohammed Bedjaoui (Algeria); Boutros Boutros-Ghali (Egypt); Juan José Calle y Calle (Peru); Jorge Castaneda (Mexico); Emmanuel Kodjoe Dadzie (Ghana); Leonardo Díaz-González (Venezuela); Jens Evensen (Norway); Laurel B. Francis, Rapporteur (Jamaica); S. P. Jagota (India); Frank X. J. C. Njenga (Kenya); Christopher Walter Pinto (Sri Lanka); Robert Q. Quentin-Baxter, First Vice-Chairman (New Zealand); Paul Reuter (France); Willem Riphagen (Netherlands); Milan Sahovic, Second Vice-Chairman (Yugoslavia); Sompong Sucharitkul (Thailand); Abdul Hakim Tabibi (Afghanistan); Doudou Thiam, Chairman (Senegal); Senjin Tsuruoka (Japan);<sup>b</sup> N. A. Ushakov (USSR); Sir Francis Vallat (United Kingdom); Stephan Verosta (Austria); Alexander Yankov (Bulgaria).

<sup>a</sup> Elected by the Commission on 6 May 1981 to fill the vacancy that had been created by the resignation of Stephen M. Schwabell (United States) upon his election to the International Court of Justice on 15 January.

<sup>b</sup> Resigned by a letter of 19 June 1981; the resultant vacancy was not filled for the remainder of the term.

On 18 November 1981, the General Assembly decided to enlarge the Commission from 25 to 34 members, elected according to the following pattern: eight from African States; seven from Asian States; three from Eastern European States; six from Latin American States; eight from Western European and other States; one from African or Eastern European States in rotation, beginning with a national of an African State; and one from Asian or Latin American States in rotation, beginning with a national of an Asian State.

On 23 November (decision 36/316), the Assembly elected the following 34 members for a five-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981 and the nine additional seats: Richard Osulale A. Akinjide (Nigeria), Riyadh Mahmoud Sami Al-Qaysi (Iraq), Balanda Mikuin Leliel (Zaire), Julio Barboza (Argentina),

Mohammed Bedjaoui (Algeria), Boutros Boutros-Ghali (Egypt), Carlos Calero Rodrigues (Brazil), Jorge Castaneda (Mexico), Leonardo Díaz-González (Venezuela), Khalafalla El Rasheed Mohamed-Ahmed (Sudan), Jens Evensen (Norway), Constantin Flitan (Romania), Laurel B. Francis (Jamaica), Jorge Enrique Illueca (Panama), Andreas J. Jacovides (Cyprus), S. P. Jagota (India), Abdul G. Koroma (Sierra Leone), José Manuel Lacleta Muñoz (Spain), Chafic Malek (Lebanon), Stephen C. McCaffrey (United States), NI Zhengyu (China), Frank X. J. C. Njenga (Kenya), Motosu Oglso (Japan), Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada (Pakistan), Robert Q. Quentin-Baxter (New Zealand), Edilbert Razafindralambo (Madagascar), Paul Reuter (France), Willem Riphagen (Netherlands), Sir Ian Sinclair (United Kingdom), Constantin A. Stavropoulos (Greece), Sompong Sucharitkul (Thailand), Doudou Thiam (Senegal), N. A. Ushakov (USSR), Alexander Yankov (Bulgaria).

#### Investments Committee

The Investments Committee consists of nine members appointed by the Secretary-General, after consultation with the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board and ACABQ, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly. Members serve for three-year terms.

#### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Jean Guyot; George Johnston; Toshio Shishido.

To serve until 31 December 1982: Aloysio de Andrade Faria; Braj Kumar Nehru, Chairman; Stanislaw Raczkowski.

To serve until 31 December 1983: David Montagu; Yves Oltramare; Emmanuel Noi Omaboe (also known as Nana Wereko Ampem II).

In addition, during 1981, Juergen Reimnitz served in an ad hoc consultative capacity.

On 9 November 1981 (decision 36/311), the General Assembly confirmed the appointment by the Secretary-General of Jean Guyot, George Johnston and Michiya Matsukawa as members for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982.

#### Joint Advisory Group on the International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT

The Joint Advisory Group was established in accordance with an agreement between UNCTAD and GATT with effect from 1 January 1968, the date on which under their joint sponsorship the International Trade Centre commenced operations.

Participation in the Group is open to all States members of UNCTAD and to all Contracting Parties to GATT.

The Group, which meets annually, held the first part of its fourteenth session at Geneva from 30 March to 3 April 1981.

Chairman: Plácido García Reynoso (Mexico).

Vice-Chairman: Wiebo J. Rijpma (Netherlands).

Rapporteur: Andrzej S. Horoszkiewicz (Poland).

#### TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

The Technical Committee of the Joint Advisory Group on the International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT meets annually to review the Centre's work programme and organizational structure and reports to the Group.

The Committee, which is open to the participation of experts, as well as officials responsible for national trade promotion activities, from any country represented in the Joint Advisory Group, held its tenth session at Geneva from 9 to 13 February 1981.

Chairman: Arvind Govind Barvé (Kenya).

#### Joint Inspection Unit

The Joint Inspection Unit consists of not more than 11 Inspectors appointed by the General Assembly from candi-

dates nominated by Member States following appropriate consultations, including consultations with the President of the Economic and Social Council and with the Chairman of ACC. The Inspectors, chosen for their special experience in national or International administrative and financial matters, with due regard for equitable geographical distribution and reasonable rotation, serve in their personal capacity for five-year terms.

#### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1982: Mark E. Allen (United Kingdom); A. S. Bryntsev (USSR); Toman Hutagalung (Indonesia); Julio C. Rodriguez Arias (Argentina); Joseph Adolph Sawe (United Republic of Tanzania); Zakaria Slbahi, Chairman (Syrian Arab Republic).

To serve until 31 December 1985: Maurice Bertrand, Vice-Chairman (France); Alfred Nathaniel Forde (Barbados); Moustapha Ould Khalifa (Mauritania); Earl D. Sohm (United States); Miljenko Vukovic (Yugoslavia).

On 17 December 1981 (decision 36/320), the General Assembly appointed the following members for a five-year term beginning on 1 January 1983 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1982: Mark E. Allen (United Kingdom), A. S. Efimov (USSR), Toman Hutagalung (Indonesia), Mohamed Salah Eldin Ibrahim (Egypt), Nasser Kaddour (Syrian Arab Republic), Norman Williams (Panama).

#### Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations

The Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations, which was to consist of 54 Member States appointed by the President of the General Assembly, did not meet in 1981.

Members:<sup>a</sup> Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Canada, Chad, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela.

<sup>a</sup> Six seats remained unfilled in 1981.

#### Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

#### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER'S PROGRAMME

The Executive Committee held its thirty-second session at Geneva from 12 to 21 October 1981.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Holy See, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Morocco, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Chairman: Peter H. R. Marshall (United Kingdom).

Vice-Chairman: Ibrahim Kharmah (Lebanon).

Rapporteur: A. L. Davérède (Argentina).

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees: Poul Hartling.

Deputy High Commissioner: Dale S. De Haan (until 31 August), William Richard Smyser (from 1 September).

#### SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION

The Sub-Committee of the Whole on International Protection held its sixth meeting at Geneva on 8, 9 and 12 October 1981.

Chairman: Omer Yousif Birido (Sudan).

#### SUB-COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS

Following consultations between them early in 1981, the Bureau of the Executive Committee and the High Commissioner proposed that a Sub-Committee on Administrative and Financial Matters, composed of all Executive Committee members, be convened immediately before the Executive Committee's thirty-second session. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee, with provisional working arrangements, met on 8 and 9 October 1981.

Chairman: Peter H. R. Marshall (United Kingdom).

At its thirty-second session, the Executive Committee formally established the Sub-Committee, with terms of reference to include, primarily, assisting the Executive Committee in the managerial, financial and administrative aspects of its work.

#### Panel for Inquiry and Conciliation

The Panel for Inquiry and Conciliation was established by the General Assembly in 1949.<sup>7</sup> It was to consist of qualified persons, designated by United Nations Member States, each to serve for a term of five years.

The Panel was not called upon in 1981.

#### Panel of External Auditors

The Panel of External Auditors consists of the members of the United Nations Board of Auditors and the appointed external auditors of the specialized agencies and IAEA.

#### Panel of Military Experts

The General Assembly's "Uniting for Peace" resolutions called for the appointment of military experts to be available, on request, to United Nations Member States wishing to obtain technical advice on the organization, training and equipment of elements within their national armed forces which could be made available, in accordance with national constitutional processes, for service as a unit or units of the United Nations upon the recommendation of the Security Council or the General Assembly.

#### Peace Observation Commission

The Peace Observation Commission did not meet in 1981.

Members (until 31 December 1981): Czechoslovakia, France, Honduras, India, Israel, New Zealand, Pakistan, Sweden, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

On 18 December 1981 (decision 36/323), the General Assembly appointed the following members for a two-year period with effect from 1 January 1982: Czechoslovakia, France, Honduras, India, Maldives, New Zealand, Pakistan, Sweden, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

#### Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Question of Palestine

On 10 December 1981, the General Assembly authorized the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (p. 1511) to act as the Preparatory Committee for an International Conference on the Question of Palestine to be convened under United Nations auspices not

<sup>7</sup>See YUN 1948-49, p. 416, resolution 268 D (III) of 28 April 1949.

<sup>8</sup>See YUN 1950, p. 193, resolution 377(V) of 3 November 1950.

later than 1984. The Preparatory Committee was to take all the necessary steps for the organization of the Conference and make recommendations regarding, inter alia, its date and duration, place and provisional agenda, and participation in the Conference.

The Preparatory Committee did not meet in 1981.

Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session  
of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament

The 78-member Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (to be held in 1982) held two sessions in 1981, at United Nations Headquarters: its second from 4 to 15 May; and its third from 5 to 16 October.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Chairman: Oluyemi Adeniji (Nigeria).

Vice-Chairmen: Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Bulgaria, German Democratic Republic, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, Peru, Yugoslavia.

Rapporteur: Omer Ersun (Turkey).

Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations  
Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful  
Uses of Outer Space

The Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space was designated by the General Assembly as the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, to be held in 1982.

The Preparatory Committee held its third session, during the twenty-fourth session of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (p. 1511).

Chairman: Peter Jankowitsch (Austria).

Vice-Chairmen: Teodor Marinescu (Romania).

Rapporteur: Carlos Morelra Garcia (Brazil).

ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE  
FOR THE SECOND UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON  
THE EXPLORATION AND PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

The Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space was designated by the General Assembly as the Advisory Committee to the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

The Advisory Committee met in 1981 during the eighteenth session of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee (p. 1511).

Chairman: J. H. Carver (Australia).

Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference  
for the Promotion of International Co-operation

In the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy

In 1981, the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in

the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (scheduled for 1983), which was to be composed of 70 Member States and, on an equal footing, other Member States which might express interest in participating in the Committee's work, had a membership of 58. It held its first session at Vienna, Austria, from 3 to 7 August 1981.

Members:<sup>a</sup> Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil,<sup>b</sup> Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica,<sup>b</sup> Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala,<sup>b</sup> Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,<sup>b</sup> Malaysia,<sup>b</sup> Mauritania,<sup>b</sup> Mexico, Morocco,<sup>b</sup> Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines,<sup>b</sup> Poland, Romania, Spain,<sup>b</sup> Sri Lanka,<sup>b</sup> Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic,<sup>b</sup> Thailand,<sup>b</sup> Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates,<sup>b</sup> United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

<sup>a</sup> Appointed by the President of the General Assembly's thirty-fifth session, as stated in his Communications of 1 July, 31 July (With respect to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania and Morocco) and 11 September 1981 (with respect to Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand and the United Arab Emirates).

<sup>b</sup> Not represented at the first session.

Chairman: Novak Priblcevic (Yugoslavia).

Vice-Chairmen: F. K. A. Allotey (Ghana), Essam El-Din Hawas (Egypt), Suror Merza Mahmoud (Iraq), L. A. Olivieri (Argentina), Alvaro Salcedo Rubio (Peru), B. Skala (Sweden), Jan Strucka (Czechoslovakia), Gerrit Willem Van Barneveld Kooy (Netherlands).

Rapporteur: Sumaryo Suryokusumo (Indonesia).

Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference  
on New and Renewable Sources of Energy

The Committee on Natural Resources (p. 1535) was designated by the General Assembly as the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 1526).

During 1981, the Preparatory Committee, open to the participation of all States as full members, held its third session from 30 March to 16 April and the first part of its fourth from 8 to 26 June, at United Nations Headquarters; and its resumed fourth and final session from 3 to 7 August at Nairobi, Kenya.

Chairman: Makoto Taniguchi (Japan).

Vice-Chairmen: Ion Goritza (Romania) (third and first part of fourth session), Dan Nicoloci (Romania) (resumed fourth session); Richard J. Martin (New Zealand); Pedro Sorensen Mosquera (Venezuela).

Rapporteur: Richard H. O. Okwaro (Kenya).

Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference  
on the Least Developed Countries

The Intergovernmental Group on the Least Developed Countries of UNCTAD was designated by the General Assembly as the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (p. 1526).

The Preparatory Committee, open to the full participation of all States members of UNCTAD, held its third and final session at Geneva from 29 June to 10 July 1981.

Chairman: Hans V. Ewerlof (Sweden).

Vice-Chairmen: N. Dialle (Guinea), Gu Yijie (China), Y. Guirand (Haiti), Takayuki Kimura (Japan), Bijaya Bahadur Pradhan (Nepal), Willy Schild (German Democratic Republic).

Rapporteur: Ibrahim A. Hamra (Sudan).

Special Committee against Apartheid

Members:<sup>a</sup> Algeria, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal,

Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian SSR.

<sup>a</sup> By the end of 1981, additional members remained to be appointed in pursuance of a 1979 General Assembly request<sup>9</sup> to expand the Committee's membership.

Chairman: B. Akporode Clark (Nigeria) (until 14 September),  
Alhaji Yusuff Maitama-Sule (Nigeria) (from 14 September).  
Vice-Chairmen: Uddhav Deo Bhatt (Nepal), V. A. Kravets  
Ukrainian SSR).  
Rapporteur: Gervais Charles (Haiti).

#### SUB-COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS AND INFORMATION

Members: Algeria (Chairman), German Democratic Republic,  
Nepal, Somalia, Trinidad and Tobago.

#### SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTIONS AND COLLABORATION WITH SOUTH AFRICA

Members: Ghana (Chairman), Hungary, India, Peru, Sudan.

#### Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force In International Relations

The 35-member Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations held one series of meetings at United Nations Headquarters between 23 March and 17 April 1981.

Members: Argentina, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Cuba,<sup>a</sup> Cyprus, Ecuador,<sup>a</sup> Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mexico,<sup>a</sup> Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

<sup>a</sup> Replaced Nicaragua, Panama and Peru in accordance with a system of rotation agreed upon by the Latin American States when the Special Committee was constituted.

Chairman: Nabil A. Elaraby (Egypt).  
Vice-Chairmen: Jargalsaikhany Enkhasaikhan (Mongolia),  
Oscar González César (Mexico), Ryszard Krystosik  
(Poland).  
Rapporteur: Eric Duchêne (Belgium).

#### Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations

During 1981, the 33-member Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations held meetings at United Nations Headquarters on 17 July and 6 and 26 August.

Members: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina (Vice-Chairman), Australia, Austria, Canada (Vice-Chairman), Denmark, Egypt (Rapporteur), El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Hungary (Vice-Chairman), India, Iraq, Italy, Japan (Vice-Chairman), Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria (Chairman), Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

#### WORKING GROUP

Members: France, India, Mexico, Pakistan, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, and the officers of the Special Committee.

#### Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization

The 47-member Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization held a series of meetings at United Nations Headquarters between 17 February and 14 March 1981.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia, Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Chairman: Sergio González Gálvez (Mexico).  
Vice-Chairmen: Bengt H. G. A. Broms (Finland), Nabil A. Elaraby (Egypt), Dietmar Hücke (German Democratic Republic).  
Rapporteur: María Lourdes Ramiro Lopez (Philippines).

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

Members: Afghanistan, Australia, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark,<sup>a</sup> Ethiopia, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

<sup>a</sup> Withdraw from membership as from 31 December 1981, as stated in a letter of 22 October to the President of the General Assembly. On 25 November (decision 36/317), the Assembly confirmed the appointment by its President of Norway, effective 1 January 1982, to fill the resultant vacancy.

Chairman: Frank Owen Abdullah (Trinidad and Tobago).  
Vice-Chairmen: Niels Peter Georg Helmskov (Denmark), Stefan Kalina (Czechoslovakia), Abdul G. Koroma (Sierra Leone).  
Rapporteur: Mohamed Farouk Adhami (Syrian Arab Republic).

#### SUB-COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS, INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE

Members: Bulgaria, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia (Chairman), Denmark, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Mali, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia.

#### SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES

Members: Afghanistan, Australia (Rapporteur), Bulgaria, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast (Chairman), Mali, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

#### WORKING GROUP

In 1981, the Working Group of the Special Committee, which functions as a steering committee, consisted of: Congo, Cuba, Iran, Tunisia; the five officers of the Special Committee; and the Chairman and the Rapporteur of the Subcommittee on Small Territories.

#### Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories

Members: Senegal (Chairman), Sri Lanka, Yugoslavia.

#### Special Committee to Select the Winners of the United Nations Human Rights Prize

The Special Committee to Select the Winners of the United Nations Human Rights Prize was established pursuant to a 1966 resolution of the General Assembly<sup>10</sup> recommending that a prize or prizes in the field of human rights be awarded not more often than at five-year intervals. Prizes were awarded for the third time on 11 December 1978.

The Special Committee did not meet in 1981.

<sup>9</sup>See YUN 1979, p. 201, resolution 34/93 R of 17 December 1979.

<sup>10</sup>See YUN 1966, p. 457, resolution 2217 A (XXI) of 19 December 1966, esp. recommendation C of annex.

Members: The President of the General Assembly, the President of the Economic and Social Council, the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, the Chairman of the Commission on the Status of Women and the Chairman of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

#### United Nations Administrative Tribunal

##### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Francisco A. Forteza, Second Vice-President (Uruguay); Endre Ustor, First Vice-President (Hungary).

To serve until 31 December 1982: Mrs. Paul Bastid, President (France); Mutuale Tshikankie (Zaire); Samarendranath Sen (India).

To serve until 31 December 1983: Arnold Wilfred Geoffrey Kean (United Kingdom); Herbert K. Reis (United States).

On 9 November 1981 (decision 36/312), the General Assembly appointed Luis Maria de Posadas Montero (Uruguay) and Endre Ustor (Hungary) for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981.

#### United Nations Capital Development Fund

The United Nations Capital Development Fund was set up as an organ of the General Assembly to function as an autonomous organization within the United Nations framework, with the control of its policies and operations to be exercised by a 24-member Executive Board elected by the General Assembly from Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of IAEA. The chief executive officer of the Fund, the Managing Director, exercises his functions under the general direction of the Executive Board. The Executive Board reports to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

##### EXECUTIVE BOARD

The UNDP Governing Council (p. 1539) acts as the Executive Board of the Fund and the UNDP Administrator as its Managing Director (see below)—in conformity with measures the General Assembly adopted provisionally in 1967<sup>11</sup> and reconfirmed yearly until 1980.<sup>12</sup> On 17 December 1981 (p. 469), the Assembly decided that UNDP continue to provide the Fund with, among other things, all headquarters administrative support services; the Fund thus continued to operate under the same arrangements.

Managing Director: F. Bradford Morse (UNDP Administrator).

#### United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

##### EXECUTIVE BOARD

The Executive Board of UNICEF (p. 1538) reports to the Economic and Social Council and, as appropriate, to the General Assembly.

#### United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL)

The United Nations Commission on International Trade Law consists of 36 members elected by the General Assembly, in accordance with a formula providing equitable geographical representation and adequate representation of the principal economic and legal systems of the world. Members serve for six-year terms.

The Commission held its fourteenth session at Vienna, Austria, from 19 to 26 June 1981.

##### Members:

To serve until the day preceding the Commission's regular annual session in 1983: Australia, Austria, Burundi,<sup>a</sup> Chile, Colombia,<sup>a</sup> Egypt, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Indonesia, Japan, Nigeria, Singapore, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania.<sup>a</sup>

To serve until the day preceding the Commission's regular annual session in 1986: Cuba, Cyprus,<sup>a</sup> Czechoslovakia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Kenya, Peru,<sup>a</sup> Philippines, Senegal,<sup>a</sup> Sierra Leone, Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United States, Yugoslavia.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the fourteenth session.

Chairman: Warren Khoo Leang Huat (Singapore).

Vice-Chairmen: Rafael Eyzaguirre (Chile), E. Sam (Ghana), I. Szasz (Hungary).

Rapporteur: Alfred Duchek (Austria).

##### WORKING GROUP ON

##### INTERNATIONAL CONTRACT PRACTICES

The Working Group on International Contract Practices held its second session at United Nations Headquarters from 13 to 17 April 1981.

Members: Austria, Czechoslovakia, France, Ghana,<sup>a</sup> Guatemala,<sup>a</sup> Hungary, India, Japan, Kenya, Philippines, Sierra Leone,<sup>a</sup> Trinidad and Tobago, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the second session.

Chairman: I. Tarko (Austria).

Rapporteur: M. Cuker (Czechoslovakia).

##### WORKING GROUP ON

##### INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS

The Working Group on International Negotiable Instruments held two sessions in 1981: its tenth at Vienna, Austria, from 5 to 16 January; and its eleventh at United Nations Headquarters from 3 to 14 August.

Members: Chile, Egypt, France, India, Nigeria, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Chairman: René Roblot (France).

Rapporteur: Essam El-Din Hawas (Egypt) (tenth session), Ibrahim Youssri (Egypt) (eleventh session).

##### WORKING GROUP ON THE

##### NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER

The Working Group on the New International Economic Order, which is composed of all States members of UNCITRAL, held its second session at Vienna, Austria, from 9 to 18 June 1981. All the members were represented except Burundi, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Peru, Senegal and Sierra Leone.

Chairman: Leif Sevón (Finland).

Rapporteur: Stephen K. Muchui (Kenya).

#### United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine

Members: France, Turkey, United States.

#### United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)

Members of UNCTAD are Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of IAEA.

##### TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The Trade and Development Board is a permanent organ of UNCTAD. Its membership is drawn from the following list of UNCTAD members.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>11</sup>See YUN 1967, p. 372, resolution 2321 (XXII) of 15 December 1967, esp. para. 1 (a) and (b).

<sup>12</sup>See YUN 1980, p. 607, decision 35/422 of 5 December 1980, esp. para. (c).

Part A. Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu,<sup>b</sup> Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe,<sup>c</sup> Namibia.<sup>c</sup>

Part B. Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

Part C. Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize,<sup>b</sup> Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia,<sup>c</sup> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines,<sup>c</sup> Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Part D. Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian SSR, USSR.

<sup>a</sup> Antigua and Barbuda became a Member of the United Nations and, ipso facto, a member of UNCTAD on 11 November 1981. Its treatment for the purpose of elections was not determined in 1981.

<sup>b</sup> Became Members of the United Nations and, ipso facto, members of UNCTAD on 15 and 25 September 1981, respectively, after the fifth (1979) session of the Conference. On 28 September 1981, the Board decided that they should be associated with the countries listed in Parts A and C, respectively, for the purpose of elections, pending approval by the Conference at its sixth (1983) session.

<sup>c</sup> Became members of UNCTAD after the fifth (1979) session of the Conference. By decision of the Board, they were subsequently included in Parts A (Namibia and Zimbabwe) and C (Saint Lucia, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) for the purpose of elections, pending approval by the Conference at its sixth (1983) session.

#### BOARD MEMBERS AND SESSIONS

The membership of the Board is open to all UNCTAD members. Those wishing to become members of the Board communicate their intention to the Secretary-General of UNCTAD for transmittal to the Board President, who announces the membership on the basis of such notifications.

The Trade and Development Board held two sessions in 1981, at Geneva: its twenty-second from 9 to 20 March (first part) and on 12 May (second part); and its twenty-third from 28 September to 12 October (first part) and from 4 to 6 November (second part).

Members: Afghanistan,<sup>a,b,c</sup> Algeria, Angola,<sup>a,b,c,d</sup> Argentina,<sup>b</sup> Australia, Austria, Bangladesh,<sup>b</sup> Barbados,<sup>c</sup> Belgium, Benin,<sup>c</sup> Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma,<sup>a,b</sup> Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Central African Republic,<sup>b,c</sup> Chad,<sup>c</sup> Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica,<sup>b</sup> Cuba,<sup>b</sup> Cyprus,<sup>b,c</sup> Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea,<sup>a,b</sup> Democratic Yemen,<sup>b</sup> Denmark, Dominican Republic,<sup>b</sup> Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon,<sup>b</sup> German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada,<sup>a,b,c</sup> Guatemala,<sup>b</sup> Guinea,<sup>c</sup> Guyana,<sup>c</sup> Haiti,<sup>c</sup>

Honduras,<sup>b</sup> Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland,<sup>b</sup> Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast,<sup>b</sup> Jamaica,<sup>b</sup> Japan, Jordan, Kenya,<sup>b,c</sup> Kuwait,<sup>b</sup> Lebanon,<sup>b</sup> Liberia,<sup>a,b,c</sup> Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein,<sup>b,c</sup> Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali,<sup>c</sup> Malta, Mauritania,<sup>c</sup> Mauritius,<sup>b,c,f</sup> Mexico, Mongolia,<sup>b,c</sup> Morocco, Netherlands,<sup>b</sup> New Zealand,<sup>c</sup> Nicaragua,<sup>b</sup> Nigeria, Norway, Oman,<sup>b</sup> Pakistan,<sup>b</sup> Panama,<sup>b,c</sup> Papua New Guinea,<sup>c</sup> Peru, Philippines,<sup>b</sup> Poland, Portugal,<sup>b</sup> Qatar, Republic of Korea,<sup>b</sup> Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone,<sup>c</sup> Singapore,<sup>b</sup> Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka,<sup>b</sup> Sudan, Suriname,<sup>b,c</sup> Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic,<sup>b</sup> Thailand, Togo,<sup>a,b</sup> Trinidad and Tobago,<sup>b</sup> Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda,<sup>b,c,f</sup> Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon,<sup>a,c</sup> United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta,<sup>b,c,f</sup> Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam,<sup>b,c</sup> Yemen,<sup>b,c</sup> Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia,<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the first part of the twenty-second session.

<sup>b</sup> Not represented at the second part of the twenty-second session.

<sup>c</sup> Not represented at the second part of the twenty-third session.

<sup>d</sup> Became members in 1981: Angola on 28 September and Grenada on 29 September.

<sup>e</sup> Not represented at the sessions in 1981.

<sup>f</sup> Not represented at the first part of the twenty-third session.

#### OFFICERS (BUREAU) OF THE BOARD

Twenty-second session

President: Peter H. R. Marshall (United Kingdom).

Vice-Presidents: Omer Yousif Birido (Sudan), Wilbert Kumalija Chagula (United Republic of Tanzania), Hassan Ali Dabbagh (Kuwait), S. A. Khasru (Bangladesh), Frans J. C. Klinkenbergh (Netherlands), G. Krasnov (USSR), Janos Nyerger (Hungary), Fumihiko Suzuki (Japan), Manuel Trucco (Chile), Bjornar Utheim (Norway).

Rapporteur: Carlos A. Barros-Oreiro (Uruguay).

Twenty-third session

President: Hassan Ali Dabbagh (Kuwait).

Vice-Presidents: G. Alvares-Maciel (Brazil), J. Bolanos (Cuba), Pracha Guna-Kasem (Thailand), Richard Hlavaty (Czechoslovakia), Frans J. C. Klinkenbergh (Netherlands), Andre Mangongo-Nzambi (Gabon), Peter H. R. Marshall (United Kingdom), Abdillahi Said Osman (Somalia, M. S. Pankine (USSR), Klaus R. Ziegler (Austria).

Rapporteur: P. Lintu (Finland).

#### SUBSIDIARY ORGANS OF THE TRADE AND DEVELOPMENTS BOARD

The main committees of the Board are open to the participation of all interested UNCTAD members, on the understanding that those wishing to attend a particular session of one or more of the main committees communicate their intention to the Secretary-General of UNCTAD during the preceding regular session of the Board. On the basis of such notifications, the Board determines the membership of the main committees.

#### COMMITTEE ON COMMODITIES

The Committee on Commodities did not meet in 1981.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New

Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen,<sup>a</sup> Yugoslavia, Zaire.

<sup>a</sup> Declared elected by the Trade and Development Board on 17 March 1981, thus bringing the total membership of the Committee to 98.

The Committee on Commodities has a Permanent Subcommittee on Commodities, whose membership is identical to that of the Committee. The Sub-Committee did not meet in 1981.

#### COMMITTEE ON TUNGSTEN

The Committee on Tungsten held its thirteenth session at Geneva from 7 to 11 December 1981.

Members: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Cyprus,<sup>a</sup> France, Gabon,<sup>a</sup> Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Mexico,<sup>a</sup> Netherlands, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania,<sup>a</sup> Rwanda,<sup>a</sup> Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the thirteenth session.

Chairman: Rolf Bohnke (Federal Republic of Germany).

Vice-Chairman/Rapporteur: Choophong Angproj (Thailand).

#### PERMANENT GROUP ON SYNTHETICS AND SUBSTITUTES

The Permanent Group on Synthetics and Substitutes did not meet in 1981.

Members: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chad, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Viet Nam.

#### COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The Committee on Economic Co-operation among Developing Countries did not meet in 1981.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen,<sup>a</sup> Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

<sup>a</sup> Declared elected by the Trade and Development Board on 17 March 1981, thus bringing the total membership of the Committee to 98.

#### COMMITTEE ON INVISIBLES AND FINANCING RELATED TO TRADE

The Committee on Invisibles and Financing related to Trade did not meet in 1981.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen,<sup>a</sup> Yugoslavia, Zaire.

<sup>a</sup> Declared elected by the Trade and Development Board on 17 March 1981, thus bringing the total membership of the Committee to 97.

#### COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

The Committee on Manufactures did not meet in 1981.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen,<sup>a</sup> Yugoslavia, Zaire.

<sup>a</sup> Declared elected by the Trade and Development Board on 17 March 1981, thus bringing the total membership of the Committee to 93.

#### COMMITTEE ON SHIPPING

The Committee on Shipping held its third special session at Geneva from 27 May to 6 June 1981.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic,<sup>a</sup> Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea,<sup>a</sup> Democratic Yemen,<sup>a</sup> Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras,<sup>a</sup> Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya,<sup>a</sup> Kuwait, Lebanon,<sup>a,b</sup> Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius,<sup>a</sup> Mexico, Morocco, Nether-

lands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal,<sup>a</sup> Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan,<sup>b</sup> Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda,<sup>a</sup> USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon,<sup>a</sup> United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta,<sup>a</sup> Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam,<sup>a</sup> Yemen,<sup>a,b</sup> Yugoslavia, Zaire.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the third special session.

<sup>b</sup> Declared elected by the Trade and Development Board on 17 March and (with respect to Lebanon) 28 September 1981, thus bringing the total membership of the Committee to 96.

Chairman: Adolf L. Westphalen (Brazil).

Vice-Chairmen: C. Chaimankong (Thailand), Zbigniew Kowalczyk (Poland), J. Lebhar (France), Hugo Torrijos (Panama), Rochforte L. Weeks (Liberia).

Rapporteur: J. P. G. Wiseman (United Kingdom).

#### WORKING GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL SHIPPING LEGISLATION

The Working Group on International Shipping Legislation, whose membership is identical to that of the Committee on Shipping, held its eighth session at Geneva from 12 to 30 October 1981. All members were represented except: Bolivia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Finland, Honduras, Iran, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Portugal, Senegal, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen.

Chairman: H. Gunanto (Indonesia).

Vice-Chairmen: Mohammed Dahab Abass (Sudan), Hans Jacob Bull (Norway), Guido E. Degano (Argentina), Claude Douay (France), Rifaat Izzat Rifaat (Iraq).

Rapporteur: G. Simonn (German Democratic Republic).

#### COMMITTEE ON TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY

The Committee on Transfer of Technology did not meet in 1981.

Members: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia,<sup>a</sup> Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen,<sup>a</sup> Yugoslavia, Zaire.

<sup>a</sup> Declared elected by the Trade and Development Board on 17 March 1981, thus bringing the total membership of the Committee to 91.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PREFERENCES

The Special Committee on Preferences, which is open to the participation of all UNCTAD members, held its tenth session at Geneva from 11 to 22 May 1981. Represented at the session were:

Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Chairman: Adel El Gowhari (Egypt).

Vice-Chairmen: Tibor Fabian (Hungary), Fernando Gerbasi (Venezuela), Budi Hartantyo (Indonesia), A. M. Plate (Netherlands), C. Sellami-Meslem (Algeria).

Rapporteur: J. O. Lynch (Canada).

#### INTERGOVERNMENTAL PREPARATORY GROUP ON CONDITIONS FOR REGISTRATION OF SHIPS

On 6 June 1981, at its third special session, the Committee on Shipping recommended that the Trade and Development Board convene an intergovernmental preparatory group, open to the participation of all UNCTAD members, to prepare a set of basic principles governing the conditions upon which vessels should be accepted on national shipping registers, to serve as the basis for the consideration of an international agreement by a proposed United Nations conference of plenipotentiaries.

On 9 October 1981, the Trade and Development Board, in adopting the Committee's report on its third special session, approved the recommended meeting in 1982 of the Intergovernmental Preparatory Group.

#### United Nations Council for Namibia

Members: Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Egypt, Finland, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Turkey, USSR, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

President: Paul John Firmino Lusaka (Zambia).

Vice-Presidents: Mohammed Bedjaoui (Algeria); A. Coskun Kirca (Turkey); Miljan Komatina (Yugoslavia); Brajesh Chandra Mishra (India) (until 15 May 1981), Natarajan Krishnan (India) (from 15 May); Noel G. Sinclair (Guyana).

United Nations Commissioner for Namibia: Martti Ahtisaari.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Until the expiration of his term on 31 December 1981; no replacement was appointed during 1981.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR NAMIBIA

Members: Australia, Finland, India, Nigeria, Romania, Senegal, Turkey, Venezuela (Vice-Chairman/Rapporteur), Yugoslavia, Zambia; the President of the Council (ex-officio Chairman).

#### STANDING COMMITTEE I

Members: Algeria, Belgium, China, Colombia, Finland, Haiti, Indonesia, Nigeria, Poland, Senegal, Turkey (Vice-Chairmen), USSR, United Republic of Cameroon (Chairman), Venezuela, Zambia.

#### STANDING COMMITTEE II

Members: Angola, Australia, Bangladesh, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chile, Cyprus, Finland, Guyana, Liberia (Vice-



Chairman), Mexico, Pakistan (Chairman), Romania, Zambia.

#### STANDING COMMITTEE III

Members: Algeria, Angola, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria (chairman), Burundi, Colombia, Cyprus, Egypt, India, Mexico (Vice-Chairman), Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

#### STEERING COMMITTEE

In 1981, the Steering Committee consisted of the Council's President and five Vice-Presidents, the chairmen of its three standing committees and the Vice-Chairman/Rapporteur of the Committee on the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

#### GOVERNING COUNCIL

The Governing Council of UNDP (p. 1539) reports to the Economic and Social Council and through it to the General Assembly.

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

#### GOVERNING COUNCIL

The Governing Council of UNEP consists of 58 members elected by the General Assembly for three-year terms.

Seats on the Governing Council are allocated as follows: 16 to African States, 13 to Asian States, 6 to Eastern European States, 10 to Latin American States, and 13 to Western European and other States.

The Governing Council, which reports to the Assembly through the Economic and Social Council, held its ninth session at Nairobi, Kenya, from 13 to 26 May 1981.

##### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Australia, Botswana, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, India, Iraq, Italy, Kuwait, Liberia, Malawi, Mexico, Panama, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago,<sup>a</sup> Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, Uruguay.

To serve until 31 December 1982: Argentina, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Indonesia, Mauritania,<sup>a</sup> New Zealand, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone,<sup>a</sup> Sudan, Sweden, United Arab Emirates, Yugoslavia.

To serve until 31 December 1983: Brazil, Egypt, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Haiti,<sup>a</sup> Iceland, Japan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Netherlands, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United States, Venezuela, Zaire.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the ninth session.

President: Mateo J. Magarinos de Mello (Uruguay).

Vice-Presidents: Abdulbar A. Al-Gain (Saudi Arabia), Lothar Hertel (German Democratic Republic), John Kofi Offeh (Ghana).

Rapporteur: Frans L. Schlingemann (Netherlands).

Executive Director of UNEP: Mostafa Kamal Tolba.

On 19 November 1981 (decision 36/314), the General Assembly elected the following 20 members for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Afghanistan, Botswana, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Colombia, Greece, Guinea, India, Jamaica, Mexico, Morocco, Oman, Poland, Senegal, Spain, Thailand, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay.

United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA)

The United Nations Fund for Population Activities, a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, plays a leading role

within the United Nations system in promoting population programmes and in providing assistance to developing countries at their request in dealing with their population problems. It operates under the overall policy guidance of the Economic and Social Council and under the financial and administrative policy guidance of the Governing Council of UNDP.

Executive Director: Rafael M. Salas.

Deputy Executive Director: Halvor Gille.

United Nations Industrial Development  
Organization (UNIDO)

#### INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The Industrial Development Board, the principal organ of UNIDO, consists of 45 States elected by the General Assembly, on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, to serve for three-year terms. States eligible for election to the Board are those which are Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of IAEA.

The Board reports annually to the Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

The Board's membership is drawn from the following four groups of States:

List A. 18 of the following States: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu,<sup>a</sup> Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

List B. 15 of the following States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

List C. 7 of the following States: Antigua and Barbuda,<sup>a</sup> Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize,<sup>a</sup> Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela.

List D. 5 of the following States: Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian SSR, USSR.

<sup>a</sup> Included in the list, as shown, by a General Assembly resolution of 17 December 1981.

The Industrial Development Board held its fifteenth session at Vienna, Austria, on 7 May and from 15 to 30 May 1981.

#### BOARD MEMBERS

To serve until 31 December 1981: Australia, Burundi, China, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iraq, Malaysia,

Malta, Mexico, Nigeria, Panama, Poland, Togo,<sup>a</sup> Turkey, United Kingdom.

To serve until 31 December 1982: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Central African Republic,<sup>a</sup> Czechoslovakia, Gabon, Indonesia, Italy, Kenya, Madagascar, Morocco,<sup>a</sup> Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, USSR.

To serve until 31 December 1983: Brazil, Denmark, Ecuador, France, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, India, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, Pakistan, Romania, Sri Lanka, United States, Zambia.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the fifteenth session.

President: K. L. Dalal (India).

Vice-Presidents: Franciszek Adamkiewicz (Poland), Ernesto Koref (Panama), Sten Lilholt (Denmark).

Rapporteur: Muhammed M. Aliyu (Nigeria).

Executive Director of UNIDO: Abd-El Rahman Khane.

Deputy Executive Director of UNIDO: Philippe Jacques Farlan Carré.

On 17 December 1981 (decision 36/322), the General Assembly elected the following 15 members of the Industrial Development Board for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Australia, China, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iraq, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Mexico, Panama, Sierra Leone, Spain, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, United Kingdom, Venezuela.

#### PERMANENT COMMITTEE

The Permanent Committee has the same membership as the Industrial Development Board and normally meets twice a year.

During 1981, the Committee held its fifteenth session from 7 to 15 May and its sixteenth from 16 to 21 November, both at Vienna, Austria. All members attended, except Burundi, the Central African Republic, Malta, Morocco and Togo, which were not represented at either session; and Gabon and Guinea, which were not represented at the sixteenth session.

Chairman: K. L. Dalal (India).

Vice-Chairmen: Franciszek Adamkiewicz (Poland), Ernesto Koref (Panama), Sten Lilholt (Denmark).

Rapporteur: Anthony Eugne Bayode Ayeni (Nigeria) (until 10 May), Muhammed M. Aliyu (Nigeria) (from 10 May).

#### United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)

The Executive Director of UNITAR, in consultation with the Board of Trustees of the Institute, reports, through the Secretary-General, to the General Assembly and, as appropriate, to the Economic and Social Council and other United Nations bodies.

#### BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Board of Trustees of UNITAR consists of: (a) up to 24 members appointed on a broad geographical basis by the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Presidents of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council; and (b) four ex-officio members.

The Board held its twentieth session (with its composition as of 1 July 1981) at United Nations Headquarters from 1 to 4 September 1981.

Members (until 30 June 1981):

To serve until 30 June 1981: William H. Barton (Canada); Roberto E. Guyer (Argentina); Tommy T. B. Koh (Singapore); Harvey Picker (United States); Walter F. Rau (Federal Republic of Germany); Shizuo Saito (Japan); Arséne Assouan Usher (Ivory Coast); Piero Vinci (Italy).

To serve until 30 June 1982: Ole Algard (Norway); Abdalla Yaccoub Bishara (Kuwait); Louis de Guiringaud (France); Johan Kaufmann (Netherlands); Gwendoline Chomba

Konie (Zambia); Missoum Sbih (Algeria); Inga Thorsson (Sweden); B.S. Vaganov (USSR).

To serve until 30 June 1983: Wahbi El-Bouri (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); Lai Ya-li (China); Donald O. Mills (Jamaica); Bibiano F. Osorio-Tafall (Mexico); Agha Shahi (Pakistan); Victor Umbricht (Switzerland); Brian E. Urquhart (Secretariat); Anton Vratusa (Yugoslavia).

The Secretary-General appointed the following members for a three-year term beginning on 1 July 1981 to fill seven of the eight vacancies occurring on 30 June: Siméon Aké (Ivory Coast), William H. Barton (Canada), Ademar M. A. d'Alcantara (Belgium), Roberto E. Guyer (Argentina), K. Natwar-Singh (India), Shiruo Saito (Japan), Rüdiger von Wechmar (Federal Republic of Germany). The eighth member, to be from the United States, had not been appointed by the end of 1981.

Members (from 1 July 1981):

To serve until 30 June 1982: Ole Algard (Norway); Abdalla Yaccoub Bishara, Vice-Chairman (Kuwait); Louis de Guiringaud, Chairman (France); Johan Kaufmann (Netherlands); Gwendoline Chomba Konie (Zambia); Missoum Sbih (Algeria); Inga Thorsson (Sweden); B. S. Vaganov (USSR).

To serve until 30 June 1983: Wahbi El-Bouri (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); Lai Ya-li (China); Donald O. Mills (Jamaica); B. F. Osorio-Tafall (Mexico); Agha Shahi (Pakistan); Victor Umbricht (Switzerland); Brian E. Urquhart (Secretariat); Anton Vratusa (Yugoslavia).

To serve until 30 June 1984: <sup>a</sup> Siméon Aké (Ivory Coast); William H. Barton (Canada); Ademar M. A. d'Alcantara (Belgium); Roberto E. Guyer (Argentina); K. Natwar-Singh (India); Shizuo Saito (Japan); Rüdiger von Wechmar (Federal Republic of Germany).

<sup>a</sup> One seat, to be filled by a member from the United States, remained vacant during 1981.

Ex-officio members: The Secretary-General, the President of the General Assembly, the President of the Economic and Social Council and the Executive Director of UNITAR.

Executive Director of UNITAR: Davidson S. H. W. Nicol.

#### United Nations interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development

With the coming into operation of the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development on 1 January 1982, the United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development ceased to exist as from 31 December 1981.

An organ of the General Assembly, the Fund had been administered by the Administrator of UNDP, who reported to its Governing Council and to the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development. The Committee in turn reported on the Fund's operation to the Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

#### United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board

The United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board is composed of 21 members, as follows:

Six appointed by the United Nations Staff Pension Committee (two from members elected by the General Assembly, two from those appointed by the Secretary-General, two from those elected by participants).

Fifteen appointed by Staff Pension Committees of other member organizations of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund,<sup>a</sup> as follows: two each by WHO, FAO, UNESCO; and one each by ILO, ICAO, IAEA, WMO, IMCO, ITU, ICITO/GATT, WIPO, IFAD.

The Board held its twenty-ninth session at Geneva from 22 June to 3 July 1981.

<sup>a</sup> The membership of the Fund includes the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property, which was admitted to the Fund with effect from 1 January 1981 by a 1980 General Assembly resolution.<sup>13</sup>

#### Members:

##### United Nations

Representing the General Assembly: Representatives: Sol Kuttner (United States); Rudolf Schmidt (Federal Republic of Germany). Alternates: Michael G. Okeyo (Kenya); Mario Majoli (Italy); Ernesto C. Garrido (Philippines); Enrique Buj-Flores (Mexico).

Representing the Secretary-General: Representatives: Helmut F. Debatin (Federal Republic of Germany); James O. C. Jonah (Sierra Leone). Alternates: Clayton C. Timbrell (United States); V. Elissejev (USSR); Raymond Gieri (United States).

Representing the Participants: Representatives: Angel Antonio Garcia (United States); Eduardo Albertal (Argentina). Alternates: Anders Tholle (Denmark); Rosa Maria Vicien-Milburn (Argentina); Sergio Zampetti (Italy); Bruce C. Hillis (Canada).

##### International Labour Organisation

Representing the Executive Head: Representative: Niall MacCabe (Ireland). Alternates: William Farr (United Kingdom); Patrick M. C. Denby (United Kingdom).

##### World Health Organization

Representing the Governing Body: Representative: Dr. A. Sauter, Chairman (Switzerland).

Representing the Executive Head: Representative: Alistair J. S. Taylor (United Kingdom). Alternates: John Morgan (Australia); Robert L. Munteanu (Romania); Warren W. Furth (United States).

##### Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Representing the Governing Body: Representative: Horatio Mends (Ghana). Alternates: C. Palmer (Sierra Leone); Sayed A. A. Khalil (Sudan).

Representing the Participants: Representative: Aurelio Marcucci (Italy). Alternates: Giuseppe Pellegrini (Italy); Pietro E. Buttinelli (Italy).

##### United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

Representing the Governing Body: Representative: Al-Fatih Ibrahim Hamad (Sudan). Alternate: Francis Briquet (France).

Representing the Executive Head: Representative: Gilles de Leiris (United States). Alternate: Serge Vieux (Haiti).

##### International Civil Aviation Organization

Representing the Executive Head: Representative: Daniel E. Conway (United States). Alternate: Shelton E. Jayasekera, Second Vice-Chairman (Sri Lanka).

##### International Atomic Energy Agency

Representing the Participants: Representative: William E. Price, First Vice-Chairman (United States).

##### World Meteorological Organization

Representing the Participants: Representative: Robin M. Perry (United Kingdom). Alternates: Mohammed Husain (Pakistan); M. Favre (Switzerland).

##### Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization

Representing the Governing Body: Representative: G. S. Santa-Cruz (Chile). Alternate: M. Bley (Federal Republic of Germany).

##### International Telecommunication Union

Representing the Executive Head: Representative: Michel Bardoux (France). Alternate: Jean-Patrick Bare (France).

##### Interim Commission for the International Trade Organization/General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

Representing the Participants: Representative: Peter Williams (United Kingdom). Alternate: Hugo Glanzmann (Switzerland).

##### World Intellectual Property Organization

Representing the Governing Body: Representative: B. Ziese (Federal Republic of Germany).

##### International Fund for Agricultural Development

Representing the Participants: Representative: Marlies Frey-Licari, Rapporteur (Federal Republic of Germany). Alternate: John McGhie (United Kingdom).

#### STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE PENSION BOARD

Members (elected at the Board's twenty-ninth session):

##### United Nations (Group I)

Representing the General Assembly: Representative: Mario Majoli. Alternates: Sol Kuttner, Rudolf Schmidt, Michael G. Okeyo, Ernesto C. Garrido.

Representing the Secretary-General: Representative: Helmut F. Debatin. Alternates: James O. C. Jonah, Clayton C. Timbrell, V. Elissejev, Raymond Gieri.

Representing the Participants: Representative: Angel Antonio Garcia. Alternates: Eduardo Albertal, Anders Tholle, Rosa Maria Vicien-Milburn, Sergio Zampetti, Bruce C. Hillis.

##### Specialized agencies (Group II)

Representing the Governing Body: Representative: William M. Yoffee (ILO). Alternates: J. Mainwaring (ILO), G. M. J. Veldkamp (ILO), R. M. Schibli (ILO).

Representing the Executive Head: Representative: Allstair J. S. Taylor (WHO). Alternate: John Morgan (WHO).

Representing the Participants: Representative: William E. Price (IAEA). Alternates: Robin M. Perry (WMO), Lorentz Goll (IMCO), J. Balfroid (ITU).

##### Specialized agencies (Group III)

Representing the Governing Body: Representative: Shri Ramadhar (FAO). Alternates: Horatio Mends (FAO), M. Ivankovich de Arosemena (FAO), R. De Meira (FAO), Sayed A. A. Khalil (FAO), C. Palmer (FAO).

Representing the Executive Head: Representative: Gilles de Leiris (UNESCO). Alternate: Serge Vieux (UNESCO).

Representing the Participants: Representative: Richard Wipf (WIPO). Alternates: Marlies Frey-Licari (IFAD), Francis X. Byrne (ICAO), Peter Williams (ICITO/GATT).

#### COMMITTEE OF ACTUARIES

The Committee of Actuaries consists of five members, each representing one of the five geographical regions of the United Nations.

Members: Ajibola O. Ogunshola (Nigeria), Region I (African States); Kunio Takeuchi (Japan), Region II (Asian States); E. M. Chetyrkin (USSR), Region III (Eastern European States); Gonzalo Arroba (Ecuador), Region IV (Latin American States); Robert J. Myers (United States), Region V (Western European and other States).

#### United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)

##### ADVISORY COMMISSION OF UNRWA

The Advisory Commission of UNRWA met at Vienna, Austria, on 27 August 1981.

Members: Belgium, Egypt, France, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey (Chairman), United Kingdom, United States.

##### WORKING GROUP ON THE FINANCING OF UNRWA

Members: France, Ghana (Vice-Chairman), Japan, Lebanon, Norway (Rapporteur), Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey (Chairman), United Kingdom, United States.

<sup>13</sup> See YUN 1980, p. 1185, resolution 35/215 A of 17 December

Commissioner-General of UNR WA: Olof Rydbeck.  
Deputy Commissioner-General of UNRWA: Alan J. Brown.

United Nations Scientific Advisory Committee  
The United Nations Scientific Advisory Committee did not meet in 1981.

Members: Brazil, Canada, France, India, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

United Nations Scientific Committee on the  
Effects of Atomic Radiation

The 20-member United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation held its thirtieth session at Vienna, Austria, from 6 to 10 July 1961.

Members: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Poland, Sudan, Sweden, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Chairman: Z. Jaworowski (Poland).  
Vice-Chairman: D. Beninson (Argentina).  
Rapporteur: T. Kumatori (Japan).

United Nations Special Fund  
(to provide emergency relief and development assistance)

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

The activities of the United Nations Special Fund were suspended, ad interim, in 1978 by the General Assembly, which assumed the functions of the Board of Governors of the Fund. On 4 December 1981 (decision 36/424), the Assembly decided to continue performing those functions, within the context of its consideration of the item on development and international economic co-operation, pending consideration of the question at its thirty-eighth (1983) session.

United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked  
Developing countries

The General Assembly established the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries in 1975 and approved its statute in 1976. The Special Fund was to operate as an organ of the Assembly, with its policies and procedures to be formulated by a Board of Governors.

The chief executive officer of the Special Fund, the Executive Director, to be appointed by the Secretary-General subject to the confirmation of the Assembly, was to discharge his functions under the guidance and supervision of the Board of Governors and an Executive Committee, if established.

Pending appointment of the Executive Director, the Administrator of UNDP, in close collaboration with the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, manages the Fund.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

A 36-member Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries was to be elected by the General Assembly from among Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of IAEA, keeping in view the need for a balanced representation of the beneficiary land-locked developing countries and their transit neighbours, on the one hand, and potential donor countries on the other.

Members were to serve three-year terms, except that at the first election the terms of one third of the members were to be for one year and those of a further third for two years.

The Board was to report annually to the Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

On 17 December 1981 (decision 36/319), the Assembly deferred election of the Board to its thirty-seventh (1962) session.

United Nations Staff Pension Committee

The United Nations Staff Pension Committee consists of three members elected by the General Assembly, three ap-

pointed by the Secretary-General and three elected by the participants in the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund. The term of office of the elected members is three years.

Members:

Elected by Assembly (to serve until 31 December 1982):  
Members: Ernesto C. Garrido; Sol Kuttner, Chairman (from 28 September); Marlo Majoll. Alternates: Enrique Buj-Flores; Michael G. Okeyo; Rudolf Schmidt. Chairman (until 28 September).<sup>a</sup>

Appointed by Secretary-General (to serve until further notice): Members: Helmut F. Debatin; James O. C. Jonah; Clayton C. Timbrell. Alternates: Raymond Gieri; V. Ellsjejev.

Elected by Participants (to serve until 31 December 1962):  
Members: Angel Antonio Garcia; Eduardo Albertal; Anders Tholle; Alternates: Rosa Maria Vicien-Milburn; Sergio Zampetti; Bruce C. Hillis.

<sup>a</sup> Resigned on 28 September 1981; Jobst Holborn was elected on 9 November 1981 (decision 36/313) to fill the resultant vacancy.

United Nations University

COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY

The Council of the United Nations University, the governing board of the University, consists of: (a) 24 members appointed jointly by the Secretary-General and the Director-General of UNESCO, in consultation with the agencies and programmes concerned including UNITAR, who serve in their personal capacity for six-year terms; (b) the Secretary-General, the Director-General of UNESCO and the Executive Director of UNITAR, who are ex-officio members; and (c) the Rector of the University, who is normally appointed for a five-year term.

The Council held two sessions in 1961: its seventeenth at Geneva from 22 to 26 June; and its eighteenth at Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, from 21 to 25 November.

Members:

To serve until 2 May 1983: Estefania Aidaba-Lim (Philippines);<sup>a</sup> Pawel Bozyk (Poland); Carlos Chagas (Brazil);<sup>a</sup> Wilbert Kumalija Chagula (United Republic of Tanzania); Jean Coulomb, Vice-Chairman (seventeenth session) (France); Shams E. El-Wakil (Egypt);<sup>a</sup> Rev. Felipe E. MacGregor, Vice-Chairman (Peru); Abdelsalam Majali, Chairman (Jordan); Malu wa Kalenga, Vice-Chairman (seventeenth session) (Zaire);<sup>a</sup> Stephan Verosta (Austria);<sup>a</sup> Ines Wesley Tanaskovic (Yugoslavia).

To serve until 2 May 1986: Ungku Abdul Aziz (Malaysia);<sup>b</sup> Daniel Adzei Bekoe (Ghana); Elise M. Boulding, Vice-Chairman (United States); Satish Chandra (India); Vally Charles Diarrassouba (Ivory Coast);<sup>a</sup> Dennis H. Irvine, Vice-Chairman (eighteenth session) (Guyana); André Louis Jaumotte (Belgium); Relmut Jochimsen, Vice-Chairman (eighteenth session) (Federal Republic of Germany);<sup>a</sup> F. S. C. P. Kalpage (Sri Lanka); Sir John Kendrew (United Kingdom); Karl Eric Knutsson (Sweden); Shizuo Saito, Vice-Chairman (Japan); Victor Luis Urquidí (Mexico).<sup>a</sup>

Ex-officio members: The Secretary-General, the Director-General of UNESCO and the Executive Director of UNITAR. Rector of the United Nations University: Mr. Soedjatmoko.

<sup>a</sup> Did not attend the eighteenth session.

<sup>b</sup> Did not attend the seventeenth session.

The Council maintained two standing committees during 1981: the Committee on Finance and Budget; and the Com-

<sup>14</sup> See YUN 1975, p. 387, resolution 3504(XXX) of 15 December 1975.

<sup>15</sup> See YUN 1976, p. 356, text of statute, annexed to resolution 31/177 of 21 December 1976.

mittee on Programme and Institutional Relations. In addition, it appointed an ad hoc committee to review its rules of procedure and the committee system.

#### United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture

##### BOARD OF TRUSTEES

On 16 December 1981, the General Assembly, in redesignating the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile as the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture, decided that the Fund was to be administered by the Secretary-General, with the advice of a Board of Trustees composed of a chairman and four other members with wide experience in the field of human rights, acting in their personal capacity, to be appointed by the Secretary-General with due regard for equitable geographical distribution and in consultation with their Governments.

The Board had not been appointed by the end of 1981.

#### World Food Council

The World Food Council, at the ministerial or plenipotentiary level, functions as an organ of the United Nations and reports to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council. It consists of 36 members, nominated by the Economic and Social Council and elected by the Assembly according to the following pattern: nine members from African States, eight from Asian States, seven from Latin American States, four from socialist States of Eastern Europe and eight from Western European and other States. Members serve for three-year terms.

During 1981, the World Food Council held its seventh session at Novi Sad, Yugoslavia, from 25 to 29 May. It was preceded by a series of preparatory meetings held at Rome from 21 to 24 April.

##### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Botswana, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Liberia,<sup>a</sup> Mexico, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia.

To serve until 31 December 1982: Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados,<sup>a</sup> Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Honduras, Nicaragua, Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Sudan, USSR.

To serve until 31 December 1983: Argentina, Egypt, France, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Norway, Pakistan, Rwanda, Zaire.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the seventh session.

President: Francisco Merino Rábago (Mexico).

Vice-Presidents: Soedarsono Hadisapoetro (Indonesia).

Robert Sagna (Senegal), Dumitru Vsiliu (Romania).

Rapporteur: Aage Bothner (Norway).

Executive Director: Maurice J. Williams.

Deputy Executive Director: Salahuddin Ahmed.

On 21 October 1981 (decision 1981/195), the Economic and Social Council nominated the following 14 States, 12 of which were to be elected by the General Assembly, for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Botswana, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Gambia, Greece, India, Mexico, Thailand, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Uruguay, Yugoslavia. All but Chile and Uruguay were elected by the Assembly on 27 October 1981 (decision 36/308).

## Conferences

#### International Conference on Kampuchea

The International Conference on Kampuchea was held at United Nations Headquarters from 13 to 17 July 1981. Participating were 79 States, as follows:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central Afri-

can Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Also attending as observers were 14 States, as follows:

Botswana, Djibouti, Finland, Guinea, Holy See, Liberia, Mali, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Republic of Cameroon.

President: Willibald Pahr (Austria).

Vice-Presidents: Mario Carias Zapata (Honduras), Massamba Sarré (Senegal).

Rapporteur: Ilinome Frank Tarua (Papua New Guinea).

#### international conference on sanctions against South Africa

The International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, organized by the United Nations in co-operation with OAU, was held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981. Participating were the following 121 States and the United Nations Council for Namibia:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Wet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

President: Salim Ahmed Salim (United Republic of Tanzania).

Vice-Presidents: Johan Jorgen Hoist (Norway), Y. N. Kochubey (Ukrainian SSR), Mochtar Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Porfirio Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Moustapha Niasse (Senegal); B. Akporode Clark (Nigeria) (Chairman, Special Committee against Apartheid), Edem Kodjo (Secretary-General, OAU), the Chairmen of the Political and Technical Commissions (ex officio).

Rapporteur-General: Mohamed Sahnoun (Algeria).

#### Chairmen of commissions

Political Commission: Paulo Teixeira Jorge (Angola).

Technical Commission: Noel G. Sinclair (Guyana).

#### Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea

Participation in the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea was open to all Member States of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies and IAEA.

During 1981, the Conference held its tenth session, in two parts: from 9 March to 16 April at United Nations Headquarters and from 3 to 28 August at Geneva. Participating were the following 158 States and the United Nations Council for Namibia:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin,<sup>a</sup> Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic,<sup>a</sup> Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti,<sup>a</sup> Dominica,<sup>b</sup> Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada,<sup>b</sup> Guatemala, Guinea,<sup>a</sup> Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic,<sup>a</sup> Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives,<sup>a</sup> Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nauru,<sup>a</sup> Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay,<sup>a</sup> Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda,<sup>a</sup> Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines,<sup>b</sup> Samoa,<sup>a</sup> San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles,<sup>a</sup> Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands,<sup>a</sup> Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

The Cook Islands and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands were represented by observers.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the second part of the tenth session.

<sup>b</sup> Not represented at the first part of the tenth session.

President: Tommy T. B. Koh (Singapore).

Vice-Presidents: Algeria, Belgium, Bolivia, Chile, China, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Liberia, Madagascar, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Sri Lanka, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Rapporteur-General: Kenneth O. Rattray (Jamaica).

Chairmen of committees:

First Committee: Paul Bamela Engo (United Republic of Cameroon).

Second Committee: Andrés Aguilar (Venezuela).

Third Committee: Alexander Yankov (Bulgaria).

General Committee: President of the Conference.

Drafting Committee: J. Alan Beesley (Canada).

Credentials Committee: Karl Wolf (Austria).

#### United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy

The United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy was held at Nairobi, Kenya, from 10 to 21 August 1981. Participating were the following 125 States and the United Nations Council for Namibia:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany,

Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

President: John Henry Okwonyo (Kenya).

Vice-President in charge of co-ordination: Porfirio Murioz Ledo (Mexico).

Vice-Presidents: Argentina, China, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Iceland, India, Jamaica, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey, USSR, United States, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Rapporteur-General: Jan Witek (Poland).

Chairmen of committees:

First Committee: Makoto Taniguchi (Japan).

Second Committee: Mario Franzì (Italy).

Credentials Committee: Jorge Luis Borrayo Reyes (Guatemala).

#### United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

The United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries was held at Paris from 1 to 14 September 1981. Participating were 142 States, as follows:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

President: Jean-Pierre Cot (France).

Vice-Presidents: Algeria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iraq, Japan, Nepal, Norway, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Rapporteur-General: Tibor Fabian (Hungary).

Chairmen of committees:

Committee I: J. Brito (Cape Verde).

Committee II: A. M. A. Muhith (Bangladesh).

Credentials Committee: Edouard Francisque (Haiti).

## Security Council

The Security Council consists of 15 Member States of the United Nations, in accordance with the provisions of Article 23 of the United Nations Charter as amended in 1965.

### MEMBERS

Permanent members: China, France, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Non-permanent members: German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda.

On 15 October 1981 (decision 36/306), the General Assembly elected Guyana, Jordan, Poland, Togo and Zaire for a two-year term beginning on 1 January 1982, to replace the German Democratic Republic, Mexico, the Niger, the Philippines and Tunisia, whose terms of office were to expire on 31 December 1981.

### PRESIDENTS

The presidency of the Council rotates monthly, according to the English alphabetical listing of its member States. The following served as Presidents during 1981:

Month	Member	Representative
January	China	Ling Qing
February	France	Jacques Leprette
March	German Democratic Republic	Peter Florin
April	Ireland	Noel Dor
May	Japan	Masahiro Nisibori
June	Mexico	Porfirio Muñoz Ledo
July	Niger	Idé Oumarou
August	Panama	Jorge Enrique Illueca
September	Philippines	Carlos P. Romulo
October	Spain	Jaime de Piniés
November	Tunisia	Taieb Slim
December	Uganda	Olara Otunnu

### Collective Measures Committee

The Collective Measures Committee (p. 1509) reports to both the General Assembly and the Security Council.

### Military Staff Committee

The Military Staff Committee consists of the chiefs of staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. It met fortnightly throughout 1981; the first meeting was held on 15 January and the last on 30 December.

### Standing committees

There are two standing committees of the Security Council, each composed of representatives of all Council members:

Committee of Experts (to examine the provisional rules of procedure of the Council and any other matters entrusted to it by the Council)

Committee on the Admission of New Members

In addition, the Council maintains an ad hoc Committee on Council Meetings Away from Headquarters.

### Ad hoc bodies

Ad Hoc Sub-Committee on Namibia

The Ad Hoc Sub-Committee on Namibia consists of all the members of the Security Council. It did not meet in 1981.

Committee of Experts Established by the Security Council at its 1506th Meeting  
(on the question of micro-States)

The Committee of Experts consists of all the members of the Security Council. The chairmanship is rotated monthly in the English alphabetical order of the member States.

The Committee did not meet in 1981.

Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People

The Committee (p. 1511) reports to the General Assembly, which has also drawn the attention of the Security Council to the need for urgent action on the recommendations of the Committee.

Security Council Commission established under Resolution 446(1979)  
(to examine the situation relating to settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem)  
Members:<sup>a</sup> Bolivia, Portugal (Chairman), Zambia.

<sup>a</sup>Not Council members in 1981.

Security Council Commission of Inquiry Established under Resolution 496(1981)

On 15 December 1981, the Security Council decided to send a commission of inquiry, composed of three Council members, to investigate the origin, background and financing of a 25 November mercenary aggression against Seychelles, as well as to assess and evaluate economic damages. The Commission, whose members were to be appointed after consultations between the Council President and Council members and Seychelles, did not meet in 1981.

Members:<sup>a</sup> Ireland, Japan, Panama.

<sup>a</sup>Appointed by the President of the Security Council, as stated in his note of 24 December 1981.

Security Council Committee Established by Resolution 421(1977) concerning the Question of South Africa

The Committee consists of all the members of the Security Council.

Chairman: Porfirio Muñoz Ledo (Mexico).  
Vice-Chairmen: Philippines, Uganda.

Special Committee against Apartheid

The Special Committee against Apartheid (p. 1515) reports to both the General Assembly and the Security Council.

### PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS AND SPECIAL MISSIONS

United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine (UNTSO)

Chief of Staff: Major-General Erkki Raine Kaira (until 19 February), Major-General Emmanuel Alexander Erskine (from 20 February).

United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF)  
Force Commander: Major-General Guenther G. Greindl (until 25 February), Major-General Erkki Raine Kaira (from 25 February).

United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL)  
force Commander: Major-General Emmanuel Alexander Erskine (until 15 February), Lieutenant-General William Callaghan (from 15 February).

United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP)  
Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Cyprus:  
Hugo J. Gobbi.  
Force Commander: Major-General James Joseph Quinn  
(until 28 February), Major-General Guenther G. Greindl  
(from 1 March).

United Nations Military Observer Group  
in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP)  
Chief Military Observer: Brigadier-General Stig Waldenstrom.

United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAQ)  
Authorized by the Security Council in 1978,<sup>16</sup> the United Nations Transition Assistance Group had not been emplaced in Namibia by the end of 1981.

Special Representative of the Secretary-General: Martti Ahtisaari.  
Commander-designate: Lieutenant-General Dewan Prem Chand.

<sup>16</sup> See YUN 1978, p. 915, resolution 435(1978) of 29 September 1978.

## Economic and Social Council

The Economic and Social Council consists of 54 Member States of the United Nations, elected by the General Assembly, each for a three-year term, in accordance with the provisions of Article 61 of the United Nations Charter as amended in 1965 and 1973.

### MEMBERS

To serve Until 31 December 1981: Algeria, Barbados, Brazil, Cyprus, Ecuador, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Pakistan, Senegal, Spain, Turkey, Venezuela, Zambia.

To serve until 31 December 1982: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Ethiopia, Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Thailand, United States, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

To serve until 31 December 1983: Argentina, Bangladesh, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, China, Denmark, Fiji, India, Kenya, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Poland, Sudan, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon.

On 15 October 1981 (decision 36/307), the General Assembly elected the following 18 States for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Austria, Benin, Brazil, Colombia, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Japan, Liberia, Mali, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Swaziland, Tunisia, Venezuela.

### SESSIONS

Organizational session for 1981: United Nations Headquarters, 3-6 February.

First regular session of 1981: United Nations Headquarters, 14 April-8 May.

Second regular session of 1981: Geneva, 1-24 July.

Resumed second regular session of 1981: United Nations Headquarters, 21 October and 2 and 25 November.

### OFFICERS

President: Paul John Firmimo Lusaka (Zambia).

Vice-Presidents: Uddhav Deo Bhatt (Nepal); Miljan Komatina (Yugoslavia); Ronald G. Mapp (Barbados) (until 21 October), Davidson L. Hepburn (Bahamas) (from 2 November); John Reid Morden (Canada).

### Subsidiary and other related organs

#### SUBSIDIARY ORGANS

In addition to three regular sessional committees, the Economic and Social Council may, at each session, set up other committees or working groups, of the whole or of limited membership, and refer to them any items on the agenda for study and report.

Other subsidiary organs reporting to the Council consist of functional commissions, regional commissions, standing committees, expert bodies and ad hoc bodies.

The inter-agency Administrative Committee on Co-ordination also reports to the Council.

### Sessional bodies

#### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Each of the sessional committees of the Economic and Social Council consists of the 54 members of the Council.

First (Economic) Committee. Chairman: Miljan Komatina (Yugoslavia). Vice-Chairmen: Onur Gokce (Turkey), Luzmila Zanabria (Peru).

Second (Social) Committee. Chairman: Ronald G. Mapp (Barbados). Vice-Chairmen: Aicha Hania Semichi (Algeria), Pera Caroline Wells (Australia).

Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee. Chairman: John Reid Morden (Canada). Vice-Chairmen: Pedro Uriarte (Chile), Juergen Zenker (German Democratic Republic).

#### SESSIONAL WORKING GROUP ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS

Members: Barbados, Bulgaria, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Iraq, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nicaragua, Norway, Senegal, Spain, USSR, Zaire.

Chairman: Edwin R. Johnson (Ecuador).

Vice-Chairmen: Balla Mandau Dia (Senegal), A. Jiménez Butragueño (Spain), Ulrich Kords (German Democratic Republic).

Rapporteur: Satyabrata Pal (India).

On 8 May 1981 (decision 1981/158), the Economic and Social Council renamed the Group the Sessional Working Group (of Governmental Experts) on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic and Social and Cultural Rights. Subject to review, the Group's membership would remain at 15, distributed equally among the geographical regions and appointed yearly by the President of the Council at its organizational session. The Group would meet yearly, in principle for a three-week period, starting a week before the Council's first regular session. On the same date (decision 1981/161), the Council decided that the 1982 Bureau be constituted as follows: Chairman-African States; Vice-Chairmen-Western European and other States, Asian States, Latin American States; Rapporteur-Eastern European States.

### Functional commissions and subsidiaries

#### Commission for Social Development

The Commission for Social Development consists of 32 members, elected for four-year terms by the Economic and Social Council according to a specific pattern of equitable geographical distribution.

#### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1982: Bolivia, Chad, Cyprus, India, Lesotho, Nicaragua, Norway, Romania, Senegal, Togo, United Kingdom.

To serve until 31 December 1983: Costa Rica, El Salvador, France, Indonesia, Kenya, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United States.



To serve until 31 December 1984: Chile, Italy, Madagascar, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey.

The Commission held its twenty-seventh session at Vienna, Austria, from 9 to 19 February 1981. The members were represented as follows:

Bolivia: (not represented). Chad: Ally Houna Golo, Chairman. Chile: Maria Teresa Infante Barros. Costa Rica: Elias Rojas Guardia; Ana Cecilia Hidalgo (alternate). Cyprus: (not represented). El Salvador: Adalberto Gonzalez. France: Marinette Girard. India: Khaleeq Ahmed Naqvi; Shivshankar Menon (alternate). Indonesia: Agoeng Joewono Tjokrosoeseno, Haryono Nimpuno: Wahju Soekotjo, Dalnidra Aman (alternates). Italy: Anna Maria Cavallone; Enrico Guicciardi (alternate). Kenya: Joseph Mullo; S. M. Oisebe, G. W. Mahinda (alternates). Lesotho: Mahlaphe Theresia Qoane; Ntshli Matete (alternate). Madagascar: (not represented). Mongolia: Luvsandanzangyn Ider. Morocco: Mohammed Loullchki. Netherlands: Gradus Hendriks; Adhish Haldar, Frans L. Schlingemann, E. Hofland (alternates). Nicaragua: Jaime Pasquero Romero, Rapporteur. Norway: Kaare Salvesen, Vice-Chairman; Embret Aasen (alternate). Panama: Ana Hernández de Pitti. Philippines: Domingo L. Slazon; Ofella Castano, Edgardo J. Garcia (alternates). Poland: Michael Dobroczyński; Zbigniew Szymanski (alternate). Romania: Vasile Galgau; Marin Buhoara (alternate). Senegal: (not represented). Sudan: Ahmed E. Tigani El Tayeb. Sweden: Bertil Mathson; Hans Linton, Anders Elofson (alternates). Thailand: Chandram S. Chandratat, Vice-Chairman: Tuang Muktasiri (alternate). Togo: (not represented). Turkey: Mustafa Ketan; Erdal Gurok (alternate). Ukrainian SSR: I. S. Khmel, Vice-Chairman. USSR: A. P. Biryukova; L. S. Lobanov, F. N. Strok, Y. G. Lunkov, A. N. Samoilov, B. S. Avramenko (alternates). United Kingdom: Peter H. R. Marshall; R. I. T. Cromartie, P. Kuenstler, R. Manley, C. J. Ingham, B. W. MacKenzie (alternates). United States: Karl Cherny; John W. McDonald, Jr., David Hohman, Carol A. Colloton (alternates).

#### Commission on Human Rights

The Commission on Human Rights consists of 43 members, elected for three-year terms by the Economic and Social Council according to a specific pattern of equitable geographical distribution.

#### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Argentina, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Cuba, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iraq, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Portugal, United Kingdom, Uruguay.

To serve until 31 December 1982: Algeria, Byelorussian SSR, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Netherlands, Panama, Peru, Syrian Arab Republic, USSR, Zambia.

To serve until 31 December 1983: Australia, Brazil, Fiji, France, Ghana, Jordan, Mexico, Philippines, Poland, Senegal, Uganda, United States, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

The Commission held its thirty-seventh session at Geneva from 2 February to 13 March 1981. The members were represented as follows:

Algeria: Anlsee Salah-Bey; Mohamed Bergham (alternate). Argentina: Gabriel O. Martinez; Atlio Norberto Moltenl, Victor Beauge (alternates). Australia: Owen Lennox Davis, Vice-Chairman: Christopher Leslie Lamb, Pera Caroline Wells, Erika Feller (alternates). Benin: Henri Amoussou Kpakpa; Abiodoun Georges Whannou (alternate). Brazil: Carlos Calero Rodrigues, Chairman: Luiz Antonio Jardim Gaaliardi, Gilberto Vergne Saboia, Renato Xavier, Enio Cordeiro (alternates). Bulgaria: Ivan Garvalov; Nikola Stolmenov (alternate). Burundi: TERENCE Nsanze; Athanase Nikoyagize, Benoit Seburyamo, Tharcisse Ntakibirora, Audace Bitabuzi, Nestor Ndamama (alternates). Byelorussian SSR: L. I. Maksimov; V. V. Grekov, S. S. Ogurtsov (alternates). Canada:

Yvon Beaulne; Richard McKinnon (alternate). Costa Rica: Luis Alberto Varela Quirós; Marta E. Odlo Benito (alternate). Cuba: Luis Solá Vila; Frank Ortiz Rodriguez, Maria A. Flores, Julio Heredia Pérez (alternates). Cyprus: Andreas C. Pouyouros; Michael Pissas, Andrestinos Papadopoulos (alternates). Denmark: Niels Boel; Eigll Pedersen (alternate). Ethiopia: Tadesse Terrefe; Kongit Sineglorgis, Feseha Masresha (alternates). Fiji: Narsi B. Raniga; Ross I. V. Ligairi (alternate). France: Jean-Claude Soyer; Jacques Le Blanc, Louis Glustetti (alternates). Germany, Federal Republic of: Gerhard Jahn; Ulrich Sahm, Norbert Lang (alternates). Ghana: Jonas Kwami Dotse Foll. Greece: Anestis Papastefanou; Constantin Ivraakis. Emmanuel Roucounas (alternates). India: A. A. Rahim; A. P. Venkateswaran (alternate). Iraq: Munther Ahmed Al-Mutlak; Habib Abdul Jalil Al-Qaysi, Basil Yousef, Karim Jabbar Al-Ani (alternates). Jordan: Ghaleb Z. Barakat; Waheed M. Sadl (alternate). Mexico: Luis Padilla Nervo; Antonio Gonzalez de Leon (alternate). Mongolia: Dugersurengiin Erdemblemeg; Boldyn Navchaa, Dorjsurengiin Khurelbaatar (alternates). Morocco: Ali Skalli; El Ghali Benhima, M'Hamed Ammor. Hassan Oufir, Ali Benbouchta (Rapporteur), Ali Bojji, Ali Atmani, Abbas Berrada, Abdeslam Ziadi (alternates). Netherlands: Max van der Steel; Herman Burgers, Roelof R. Smit (alternates). Nigeria: Oluyemi Adeniji; M. B. Brimah, A. A. Akinleye, Olajumoke Oladayo Obafemi, J. O. Coker, Olufemi A. Owoaje, B. Owoseni (alternates). Pakistan: Agha Hilaly; Mansur Ahmad (alternate). Panama: Octavia Ferrer Anguizola; Luis E. Martinez Crur (alternate). Peru: Rosa Esther Silva y Silva; Carmen Silva de Arana (alternate). Philippines: José D. Ingles, Vice-Chairman: Julia L. Palarca (alternate). Poland: Adam Lopatka; Bogdan Russin, Włodzimierz Kalinowski, Tadeusz Strojwas (alternates). Portugal: Angelo Vidal d'Almeida Ribeiro; Antonio Martins da Cruz (alternate). Senegal: Kéba M'Baye; Alioune Séne, Abdoulaye Diéye, Ousmane Tanor Dieng, Samba Mbodj. Mohamed El Moustapha Diagna, Seydou Diop (alternates). Syrian Arab Republic: Dia Allah El-Fattal; Ahmed Saker, M. Jalal Al-Baroudi (alternates). Uganda: Olara Otunnu; Christopher Twesigye (alternate). USSR: V. A. Zorin; V. N. Sofinsky, D. V. Bykov, K. F. Gutsenko, V. V. Lochtnin, S. V. Chernichenko (alternates). United Kingdom: Viscount Colville of Culross; Peter H. R. Marshall, Richard Curtis Fursland, C. W. Long, K. Colvin, D. R. Snoxell, M. G. Hilson (alternates). United States: Michael Novak; Richard Schifter, Gerald B. Helman, Warren E. Hewitt (alternates). Uruguay: Carlos Giamburno; Luis A. Carresse. Carlos A. Nadal Rios, Elsa Borges de Stella (alternates). Yugoslavia: Ivan Tosevski, Vice-Chairman: Marko Vrhunec (alternate). Zaire: Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya; N'Kongo Dontoni Bwanda (alternate). Zambia: Chama L. C. Mubanga-Chipoya.

On 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134), the Economic and Social Council elected the following 15 members for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Argentina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Cuba, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Pakistan, Rwanda, Togo, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Zimbabwe.

#### AD HOC COMMITTEE ON

#### PERIODIC REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The Ad Hoc Committee on Periodic Reports on Human Rights did not meet in 1981. It ceased to exist when the Economic and Social Council terminated the periodic reporting system on human rights on 8 May (decision 1981/151), on the recommendation of the Commission on Human Rights.

#### AD HOC WORKING GROUP OF EXPERTS

established by Commission on Human

Rights resolution 2(XXIII) of 6 March 1967)

Members: Annan Arkyin Cato (Ghana); Humberto Diaz-Casanueva (Chile); Felix Ermacora (Austria); Branimir M. Jankovic, Vice-Chairman (Yugoslavia); Kéba M'Baye, Chairman/Rapporteur (Senegal); Mulka Govinda Reddy (India).

GROUP OF THREE ESTABLISHED UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE SUPPRESSION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF APARTHEID  
Members: Bulgaria, Cuba, Nigeria.

The Group of Three held its fourth session at Geneva from 26 to 30 January 1981. The members were represented as follows:

Bulgaria: Roumiana Dermendjieva. Cuba: Julio Heredia Perez; Frank Ortiz Rodriguez, Chairman/Rapporteur. Nigeria: Oluyemi Adeniji; Olufemi A. Owoaje.

#### SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

The Sub-Commission consists of 26 members elected by the Commission on Human Rights from candidates nominated by Member States of the United Nations, in accordance with a scheme to ensure equitable geographical distribution. Members serve in their individual capacity as experts, rather than as governmental representatives, each for a three-year term.

Members:<sup>a</sup> Marc Bossuyt (Belgium), W. Beverly Carter, Jr. (United States), Dumitru Ceausu (Romania), Abu Sayeed Chowdhury (Bangladesh), Erica-Irene A. Daes (Greece), Asbjorn Eide (Norway), Raúl Ferrero Costa (Peru), Jonas Kwami Dotse Foli (Ghana), Riyadh Aziz Hadi (Iraq), Ibrahim Sulaiman Jimeta (Nigeria), Nasser Kaddour (Syrian Arab Republic), Ahmed Mohamed Khalifa (Egypt), Antonio Martinez-Bdez (Mexico), Syed S. A. Masud (India), Chama L. C. Mubanga-Chipoya (Zambia), Mohamed Yousif Mudawi (Sudan), Elizabeth Odio Eneito (Costa Rica), Julio Oyhanarte (Argentina), Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada (Pakistan), Nicole Questiaux (France), Jorge Eduardo Ritter (Panama), V. N. Sofinsky (USSR), Ivan Tosevski (Yugoslavia), Halima Embarek Warzazi (Morocco), Benjamin Charles George Whitaker (United Kingdom), Fisseha Yimer (Ethiopia).

<sup>a</sup> Elected on 12 March 1981 to serve for three years with immediate effect.

The Sub-Commission held its thirty-fourth session at Geneva from 17 August to 11 September 1981, with the following members and alternates:

Marc Bossuyt (Belgium), W. Beverly Carter, Jr.; John Carey (alternate) (United States), Dumitru Ceausu; Mihail Bichir (alternate) (Romania), Abu Sayeed Chowdhury (Bangladesh), Erica-Irene A. Daes, Rapporteur (Greece), Asbjorn Eide (Norway), Raúl Ferrero Costa, Chairman (Peru), Jonas Kwami Dotse Foli (Ghana), Riyadh Aziz Hadi;<sup>a</sup> Nuri Humoud Salman (alternate) (Iraq), Ibrahim Sulaiman Jimeta; Olufemi A. Owoaje (alternate) (Nigeria), Nasser Kaddour (Syrian Arab Republic), Ahmed Mohamed Khalifa; Waguih Hanafi (alternate) (Egypt), Antonio Martinez-Bbez (Mexico), Syed S. A. Masud, Vice-Chairman (India), Chama L. C. Mubanga-Chipoya (Zambia), Mohamed Yousif Mudawi, Vice-Chairman (Sudan), Elizabeth Odio Benito; Marta E. Odio Benito (alternate) (Costa Rica), Julio Oyhanarte; Juan Facundo Gomensoro (alternate) (Argentina), Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada;<sup>a</sup> Munir Akram (alternate) (Pakistan), Nicole Questiaux; Louis Joinet (alternate) (France), Jorge Eduardo Ritter;<sup>a</sup> Mary Perdomo de Sousa (alternate) (Panama), V. N. Sofinsky (USSR), Ivan Tosevski, Vice-Chairman (Yugoslavia), Halima Embarek Warzazi (Morocco), Benjamin Charles George Whitaker (United Kingdom), Fisseha Yimer (Ethiopia).

<sup>a</sup> Did not attend the thirty-fourth session.

#### Working Group

(established by resolution 2(XXIV) of 16 August 1971 of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 1503 (XL VIII))

The Working Group on Communications concerning human rights held its tenth session at Geneva from 3 to 14 August 1981.

Members: W. Beverly Carter, Jr. (United States); Ibrahim Sulaiman Jimeta (Nigeria);<sup>a</sup> Antonio Martinez-Bdez, Chairman/Rapporteur (Mexico); Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada (Pakistan); V. N. Sofinsky (USSR).

<sup>a</sup> Did not attend the tenth session.

#### Working Group

(established on 21 August 1974 by resolution 11 (XXVII) of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities)

The Working Group on Slavery held its seventh session at Geneva from 10 to 14 August and on 20 August 1981.

Members: Dumitru Ceausu (Romania);<sup>a</sup> Abu Sayeed Chowdhury, Chairman/Rapporteur (Bangladesh); Rail Ferrero Costa (Peru); Mohamed Yousif Mudawi (Sudan); Benjamin Charles George Whitaker (United Kingdom).

<sup>a</sup> Did not attend the seventh session.

#### WORKING GROUP OF GOVERNMENTAL EXPERTS ON THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT

On 11 March 1981, the Commission on Human Rights decided to establish a working group to study the scope and contents of the right to development and the most effective means to ensure the realization of the economic, social and cultural rights enshrined in various international instruments, paying particular attention to the obstacles encountered by developing countries in their efforts to secure the enjoyment of human rights. This decision was approved by the Economic and Social Council on 8 May (decision 1981/149).

The Working Group, composed of 15 governmental experts appointed by the Chairman of the Commission, with due regard for equitable geographical distribution, held two sessions in 1981, at Geneva: its first from 20 to 24 July; and its second from 23 November to 4 December.

Members: Peter L. Berger (United States); D. V. Bykov (USSR);<sup>a</sup> Juan Carlos Capunay (Peru); Gilies Chouraqui, Rapporteur (France); Paul J. I. M. de Waart (Netherlands); Salah Fellah (Algeria); Riyadh Aziz Hadi (Iraq);<sup>a</sup> Julio Heredia Pérez, Vice-Chairman (Cuba); Luis E. Martinez Cruz (Panama); Viswanathan Ramachandran, Vice-Chairman (India); Ahmed Saker (Syrian Arab Republic); Alioune Sène, Chairman (Senegal); Kongit Sinegiorgis (Ethiopia); Henryk J. Sokalski (Poland); Danilo Turk, Vice-Chairman (Yugoslavia).

<sup>a</sup> Did not attend the second session.

#### WORKING GROUP ON ENFORCED OR INVOLUNTARY DISAPPEARANCES

During 1981, the mandate of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances was extended for one year by a Commission on Human Rights decision of 26 February, as approved by the Economic and Social Council on 6 May (decision 1981/139).

The Working Group met on 13 February at Geneva; it held its fourth session at United Nations Headquarters from 11 to 15 May, and its fifth and sixth sessions at Geneva, from 14 to 18 September and from 30 November to 7 December, respectively.

Members: Viscount Colville of Culross, Chairman/Rapporteur (United Kingdom); Jonas Kwami Dotse Foli (Ghana);<sup>a</sup> Agha Hilaly (Pakistan);<sup>a</sup> Ivan Tosevski (Yugoslavia); Luis Alberto Varela Quirós (Costa Rica).

<sup>a</sup> Appointed on 13 March 1981 to replace, respectively: Kwado Faka Nyamekye (Ghana), who resigned by a letter of 29 January; and Waleed M. Sadi (Jordan), who had been temporarily filling a vacancy since 30 October 1980.

## WORKING GROUPS

(to study situations revealing a consistent pattern of gross violations of human rights)

Working Group established by Commission on Human Rights decision 8 (XXXVI) of 7 March 1980:  
Members: Mohamed Redha Al-Jabiri, Chairman/Rapporteur (Iraq); Octavia Ferrer Anguizola (Panama); Chama L. C. Mubanga-Chipoya (Zambia); Ivan Tosevski (Yugoslavia); Max van der Steel (Netherlands).

Working Group established by Commission on Human Rights decision 4(XXXVII) 6 March 1981:  
Members: Niels Boel (Denmark); Octavio Ferrer Anguizola (Panama); Andreas C. Pouyouros (Cyprus); Anisse Salah-Bey (Algeria); Ivan Tosevski (Yugoslavia).

## WORKING GROUPS (OPEN-ENDED)

Working Group established by Commission on Human Rights resolution 34(XXXVI) of 12 March 1980 (to drafts convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment):  
Chairman/Rapporteur: Anestis Papastefanou (Greece).

Working Group established by Commission on Human Rights resolution 36(XXXVI) of 12 March 1980 (to draft a convention on the rights of the child):  
Chairman/Rapporteur: Adam Lopatka (Poland).

## Commission on Narcotic Drugs

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs consists of 30 members, elected for four-year terms, by the Economic and Social Council from among the Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies and the parties to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, with due regard for the adequate representation of (a) countries which are important producers of opium or coca leaves, (b) countries which are important in the manufacture of narcotic drugs, and (c) countries in which drug addiction or the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs constitutes an important problem, as well as taking into account the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

## Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, USSR, United Kingdom.

To serve until 31 December 1983: Argentina, Colombia, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, India, Italy, Madagascar, Malawi, Norway, Pakistan, Spain, Thailand, United States, Yugoslavia.

The Commission held its twenty-ninth session at Vienna, Austria, from 2 to 11 February 1981. The members were represented as follows:

Algeria: Smail Bouzar, Rapporteur; Amar Ouzzane (alternate). Argentina: Juan Carlos Garcia Fernandez, Second Vice-Chairman; Horatio Rolando Cattani (alternate). Australia: A. D. Campbell; Kenneth W. Edmondson, Brian C. Bates (alternates), Belgium: B. J. A. Huyghe-Braeckmans. Brazil: Arthur Pereira de Castilho Neto; Lauro Solero (alternate). Colombia: Roberto Herrera Vergara; Guillermo Orjuela-Bermeo (alternate). France: Albert Tigner; Christiane Barrau (alternate), German Democratic Republic: Ulrich Schneidewind; Dietmar Singer (alternate). Germany, Federal Republic of: Dr. Oskar Schroeder; Günter Dahlhoff (alternate). Hungary: Istvan Bayer; Imre Soos (alternate). India: B. B. Gujral; Madan M. Bhatnagar, Sharad Shripad Gothoskar (alternates). Indonesia: Sukardjo Subadi, Johan Frederik Mambu, Sirad Atmodjo, Mr. Suhadibroto, Benny Lirungan, Dalindra Aman, A. Satari, Christiadi Mangkuseputro. Iran: Sayed Hossein Fakhri; Dr. Ahmad Mohit

(alternate). Italy: Giuseppe di Gennaro, First Vice-Chairman; Francesco Pocchiari, Roberto Falaschi (alternates). Japan: Tsutomu Shimomura, Takahiro Yamada, Toshihiro Araki. Madagascar: Jean Randresiarison. Malawi: Patrick Simon Peter Tembo. Mexico: Fernando Baeza Melendez; Jesús Yanez-Orviz, Francisco Olguin Uribe, Arturo Galindo Ochoa (alternates), Norway: Torbjorn Mork; Bjorn Joeldal, Hermann Berger, Arne Huuse, Oddvar Saether, Ketil Bentren, Inge Staalesen (alternates). Pakistan: Mairaj Husain; Ariz Ahmad Khan (alternate). Panama: Laura Torres de Rodriguez. Spain: Luis Enrique Ildefonso y Romo, Felix Caldeó Moreno. Thailand: Police Major-General Chavalit Yodmani, Chairman; Panya Vanasatit, Vichai Poshychinda, Aran Suwanbubpa, Abinant Na Ranong (alternates). Togo: Amouzouvi Kuevibeku. Tunisia: Ahmed Ghezal; Khereddine Abdelali, Mohamed Fekih, Slaheddine Fourati, Monji Kaouache, Mondher Mami (alternates). Turkey: Ecmel Barutcu; Mesut Orsa, Tahsin Tarlan, Hayrettin Hanagasi, Adnan Coskun, Uygur Tazebay, Sule Soysal, Atilla Aytek, Numan Baycin, Luis Enrique Ildefonso y Romo, Felix Caldeó Moreno. USSR: Dr. E. A. Babaian; P. Dziuobenko, F. N. Strok (alternates). United Kingdom: Brian Oliver Bubbear; D. J. Hardwick, Bruce W. Mackenzie (alternates). United States: Roger Kirk; Clyde D. Taylor (alternate). Yugoslavia: Petar Dzundev; Milan Skrij, Vido Popadic, Milivoj Mihic (alternates).

On 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134), the Economic and Social Council elected the following 15 members for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Panama, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Turkey, USSR, United Kingdom, Zaire.

## SUB-COMMISSION ON ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFIC AND RELATED MATTERS IN THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

Members: Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan, Sweden, Turkey.

The Sub-Commission met at Vienna, Austria, on 29 and 30 January and from 5 to 7 October 1981, with the following members and their representatives:

Afghanistan: (not represented). Iran: Sayed Hossein Fakhri. Pakistan: Mairaj Husain, Vice-Chairman. Sweden: Lars Hultstrand. Turkey: Ecmel Barutcu, Chairman.

## MEETING OF OPERATIONAL HEADS OF NATIONAL NARCOTICS LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, FAR EAST REGION

A meeting to co-ordinate regional activities directed against illicit drug traffic has been convened annually following endorsement on 15 May 1974 by the Economic and Social Council of a recommendation by the Ad Hoc Committee on Illicit Traffic in the Far East Region to hold such a meeting.<sup>17</sup> It is usually held in any one of the region's capitals close to the centre of trafficking routes.

The meeting is open to any country in the region approved by the Commission, as well as to observers from the Customs Co-operation Council, the International Criminal Police Organization and the International Narcotics Control Board. Any interested Government outside the region may be invited by the Secretary-General to send an observer at its own expense.

## Commission on the Status of Women

The Commission on the Status of Women consists of 32 members, elected for four-year terms by the Economic and Social Council according to a specific pattern of equitable geographical distribution.

The Commission did not meet in 1981..

<sup>17</sup> See YUN 1974, p. 615, resolution 1845(LVI).

**Members:**

To serve until 31 December 1982: Czechoslovakia, Finland, Ghana, Iraq, Malaysia, Panama, Senegal, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

To serve until 31 December 1983: China, Cuba, France, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Lesotho, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan.

To serve until 31 December 1984: Canada, Egypt, India, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian SSR, Venezuela, Zaire.

**Population Commission**

The Population Commission consists of 27 members, elected for four-year terms by the Economic and Social Council according to a specific pattern of equitable geographical distribution.

On 25 November 1981, the Council designated the Commission as the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on Population (p. 1537).

**Members:**

To serve until 31 December 1981: Barbados, Egypt, India, Japan, Malawi, Panama, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

To serve until 31 December 1983: Ecuador, Finland, France, Indonesia, Morocco, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Ukrainian SSR.

To serve until 31 December 1984: Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Rwanda, Thailand, Zaire.

The Commission held its twenty-first session at United Nations Headquarters from 26 January to 4 February 1981. The members were represented as follows:

Barbados: Eric L. Straughn; Ricardo Randolph Browne (alternate). Ecuador: Eduardo Santa Alvite. Egypt: Aziz Bindari; Moustafa El Gindi, Hassan Gadel Hak, Mohamed Talaat S. Khalil (alternates). Finland: Kauko M. Sipponen, Vice-Chairman; Marjatta Rasi, Anna-Liiss Korhonen (alternates). France: Alfred Sauvy; Jean Bourgeois-Pichat (alternate). Greece: Vassilios Valaoras. Honduras: Juan Jose Cueva Membreno. Hungary: Barnabas Barta; Andras Klinger (alternate). India: Serla Grewal; Vaaant Vishnu Nevrekar (alternate). Indonesia: Ali Bustam; Hidayat Mukmin, Mr. Poerwanto, Nursin Rigin. Purbo S. Suwondo (alternates). Japan: Nobuo Shinozaki; Makoto Wakasugi, M. Atoh (alternates). Malawi: E. F. Ching'anda. Morocco: Mohamed Bijaad. Netherlands: Dirk Jan van de Kaa, E. J. N. Brouwers, Steven E. Ramondt. Nigeria: O. O. Olaifa; F. J. Falodun (Rapporteur), J. A. Otokiti (alternates). Norway: Petter Jacob Bjerpe; Mette Ravn (alternate). Panama: Hildebrando Araica, Vice-Chairmen. Peru: Carlos Munoz Torcello. Rwanda: Silas Niyibizi. Sierra Leone: Rosalind Omolaja Forde; Chris Esanami George Jasabe, William Sebana Bangura (alternates). Sri Lanka: Wickrema S. Weerasooria, Chairman. Thailand: Visit Boonyakesanond. Ukrainian SSR: A. A. Zhuk. Vice-Chairman; I. M. Turyanskiy (alternate). USSR: A. A. Isourov; N. I. Yevdokeyev, A. S. Anikushin (alternates). United Kingdom: Jean Helen Thompson; C. D. Walker, William G. Ehrman (alternates). United States: Richard E. Benedict; Conrad Taeuber, Philander P. Claxton, Jr., Patricia Baldi, Samuel Baum, Frank W. Brecher (alternates). Zaire: Bangula Maneno, Kalupala Lukangu.

On 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134), the Economic and Social Council elected the following nine members for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Bolivia, China, Japan, Mexico, Sudan, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Zambia.

**Statistical Commission**

The Statistical Commission consists of 24 members, elected for four-year terms by the Economic and Social Council ac-

cording to a specific pattern of equitable geographical distribution.

**Members:**

To serve until 31 December 1981: Canada, Egypt, Ethiopia, Jamaica, Spain, Tunisia, USSR, United States.,

To serve until 31 December 1983: Austria. Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Ghana, Hungary, India, Iraq, Kenya.

To serve until 31 December 1984: Australia, Brazil, Finland, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Ukrainian SSR, United Kingdom.

The Commission held its twenty-first session at United Nations Headquarters from 12 to 21 January 1981. The members were represented as follows:

Australia: Roy James Cameron; P. Atcherley (alternate). Austria: Lothar Bosse. Brazil: Jesse de Souza Montello; Marco Antonio de Souza Aguiar (alternate). Canada: Martin B. Wilk; Guy Leclerc, David A. Worton, Bela Prigly (alternates). Czechoslovakia: Jan Kazimour. Ecuador: Gastón Acoata Cordero. Egypt: Hassan Gadel Hak, Soad Shalaby, Ramzy Ezzeldin Ramzy (alternates). Ethiopia: Mitike Beyene. Finland: Olavi E. Niitamo; Tapio Leppo, Aarno Laiho (alternates). Ghana: O. A. Y. Jackson. Hungary: Vera Nyitrai, Vice-Chairman; Agoston Pelva (alternate). India: K. C. Seal, Vice-Chairman. Iraq: Abdul Rahman Jubory; Wisam Jamil Tawfiq, Ali Nahi Hassoon (alternates). Jamaica: (not represented). Japan: Saburo Kawai; Yuki Miura, Minoru Matsui, Makoto Wakasugi, Yuko Ishida (alternates). Kenya: Parmmeet Singh, Vice-Chairman. Malaysia: Khoo Teik Huat. Mexico: Sergio Mote Marin; Heladio Jiménez Zaragoza (alternate). Spain: Francisco Azorin Poch; Jose Luis Sánchez Crespo, Carmen Arribas (alternates). Tunisia: (not represented). Ukrainian SSR: N. N. Artemyev. USSR: M. A. Korolev; N. I. Yevdokeyev, A. A. Konevsky (alternates). United Kingdom: Sir Arthur John Boreham, Rapporteur; K. V. Henderson, T. F. Hughes, M. Glynn D. Evans (alternates). United States: Joseph W. Duncan, Chairman; Meyer Zitter (alternate).

On 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134), the Economic and Social Council elected the following eight members for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Argentina, France, Ireland, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria, Spain, Togo, USSR.

**WORKING GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL PROGRAMMES AND CO-ORDINATION**

The Working Group consists of the Bureau of the Statistical Commission; the representatives to the Commission of the two major contributors to the United Nations budget, unless these are already represented in the Bureau; and one representative to the Commission from a developing country from among members of each of the following: ECA, ECLA, ECWA and ESCAP, unless these are also already represented in the Bureau. Members serve two-year terms.

Since its establishment by the Economic and Social Council on 31 May 1968,<sup>18</sup> the Working Group had held nine sessions, the ninth at Geneva from 29 September to 2 October 1981. Attending the ninth session were:

Sir Arthur John Boreham (United Kingdom); Joseph W. Duncan, Chairman (United States); M. A. Korolev (USSR); Vera Nyitrai (Hungary); K. C. Seal (India).

**Regional commissions****Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)**

The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific held its thirty-seventh session at Bangkok, Thailand, from 10 to 20 March 1981.

<sup>18</sup> See YUN 1968, p. 463, resolution 1306(XLIV).

Members: Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burma, China, Democratic Kampuchea, Fiji, France, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives,<sup>a</sup> Mongolia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tonga, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Viet Nam.

Associate members: Brunei,<sup>a</sup> Cook Islands, Guam,<sup>a,b</sup> Hong Kong, Kiribati, Niue, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Tuvalu,<sup>a</sup> Vanuatu,<sup>a,c</sup>

Switzerland, not a Member of the United Nations, participates in a consultative capacity in the work of the Commission.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the thirty-seventh session.

<sup>b</sup> Became an associate member on 10 March 1981.

<sup>c</sup> Retained associate membership throughout 1981 although admitted to the United Nations on 15 September 1981.

Chairman: Mahe U. Tupouniua (Tonga).

Vice-Chairmen: Jambalyn Banzar (Mongolia), Rafael M. Iletto (Philippines), M. Humayun Khan (Pakistan), Noel Levi (Papua New Guinea), M. H. M. Naina Marikkar (Sri Lanka), John Moore (Australia), Motoo Ogiso (Japan), Soulivong Phrasithideth (Lao People's Democratic Republic), M. Saifur Rahman (Bangladesh), Ratna Shamsheer J. B. Rana (Nepal), Siddhi Savetsila (Thailand), Zhang Wenjin (China).

Following are the main subsidiary bodies of the Commission:

For policy and direction: Advisory Committee of Permanent Representatives and Other Representatives Designated by Members of the Commission.

For sectoral review and project formulation and programming:<sup>a</sup> Committee on Agricultural Development; Committee on Development Planning; Committee on Industry, Technology, Human Settlements and the Environment; Committee on Natural Resources; Committee on Population; Committee on Shipping, and Transport and Communications; Committee on Social Development; Committee on Statistics; Committee on Trade; Special Body on Land-locked Countries.

For project implementation: Advisory Council, Statistical Institute for Asia and the Pacific; Committee for Co-ordination of Joint Prospecting for Mineral Resources in Asian Off-shore Areas; Committee for Co-ordination of Joint Prospecting for Mineral Resources in South Pacific Offshore Areas; Governing Council, Regional Mineral Resources Development Centre; Interim Committee for Co-ordination of Investigations of the Lower Mekong Basin; Management Board, Asian and Pacific Development Centre; Typhoon Committee.

<sup>a</sup> Ad hoc Conferences are convened for Issues not dealt with by the committees.

#### Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)

The Economic Commission for Africa meets in annual session at the ministerial level known as the Conference of Ministers.

The Commission held its sixteenth session (seventh meeting of the Conference of Ministers) at Freetown, Sierra Leone, from 6 to 10 April 1981.

Members: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde,<sup>a</sup> Central African Republic, Chad,<sup>a</sup> Comoros, Congo, Djibouti,<sup>a</sup> Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar,<sup>a</sup> Malawi,<sup>a</sup> Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius,<sup>a</sup> Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles,<sup>a</sup> Sierra Leone,

Somalia, South Africa,<sup>b</sup> Sudan, Swaziland,<sup>a</sup> Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.<sup>c</sup>

Switzerland,<sup>a</sup> not a Member of the United Nations, participates in a consultative capacity in the work of the Commission.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the sixteenth session.

<sup>b</sup> On 30 July 1963, the Economic and Social Council decided that South Africa should not take part in the work of ECA until conditions for constructive co-operation had been restored by a change in South Africa's racial policy.

<sup>c</sup> On 24 July 1981 (decision 1981/188), the Economic and Social Council, noting that Zimbabwe had become a full member of ECA (on 25 August 1980), amended the terms of reference of ECA by deleting the article relating to the associate membership of States responsible for international relations in African non-self-governing territories.

Chairman: S. S. Banya (Sierra Leone).

First Vice-Chairman: Sadek Bonzayen (Tunisia).

Second Vice-Chairman: Serge Kananiye (Burundi).

Rapporteur: M. V. Mulapo (Lesotho).

The Commission has established the following principal legislative organs:

Conference of Ministers; sectoral ministerial conferences, each assisted by an appropriate committee of technical officials; Council of Ministers of each Multinational Programming and Operational Centre, assisted by its committee of officials; Governing Council, African Institute for Economic Development and Planning.

The Commission has also established the following:

Joint Conference of African Planners, Statisticians and Demographers, and Technical Preparatory Committee of the Whole (two standing technical bodies); Intergovernmental Committee of Experts for Science and Technology Development; Joint Intergovernmental Regional Committee on Human Settlements and Environment.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Formerly called the Intergovernmental Regional Committee on Human Settlements. It was renamed by the Commission on 10 April 1981.

#### Economic Commission for Europe (ECE)

The Economic Commission for Europe held its thirty-sixth session at Geneva from 30 March to 8 April 1981.

Members: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia.

The Holy See, Liechtenstein and San Marino,<sup>a</sup> which are not Members of the United Nations, participate in a consultative capacity in the work of the Commission.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the thirty-sixth session.

Chairman: Ulrich Sahn (Federal Republic of Germany).

Vice-Chairman: Ferenc Bartha (Hungary).

Rapporteurs: Sacho Spassov (Bulgaria), Christian Strohal (Austria).

The Commission has established the following principal subsidiary bodies:

Chemical Industry Committee; Coal Committee; Committee on Agricultural Problems; Committee on Electric Power; Committee on Gas; Committee on Housing, Building and

<sup>19</sup> See YUN 1963, p. 274, resolution 974 D IV (XXXVI).

Planning; Committee on the Development of Trade; Committee on Water Problems; Conference of European Statisticians; Inland Transport Committee; Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Environmental Problems; Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Science and Technology; Senior Economic Advisers to ECE Governments; Steel Committee; Timber Committee.

Other subsidiary bodies are: the Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Energy; and the Working Party on Engineering Industries and Automation.

Ad hoc meetings of experts are convened for sectors of activity not dealt with by these principal bodies.

#### Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA)

The Economic Commission for Latin America held its nineteenth session at Montevideo, Uruguay, from 4 to 15 May 1981.

Members: Antigua and Barbuda,<sup>a,b</sup> Argentina, Bahamas,<sup>a</sup> Barbados,<sup>a</sup> Belize,<sup>a,c</sup> Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica,<sup>a</sup> Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana,<sup>a</sup> Haiti,<sup>a</sup> Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia,<sup>a</sup> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines,<sup>a</sup> Spain, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Associate members: Netherlands Antilles,<sup>d</sup> West Indies Associated States<sup>a</sup> (St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla and the territory of Montserrat-collectively as a single member).

Switzerland,<sup>a</sup> not a Member of the United Nations, participates in a consultative capacity in the work of the Commission.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the nineteenth session.

<sup>b</sup> Became a full member on 11 November 1981.

<sup>c</sup> Became a full member on 25 September 1981.

<sup>d</sup> Became an associate member on 14 May 1981.

Chairman: Valentin Arismendi (Uruguay).

First Vice-Chairmen: Ambrose E. Da Costa (Jamaica).

Second Vice-Chairmen: Gustavo R. Gonzales (Panama).

Third Vice-Chairmen: Rafael Gomez-Jordanay Prats (Spain).

Rapporteur: Antonio Oviedo (Colombia).

The Commission has established the following principal subsidiary bodies:

Caribbean Development and Co-operation Committee; Committee of High-level Government Experts; Committee of the Whole; Committee on Central American Economic Co-operation and its Inter-agency Commission: Trade Committee; Governing Council, Latin American Demographic Centre; Technical Committee, Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning.

#### Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA)

The Economic Commission for Western Asia held its eighth session at Sana'a, Yemen, from 3 to 7 May 1981.

Members: Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan,<sup>a</sup> Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Yemen; Palestine Liberation Organization.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the eighth session.

Chairmen: Fouad Qaid Mohammad (Yemen).

Vice-Chairmen: Salim Yassine (Syrian Arab Republic), Ahmad Younis (Palestine Liberation Organization).

Rapporteur: Leyla Hassan Ma'ruf (Iraq).

The Commission has established the following:

Standing Committee, to advise on arrangements for sessions and other meetings of the Commission and on other

matters as needed; Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Expert Committee; Regional Water Resources Council.

#### Standing committees

##### Commission on Human Settlements

The Commission on Human Settlements consists of 58 members elected by the Economic and Social Council for three-year terms according to a specific pattern of equitable geographical distribution; It reports to the General Assembly through the Council.

The Commission held its fourth session at Manila, Philippines, from 27 April to 6 May 1981.

##### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Australia, Bangladesh, Chile, Czechoslovakia,<sup>a</sup> Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala,<sup>a</sup> India, Italy, Jordan,<sup>a</sup> Kenya, Malawi, Poland, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Togo,<sup>a</sup> United Republic of Cameroon,<sup>a</sup> Venezuela, Viet Nam.

To serve until 31 December 1982: Belgium, Canada, Colombia,<sup>a</sup> Cuba, Egypt, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Lesotho, Malaysia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Sierra Leone, Uganda.

To serve until 31 December 1983: Argentina, Barbados,<sup>a</sup> Bulgaria, Burundi, Denmark, Finland, Guinea,<sup>a</sup> Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Somalia,<sup>a</sup> Spain,<sup>a</sup> Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic,<sup>a</sup> USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Zambia.

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the fourth session.

Chairmen: Imelda R. Marcos (Philippines).

Vice-Chairmen: Mooki V. Molapo (Lesotho), Hans Pflaumer (Federal Republic of Germany), Janos Szabo (Hungary).

Rapporteur: Gloria Knight (Jamaica).

On 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134), and on 21 October (with respect to Jordan) and 2 November (with respect to Romania) (decision 1981/196), the Economic and Social Council elected the following 19 members for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Byelorussian SSR, Chile, Cyprus, El Salvador, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, India, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Morocco, New Zealand, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Zimbabwe.

##### Commission on Transnational Corporations

The Commission on Transnational Corporations consists of 48 members, elected from all States for three-year terms by the Economic and Social Council according to a specific pattern of geographical distribution.

The Commission held its seventh session at Geneva from 31 August to 11 September 1981.

##### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Algeria, Canada, India, Iran, Iraq,<sup>a</sup> Italy, Ivory Coast,<sup>a</sup> Jamaica, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Swaziland,<sup>a</sup> Turkey, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

To serve until 31 December 1982:<sup>b</sup> Brazil, Cuba,<sup>a</sup> Kenya,<sup>a</sup> Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Philippines, Somalia,<sup>a</sup> Sweden, Thailand, Uganda, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Zaire.

To serve until 31 December 1983:<sup>c</sup> Argentina, China, Costa Rica,<sup>a</sup> Egypt, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Guinea,<sup>a</sup> Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Romania, Sierra Leone,<sup>a</sup> Switzerland.

Expert advisers (to serve through the eighth (1982) session): Michael A. Ajomo (Nigeria), James Dennis Akumu (Kenya), S. Babar Ali (Pakistan), Aloysio de Andrade Faria (Brazil),<sup>d,e</sup> José A. Encinas del Pando (Peru), Johan M. Goudswaard (Netherlands), Elizabeth R. Jager (United

States), Kiyoshi Kojima (Japan),<sup>d</sup> David Lea (United Kingdom), Carlos Omar Navarro Carrasco (Venezuela), Samuel Paul (India), Gianandrea Sandri (Italy), Bogdan Sosnowski (Poland), Gerd Tacke (Federal Republic of Germany),<sup>e</sup> Branko Vukmir (Yugoslavia), Ralph A. Weller (United States).

<sup>a</sup> Not represented at the seventh session.

<sup>b</sup> One seat allocated to a member from Asian States remained unfilled in 1981.

<sup>c</sup> Two seats allocated to members from Asian States remained unfilled in 1981.

<sup>d</sup> Did not attend the seventh session.

<sup>e</sup> Resigned with effect from 1 April and 11 September 1981, respectively; Jones Santos Neves (Brazil) and Louis von Planta (Switzerland) were appointed by the Commission on 9 September 1981 to fill the resultant vacancies for the remainder of the term. Mario Joel Ramos da Silva (Portugal) was also appointed on that date to redress the imbalance in the representation of the three world-wide trade union federations accorded category I consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. As agreed by the Commission, his appointment would become effective on the date of the voluntary resignation of one expert adviser before the Commission's eighth session.

Chairmen: Nitish Kumar Sengupta (India).

Vice-Chairmen: Horst Heininger (German Democratic Republic), Gabriel O. Ijewere (Nigeria), Seymour Rubin (United States).

Rapporteur: Julio César Freyre (Argentina).

On 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134), the Economic and Social Council elected the following members for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill 15 of the 16 vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Algeria, Canada, Congo, Ghana, India, Iran, Italy, Jamaica, Pakistan, Peru, Swaziland, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

No further election was held in 1981 for the remaining vacancy.

#### INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKING GROUP ON A CODE OF CONDUCT

The Intergovernmental Working Group, a working group of the whole of the Commission, held three sessions at United Nations Headquarters in 1981: its twelfth from 5 to 23 January, its thirteenth from 6 to 17 April and its fourteenth from 18 to 29 May.

Chairman: Sten Niklasson (Sweden).

Vice-Chairmen: R. S. Bhatt (India), Hassan Gadel Hak (Egypt), Horst Heininger (German Democratic Republic).

Rapporteur: Luzmila Zanabria (Peru).

#### Committee for Programme and Co-ordination

The Committee for Programme and Co-ordination is the main subsidiary organ of the Economic and Social Council and of the General Assembly for planning, programming and co-ordination and reports directly to both. It consists of 21 members nominated by the Council and elected by the Assembly for three-year terms according to a specific pattern of equitable geographical distribution.

The Committee held an organizational meeting on 6 April and its twenty-first session from 4 to 29 May and on 8 and 9 June 1981, both at United Nations Headquarters.

#### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Belgium, Norway, Pakistan, Romania, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia.

To serve until 31 December 1982: Argentina, Costa Rica, France, Sudan, USSR, United Republic of Tanzania, United States.

To serve until 31 December 1983: Brazil, India, Japan, Morocco, Philippines, Senegal, United Republic of Cameroon.

Chairman: Niaz A. Naik (Pakistan).

Vice-Chairmen: Mirko Bunc (Yugoslavia), Mario A. Esquivel Tobar (Costa Rica), Tommo Monthe (United Republic of Cameroon).

Rapporteur: William G. Ehrman (United Kingdom).

On 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134), the Economic and Social Council nominated the following eight Member States of the United Nations, seven of which were to be elected by the General Assembly, for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Germany, Federal Republic of, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Romania, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia. All but Norway were elected by the Assembly on 19 November 1981 (decision 36/315).

#### Committee on Natural Resources

The Committee on Natural Resources consists of 54 members, elected by the Economic and Social Council for four-year terms in accordance with the geographical distribution of seats in the Council.

The Committee held its seventh session at United Nations Headquarters from 18 to 29 May 1981.

#### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1982:<sup>a</sup> Argentina, Australia, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Chad, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Iran, Iraq,<sup>b</sup> Italy, Ivory Coast,<sup>b</sup> Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Senegal,<sup>b</sup> Spain, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United States, Yugoslavia.

To serve until 31 December 1984:<sup>a</sup> Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Colombia,<sup>b</sup> Dominican Republic,<sup>b</sup> Greece, Guinea, India, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Morocco,<sup>b</sup> Niger,<sup>b</sup> Paraguay, Peru, Sierra Leone,<sup>b</sup> Sudan, Ukrainian SSR,<sup>c</sup> USSR, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

<sup>a</sup> Two seats allocated to members from Asian States remained unfilled in 1981.

<sup>b</sup> Not represented at the seventh session.

<sup>c</sup> Elected on 6 February 1981 (decision 1981/104).

Chairman: Sir Egerton Richardson (Jamaica).

Vice-Chairmen: S. M. H. Bokhari (Pakistan), Daniel D. C. Don Nanjira (Kenya), V. I. Filippov (Ukrainian SSR).

Rapporteur: Willy J. Stevens (Belgium).

#### Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies

The Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies, established by the Economic and Social Council on 16 February 1946, was reconstituted by the Council on 13 May 1976 for the purpose of negotiating a relationship agreement between the United Nations and IFAD.

The Committee adjourned sine die on 11 May 1977 upon completion of its report on the negotiations.

#### Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations consists of 13 members of the Economic and Social Council, elected for a term of four years by the Council according to a specific pattern of equitable geographical representation.

In 1981, the Committee met at United Nations Headquarters between 9 and 20 February, on 14 April and on 1 July.

Members (until 31 December 1982): Chile, Cuba, France, Ghana, India, Iraq, Kenya, Pakistan, Sweden, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Chairman: Sarbuland Khan (Pakistan).

Vice-Chairmen: A. A. Ozadovsky (Ukrainian SSR).

Rapporteur: Richard H. O. Okwaro (Kenya).

On 20 July 1981, the Economic and Social Council decided to enlarge the Committee from 13 to 19 members, the seats to

be distributed as follows: five from African States; four each from Asian, Latin American, and Western European and other States; and two from Eastern European States. The additional members were not elected in 1981.

### Expert bodies

#### Ad Hoc Group of Experts on International Co-operation In Tax Matters

The Ad Hoc Group of Experts on International Co-operation in Tax Matters was to consist of 25 members drawn from 15 developing and 10 developed countries, appointed by the Secretary-General to serve in their individual capacity.

The Ad Hoc Group, which meets every two years, held its first meeting at Geneva from 7 to 18 December 1981.

Members:<sup>a</sup> Maurice Hugh Collins, Chairmen (United Kingdom); Jean François Court (France); T. Dekker (Netherlands); Francisco O. N. Dornelles, first Vice-Chairmen (Brazil); Hussein M. El Baroudi (Egypt);<sup>b</sup> Mordecai S. Feinberg (United States); José Ramón Fernández Perez (Spain); Antonio H. Figueroa (Argentina); Mayer Gabay (Israel); Yasuyuki Kawahara (Japan); R. R. Khosla, Second Vice-Chairmen (India); Marwan Koudsi (Syrian Arab Republic); Felipe Lamarca (Chile);<sup>b</sup> Daniel Luthi (Switzerland); Thomas Menck (Federal Republic of Germany); Canute R. Miller (Jamaica);<sup>b</sup> Medaghri Alaoui Mohamed (Morocco);<sup>b</sup> Alberto Navarro Rodriguez (Mexico); I. O. Oni, Rapporteur (Nigeria); Alfred Philipp (Austria); Rainer Söderholm (Finland); Sutadi Sukarya (Indonesia); Andre Titty (United Republic of Cameroon); Abdul Waheed (Pakistan).

<sup>a</sup>Twenty-four members were appointed by the Secretary-General in accordance with a 1980 Economic and Social Council decision to increase the Group's membership from 20 to 25.<sup>20</sup> One member from a developing country remained to be appointed as at the end of 1981.

<sup>b</sup> Did not attend the first meeting.

#### Committee for Development Planning

The Committee for Development Planning is composed of 24 experts representing different planning systems. They are appointed by the Economic and Social Council, on nomination by the Secretary-General, to serve in their personal capacity for a term of three years.

The Committee held its seventeenth session at United Nations Headquarters from 23 March to 1 April 1981.

Members (until 31 December 1983):<sup>a</sup> Ismail-Sabri Abdalla (Egypt); Khatijah Ahmad (Malaysia); Abdlatif Y. Al-Hamad (Kuwait);<sup>b</sup> Maria Augusztinovic, Vice-Chairmen (Hungary); Hendricus Cornelis Bos (Netherlands); William Gilbert Demas, Chairman (Trinidad and Tobago); Jose Encarnacion, Jr. (Philippines); Gerhard Fels (Federal Republic of Germany); Celso Furtado (Brazil); Robert K. A. Gardiner (Ghana); Shinichi Ichimura (Japan); Richard Jolly, Rapporteur (United Kingdom); V. N. Kirichenko (USSR); John P. Lewis (United States); Li Zong (China); Gabriel Mignot (France); J. M. Mwanza (Zambia); Joseph Elenga Ngaporu (Congo); G. O. Nwankwo (Nigeria);<sup>b</sup> Goran Ohlin (Sweden); Jozef Pajestka (Poland); I. G. Patel (India); Germánico Salgado (Ecuador); Leopoldo Solis (Mexico).<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Appointed on 6 February (decision 1981/104) and (with respect to G. O. Nwankwo (Nigeria)) on 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134).

<sup>b</sup> Did not attend the seventeenth session.

#### Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

The Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods is composed of experts from countries interested in the international transport of dangerous goods. The experts are made available by their Governments at the request of the Secretary-General. The membership, which was to be in-

creased from 10 to 15 in accordance with a 1975 resolution of the Economic and Social Council,<sup>21</sup> remained at 13 in 1981. The Committee did not meet during the year.

Members: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Norway, Poland, Thailand, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

The Committee may alter, as required, the composition of its subsidiary bodies. In addition, any Committee member may participate in the work of and vote in those bodies provided such member notify the United Nations Secretariat of the intention to do so.

#### GROUP OF EXPERTS ON EXPLOSIVES

The Group of Experts on Explosives held its twenty-first session at Geneva from 12 to 16 October 1981. The experts who attended the session were:

L. P. Andronov (USSR); J. des Rivières (Canada); J. Engeland (Federal Republic of Germany); O. Hakenstad (Norway); P. Marrec (France); C. Schultz (United States); R. R. Watson, Chairman (United Kingdom).

#### GROUP OF RAPORTEURS OF THE COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS

The Group of Rapporteurs of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods held its twenty-seventh session at Geneva from 3 to 14 August 1981. The experts who attended the session were:

L. P. Andronov, Chairman (USSR); T. Austerheim (Norway); T. D. Ellison (Canada); J. Engeland (Federal Republic of Germany); L. Grainger (United Kingdom); K. Kumagai (Japan); P. Marrec (France); A. I. Roberts (United States); L. Savi (Italy); D. Wiwczaruk, Vice-Chairman (Canada).

#### Committee on Crime Prevention and Control

The Committee on Crime Prevention and Control consists of 27 members elected for four-year terms by the Economic and Social Council, according to a specific pattern of equitable geographical representation, from among experts nominated by Member States.

The Committee did not meet in 1981.

#### Members:

To serve until 31 December 1982: S. V. Borodin (USSR), Dusan Cotic (Yugoslavia), Ahmed Mohamed Khalifa (Egypt), Manuel López-Rey y Arrojo (Bolivia), Francis Joseph Mahony (Australia), Mustafa Abdul Majid-Karah (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Jorge Arturo Montero-Castro (Costa Rica), Chadly Mohamed Ahmed Nefzaoui (Tunisia), John Olden (Ireland), P. R. Rajagopal (India), Simone Andrée Razes (France), Saladh El-Din Salhadar (Syrian Arab Republic), Silvino Julian Sorhegui Mato (Cuba), Yoshio Suzuki (Japan).

To serve until 31 December 1984: A. Adeyemi (Nigeria), Anthony John Edward Brennan (United Kingdom), Giuseppe di Gennaro (Italy), Ronald L. Gainer (United States), Jozsef Godony (Hungary), Aura Guerra de Villaláz (Panama), Ds. Hudioro (Indonesia), Abdul Meguid Ibrahim Kharbit (Kuwait), Mawik-Ndi-Muyeng (Zaire), Juan Manuel Mayorca (Venezuela), Albert Metzger (Sierra Leone), Abdel Aziz Abdalla Shiddo (Sudan), Ramananda Prasad Singh (Nepal).

#### United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names

The United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names held its ninth session at United Nations Headquarters from 17 to 27 February 1981. Attending the session were the chairmen or chief representatives of 16 of the 17 geographical/linguistic divisions, as follows:

<sup>20</sup>See YUN 1980, p. 534, decision 1980/155 of 18 July 1980.

<sup>21</sup>See YUN 1975, p. 734, resolution 1973(LIX) of 30 July 1975.



Africa Central Division: Eduardo Carlos (Angola).  
 Africa East Division: David Kamau (Kenya).  
 Africa West Division: Olumuyiwa Adebekun (Nigeria).  
 Arabic Division: Abdelhadi Tazi (Morocco).  
 Asia East Division (other than China): Seok-Yoon Choi (Republic of Korea).  
 Asia South-East and Pacific South-West Division:<sup>a</sup> Abdul Majid Mohamed (Malaysia).  
 Asia South-West Division (other than Arabic): S. Erinc (Turkey).  
 China Division: Wang Jitong (China).  
 Dutch- and German-speaking Division: F. J. Ormeling (Netherlands); Joseph Breu, Chairman (Austria).  
 East Central and South-East Europe Division: M. Szymczak (Poland).  
 India Division: Not represented.  
 Latin America Division: Idelis Velazquez (Cuba).  
 Norden Division: Allan Rostvik (Sweden).  
 Romano-Hellenic Division: J. Ramondou (France).  
 Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Division: A. Zemtsev (USSR).  
 United Kingdom Division: H. A. G. Lewis (United Kingdom).  
 United States of America and Canada Division: Alan Rayburn, Rapporteur (Canada);<sup>b</sup> R. Randall (United States).

<sup>a</sup>Formerly known as the Asia South-East and Pacific Division, it was renamed by the Group of Experts at its ninth session.

<sup>b</sup>Also assumed the functions of the Vice-Chairman, W. J. Absaloms (Kenya), who was absent from the ninth session.

#### Ad hoc bodies

Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting

The Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting consists of 34 members elected by the Economic and Social Council according to a specific pattern of equitable geographical distribution. Each member is represented by an expert whom it appoints.

The Group, which was to have completed its work before the seventh (1981) session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations (see above), was authorized by the Council on 2 November 1981 (decision 1981/198) to hold two more sessions in 1982, with the objective of submitting its final recommendations to the Commission at its eighth (1982) session.

The Group held two sessions in 1981, at United Nations Headquarters: its third from 19 to 30 January; and its fourth from 16 to 27 March.

Members:<sup>a</sup> Algeria,<sup>b</sup> Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China,<sup>b</sup> Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Iran, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Swaziland, Switzerland, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States.

<sup>a</sup>The seats allocated to two members from Eastern European States remained unfilled in 1981.

<sup>b</sup>Elected on 6 February 1981 (decision 1981/104).

Chairman: Jaime C. Laya (Philippines).  
 Vice-Chairmen: Mohamed Adel El-Safty (Egypt), Pieter A. Wessel (Netherlands).  
 Rapporteur: Ricardo J. Fox (Argentina).

Committee on Candidatures for Election to the International Narcotics Control Board

The Committee on Candidatures, originally established by the Economic and Social Council on 4 March 1966, was re-established by the Council on 3 February 1981 (decision

1981/101) for the purpose of selecting nominees for election to the International Narcotics Control Board for a term of office from 2 March 1982 to 1 March 1987 and to fill a vacancy for a term from the date of election to 1 March 1982.

The Committee held a closed session at Vienna, Austria, on 2 and 3 March 1981.

Members: Australia, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Japan, Sweden, Turkey (chairman), USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on Population

On 25 November 1981, the Economic and Social Council designated the Population Commission (p. 1532) as the inter-governmental Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on Population, to be held in 1984.

The Preparatory Committee, which was to meet in open-ended session with the participation of any other State, did not meet in 1981.

Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination

On 6 May 1981 (decision 1981/130), the Economic and Social Council authorized its President, in consultation with the regional groups, to appoint, on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, a preparatory sub-committee of 23 Member States, to complete preparations for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, to be held in 1983.

The Preparatory Sub-Committee did not meet in 1981.

Members:<sup>a</sup> Bulgaria, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Iraq, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, USSR, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

<sup>a</sup>Nineteen members were appointed by the Council President, as stated in his letter of 15 December 1981 to the Secretary-General. No further appointments took place before the end of the year.

#### Administrative Committee on Co-ordination

The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination held three sessions in 1981: its first on 13 and 14 April and its second on 29 and 30 June, at Geneva; and its third on 29 and 30 October at United Nations Headquarters.

The membership of ACC includes, under the chairmanship of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, also the executive heads of ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, the World Bank, IMF, ICAO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMCO, WIPO, IFAD, IAEA and the secretariat of the Contracting Parties to GATT.

Also taking part in the work of ACC are the United Nations Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation; the Under-Secretaries-General for International Economic and Social Affairs, for Administration, Finance and Management, for Technical Co-operation for Development, and for Legal Affairs; and the executive heads of UNCTAD, UNDP, UNEP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNIDO, UNITAR, UNRWA and WFP.

ACC has established subsidiary bodies on organizational, administrative and substantive questions.

#### Other related bodies

##### Human Rights Committee

The Human Rights Committee (p. 1511) reports annually to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development

The Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development (p. 1512) reports annually to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

Interim Committee on New and Renewable  
Sources of Energy

The Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 1512) was to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh (1982) session through the Economic and Social Council.

International Narcotics Control Board (INCB)

The International Narcotics Control Board, established under the terms of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the 1972 Protocol, consists of 13 members, elected by the Economic and Social Council for five-year terms, three from candidates nominated by WHO and 10 from candidates nominated by Members of the United Nations and parties to the Single Convention.

The Board held two sessions in 1981, at Vienna, Austria: its twenty-ninth from 18 to 29 May; and its thirtieth from 13 October to 6 November.

Members:

To serve until 1 March 1982: Dr. N. K. Barkov, Second Vice-President (USSR); Daniel Bovet (Italy);<sup>a</sup> Dr. Tadeusz L. Chruciński (Poland); Betty C. Gough, First Vice-President (United States); Dr. Sukru Kaymakalan (Turkey);<sup>a</sup> Nobuo Motohashi (Japan);<sup>b</sup> Paul Reuter, President (France).  
To serve until 1 March 1985:<sup>c</sup> Dr. Bela Bolcs (Hungary); Dr. Diego Garcés-Giraido (Colombia); Dr. Mohsen Kchouk. Rapporteur (Tunisia); Dr. Victorio V. Olguin (Argentina); Jasjit Singh (India).

<sup>a</sup>Elected from candidates nominated by WHO.

<sup>b</sup>Elected on 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134).

<sup>c</sup>Under the terms of article 10, paragraph 3, of the 1961 Single Convention, as amended by the 1972 Protocol, the seat previously held by Dr. Babakar S. M. Diop (Senegal) became vacant in 1981; the vacancy had not been filled by the end of the year.

On 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134), the Economic and Social Council elected the following seven members for a five-year term beginning on 2 March 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 1 March: Dr. Ramón de la Fuente Muniz (Mexico);<sup>a</sup> Betty C. Gough (United States), Dr. Sukru Kaymakalan (Turkey);<sup>a</sup> Paul Reuter (France), Dr. Bror Anders Rexed (Sweden), Adolf-Heinrich von Arnim (Federal Republic of Germany), Edward Williams (Australia).

<sup>a</sup> Elected from candidates nominated by WHO

International Research and Training Institute  
for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW)

The International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women, a body of the United Nations financed through voluntary contributions, functions under the authority of a Board of Trustees.

During 1981, the agreement between the United Nations and the Government of the Dominican Republic (the host country) concerning installation of the Institute at Santo Domingo was signed in New York on 31 March and ratified by the Dominican Republic on 18 August. Pending completion of work on its accommodations, however, the Institute operated from United Nations Headquarters.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Board of Trustees of INSTRAW is composed of a President appointed by the Secretary-General; 10 members serving in their individual capacity, appointed by the Council on the nomination of the Secretary-General; and ex-officio members. Members serve for three-year terms, with a maximum of two terms.

The Board, which reports annually to the Economic and Social Council, did not meet in 1981.

Members (until 30 June 1981):

To serve until 30 June 1981: Marcelle Devaud (France), Aziza Hussein (Egypt), Nobuko Takahashi (Japan).

To serve until 30 June 1982: Gulzar Bano (Pakistan), Ester Boserup (Denmark), Vilma Espín de Castro (Cuba), Vida Tomsic (Yugoslavia).

To serve until 30 June 1983: Emmanuel T. Esquea-Guerrero (Dominican Republic), Lily Monze (Zambia), Irene Tinker (United States).

On 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134), the Economic and Social Council reappointed Marcelle Devaud (France), Aziza Hussein (Egypt) and Nobuko Takahashi (Japan) for a three-year term beginning on 1 July 1981 to fill the vacancies occurring on 30 June.

Members (from 1 July 1981):

To serve until 30 June 1982: Gulzar Bano (Pakistan), Ester Boserup (Denmark), Vilma Espín de Castro (Cuba), Vida Tomsic (Yugoslavia).

To serve until 30 June 1983: Emmanuel T. Esquea-Guerrero (Dominican Republic), Lily Monze (Zambia), Irene Tinker (United States).

To serve until 30 June 1984: Marcelle Devaud (France), Aziza Hussein (Egypt), Nobuko Takahashi (Japan).

President: Delphine Tsanga (United Republic of Cameroon).

Ex-officio members: The representative of the Secretary-General, the Director of the Institute and the directors of the centres and programmes for women of the regional commissions.

Director of the Institute: Dunja Pastizzi-Ferencic.

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner  
for Refugees (UNHCR)

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (p. 1514) reports annually to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

United Nations Capital Development Fund

EXECUTIVE BOARD

The Executive Board of the United Nations Capital Development Fund (p. 1517) reports annually to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

EXECUTIVE BOARD

The Executive Board of UNICEF consists of 30 members elected by the Economic and Social Council from Member States of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of IAEA, for three-year terms.

In 1981, the Executive Board held a special session on 22 and 23 January, a series of meetings between 11 and 22 May, an organizational meeting (with its composition as of 1 August) on 13 June, and a special session from 22 to 24 October, all at United Nations Headquarters.

Members (until 31 July 1981):

To serve until 31 July 1981: Byelorussian SSR, Ghana, India, Netherlands, Philippines, Senegal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Venezuela.

To serve until 31 July 1982: Australia, Burundi, France, Hungary, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Somalia, USSR, United States.

To serve until 31 July 1983: Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, China, Germany, Federal Republic of, Norway, Thailand, Yugoslavia.

Chairman: Paal Bog (Norway).

First Vice-Chairman: Margaret Yvonne Catley-Carison (Canada).

Second Vice-Chairman: Mihaly Simai (Hungary).

Third Vice-Chairman: Suleiman Mohamoud Aden (Somalia).

Fourth Vice-Chairman: Dr. Haydee Martinez de Osorio (Venezuela).

On 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134), the Economic and Social Council elected the following 10 members for a three-year term beginning on 1 August 1981 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 July: Austria, German Democratic Republic, India, Ivory Coast, Pakistan, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela.

Members (from 1 August 1981):

To serve until 31 July 1982: Australia, Burundi, France, Hungary, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Somalia, USSR, United States.

To serve until 31 July 1983: Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, China, Germany, Federal Republic of, Norway, Thailand, Yugoslavia.

To serve until 31 July 1984: Austria, German Democratic Republic, India, Ivory Coast, Pakistan, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela.

Chairman: Dragan Mateljak (Yugoslavia).

First Vice-Chairman: Suleiman Mohamoud Aden (Somalia).

Second Vice-Chairman: Mihaly Simai (Hungary).

Third Vice-Chairman: A. S. Gill (India).

Fourth Vice-Chairman: Francois Nordmann (Switzerland).

Executive Director of UNICEF: James P. Grant.

#### COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

Members:<sup>a</sup>

To serve until 31 July 1981: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, India, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela.

Ex-officio members: Chairman of the Executive Board, Chairman of the Programme Committee.

<sup>a</sup>The Executive Board decided in May 1981 that the Committee should be enlarged to become a committee of the whole.

Chairman: Saran Singh (India) (until 31 July), Richard Manning (Australia) (from 1 August).

#### PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

The Programme Committee is a committee of the whole of the Executive Board of UNICEF.

Chairman: Dragan Mateljak (Yugoslavia) (until 31 July), Dr. Haydee Martinez de Osorio (Venezuela) (from 1 August).

#### UNICEF/WHO Joint Committee on Health Policy

The UNICEF/WHO Joint Committee on Health Policy was established in 1948 on a recommendation of 17 July 1948 of the first World Health Assembly of WHO. It consists of: six members of the UNICEF Executive Board, among whom are the chairmen of the Executive Board and the Programme Committee who serve ex officio; and six members of the WHO Executive Board.

Since its establishment, the Joint Committee had held 23 sessions, the twenty-third at Geneva on 2 and 3 February 1981.

Members:

UNICEF ex-officio members: Paal Bog, Chairman (Norway); Dragan Matijak, Rapporteur (Yugoslavia).

Elected by UNICEF: J. C. Ingram (Australia);<sup>a</sup> Dr. Haydee Martinez de Osorio (Venezuela); Dr. N. N. Mashalaba (Botswana); Saran Singh (India).

Appointed by WHO: Dr. S. Cardorelle (Congo); Dr. J. de Deus Lisboa Ramos, Rapporteur (Cape Verde);<sup>b</sup> I. Dogramaci (Turkey); Dr. R. Orejuela (Colombia);<sup>b</sup> Dr. Adeline Wynante Patterson (Jamaica); Dr. P. Rezal (Iran).<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Did not attend the twenty-third session.

<sup>b</sup>Alternates to Dr. A. Fakhro (Bahrain). Dr. Maureen M. Law (Canada) and Shwe Tin (Burma). who did not attend the twenty-third session.

#### United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)

##### TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The Trade and Development Board (p. 1517) reports to UNCTAD; it also reports annually to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

#### United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

##### GOVERNING COUNCIL

The Governing Council of UNDP consists of 48 members, elected by the Economic and Social Council from Member States of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of IAEA.

Twenty-seven seats are allocated to developing countries as follows: 11 to African countries, 9 to Asian countries and Yugoslavia, and 7 to Latin American countries.

Twenty-one seats are allocated to economically more advanced countries as follows: 17 to Western European and other countries, and 4 to Eastern European countries.

The term of office is three years, one third of the members being elected each year.

The Governing Council held its twenty-eighth session at United Nations Headquarters from 9 June to 1 July 1981.

Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981: Austria, Bangladesh, China, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, Fiji, Gambia, Greece, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Sierra Leone, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

To serve until 31 December 1982: Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Gabon, Kuwait, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Romania, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Uganda.

To serve until 31 December 1983: Argentina, Bulgaria, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, India, Netherlands, Niger, Pakistan, Poland, Somalia, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela, Yemen.

President: Frank Owen Abdulah (Trinidad and Tobago).

First Vice-President: Per Ole Jodahi (Sweden).

Second Vice-President: Hassan Gadel Hak (Egypt).

Third Vice-President: Ignatius Benedict Fonseka (Sri Lanka).

Rapporteur: Anton Baramov (Bulgaria).

On 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134), the Economic and Social Council elected the following 18 members for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981: Austria, Barbados, Bhutan, China, Ecuador, Fiji, Italy, Japan, Mali, Mexico, Spain, Tunisia, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Zambia.

Administrator of UNDP: F. Bradford Morse.

Deputy Administrator: G. Arthur Brown.

##### BUDGETARY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Budgetary and Finance Committee, a committee of the whole, held one series of meetings in 1981 at United Nations Headquarters between 8 June and 1 July.

Chairman: Per Ole Jodahi (Sweden).

Rapporteur: Kakima Ntambi (Uganda).

#### United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

##### GOVERNING COUNCIL

The Governing Council of UNEP (p. 1521) reports to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

United Nations Industrial Development  
Organization (UNIDO)

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The Industrial Development Board (p. 1521), the principal organ of UNIDO, reports annually to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

United Nations Institute for Training  
and Research (UNITAR)

The Executive Director of UNITAR (p. 1522) reports to the General Assembly and, as appropriate, to the Economic and Social Council.

United Nations Research Institute for  
social Development (UNRISD)

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The Board of Directors of UNRISD reports to the Economic and Social Council through the Commission for Social Development.

The Board consists of:

The Chairman, appointed by the Secretary-General: Mohamed Diawara (Ivory Coast);

Seven members, nominated by the Commission for Social Development and confirmed by the Economic and Social Council (to serve until 30 June 1983): Paul-Marc Henry (France), Karl Erick Knutsson (Sweden), Vera Nyitrai (Hungary), Achola Pala Okeyo (Kenya), K. N. Raj (India), Eugene B. Skolnikoff (United States); (to serve until 30 June 1985): Gustavo Eateva (Mexico);

Eight other members, as follows: a representative of the Secretary-General, the Director of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning, the Director of the Asian and Pacific Development Centre, the Director of the African Institute for Economic Development and Planning, the Executive Secretary of ECWA, the Director of UNRISD (ex officio), and the representatives of two of the following specialized agencies appointed as members and observers in annual rotation: ILO and FAO (members); UNESCO and WHO (observers).

a Nomination confirmed by the Economic and Social Council on 6 May 1981 (decision 1981/120): Karl Erick Knutsson (Sweden) for a further two-year term, and Gustavo Esteve (Mexico) for a four-year term, both beginning on 1 July.

United Nations Special Fund

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

The Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund (p. 1524) reports annually to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked  
Developing Countries

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

A Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries (p. 1524), when constituted, was to report to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

United Nations University

COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY

The Council of the United Nations University (p. 1524), the governing board of the University, reports annually to the General Assembly, to the Economic and Social Council and to the UNESCO Executive Board through the Secretary-General and the UNESCO Director-General.

World Food Council

The World Food Council (p. 1525), an organ of the United Nations at the ministerial or plenipotentiary level, reports to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

World Food Programme

COMMITTEE ON FOOD AID

POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES

The Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes, the governing body of WFP, consists of 30 members, of whom 15 are elected by the Economic and Social Council and 15 by the FAO Council, from Member States of the United Nations or from members of FAO. Members serve for three-year terms.

The Committee reports annually to the Economic and Social Council and to the FAO Council. It also submits periodic and special reports to the World Food Council.

The Committee held two sessions during 1981, at Rome: its eleventh from 11 to 21 May; and its twelfth from 19 to 29 October.

Members:

To serve until 31 December 1981:

Elected by Economic and Social Council: Japan, New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, Sweden.

Elected by FAO Council: Angola, Brazil, Kenya, Netherlands (Second Vice-Chairman), Thailand.

To serve until 31 December 1982:

Elected by Economic and Social Council: Argentina, Ireland, Lesotho, Mexico, United Kingdom.

Elected by FAO Council: Cuba, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Sierra Leone.

To serve until 31 December 1983:

Elected by Economic and Social Council: Denmark, Greece, Hungary, India, Morocco.

Elected by FAO Council: Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, Saudi Arabia (First Vice-Chairman), United States (Chairman).

On 7 May 1981 (decision 1981/134) and (with respect to Somalia) on 21 October (decision 1981/196), the Economic and Social Council elected Belgium, Finland, Japan, Pakistan and Somalia; and, on 26 November, the FAO Council elected Brazil, Congo, Mali, Netherlands and Thailand, all for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1982 to fill the vacancies occurring on 31 December 1981.

Executive Director of WFP: Garson Nathaniel Vogel (until 29 April), Bernardo de Azevedo Brito (Acting, from 30 April). Deputy Executive Director: Bernardo de Azevedo Brito (until 29 April).

## Trusteeship Council

Article 86 of the United Nations Charter lays down that the Trusteeship Council shall consist of the following: Members of the United Nations administering Trust Territories; permanent members of the Security Council which do not administer Trust Territories; as many other members elected for a

three-year term by the General Assembly as will ensure that the membership of the Council is equally divided between United Nations Members which administer Trust Territories and those which do not.

During 1981, only one Member of the United Nations was

an administering member of the Trusteeship Council, while four permanent members of the Security Council continued as non-administering members. Therefore, the parity called for by Article 86 of the Charter was not maintained.

## MEMBERS

Member administering a Trust Territory: United States.

Non-administering members: China, France, USSR, United Kingdom.

## SESSION

Forty-eighth session: United Nations Headquarters. 18 May-11 June 1981.

## OFFICERS

President: Marrack I. Goulding (United Kingdom).

Vice-President: Paul Poudade (France).

## International Court of Justice

## Judges of the Court

The International Court of Justice consists of 15 Judges elected for nine-year terms by the General Assembly and the Security Council, each voting independently.

The following were the Judges of the Court serving in 1981, listed in the order of precedence:

Judge	Country of nationality	End of term a
Sir Humphrey Waldock, President <sup>b</sup>	United Kingdom	1982
Taslim Olawale Elias, Vice-President <sup>c</sup>	Nigeria	1985
Isaac Forster	Senegal	1982
Andre Gros	France	1982
Manfred Lachs	Poland	1985
Platon D. Morozov	USSR	1988
Nagendra Singh	India	1982
Jose Maria Rude	Argentina	1982
Hermann Mosier	Federal Republic of Germany	1985
Shigeru Oda	Japan	1985
Roberto Ago	Italy	1988
Abdullah Ali El-Erian <sup>d</sup>	Egypt	1988
José Sette Câmara	Brazil	1988
Abdullah Fikri El-Khani	Syrian Arab Republic	1985
Stephen M. Schwebel	United States	1988

a Term expires on 5 February of the year indicated.

b Died on 15 August 1961; the resultant vacancy remained unfilled for the unexpired portion of his term.

c Also exercised the functions of the presidency as Acting President, from 15 August 1981.

d Died on 12 December 1981; the resultant vacancy had not been filled by the end of the year.

Registrar Santiago Torres Bernárdez.

Deputy Registrar: Alain Pillepich.

On 5 November 1981, elections were held in both the General Assembly (decision 36/309 A) and the Security Council to fill the vacancies occurring on 6 February 1982 with the expiration of the terms of office of the following Judges: Sir Humphrey Waldock (United Kingdom), Isaac Forster (Senegal), André Gros (France), Nagendra Singh (India), Jose, Maria Ruda (Argentina).

The following Judges were elected for a term of office ending on 5 February 1991: Sir Robert Y. Jennings (United Kingdom), Guy Ladrèit de Lacharrière (France), Kéba M'Baye (Senegal), Nagendra Singh (India), Jose Maria Ruda (Argentina).

## Chamber of Summary Procedure

(as constituted by the Court on 7 March 1981)

Members: Sir Humphrey Waldock (ex officio) (until 15 August 1981), Taslim Olawale Elias (ex officio), Platon D. Morozov, Nagendra Singh, Shigeru Oda.

Substitute members: José Sette Câmara, Abdullah Fikri El-Khani.

## Parties to the Court's Statute

All Members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. Also parties to it are the following non-members: Liechtenstein, San Marino, Switzerland.

## States accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court

Declarations made by the following States accepting the Court's compulsory jurisdiction (or made under the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and deemed to be an acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court) were in force at the end of 1981:

Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, Gambia, Haiti, Honduras, India, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

## United Nations organs and specialized and related agencies

authorized to request advisory opinions from the Court

Authorised by the United Nations Charter to request opinions on any legal question: General Assembly, Security Council. Authorised by the General Assembly in accordance with the Charter to request opinions on legal questions arising within the scope of their activities: Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council, Interim Committee of the General Assembly, Committee on Application for Review of Administrative Tribunal Judgements, ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, World Bank, IFC, IDA, IMF, ICAO, ITU, WMO, IMCO, WIPO, IFAD, IAEA.

## Committees of the Court

## BUDGETARY AND ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Members: Sir Humphrey Waldock (ex officio) (until 15 August 1981), Taslim Olawale Elias (ex officio), Andre Gros, Manfred Lachs, Jose Maria Rude.

## COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS

Members: Platon D. Morozov, Shigeru Oda, José Sette Câmara.

## LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Members: Jose Maria Ruda, Hermann Mosler, Shigeru Oda, Stephen M. Schwebel.

## RULES COMMITTEE

Members: Manfred Lachs, Platon D. Morozov, Hermann Mosler, Roberto Ago, Abdullah Ali El-Erian (until 12 December 1981).

## Principal members of the Secretariat

(as at 31 December 1981)

### Secretariat

The Secretary-General: Kurt Waldheim

Executive Office of the Secretary-General  
Under-Secretary-General, Chef de Cabinet: Rafeeuddin Ahmed

Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation  
Director-General: K K K. S. Dadzie

Office of the Under-Secretaries-General for Special Political Affairs  
Under-Secretary-General: Diego Cordóvez  
Under-Secretary-General: Brian E. Urquhart  
Assistant Secretary-General: Fou-tchin Liu

Office (or Special Political Questions)  
Under-Secretary-General, Co-ordinator, Special Economic Assistance Programmes: Abdulrahim Abby Farah  
Assistant Secretary-General, Joint Co-ordinator, Unit for Special Economic Assistance Programmes: Gordon K. Goundrey

Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs  
Under-Secretary-General: William B. Buffum  
Assistant Secretary-General, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs in South-East Asia: M'Hamed Essaafi

Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters  
Assistant Secretary-General: Robert Muller

Office of Legal Affairs  
Under-Secretary-General, the Legal Counsel: Erik Suy

Department of Political and Security Council Affairs  
Under-Secretary-General: Viacheslav A. Ustinov  
Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament: Jan Martenson

Department of Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization  
Under-Secretary-General: Issoufou Saidou Djermakoye

Department of International Economic and Social Affairs  
Under-Secretary-General: Jean L. Ripert  
Assistant Secretary-General for Development Research and Policy Analysis: P. N. Dhar  
Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination: Peter Hansen  
Assistant Secretary-General for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs: Leticia Ft. Shahani

Department of Technical Co-operation for Development  
Under-Secretary-General: Bi Jilong  
Assistant Secretary-General: Margaret J. Anstee

Economic Commission for Europe  
Under-Secretary-General, Executive Secretary: Janez I. Stanovnik

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific  
Assistant Secretary-General, Executive Secretary: Shah A. M. S. Kibria

Economic Commission for Latin America  
Under-Secretary-General, Executive Secretary: Enrique V. Iglesias

Economic Commission for Africa  
Under-Secretary-General, Executive Secretary: Adebayo Adedeji

Economic Commission for Western Asia  
Under-Secretary-General, Executive Secretary: Mohamed-Said Al-Attar

Centre for Science and Technology for Development  
Assistant Secretary-General, Executive Director: Amílcar F. Ferrari

United Nations Centre for Human Settlements  
Under-Secretary-General, Executive Director: Arcot Ramachandran

United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations  
Assistant Secretary-General, Executive Director: Klaus Aksel Sahlgren

Department of Administration, Finance and Management  
Under-Secretary-General: Helmut F. Debatin

OFFICE OF FINANCIAL SERVICES  
Assistant Secretary-General: Patricia Ruedas

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL SERVICES  
Assistant Secretary-General: James O. C. Jonah

OFFICE OF GENERAL SERVICES  
Assistant Secretary-General: Clayton C. Timbrell

Department of Conference Services  
Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services and Special Assignments: Bohdan Lewandowski

Department of Public Information  
Under-Secretary-General: Yasushi Akashi

United Nations Office at Geneva  
Under-Secretary-General, Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva: Luigi Cottafavi  
Assistant Secretary-General, Deputy Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva: Mowaffak Aliaf  
Assistant Secretary-General, Personal Representative of the Secretary-General, Secretary of the Committee on Disarmament: Rikhi Jaipal

International Court of Justice Registry  
Registrar: Santiago Torres Bernárdez

### Secretariats of subsidiary organs, special representatives and other related bodies

Co-ordination of the United Nations Humanitarian Programmes Resulting from Developments in Kampuchea  
Under-Secretary-General, Special Representative of the Secretary-General: Sir Robert Jackson

Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia  
Assistant Secretary-General, United Nations Commissioner for Namibia: Martti Ahtisaari

Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator  
Under-Secretary-General, Disaster Relief Co-ordinator:  
Faruk N. Berkol

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees  
High Commissioner: Poul Hartling  
Deputy High Commissioner: William Richard Smyser

Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration  
and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space  
Assistant Secretary-General, Secretary-General of the Con-  
ference: Yash Pal

Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea  
Under-Secretary-General, Special Representative of the  
Secretary-General/c Bernardo Zuleta

United Nations Assistance for the Reconstruction  
and Development of Lebanon  
Co-ordinator Iqbal A. Akhund

United Nations Children's Fund  
Under-Secretary-General/, Executive Director: James P. Grant  
Assistant Secretary-General/, Deputy Executive Director:  
Margaret Yvonne Catley-Carison  
Assistant Secretary-General/, Deputy Executive Director,  
Programmes: Richard Jolly  
Assistant Secretary-General, Deputy Executive Director,  
External Affairs: Varindra T. Vittachi  
Assistant Secretary-General/, Special Adviser: Lucille M.  
Mair

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development  
Under-Secretary-General/, Secretary-General/ of the Confe-  
rence: Gamani Corea  
Assistant Secretary-General, Deputy Secretary-General of  
the Conference: Johannes Pronk

United Nations Development Programme  
Administrator: F. Bradford Morse  
Deputy Administrator: G. Arthur Brown  
Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Finance and Admin-  
istration: Pierre Vinde  
Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Special Activities: Paul  
Thyness  
Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau for Pro-  
gramme Policy and Evaluation: Horst Wiesebach  
Executive Director, United Nations Fund for Population  
Activities: Rafael M. Salas  
Deputy Executive Director, United Nations Fund for Popu-  
lation Activities: Halvor Gille  
Assistant Administrator and Regional Director, Regional  
Bureau for Africa: Michel Doo Kingué

Assistant Administrator and Regional Director, Regional  
Bureau for Arab States: Salah Al-Shaikhly  
Assistant Administrator and Regional Director, Regional  
Bureau for Asia and the Pacific: Andrew J. Joseph  
Assistant Administrator and Regional Director, Regional  
Bureau for Latin America: Carlos S. Vegega

United Nations Disengagement Observer Force  
Force Commander: Major-General Erkki Raine Kaira

United Nations Environment Programme  
Executive Director: Mostafa Kamal Tolba  
Assistant Secretary-General/, Deputy Executive Director:  
Peter Shaw Thacher  
Assistant Secretary-General, Assistant Executive Director,  
Office of the Environment Fund and Administration:  
Rudolf Schmidt

United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control  
Assistant Secretary-General/, Executive Director: Bror A.  
Rexed

United Nations Industrial Development Organization  
Under-Secretary-General, Executive Director: Abd-El  
Rahman Khane  
Assistant Secretary-General/, Deputy Executive Director:  
Philippe Jacques Farlan Carré

United Nations Institute for Training and Research  
Under-Secretary-General, Executive Director: Davidson S. H.  
W. Nicol

United Nations Interim Force In Lebanon  
Force Commander: Lieutenant-General William Callaghan

United Nations Peace-keeping Force In Cyprus  
Force Commander: Major-General Guenther G. Greindl  
Special Representative of the Secretary-General/: Hugo J.  
Gobbi

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine  
Refugees In the Near East  
Commissioner-General: Olaf Rydbeck

United Nations Truce Supervision Organization In Palestine  
Assistant Secretary-General/, Chief of Staff: Major-General  
Emmanuel Alexander Erskine

United Nations University  
Rector: Mr. Soedjatmoko

World Food Council  
Assistant Secretary-General, Executive Director: Maurice J.  
Williams

---

On 31 December 1981, the total number of staff of the United Nations holding permanent, probationary and fixed-term appointments with service or expected service of a year or more was 26,281. Of these, 8,878 were in the Professional and higher categories and 17,403 were in the General

Service, Manual Worker and Field Service categories. Of the same total, 22,826 were regular staff serving at Headquarters or other established offices and 3,455 were assigned as project personnel to technical co-operation projects. In addition, UNRWA had some 16,500 local area staff.

## Appendix IV

## Agenda of United Nations principal organs in 1981

This appendix lists the items on the agenda of the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council during 1981. The column headed "Page" shows the page of the present volume on which a summary of the main treatment of each item begins. For the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, the column headed "Allocation" indicates the assignment of each item to plenary meetings or committees.

Agenda item titles have been shortened by omitting mention of reports following the subject of the item. Thus, 'Question of Cyprus: report of the Secretary-General' has been shortened to 'Question of Cyprus'. Where the subject-matter

of the item is not apparent from its title, the subject is identified in square brackets; this is not part of the title.

As treatment of topics in the yearbook does not always correspond to agenda items, the page number cited in the last column does not necessarily refer to the treatment of all resolutions or decisions adopted under that item. Thus, under item 12, "Report of the Economic and Social Council", the reference is to a page in the yearbook describing the Assembly's treatment of that report; no reference is given to the resolutions on specific topics adopted under that item. These may be found by resolution or decision number in the INDEX OF RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS.

## General Assembly

Agenda items considered at the resumed thirty-fifth session  
(2-6 March, 11 May and 14 September 1981)<sup>1</sup>

Item No.	Title	Allocation	Page
3.	Credentials of representatives to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly: (b) Report of the Credentials Committee.	Plenary	351
8.	Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.	Plenary	-
20.	Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.	Plenary	127
27.	Question of Namibia.	Plenary	1129
30.	Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council.	Plenary	353
123.	Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development.	Plenary	378

Agenda of the eighth emergency special session  
(3-14 September 1981)

Item No.	Title	Allocation	Page
1.	Opening of the session by the President of the General Assembly.	Plenary	-
2.	Minute of silent prayer or meditation.	Plenary	-
3.	Credentials of representatives to the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly: (a) Appointment of the members of the Credentials Committee; (b) Report of the Credentials Committee.	Plenary Plenary	1507 351
4.	Adoption of the agenda.	Plenary	351
5.	Question of Namibia.	Plenary	1140

Agenda of the thirty-sixth session  
(first part, 15 September- 18 December 1981)

Item No.	Title	Allocation	Page
1.	Opening of the session by the Chairman of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany.	Plenary	-
2.	Minute of silent prayer or meditation.	Plenary	-
3.	Credentials of representatives to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly: (a) Appointment of the members of the Credentials Committee; (b) Report of the Credentials Committee.	Plenary Plenary	1507 351

<sup>1</sup> For items considered on 15 and 16 January 1981, see YUN 1980.



# Agenda of United Nations principal organs

1545

Item No.	Title	Allocation	Page
4.	Election of the President of the General Assembly.	Plenary	350
5.	Election of the officers of the Main Committees.	Plenary	1506
6.	Election of the Vice-Presidents of the General Assembly.	Plenary	1506
7.	Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations [on matters before the Security Council].	Plenary	353
8.	Adoption of the agenda and organization of work:		
	(a) Report of the General Committee;	Plenary	351
	(b) Subsidiary organs of the General Assembly.	5th	1366
9.	General debate.	Plenary	
10.	Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization.	Plenary	3
11.	Report of the Security Council.	Plenary	353
12.	Report of the Economic and Social Council.	Plenary. 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th	1092
13.	Report of the International Court of Justice.	Plenary	1203
14.	Report of the international Atomic Energy Agency:		
	(a) Report of the Agency;	Plenary	712
	(b) United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy.	Plenary	714
15.	Elections to fill vacancies in principal organs:		
	(a) Election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council;	Plenary	1527
	(b) Election of eighteen members of the Economic and Social Council;	Plenary	1528
	(c) Election of five members of the international Court of Justice.	Plenary	1203
16.	Appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.	Plenary	347
17.	Elections to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs:		
	(a) Election of fifteen members of the industrial Development Board;	Plenary	1522
	(b) Election of twenty members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme;	Plenary	1521
	(c) Election of twelve members of the World Food Council;	Plenary	1525
	(d) Election of seven members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination;	Plenary	1535
	(e) Election of the members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries;	Plenary	415
	(f) Election of the members of the international Law Commission.	Plenary	1513
18.	Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments:		
	(a) Appointment of five members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;	5th	1507
	(b) Appointment of six members of the Committee on Contributions;	5th	1507
	(c) Appointment of a member of the Board of Auditors;	5th	1509
	(d) Confirmation of the appointment of three members of the investments Committee;	5th	1513
	(e) Appointment of two members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal;	5th	1517
	(f) Appointment of five members of the international Civil Service Commission;	5th	1324
	(g) Appointment of six members of the Joint Inspection Unit;	Plenary	1514
	(h) Appointment of the members of the Peace Observation Commission;	Plenary	1514
	(i) Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia;	Plenary	
	(j) Confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries;	Plenary	415
	(k) Appointment of an alternate member of the United Nations Staff Pension Committee.	5th	1524
19.	Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.	Plenary. 4th	1095
20.	Admission of new Members to the United Nations.	Plenary	348
21.	Return or restitution of cultural property to the countries of origin.	Plenary	776
22.	The situation in Kampuchea.	Plenary	243
23.	Draft World Charter for Nature.	Plenary	834
24.	Historical responsibility of States for the preservation of nature for present and future generations.	Plenary	835
25.	Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference.	Plenary	355
26.	The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security.	Plenary	233
27.	Question of the Comorian island of Mayotte.	Plenary	223
28.	Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.	Plenary	130
29.	Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity.	Plenary	229
30.	international Year of Disabled Persons.	Plenary	798
31.	Question of Palestine.	Plenary	264

Item No.	Title	Allocation	Page
32.	Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa.	Plenary, SPC <sup>2</sup>	156
33.	The situation in the Middle East.	Plenary	257
34.	Question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia.	Plenary	252
35.	Question of Cyprus.		343
36.	Question of Namibia.	Plenary, 4th <sup>2</sup>	1144
37.	Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development.	Plenary	379
38.	Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council.	Plenary	353
39.	Second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.	1 st	28
40.	Reduction of military budgets.	1 st	90
41.	implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/143 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).	1 st	48
42.	Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.	1 st	70
43.	Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons.	1 st	64
44.	implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/145 B.	1 st	64
45.	Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.	1 st	44
46.	Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.	1 st	49
47.	Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.	1 st	55
48.	Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.	1 st	77
49.	implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.	1 st	94
50.	World Disarmament Conference.	1 st	26
51.	Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session:		
	(a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;	1 st	30
	(b) Report of the Committee on Disarmament;	1 st	31
	(c) Programme of research and studies on disarmament;	1 st	107
	(d) Study on the relationship between disarmament and development;	1 st	97
	(e) United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament;	1 st	108
	(f) Nuclear weapons in all aspects;	1 st	35
	(g) Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war;	1 st	41
	(h) Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session;	1 st	23
	(i) World Disarmament Campaign;	1 st	110
	(j) Disarmament Week.	1 st	112
52.	United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively injurious or to Have indiscriminate Effects.	1 st	84
53.	Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.	1 st	58
54.	Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.	1 st	58
55.	General and complete disarmament:		
	(a) Report of the Committee on Disarmament;	1 st	-
	(b) Study on the institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament;	1 st	105
	(c) Confidence-building measures;	1 st	103
	(d) Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present;	1 st	56
	(e) Study on all the aspects of regional disarmament;	1 st	88
	(f) Study on the relationship between disarmament and international security;	1 st	100
	(g) Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons;	1 st	79
	(h) Review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament;	1 st	33
	(i) Disarmament and International security;	1 st	100
	(j) Strategic arms limitation talks.	1 st	37
56.	Israeli nuclear armament.	1 st	51
57.	Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States.	1 st	150
58.	Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security:		
	(a) Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of international Security;	1 st	141
	(b) Non-interference in the internal affairs of States;	1 st	145
	(c) implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace.	1 st	149
59.	Effects of atomic radiation.	SPC	361

<sup>2</sup> Hearings of organizations.

Item No.	Title	Allocation	Page
60.	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.	SPC	325
61.	International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space.	SPC	113
62.	Preparation of an international convention on principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting.	SPC	119
63.	Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects.	SPC	152
64.	Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories.	SPC	301
65.	Question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India.	SPC	225
66.	International co-operation to avert new flows of refugees.	SPC	1050
67.	Questions relating to information.	SPC	362
68.	Question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations.	SPC	357
69.	Development and international economic co-operation:		
	(a) International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;	2nd	560
	(b) Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States;	2nd	382
	(c) Trade and development;	2nd	532
	(d) Industrialization;	2nd	577
	(e) Science and technology for development;	2nd	738
	(f) Natural resources;	2nd	676
	(g) Food problems;	2nd	719
	(h) Economic and technical co-operation among developing countries;	2nd	463
	(i) Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system;	2nd	1092
	(j) Environment;	2nd	813
	(k) Human settlements;	2nd	843
	(l) Effective mobilization and integration of women in development;	2nd	986
	(m) Long-term trends in economic development;	2nd	389
	M United Nations Special Fund;	2nd	417
	(o) United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy;	2nd	690
	(p) United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries.	2nd	408
70.	Operational activities for development:		
	(a) Operational activities of the United Nations system;	2nd	428
	(b) United Nations Development Programme;	2nd	434
	(c) United Nations Capital Development Fund;	2nd	468
	(d) United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration;	2nd	—
	(e) United Nations Fund for Population Activities;	2nd	792
	(f) United Nations Volunteers programme;	2nd	461
	(g) United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries;	2nd	415
	(h) United Nations Children's Fund;	2nd	999
	(i) World Food Programme;	2nd	728
	(j) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General.	2nd	—
71.	Training and research:		
	(a) United Nations Institute for Training and Research;	2nd	805
	(b) United Nations University;	2nd	810
	(c) Unified approach to development analysis and planning.	2nd	396
72.	Special economic and disaster relief assistance:		
	(a) Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator;	2nd	475
	(b) Special economic assistance programmes;	2nd	495
	(c) Implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region.	2nd	487
73.	Review and co-ordination of human rights programmes of organizations in the United Nations system and co-operation with other international programmes in the field of human rights.	3rd	927
74.	Implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.	3rd	865
75.	Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance.	3rd	879
76.	International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace.	3rd	1019
77.	Policies and programmes relating to youth:		
	(a) Physical education and sports exchanges among young people;	3rd	1018
	(b) Channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations;	3rd	1017
	(c) Co-ordination and information in the field of youth.	3rd	—
78.	National experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress.	3rd	764
79.	Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms:		
	(a) Implementation of General Assembly resolutions 34/46 and 35/1 74;	3rd	926
	(b) National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights.	3rd	941
80.	Question of the elderly and the aged.	3rd	1022

Item No.	Title	Allocation	Page
81.	importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights.	3rd	892
82.	Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination:		
	(a) Report of the committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination;	3rd	871
	(b) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;	3rd	874
	(c) Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid.	3rd	947
83.	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees:		
	(a) Report of the High Commissioner;	3rd	1029
	(b) International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa.	3rd	1040
84.	World Assembly on Aging.	3rd	1025
85.	Human rights and scientific and technological developments.	3rd	976
86.	Question of a convention on the rights of the child.	3rd	970
87.	International Covenants on Human Rights:		
	(a) Report of the Human Rights Committee;	3rd	890
	(b) Status of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;	3rd	933
	(c) Elaboration of a second optional protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.	3rd	899
88.	United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace:		
	(a) World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women;	3rd	980
	(b) Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women;	3rd	983
	(c) Draft Declaration on the Participation of Women In the Struggle for the Strengthening of International Peace and Security and against Colonialism. Apartheid, All Forms of Racism and Racial Discrimination, Foreign Aggression, Occupation and All Forms of Foreign Domination.	3rd	990
89.	Status of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.	3rd	994
90.	Crime prevention and criminal justice and development.	3rd	772
91.	Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment:		
	(a) Unilateral declarations by Member States against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment;	3rd	901
	(b) Draft Code of Medical Ethics.	3rd	903
92.	Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations.	4th	1115
93.	Question of East Timor.	4th	1183
94.	Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa.	4th	1105
95.	Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations.	4th	1100
96.	United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa.	4th	1117
97.	Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories.	4th	1116
98.	Financial reports and accounts, and reports of the Board of Auditors:		
	(a) United Nations Development Programme;	5th	450
	(b) United Nations Children's Fund;	5th	1008
	(c) United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East;	5th	331
	(d) United Nations Institute for Training and Research;	5th	808
	(e) Voluntary funds administered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;	5th	1038
	(f) United Nations Fund for Population Activities;	5th	785
	(g) Organization and professional practices of the Board of Auditors.	5th	1303
99.	Programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981.	5th	1282
100.	Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.	5th	1272
101.	Programme planning.	5th	1306
102.	Financial emergency of the United Nations.	5th	1296
103.	Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency:		
	(a) Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;	5th	1314

Item No.	Title	Allocation	Page
	(b) Feasibility of establishing a single administrative tribunal;	5th	1360
	(c) Impact of inflation on the budgets of the organizations of the United Nations system.	5th	1300
104.	Joint Inspection Unit.	5th	1313
105.	Pattern of conferences.	5th	1363
106.	Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations.	5th	1288
107.	Personnel questions:		
	(a) Composition of the Secretariat;	5th	1317
	(b) Other personnel questions.	5th	1326
108.	Report of the International Civil Service Commission.	5th	1323
109.	United Nations pension system.	5th	1343
110.	Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East:		
	(a) United Nations Disengagement Observer Force;	5th	295
	(b) United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon.	5th	298
111.	Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind.	6th	1212
112.	Progressive development of the principles and norms of International law relating to the new international economic order.	6th	1261
113.	United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law.	6th	1268
114.	Measures to prevent International terrorism which endangers or takes innocent human lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms and study of the underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair and which cause some people to sacrifice human lives, including their own, in an attempt to effect radical changes.	6th	1219
115.	Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries.	6th	1216
116..	Report of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force In International Relations.	6th	1205
117.	Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its fourteenth session.	6th	1252
118.	Peaceful settlement of disputes between States.	6th	1209
119.	Consideration of the draft articles on most-favoured-nation clauses.	6th	1257
120.	Review of the multilateral treaty-making process.	6th	1245
121.	Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirty-third session.	6th	1264
122.	Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization.	6th	1235
123.	Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country.	6th	1242
124.	Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives.	6th	1223
125.	Draft Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment.	6th	900
126.	Registration and publication of treaties and international agreements pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.	6th	1250
127.	Twenty-fifth anniversary of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee.	Plenary	1269
128.	Conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space.	1 st	80
129.	International campaign against traffic in drugs.	3rd	1061
130.	Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security.	Plenary	279
131.	Solemn observance of the twentieth anniversary of the first Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries.	Plenary	356
132.	Co-operation between the United Nations and the League of Arab States.	Plenary	354
133.	Declaration of a Peace Year, a Peace Month and a Peace Day.	Plenary	155
134.	Observer status for the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States In the General Assembly.	Plenary	352
135.	Prevention of nuclear catastrophe: declaration of the General Assembly.	1 st	42
136.	Israel's decision to build a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea.	SPC	319
137.	Equitable representation in the International Law Commission and enlargement of Its composition.	Plenary	1266
138.	New international humanitarian order.	3rd	968

## Security Council

### Agenda items considered during 1981<sup>3</sup>

Item No.	Title	Page
1.	Election of two members of the International Court of Justice.	1203
2.	The situation in Namibia.	1128,1133
3.	The question of South Africa.	193,195
4.	The situation in the Middle East.	284,294
5.	The situation in Cyprus.	341
6.	Complaint by Iraq [against Israel].	276
7.	Admission of new Members.	348
8.	Letter dated 1 September 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Malta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council [complaint against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya].	359
9.	Complaint by Angola against South Africa.	218
10.	Recommendation regarding the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.	347
11.	Election of five members of the International Court of Justice.	1203
12.	Consideration of the draft report of the Security Council to the General Assembly.	353
13.	Complaint by Seychelles.	226
14.	The situation in the occupied Arab territories.	309

<sup>3</sup>Numbers indicate the order in which items were taken up in 1981.

## Economic and Social Council

### Agenda of the organizational session for 1981 (3-8 February 1981)

Item No.	Title	Allocation	Page
1.	Election of the Bureau.	Plenary	1528
2.	Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters.	Plenary	1091
3.	Basic programme of work of the Council for 1981 and 1982.	Plenary	1090
4.	Elections to subsidiary bodies of the Council and confirmation of representatives on the functional commissions.	Plenary	1528
5.	Provisional agenda for the first regular session of 1981.	Plenary	1091

### Agenda of the first regular session of 1981 (14 April- 8 May 1981)

Item No.	Title	Allocation	Page
1.	Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters.	Plenary	1091
2.	Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.	Plenary	864
3.	Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.	Plenary	915
4.	Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance.	Plenary	471,1027
5.	Regional cartographic conferences.	Plenary	687
6.	Non-governmental organizations.	Plenary	1077
7.	Human rights questions.	2nd	859
8.	Measures to improve the situation and ensure the human rights and dignity of all migrant workers.	2nd	884
9.	Activities for the advancement of women: United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace.	2nd	979
10.	Social development questions.	2nd	761
11.	Narcotic drugs.	2nd	1056
12.	Unified approach to development analysis and planning.	1 st	395
13.	Statistical questions.	1 st	1068

## Agenda of United Nations principal organs

1551

Item No.	Title	Allocation	Page
14. Population questions.		1 st	778
15. Transport of dangerous goods.		1 st	569
16. Elections.		Plenary	1528
17. Consideration of the provisional agenda for the second regular session of 1981.		Plenary	1091

### Agenda of the second regular session of 1981 (1-24 July 1961; resumed 21 October, 2 and 25 November)

Item No.	Title	Allocation	Page
1. Opening of the session.		Plenary	-
2. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters.		Plenary	1091
3. General discussion of international economic and social policy, including regional and sectoral developments.		Plenary	386
4. Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance.		Plenary	471,1042
5. Human rights questions.		Plenary	938
6. Calendar of conferences.		Plenary	1089
7. Regional co-operation.		1 st	607
8. Transport and Communications Decade in Africa.		1 st	614
9. international co-operation in the field of human settlements.		1 st	843
10. Food problems.		1 st	716
11. International co-operation on the environment.		1 st	813
12. Transnational corporations. <sup>4</sup>			189,605
13. Population questions.		1 st	778
14. Industrial development co-operation.		1 st	576
15. Natural resources.		1 st	673
16. Science and technology. <sup>4</sup>			751
17. Operational activities.		3rd	418,675, 999
18. International co-operation and co-ordination within the United Nations system.		3rd	557,571, 802,1076, 1385
19. Draft programme budget for 1982-1983.		3rd	1274
20. Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations.		3rd	1099
21. Assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement by agencies and Institutions within the United Nations system.		3rd	208
22. Implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region.		3rd	486
23. Trade and development. <sup>4</sup>			539
24. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.”			890
25. United Nations University. <sup>4</sup>			810
26. Examination of long-term trends in economic development. <sup>4</sup>			389
27. Nomination of members of the World Food Council. <sup>4</sup>			1525
28. Elections <sup>4</sup>			1528

<sup>4</sup> Item considered at the resumed second regular session only, at plenary meetings.

## Trusteeship Council

### Agenda of the forty-eighth session (18 May- 11 June 1981)

Item No.	Title	Page
1. Adoption of the agenda.		
2. Report of the Secretary-General on credentials.		

Item No.	Title	Page
3.	Election of the President and the Vice-President.	1541
4.	Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 September 1980: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.	1120
5.	Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda.	1118
6.	Arrangements for the dispatch of a periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.	1119
7.	Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories.	1119
8.	Dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories.	1119
9.	Co-operation with the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.	1120
10.	Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.	1120
11.	Attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories and the situation in Trust Territories with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.	1119
12.	Co-operation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to colonial Countries and Peoples.	1119
13.	Adoption of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council.	1120



## Appendix V

## United Nations Information Centres and Offices

(As at 31 December 1981)

ACCRA. United Nations Information Centre  
Liberia and Maxwell Roads  
(P. O. Box 2339)  
Accra, Ghana  
Serving: Ghana, Sierra Leone

ADDIS ABABA. United Nations Information Service, Economic Commission for Africa  
Africa Hall  
(P. O. Box 3001 )  
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia  
Serving: Ethiopia

ALGIERS. United Nations Information Centre  
19 Avenue Chahid El Waly Mustapha Sayed  
Algiers, Algeria  
Serving: Algeria

ANKARA. United Nations Information Centre  
197 Atatürk Bulvari  
(P. K. 407)  
Ankara, Turkey  
Serving: Turkey

ANTANANARIVO. United Nations Information Centre  
22 Rue Rainitovo  
Antsahavola  
(Boîte Postale 1348)  
Antananarivo, Madagascar  
Serving: Madagascar

ASUNCION. United Nations Information Centre  
Calle Estrella y Chile  
Edificio City (3er piso)  
(Casilla de Correo 1107)  
Asunción, Paraguay  
Serving: Paraguay

ATHENS. United Nations Information Centre  
36 Amalia Avenue  
Athens 119, Greece  
Serving: Cyprus, Greece, Israel

BAGHDAD. United Nations Information Service, Economic Commission for Western Asia  
Khairat Building, Saadoun Street  
near Unknown Soldier Square  
(P. O. Box 27)  
Baghdad, Iraq  
Serving: Iraq

BANGKOK. United Nations Information Service, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific  
United Nations Building  
Rajdamnern Avenue  
Bangkok 2, Thailand

Serving: Democratic Kampuchea, Hong Kong, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam

BEIRUT. United Nations Information Centre  
Apt. No. 1, Fakhoury Building  
Montée Baim Militaire  
(P. O. Box 4656)  
Beirut, Lebanon

Serving: Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Syrian Arab Republic

BELGRADE. United Nations Information Centre  
Svetozara Markovica 58  
(P. O. Box 157)  
Belgrade, Yugoslavia YU-11001  
Serving: Albania, Yugoslavia

BOGOTA. United Nations Information Centre  
Calle 61 No. 13-23 (piso 5)  
(Apartado Aéreo 058964)  
Bogota 2, Colombia  
Serving: Colombia, Ecuador, Venezuela

BRUSSELS. United Nations Information Centre and Liaison Office  
108 Rue d'Arlon  
1040 Brussels, Belgium

Serving: Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands; liaison with European Communities

BUCHAREST. United Nations Information Centre  
16 Aurel Vlaicu Street  
(P. O. Box 1-701 )  
Bucharest, Romania  
Serving: Romania

BUENOS AIRES. United Nations Information Centre  
Ugarteche 3069  
1425 Buenos Aires, Argentina  
serving: Argentina, Uruguay

BUJUMBURA. United Nations Information Centre  
Avenue de la Poste 7  
Place de l'Indépendance  
(Boîte Postale 2160)  
Bujumbura, Burundi  
Serving: Burundi

CAIRO. United Nations Information Centre  
1 Osiris Street  
Tagher Building (Garden City)  
(Boîte Postale 282)  
Cairo, Egypt  
Serving: Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Yemen

COLOMBO. United Nations Information Centre  
202-204 Baudhaloka Mawatha  
(P. O. Box 1505)  
Colombo 7, Sri Lanka  
Serving: Sri Lanka

COPENHAGEN. United Nations Information Centre  
37 H. C. Andersen Boulevard  
DK 1553 Copenhagen V, Denmark  
Serving: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden

DACCA. United Nations Information Centre  
House 12, Road 6  
Dhanmondi  
(G. P. O. Box 3658)  
Dacca, Bangladesh  
Serving: Bangladesh

DAKAR. United Nations Information Centre  
9 Allée Robert Delmas  
(Boîte Postale 154)  
Dakar, Senegal  
Serving: Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Mauritania, Senegal

DAR ES SALAAM. United Nations Information Centre  
Zumora Machel Avenue  
Metasalamat Building (1 st floor)  
(P. O. Box 9224)  
Dar es Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania  
Serving: Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania

GENEVA. United Nations Information Service, United Nations Office at Geneva  
Palais des Nations  
1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland  
Serving: Bulgaria, Holy See, Hungary, Poland, Spain, Switzerland

ISLAMABAD. United Nations Information Centre  
House No. 26  
88th Street, Ramna 6/3  
(P. O. Box 1107)  
Islamabad, Pakistan  
Serving: Pakistan

<p>KABUL. United Nations Information Centre Shah Mahmoud Ghazi Watt (P. O. Box 5) Kabul, Afghanistan Serving: Afghanistan</p>	<p>LONDON. United Nations Information Centre 14/15 Stratford Place London, W1 N 9AF, England Serving: Ireland, United Kingdom</p>	<p>PARIS. United Nations Information Centre 4 et 6 Avenue de Saxe 75700 Paris, France Serving: France</p>
<p>KATHMANDU. United Nations Information Centre Lazimpat (P. O. Box 107) Kathmandu, Nepal Serving: Nepal</p>	<p>LUSAKA. United Nations Information Centre P. O. Box 32905 Lusaka, Zambia Serving: Botswana, Malawi, Namibia, Swaziland, Zambia</p>	<p>PORT MORESBY. United Nations Information Centre Towers Building (ground floor) Musgrave Street, Ela Beach (P. O. Box 472) Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea Serving: Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands</p>
<p>KHARTOUM. United Nations Information Centre Al Qasr Avenue, Street No. 15 Block 3, House 3 East Khartoum East (P. O. Box 1992) Khartoum, Sudan Serving: Somalia, Sudan</p>	<p>MANAMA. United Nations Information Centre King Faisal Road, Gufool (P. O. Box 26004) Manama, Bahrain Serving: Bahrain, Qatar, United Arab Emirates</p>	<p>PORT OF SPAIN. United Nations Information Centre 15 Keate Street (P. O. Box 130) Port of Spain, Trinidad Serving: Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Netherlands Antilles, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago</p>
<p>KINSHASA. United Nations Information Centre Bâtiment Deuxième République Boulevard du 30 Juin (Boîte Postale 7248) Kinshasa, Zaïre Serving: Zaïre</p>	<p>MANILA. United Nations Information Centre NEDA Building (ground floor) 106 Amorsolo Street Legaspi Village, Makati (P. O. Box 7285 (ADC), MIA Road, Pasay City) Metro Manila, Philippines Serving: Philippines</p>	<p>PRAGUE. United Nations Information Centre Panska 5 11000 Prague 1, Czechoslovakia Serving: Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic</p>
<p>LAGOS. United Nations Information Centre 17 Kingsway, Ikoyi (P. O. Box 1068) Lagos, Nigeria Serving: Nigeria</p>	<p>MASERU. United Nations Information Centre Corner Hilton Road opposite Sanlam Centre Kingsway (P. O. Box 301) Maseru 100, Lesotho Serving: Lesotho</p>	<p>RABAT. United Nations Information Centre Angle Charia Moulay Hassan et Zankat Assafi (Casier ONU) Rabat-Chellah, Morocco Serving: Morocco</p>
<p>LA PAZ. United Nations Information Centre Avenida Arce No. 2529 Edificio Santa Isabel Bioque C. 2° Mezzanine (Apartado Postal 686) La Paz, Bolivia Serving: Bolivia</p>	<p>MEXICO CITY. United Nations Information Centre Presidente Masaryk 29 (7° plso) Mexico 5, D. F., Mexico Serving: Cuba, Dominican Republic, Mexico</p>	<p>RANGOON. United Nations Information Centre 18A Manawhari Road (P. O. Box 230) Rangoon, Burma Serving: Burma</p>
<p>LIMA. United Nations Information Centre Av. Los Incas 580, San Isidro Bosque El Olivar (Apartado Postal 11199) Lima, Peru Serving: Peru</p>	<p>MONROVIA. United Nations Information Centre LBID Building Main Road, Congotown (P. O. Box 274) Monrovia, Liberia Serving: Liberia</p>	<p>RIO DE JANEIRO. United Nations Information Centre Rua Cruz Lima 19, Grupo 201 22230 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil RJ Serving: Brazil</p>
<p>LISBON. United Nations Information Centre Rua Latino Coelho No. 1 Edifício Aviz, Bioco Al -10' 1000 Lisbon, Portugal Serving: Portugal</p>	<p>MOSCOW. United Nations Information Centre 4/16 Ulitsa Lunacharskogo Moscow 121002, USSR Serving: Byelorussian SSR, Ukrainian SSR, USSR</p>	<p>ROME. United Nations Information Centre Palazzetto Venezia Piazza San Marco 50 Rome, Italy Serving: Italy, Malta</p>
<p>LOME. United Nations Information Centre Rue Albert Sarraut coin Avenue de Gaulle (Boîte Postale 911) Lomé, Togo Serving: Benin, Togo</p>	<p>NAIROBI. United Nations Information Centre P. O. Box 30218 Nairobi, Kenya Serving: Kenya</p>	<p>SAN SALVADOR. United Nations Information Centre 6a, 1 0a Calle Pte. No. 1833 y 35 Avenida Sur (Apartado Postal 2157) San Salvador, El Salvador Serving: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama</p>
	<p>NEW DELHI. United Nations Information Centre 55 Lodi Estate New Delhi 110003, India Serving: Bhutan, India</p>	

SANTIAGO. United Nations Information Service, Economic Commission for Latin America  
Edificio Naciones Unidas  
Avenida Dag Hammarskjöld  
(Casilla 179-D)  
Santiago, Chile  
Serving: Chile

SYDNEY. United Nations Information Centre  
National Mutual Centre  
44 Market Street (16th floor)  
(P. O. Box 4045, Sydney 2001, N. S. W.)  
Sydney 2000, N. S. W., Australia  
Serving: Australia, Fiji, New Zealand

TEHERAN. United Nations Information Centre  
Avenue Gandhi  
43 Street No. 3  
(P. O. Box 1555)  
Teheran, Iran  
Serving: Iran

TOKYO. United Nations Information Centre  
Shin Aoyama Building Nishikan (22nd floor)  
1-1 Minami Aoyama 1-chome,  
Mlnato-ku  
Tokyo 107, Japan  
Serving: Japan, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

TRIPOLI. United Nations Information Centre  
67-71 Turkiya Street  
(P. O. Box 358)  
Tripoli, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya  
Serving: Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

TUNIS. United Nations Information Centre  
61 Boulevard Bab-Benat  
(Boîte Postale 863)  
Tunis, Tunisia  
Serving: Tunisia

VIENNA. United Nations Information Service  
Vienna International Centre  
(P. O. Box 500)  
A-1400 Vienna, Austria  
Serving: Austria, Federal Republic of Germany

WASHINGTON, D. C. United Nations Information Centre  
2101 L Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20037, United States  
Serving: United States

YAOUNDE. United Nations Information Centre  
Immeuble Kamden  
Rue Joseph Clerc  
(Boîte Postale 836)  
Yaoundé, United Republic of Cameroon  
Serving: Central African Republic, Gabon, United Republic of Cameroon

## How to obtain previous volumes of the Yearbook

Volumes of the yearbook of the United Nations published previously may be obtained in many bookstores throughout the world and also from the Sales Section, United Nations, New York, N. Y. 10017. or from United Nations Publications, Palais des Nations, 1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland. Volumes listed below with an asterisk (\*) are special reprints of editions out of print.

Yearbook of the United Nations, 1980 Vol. 34. Sales No. E.83.I.1 \$72.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1963 Vol. 17. Sales No. 64.I.1 \$35.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1979 Vol. 33. Sales No. E.82.I.1 \$72.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1962 Vol. 16. Sales No. 63.I.1 \$35.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1978 Vol. 32. Sales No. E.80.I.1 \$60.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1961 Vol. 15. Sales No. 62.I.1 \$35.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1977 Vol. 31. Sales No. E.79.I.1 \$50.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1960 Vol. 14. Sales No. 81.I.1 \$35.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1976 Vol. 30. Sales No. E.78.I.1 \$42.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1959* Vol. 13. Sales No. 60.I.1 \$58.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1975 Vol. 29. Sales No. E.77.I.1 \$35.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1958 Vol. 12. Sales No. 59.I.1 \$35.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1974 Vol. 28. Sales No. E.76.I.1 \$35.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1957* Vol. 11. Sales No. 58.I.1 \$58.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973 Vol. 27. Sales No. E.75.I.1 \$35.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1958* Vol. 10. Sales No. 57.I.1 \$40.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1972 Vol. 26. Sales No. E.74.I.1 \$35.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1955* Vol. 9. Sales No. 56.I.20 \$40.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1971 Vol. 25. Sales No. E.73.I.1 \$35.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1954* Vol. 8. Sales No. 55.I.25 \$46.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1970* Vol. 24. Sales No. E.72.I.1 \$35.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1953* Vol. 7. Sales No. 54.I.15 \$50.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1969 Vol. 23. Sales No. E.71.I.1 \$35.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1952* Vol. 6. Sales No. 53.I.30 \$50.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1968 Vol. 22. Sales No. E.70.I.1 \$35.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1951* Vol. 5. Sales No. 52.I.30 \$50.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1967 Vol. 21. Sales No. E.68.I.1 \$35.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1950* Vol. 4. Sales No. 1951.I.24 \$75.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1966* Vol. 20. Sales No. E.67.I.1 \$50.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1948-49* Vol. 3. Sales No. 1950.I.11 \$75.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1985* Vol. 19. Sales No. 66.I.1 \$50.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1947-48 Vol. 2. Sales No. 1949.I.13 \$35.
Yearbook of the United Nations, 1964* Vol. 18. Sales No. 65.I.1 \$58.	Yearbook of the United Nations, 1948-47* Vol. 1. Sales No. 1947.I.18 \$75.

Yearbook Volumes 1-34 (1946-1980) are now also available in microfiche at the cost of US\$ 1,198.90 for silver halide or US\$ 1,041.15 for diazo duplication. Orders for microfiche sets should be sent either to the Sales Section, United Nations, New York, N. Y. 10017, or to United Nations Publications, Palais des Nations, 1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland.